

**Queenstown Lakes District Proposed District Plan  
Section 32 Evaluation Report**

For:

**Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone**

And consequential Variations to Proposed District Plan:

**Chapter 4 Urban Development**

**Chapter 25 Earthworks**

**Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development**

**Chapter 29 Transport**

**Chapter 31 Signs**

**Chapter 36 Noise**

**Report dated: 9 June 2022**

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## OUTLINE OF PROPOSAL

This variation is to introduce to the Proposed District Plan (PDP) a new zone (including a suite of objectives, policies and rules) to implement the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan. This variation also recommends associated variations to district wide PDP Chapters 4 and 27 to guide development of the new zone, and Chapters 25, 27, 29, 31 and 36 in respect of consequential amendments to recognise the new zone.

The proposal is for a new Special Purposes Zone, the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone, and to rezone the land from its current zoning (a mix of Rural, Rural Lifestyle and Large Lot Residential) under the PDP to this new urban zone. Development in the new zone will be governed by a Structure Plan to achieve:

- (a) Additional housing capacity of approximately 2400 residential units in primarily higher density typologies;
- (b) A range of open spaces, including a significant community recreational facility, to benefit the existing nearby communities as well as those to be accommodated in the new urban development;
- (c) Areas which provide for a range of commercial and service activities catering primarily to local needs;
- (d) Protection of key existing natural features including mature vegetation; and
- (e) Integrated transport and movement networks within and beyond the site, with a particular focus on achieving a significant mode shift to active and public transport.

The proposed provisions of the new Zone seek to strike a balance between providing flexibility of development design while providing clear expectations of anticipated outcomes and, where necessary, directing those outcomes. In summary, the proposed provisions provide for:

- (a) Subdivision that complies with the Structure Plan as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, with no minimum lot sizes;
- (b) A requirement to detail at subdivision stage the methods proposed to achieve a diversity of housing product and how the proposal will achieve the density standards of the Zone;
- (c) A requirement to achieve a specified residential density and avoid single, standalone residential units;
- (d) A requirement to undertake works relating to transport infrastructure prior to development occurring;
- (e) All buildings to require a resource consent to ensure control over matters of design;
- (f) Additional standards and assessment matters to achieve minimum levels of residential amenity and opportunities to assess sustainability and accessibility outcomes;
- (g) The introduction of maximum parking provisions to promote a shift to active and public transport modes.

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| OUTLINE OF PROPOSAL.....                                | 1  |
| 1. INTRODUCTION.....                                    | 3  |
| 1.1. PURPOSE OF REPORT.....                             | 3  |
| 2. BACKGROUND.....                                      | 3  |
| 2.1. PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENT.....                          | 3  |
| 2.2. MASTERPLAN PROCESS.....                            | 4  |
| 3. DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSAL.....                         | 5  |
| 3.1. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT.....                        | 5  |
| 3.2. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION.....                        | 7  |
| 3.3. CONSULTATION WITH IWI AUTHORITIES.....             | 8  |
| 3.4. CONSULTATION WITH STATUTORY BODIES.....            | 9  |
| 4. CURRENT STATE, ISSUES, AND DESIRED OUTCOMES.....     | 11 |
| 4.1. CURRENT STATE.....                                 | 11 |
| 4.2. ISSUES.....  | 13 |
| 4.3. OUTCOMES.....                                      | 16 |
| 5. BROAD OPTIONS CONSIDERED.....                        | 17 |
| 6. SCALE AND SIGNIFICANCE.....                          | 22 |
| 7. EVALUATION OF PROPOSED OBJECTIVES.....               | 23 |
| 8. EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, BENEFITS, COST, RISK..... | 64 |
| 9. CONCLUSIONS.....                                     | 72 |
| APPENDIX 1A - PROPOSAL.....                             | 1  |
| APPENDIX 2A - STATUTORY CONTEXT.....                    | 2  |
| APPENDIX 2A - STATUTORY CONTEXT.....                    | 3  |
| APPENDIX 2B - PLANNING CONTEXT.....                     | 14 |
| APPENDIX 3A – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.....                  | 44 |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

Section 32 of the Act requires objectives in plan change proposals to be examined for their appropriateness in achieving the purpose of the Act, and the policies and methods of those proposals to be examined for their efficiency, effectiveness and risk in achieving the objectives. Section 32 (s32) of the RMA is integral to ensuring transparent, robust decision-making on RMA plans and policy statements (proposals).

This report fulfils Council's obligations under section 32 of the Act. The analysis set out below (within sections 2 to 8) should be read together with the text of Appendix 1A.

The effects of new policies and rules on the community, the economy, and the environment need to be clearly identified and assessed as part of this evaluation. The analysis must be documented, so stakeholders and decision-makers can understand the reasoning behind policy proposals.

Section 32 requires that:

- new proposals must be examined for their appropriateness in achieving the purpose of the RMA, being the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;
- As part of considering appropriateness, the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects of implementing the new policies and rules need to be clearly identified and assessed;
- all advice received from iwi authorities and the response to the advice needs to be summarised; and
- the analysis must be documented, so stakeholders and decision-makers can understand the rationale for policy choices.

The full text of Section 32 can be found in Appendix 2A.

Addressing the issues set out below will result in a more appropriate regime of managing the effects of activities in TPLM and is consistent with achieving the purpose of the Act.

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1. PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENT

The TPLM corridor between Shotover River (Kimi-ākau) and Lake Hayes (Te Whaka-ata a Haki-te-kura) is an area of significance for many locals, often seen as a gateway into Queenstown. It is also an area of major strategic importance for Queenstown and the wider lakes district. This area was included in Stage 2 of the District Plan review, as part of the review of the zoning of the wider Wakatipu Basin.

The wider TPLM area has been developing incrementally since 1998, when Lake Hayes Estate was zoned to allow a large low-density residential subdivision (approximately 617 residential units). Along with the later approval of Shotover Country (approximately 884 residential units) the southern side of SH6 has become the largest residential population centre in the Wakatipu Basin.

More recently the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013 (HAASHA) and associated Special Housing Area (SHA) proposals have shaped the planning landscape. These proposals led to a significant residential area with capacity for over 2100 residential units, but with very little in the way of local facilities.

The area is set out in **Figure 1** below.



**Figure 1:** Showing plan change area, existing residential areas, and Shotover Bridge

In October 2017 Council agreed to incorporate a portion of Ladies Mile within its SHA Lead Policy. In early 2019, Council received three SHA proposals located in the TPLM area. These applications created a large amount of public interest due in part to the already congested SH6 corridor and Shotover Bridge and the timing of the application process coinciding with major road works at Quail Rise, and concerns regarding continued growth east of the Shotover River. More than 300 submissions on one proposal (the SHA known as “Laurel Hills” on the south side of State Highway 6) were made during the call for public feedback, with just three submissions predominantly in support of the proposals. Despite the SHAs being recommended for approval by QLDC staff, in April 2019 Council resolved not to recommend them to the Minister, with strong concerns expressed over transport and infrastructure issues<sup>1</sup>.

Following the decision not to support the SHA proposals, Council was presented with a report that identified potential options for the future of the TPLM area in May 2019<sup>2</sup>. Council resolved to:

*“Agree that Ladies Mile may be developed for urban purposes in the medium to long term and that a proactive Council led planning approach should be undertaken, taking into account the wide range of community, housing, recreation, transport, green space and infrastructure considerations on Ladies Mile and the surrounding area.”*

## 2.2. MASTERPLAN PROCESS

Following the Council resolution in May 2019, a report was commissioned to set the direction for development at TPLM<sup>3</sup>. The report recommended QLDC develop a Masterplan and plan change in parallel, and to establish the procurement process to undertake it.

In August 2020 a consultant team was engaged by Council, and a Project Working Group, Project Control Group and Political Sounding Board were set up to oversee the development of the project. From August to November, consultation with affected

<sup>1</sup> Meeting of the Queenstown Lakes District Council 18 April 2019 (links to items [1](#), [2](#) and [3](#))

<sup>2</sup> Minutes of the Meeting of Queenstown Lakes District Council on 30 May 2019 ([link](#))

<sup>3</sup> The Ladies Mile Te Pūhahi Masterplan Establishment Report ([link](#))

landowners and stakeholders was undertaken to inform the development of a number of draft Masterplan options. Over four days in November 2020, three options were made available to the public for their input via an online survey and through two public open day sessions held at Shotover Primary School.

The feedback received from this initial round of consultation identified traffic congestion as one of the main concerns of the community<sup>4</sup>. Following a Council-held public meeting on this issue in January 2021, further traffic modelling was commissioned in early 2021.

In April 2021, Council resolved<sup>5</sup> to notify a draft Masterplan, draft Transport Strategy and accompanying draft plan variation for public consultation (non-statutory) in April 2021. The consultation period ran for 20 working days. Two online surveys (one for the draft Masterplan and one for the draft planning provisions) were the primary method for collecting feedback, however feedback via email was also received.

The results of the community consultation period focused heavily on traffic congestion and the majority were in opposition to the draft Masterplan<sup>6</sup>. At a Council meeting on 29 July 2021, Council directed that further work be undertaken on the planning provisions and other methods to consider a staged zoning approach that restricted development until the necessary transport interventions are confirmed.

At a Council meeting on 28 October 2021<sup>7</sup>, Council resolved to adopt the draft Masterplan while noting the management and funding of stormwater, location of schools and ecological plan were yet to be resolved.

In June 2022, [placeholder for outcome of Council meeting]

### 3. DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSAL

#### 3.1. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The development of the Masterplan and associated planning provisions was governed by a Project Working Group which consisted of representatives from the following groups:

- The project team;
- Kainga Ora;
- Waka Kotahi (NZTA);
- Te Ao Marama;
- Aukaha;
- Council departments including Property and Infrastructure (Parks and Reserves, Infrastructure, Transport, and Community Services), Corporate Services, and Planning and Development.

This group meet fortnightly during the development of the Masterplan to give input and to discuss feedback received from other stakeholders.

Following the establishment of the Masterplan project in August 2020, initial meetings were held with all landowners (or their representatives) within the focus area to introduce the project and understand their aspirations with regards to their land. Following the revision and reduction of the focus area, engagement continued with those remaining landowners affected.

The following key feedback was received from stakeholders (summarised) during development of the proposal:

<sup>4</sup> Ladies Mile Te Pūhahi Community Engagement Summary Report dated 18 December 2020 ([link](#))

<sup>5</sup> Meeting of the Queenstown Lakes District Council 29 April 2021 ([link](#))

<sup>6</sup> Ladies Mile Te Pūhahi Consultation Summary Report dated 14 June 2021 ([link](#))

<sup>7</sup> Meeting of the Queenstown Lakes District Council 28 October 2021 (links to [item 2](#) and [minutes](#))

| Stakeholder                                | Feedback  | Comment   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Landowners within the proposed zone</b> | <p>Landowners were consulted through the development of the Masterplan and varied in their responses (received through verbal feedback via meetings and also through the public consultation periods). Overall, most landowners are open to urban development in this area, although the manner (particularly density) and the nature of the development (particularly the location of key elements such as schools and parks) as they relate to specific sites are not supported by some landowners.</p> <p>One centrally located landowner does not support urban development in this location, and has concerns about how future development on neighbouring properties will affect them and their business.</p> <p>With regards to feedback on the draft provisions in the consultation period of April 2021, some landowners were not supportive of strict density requirements (as being too high or too inflexible) and requirements to consult with adjoining landowners.</p> <p>Further landowner engagement took place over December 2021 and January 2022 with a revised set of draft planning provisions. Feedback received via this engagement was primarily in relation to density of development, setbacks from the State Highway, and site-specific provisions.</p> | <p>Landowner opposition tended to relate to where land was required for community purposes (such as for parks or stormwater management), which would necessarily affect the amount of land available for development. Overall, the development of the Masterplan sought to locate these key elements in the most appropriate place from a design perspective, rather than considering landholdings and this has been carried through to the key elements in the Structure Plan. While a consolidated stormwater management approach is still considered the preferred option (and will be further investigated for feasibility in a separate workstream) the opposition from landowners to showing these areas on the Structure Plan has been acknowledged and these areas removed.</p> <p>The plan provisions are enabling, not mandatory, so no landowner is forced to give effect to them. It is noted that the landowner that is concerned about the effects on their business is entitled to rely on their existing consents and existing use rights, and is the covenantor of a range of covenants, including no-complaints covenants affecting surrounding properties.</p> <p>The requirement for consultation with adjoining landowners was removed.</p> <p>Retesting of the practical implications of the density has been undertaken and the number of “heavy build” (i.e. greater than three storeys) typologies required to achieve the density standard was not excessive.</p> |
| <b>Waka Kotahi (NZTA)</b>                  | Waka Kotahi is generally supportive of the aims of the Masterplan in relation to effects on State Highway 6 subject   | The Ladies Mile Transport Strategy (Appendix 3A) sets out the vision for the transport network with the urban   |



| Stakeholder       | Feedback   | Comment  |
|-------------------|--|--|
|                   | to meeting mode shift targets <sup>8</sup> . Matters of interest raised by Waka Kotahi included development of the proposed intersections, crossings of the State Highway, and traffic generation on State Highway 6.  | development of the land, taking into account the existing residential communities of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country.<br>The Transport Strategy sets out the interventions that will be required to achieve the mode shift targets sought by Waka Kotahi and Way To Go, including both regulatory methods and interventions which are the responsibility of / require involvement with other organisations.                                 |
| <b>Way To Go</b>  | Way to Go is a partnership between Council, Waka Kotahi (NZTA) and Otago Regional Council to improve the transport network in the Wakatipu area <sup>9</sup> . The project team met regularly with Way To Go representatives during the development of the Masterplan. Way To Go is generally supportive of the urbanisation of this land subject to meeting mode shift targets. | Waka Kotahi representatives have been present at regular meetings held to discuss the planning provisions, and have provided written feedback which has been taken into account in the drafting.   |
| <b>Kainga Ora</b> | Kainga Ora representatives have been involved in the Masterplan process as a member of the Project Working Group. They also gave specific feedback on the planning provisions relating to design matters (particularly standards for residential buildings) of which they were generally supportive but noted some standards which they considered to be superfluous.            | The plan provisions seek to achieve a balance between providing a good level of residential amenity to future residents while still ensuring that developments can be undertaken in a cost-effective manner and therefore contribute to the provision of affordable housing. The feedback received in early stages of the development of the provisions, particularly on those provisions related to design matters, have been taken into account. |

### 3.2. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

An overview of the community consultation is set out at Section 2.2 above. In addition to those processes, a community information session was held at Shotover Primary School on 5 May 2021 (during the 20 working day feedback period), and included a half hour presentation of the key moves of the draft Masterplan and planning provisions, with attendees then breaking into smaller groups to consider the Masterplan by topic. The meeting was attended by approximately 110 members of the public. Questions were answered in a formal question-and-answer session, with attendees directed to the online surveys to submit their feedback.

Detailed summaries of the feedback received in April 2021 consultation period are available online<sup>10</sup>. Engagement was also undertaken with members of the project team and the Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country Community Association (LHESCCA) as a

<sup>8</sup> Waka Kotahi Position Statement (8 October 2020) summarised in Appendix E of the TPLM Transport Strategy dated March 2022 ([Appendix 3A](#))

<sup>9</sup> Way To Go investigations include the following projects: the Wakatipu Active Travel Network, Wakatipu Park & Ride Facilities, the Frankton Masterplan, and the Frankton to Queenstown business cases. The development of a QLDC Mode Shift Plan is currently underway.

<sup>10</sup> Masterplan feedback ([online form](#) and [email](#)) and planning provisions feedback ([online form](#) and [email](#))



representative of their members of the adjoining communities of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country. The key feedback from LHESSCA was that effects on traffic congestion are the main concern with residents.

Overall, the majority of feedback received in the April 2021 period was in opposition to the draft Masterplan, with concern focused on whether development was appropriate in this location and the impacts on traffic congestion in the area. Positive outcomes identified included the provision of additional facilities and open spaces.

The feedback on the draft planning provisions raised general concerns regarding the lack of flexibility in a number of key provisions and the impact that these may have on development outcomes.

As set out in Section 2.2 above, following the April 2021 consultation the Council directed that further work be undertaken on the planning provisions and other methods to consider a staged zoning approach that restricted development until the necessary transport interventions were confirmed. In response, revised detailed planning provisions (an objective, policy suite, and rules) were put forward to Council in October 2021<sup>11</sup> in conjunction with a range of non-planning mechanisms to be progressed via other methods (such as Business Cases).

The proposed provisions focused on:

- (a) Providing a range of activities, such as education, commercial and community facilities that will reduce the need for travel;
- (b) Encourage integration between Te Pūtahi – Ladies Mile and the existing residential communities by requiring safe crossing points across State Highway 6 and new road connections that will enable increased bus services;
- (c) Promoting public transport through residential densities, discouraging private vehicle ownership through limited car parking and requiring public transport related infrastructure to be in place prior to development;
- (d) Promotion of active travel, through limited car parking and requiring minimum cycle parking requirements;
- (e) Avoiding development where specific transport infrastructural works have not been completed, unless it can be demonstrated that development will avoid future and cumulative adverse effects from additional traffic movements, particularly at weekday daily peak periods, on State Highway 6; and
- (f) Requiring workplace and school travel plans through resource consents that will promote reliance on public and active transport and reduce private vehicle trips.

### 3.3. CONSULTATION WITH IWI AUTHORITIES

Clause 3(1)(d) of Schedule 1 of the RMA sets out the requirements for local authorities to consult with iwi authorities during the preparation of a proposed plan. Clause 4A requires the Council to provide a copy of a draft proposed plan to iwi authorities consulted, prior to notification, and have particular regard to any advice received.

Iwi representatives from Aukaha and Te Ao Marama Inc. have been closely involved in the development of the TPLM Masterplan throughout the design process<sup>12</sup>. As noted above at Section 3.1, representatives were members of the Project Working Group established by the Council to facilitate input from key stakeholders. This group meet fortnightly during the development of the Masterplan to give input and to discuss feedback received.

The iwi representatives provided the values framework of importance to runaka to be incorporated into the design of the Masterplan, which were in turn based on values provided

<sup>11</sup> Meeting of the Queenstown Lakes District Council 28 October 2021 ([link](#))

<sup>12</sup> Note that in addition to direct consultation on the plan variation, Kai Tahu is also a member of the Wahiora Grow Well Partnership, which developed the Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan. The Spatial Plan identifies the land subject to this plan variation as being within the Eastern Corridor Priority Development Area (Ladies Mile).

in relation to both the development of the Spatial Plan and those used by the Ministry of Education. These are set out in **Figure 1** below.

| Values Framework incorporated into the Te Pūtahi masterplan |                                |                              |  |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Values Framework  | Values                         | Description                  | Application  |
| MoE Values framework  | <a href="#">Whanaukataka</a>   | Family and community focused | Ensuring consideration of the social implications of decisions to enable community and whanau connections and growth   |
|   | <a href="#">Manaakitaka</a>    | Hospitality                  | Demonstrating behaviour that acknowledges the expression of aroha, hospitality, generosity and mutual respect  |
|   | <a href="#">Rakatirataka</a>   | Leadership                   | Ensuring the treaty partnership is recognised and mana whenua leadership is fully included throughout the decision making process  |
| Spatial Plan Values framework                               | <a href="#">Haere whakamua</a> | Future Focused               | Adopting a forward looking orientation with future generations in mind   |
|   | <a href="#">Tikaka</a>         | Appropriate Action           | Ensuring consideration of the appropriateness of decisions that will have a bearing on social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes   |
|   | <a href="#">Kaitiakitaka</a>   | Stewardship                  | Enabling the inherited responsibility and obligations of mana whenua to support and protect people, the environment, knowledge, culture, language and resources on behalf of future generations  |
|   | <a href="#">Mauri</a>          | Life Force                   | Recognises that water/streams have a life force that stems from time immemorial. There is a high duty for kaitiaki (and others) to maintain an intact and healthy mauri, a measure that recognises a river has a life and force ordained by greater powers than humans, and is not to be neglected |

*Figure 1: Values Framework gifted by iwi and incorporated into the design of the TPLM Masterplan*

The key resource management issue for iwi for the development of this land for urban purposes is stormwater management. Discharge to awa is to be avoided, and high levels of treatment and attenuation of stormwater are important to protect the mauri of the awa.

The key method for responding to the above values in the planning provisions has been through the Structure Plan and associated provisions. In addition, in direct response to feedback received on the draft provisions, the following have been included:

- The key values, including whanaukataka and haere whakamua, have been incorporated into the Zone's purpose statement;
- Additions to assessment matters indicating a preference for indigenous species from the ecological district to be utilised in landscaping; and
- The incorporation of a new policy in Chapter 4 (Policy 4.2.2.22) addressing the values established through the plan-making process.

### 3.4. CONSULTATION WITH STATUTORY BODIES

Clause 3(1) also requires local authorities to consult with (a) the Minister for the Environment; and (b) those other Ministers of the Crown who may be affected by the policy statement or plan; and (c) local authorities who may also be affected; and (e) any customary marine title group in the area, that may be affected by changes made to the District Plan.

[Placeholder for 3(1) consultation]

| Statutory Body | Feedback | Comment |
|----------------|----------|---------|
|----------------|----------|---------|

|                                     |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Ministry of Education</b>        | <p>The Ministry has been consulted with through the development of the Masterplan and has reviewed draft versions of the planning provisions as they relate to Education Activities. It provided feedback during the non-statutory process held in April/May 2021.</p> <p>The Ministry supports the location of the primary school as indicated on the Masterplan. It does not support the location of the high school as shown on the Masterplan, with its preferred site being on the south side of State Highway 6 at the Council-owned property of No. 516. The Ministry is supportive of the planning provisions (policy direction to enable, Restricted Discretionary activity status) for Education Activities within the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone.</p>   | <p>The use of No. 516 for a high school (either on its own or co-locating with community sports hub) was explored through the Masterplan design process and discounted due to lack of space (co-locating) and the need to locate schools closer to the denser areas of residential activity on the north side of State Highway 6.</p> <p>While the preferred school locations are shown in the Masterplan, the locations are not mandated through the planning provisions and therefore these are generally enabling of Education Activities across the Zone, recognising that other processes (including the land acquisition process and Notices of Requirement) will be involved and therefore maintaining flexibility for the establishment of schools in the Zone is key.</p> |
| <b>Otago Regional Council</b>       | <p>The regional council did not provide feedback at the non-statutory consultation process held in April/May 2021. Early consultation with policy staff on the development of this area for urban purposes was supported, with the recommendation that greater density was preferable, to ensure efficient use of the land and to safeguard other rural areas from development. The regional council was involved in the development of the Spatial Plan, which identified this land as part of the priority development area in the eastern corridor.</p> <p>The regional council was also represented on Way To Go (see above), and their staff were involved in going discussions regarding the implications of the Masterplanning process on the State Highway, particularly as it related to the public transport network, including bus level of service and routes.</p> | <p>The density of development has been carefully tested to achieve a balance between the maximum number of residential units to support the outcomes of the proposal and the most efficient use of the land, while recognising constraints arising from infrastructure (capacity of the state highway). Urban development at this location is consistent with the Spatial Plan, and therefore implements strategic growth developed with input from the regional council.</p>  |
| <b>Ministry for the Environment</b> | <p>Engagement with Ministry staff regarding the potential use of a Streamlined Planning Process for</p>  | <p>No changes to the proposal as a direct result of engagement.</p>  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | the variation was held in 2020 and 2021. Any feedback received from the Ministry did not directly relate to proposal. |  |
|--|---|--|

## 4. CURRENT STATE, ISSUES, AND DESIRED OUTCOMES

### 4.1. CURRENT STATE

The current state of the land includes outcomes from the following processes:

1. Planning history relating to SHA proposals;
2. Planning history relating to the District Plan review; and
3. Council strategic direction.

#### 4.1.1 Planning history relating to SHA proposals

The HAASHA legislation and associated Special Housing Area (SHA) proposals have contributed significantly to shaping the planning landscape in the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile area. In October 2014 the Council and Government entered into the Queenstown-Lakes District Housing Accord (the Housing Accord). The Housing Accord was intended to increase housing supply and improve housing affordability in the District by facilitating development of quality housing that meets the needs of the growing local population. A Lead Policy was developed under the Housing Accord, to identify appropriate areas for growth and affordability outcomes that proposals would need to achieve.

This Lead Policy included the approval of the Bridesdale SHA (SH150001 for approximately 136 residential units), the Queenstown Country Club SHA (SH160140 for 376 retirement units) and the Shotover Country SHA (SH160139 for 101 residential units) which was an extension to the zoned area of Shotover Country. Changes in zoning through the PDP also allows for an additional 119 residential units (although this is under appeal).

The Ladies Mile area south of State Highway 6 currently has capacity for approximately 2124 residential units which could result in around 5734 people living within the area. The approved SHAs have so far resulted in 50 properties being made available to the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust for affordable housing purposes in the wider Ladies Mile area.

In October 2017 the Council agreed to incorporate the northern part of Ladies Mile area into the Lead Policy. This included an Indicative Masterplan, to provide for intensive residential development with a small mixed-use area to maximise the yield of the land. This aligned with the then National Policy Statement – Urban Development Capacity 2016, which directed high growth Councils (including the QLDC) to provide sufficient urban development capacity to support housing and business growth, put greater emphasis on enabling change and development when making decisions about urban development, and ensure that planning processes facilitate urban development.

In April 2019 three SHA proposals for development within the Indicative Masterplan area, including two on the northern side of the state highway, were rejected by Council, primarily due to traffic concerns.

The Government decided not to extend the HAASHA legislation and repealed sections 16 and 17 from 19 September 2019, meaning no new SHAs can be established. Any future development in the area would therefore need to be considered via a resource consent application (and against the provisions of the underlying rural zoning) or be the subject of a private plan change application. Due to the large number of underlying titles and ownership and the existing underlying zoning, any such process would not be able to encompass the comprehensive and integrated development of a large area for urban development.

#### 4.1.2 District Plan Review

The Queenstown Lakes District Council is currently undertaking a review of its Operative District Plan in stages. Stage 1 was notified in 2015, Stage 2 was notified in 2017, and Stage 3 was notified in 2019. All stages are now in the appeal process. Further stages are expected to be notified in the future, to include land not yet reviewed.

The land subject to the Proposed Plan Variation was initially notified as Rural Zone in Stage 1 of the District Plan Review, with the western end adjacent to Lake Hayes subsequently varied as a result of the Wakatipu Basin variation in Stage 2 to Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone. The Stage 2 variation was initiated at the recommendation of the Independent Hearings Panel in Stage 1 to commission a Wakatipu Basin Land Use Study<sup>13</sup> (WBLUS) to identify a planning regime for the Wakatipu Basin.

The WBLUS was completed in 2017 and considered that additional urban scale development was appropriate in the Ladies Mile location, noting it had high capability to absorb additional development. To achieve urban development, the WBLUS recommended the inclusion of a Ladies Mile Gateway Precinct overlaid on top of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone. The Precinct anticipated low to medium density of housing (1:450m<sup>2</sup> and/or 1:250m<sup>2</sup>), subject to a 75m setback from State Highway 6 and all buildings requiring resource consent. It recommended a structure plan process to assess amenity, landscape and infrastructure issues at a granular exercise.

#### 4.1.3 Council Strategic Direction

The Council decision deliberately chose, at that time, not to move forward with the recommendations of WBLUS and did not identify the land as the Ladies Mile Gateway Precinct in the Wakatipu Basin variation. At that time, it was noted that anticipated that the area could be subject to future SHA applications under HAASHA, or a future detailed plan variation.

In the Wakatipu Basin, land that has a combination of attributes that make that land suitable for accommodating significant population growth, is scarce. These attributes include:

- (a) Physically suitable for development (topography, serviceability);
- (b) Adjacent or proximate to existing urban areas;
- (c) On or easily accessible to main transport corridors, and able to be developed in a way that promotes modal shift away from single car trips and towards public and active transport;
- (d) Able to be developed without compromising natural values, including, in particular, appreciation of the Wakatipu's outstanding natural landscapes and features;
- (e) Able to provide social amenities to serve the local population (existing and future).

Given that the TPLM land has all of these attributes, development of the land to the densities enabled by the operative PDP zonings would be an inefficient use of that land and a significant loss of opportunity for urban expansion to accommodate population growth.

This has been recognised by the strategic direction of the Council in:

- (a) Preparing the Ladies Mile Te Pūtahi Masterplan Establishment Report, which set the direction for the proposed Ladies Mile Masterplan and recommended the Council develop a Masterplan and plan change process in parallel;
- (b) Engaging consultants to prepare a masterplan and associated plan variation for the urban development of the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile land;

<sup>13</sup> Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study March 2017 ([link](#))

- (c) Promoting, in its Spatial Plan, the Ladies Mile area is identified as a future urban area and priority development area, as a new transit-oriented neighbourhood offering new housing choices.

## 4.2. ISSUES

The planning history summarised above has identified a number of specific matters that need to be responded to. These were summarised in the Ladies Mile Te Pūtahi Masterplan Establishment Report as follows:<sup>14</sup>

- (a) It is an area of significance to many locals.
- (b) It is considered by some to be part of the 'rural gateway' into Queenstown, and an area that demarks the rural and urban areas of the Wakatipu Basin.
- (c) There are currently capacity issues around the State Highway corridor and Shotover Bridge that runs through Ladies Mile.
- (d) Land ownership is fragmented.
- (e) There are existing issues around parking, community severance and a lack of community facilities serving existing nearby residential communities.
- (f) The current residential areas lack a sense of being a cohesive village, there are few facilities and services, so external trips need to be made to carry out everyday tasks.
- (g) Some of the Ladies Mile area is classed as highly productive land and consideration of the use of this land in the context of the District needs to be undertaken.

These have been distilled into four key resource management issues as set out in the table below.

| Key issues   | Summary  |
|--|--|
| <b>Issue 1 – Population growth and housing affordability</b> | <p>Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the District had been experiencing unprecedented levels of population, visitor, and economic growth. In the last two decades the District has become the most expensive place in New Zealand to live, while at the same time the population has more than doubled to approximately 42,000. Housing supply, choice and affordability have not kept up with this growth and as a result many residents struggle to find suitable and affordable homes.</p> <p>The Council's Change the Path<sup>15</sup> scenario (high growth) would see an additional 10,800 people in the district over the decade to 2030 (+27%) and an additional 36,000 by 2050 to reach 76,700 residents (+87%). The total dwelling projections based on these numbers can be converted to the following demand for dwellings increase:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 930 additional dwellings to reach 19,690 by 2023 (short term),</li> <li>b. 6,400 additional dwellings to reach 24,980 by 2030 (medium term); and</li> <li>c. 19,800 additional dwellings to reach 37,960 by 2050 (long term).</li> </ol> <p>The Housing Development Capacity Assessment 2021<sup>16</sup> (HCA) modelling indicates that housing demand is likely to change as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases in the number of older households, with those in the 60+ and above categories more than doubling over the medium to long</li> </ul> |

<sup>14</sup> Ladies Mile Te Pūtahi Masterplan Establishment Report, page 14

<sup>15</sup> QLDC Demand Projections July 2020 ([link](#))

<sup>16</sup> Housing Development Capacity Assessment 2021 Main Report ([link](#)) and Housing Development Capacity Assessment 2021 Technical Report ([link](#))



| Key issues   | Summary  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>term. Younger age groups (including children) start to make up only a relatively small proportion of the future population;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases in one person and couple householders, with one person and couple households accounting for around three-quarters of the total household growth in the medium term, and in the long term;</li> <li>• Lower and lower-middle income households are expected to account for a greater share of future housing demand (20% currently increasing to 25% long term).</li> </ul> <p>This analysis indicates that housing affordability is going to become progressively more important for non-owner households in the middle and later years, as lifetime earning potential reduces, and ability to access housing finance often reduces; and that these changes should translate into market supply, in theory, over the medium to long term, of dwelling types decreasing in both size and cost.</p> <p>The HCA finds that at a total urban environment level, there is sufficient development capacity (just) to meet projected long-term demand (inclusive of a margin). While housing numbers are increasing, housing affordability has been steadily decreasing, with the average median house price in the District increasing from \$873,469 in June 2017 to \$1,018,250 in March 2021. This is a significant issue for the District, as analysis shows that currently over 83% of our first-home buyer households and 37% of renters are spending more than 30% of their income on housing costs. These are at levels far higher than other parts of the country.</p> <p>The HCA finds that there is a current shortfall of housing in price bands below \$500,000 (-2,350 affordable dwellings in 2020 for first home buyers, with the majority of these households in rental accommodation). These housing affordability shortfalls are set to worsen if there are no interventions by 2050 to help first home buyers get into the housing market. Otherwise, there could be a shortfall of 6,960 affordable dwellings affecting dwelling value bands all the way up to \$1.19m.</p> <p>While the COVID-19 pandemic has created uncertainty about the future, the underlying drivers of demand to live in or visit the District remain, and growth is expected to return in due course. Current forecasts suggest the number of residents, visitors and jobs in the Queenstown Lakes are likely to grow slowly in the next few years as a result of the pandemic. Over a longer timeframe, growth is expected to accelerate.</p> |
| <p><b>Issue 2 – Safe and efficient functioning of the transportation network</b></p> | <p>Based on recent analysis, Council officials and Waka Kotahi have a shared view that the Shotover Bridge (refer to <b>Figure 1</b> above) has already reached its capacity in terms of numbers of vehicles that can travel across it without producing queues of traffic at certain times of the day, and that this would get worse with significant urban development in Ladies Mile if nothing else changed. It is also apparent that duplicating or replacing the Shotover Bridge in the short to medium term is highly uncertain as it is not currently funded or programmed for replacement.</p> <p>Both the Council and Waka Kotahi agree that the co-ordinated planning of the area is the optimum method for ensuring that supporting transportation infrastructure best meets the requirements of the area. This includes the incorporation of a range of land uses (specifically local amenity) to reduce the propensity for longer distance trips to be generated onto the transport</p>  |

| Key issues                                 | Summary   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>network. More specifically, the transportation challenges to growth in this part of the Wakatipu Basin can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) All essential community facilities on are located on the west side of Shotover Bridge;</li> <li>(b) Morning peak period has queues westbound from Shotover Bridge, but no queues in school holidays. Ministry of Education data indicates approximately 870 students reside east of Shotover Bridge and attend schools to the west. Approximately 19% of traffic on Shotover Bridge, westbound in the morning peak, is pupil drop-off only, along with 34% of traffic northbound on Stalker Rd and Howards Drive;</li> <li>(c) High car ownership rates (approximately 96% of households own at least 1 car) and high dependency on car trips - 78% of journeys to work are driving car alone<sup>17</sup>;</li> <li>(d) Low density housing does not provide the scale of demand to support viable public transport;</li> <li>(e) There are no bus priority measures, so bus passengers currently experience the same congestion as those travelling in private vehicles<sup>18</sup>;</li> <li>(f) There are existing network gaps and/or poor provision for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>(g) Rather than viewing the capacity of the bridge as preventing any further development in this area, the bridge can be seen as an opportunity to achieve changes of mode to public transport and active modes. Moving people from travelling in single occupant vehicles to other modes in response to congestion constraints is not uncommon around the world and can be done with a great deal of effort and investment. Given the growth of the district, this challenge needs to be tackled to ensure the transport network continues to perform.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Issue 3 – Efficient land use</b></p> | <p>Decisions on the zoning of this land were notified in both Stage 1 of the PDP review (for those parcels zoned Rural) and as part of the Stage 2 decisions in March 2019 as part of the Wakatipu Basin variation. Privately owned land was subsequently zoned Rural, Rural Lifestyle, Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, and Large Lot Residential A in response to submissions. Reserve land was zoned an Open Space zoning.</p> <p>In its recommendation to the Council on the zoning of this land, the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) IHP acknowledged that the land at issue would be appropriate for comprehensively planned urban development, but this was not an option open to it through the notified zoning or submissions received, and it resolved to zone the land for rural living purposes.</p> <p>The result of this decision was the ability for a large proportion of the TPLM area to be developed at a very low residential, resulting in a possible yield of approximately 20 sections in the Rural Lifestyle Zone and 99 sections in the Large Lot Residential Zone.</p> <p>Following the notification of decisions, it is now open to landowners (subject to applying for consent) to apply for complying development in accordance with this new zoning – i.e. in the order of 120 new dwellings.</p>  |

<sup>17</sup> Page 52, Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan Transport Strategy, March 2022

<sup>18</sup> Page 53, Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan Transport Strategy, March 2022

| Key issues   | Summary  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>In the Wakatipu Basin, land that has a combination of attributes that make that land suitable for accommodating significant population growth, is scarce. These attributes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Physically suitable for development (topography, serviceability);</li> <li>(b) Adjacent or proximate to existing urban areas;</li> <li>(c) On or easily accessible to main transport corridors, and able to be developed in a way that promotes modal shift away from single car trips and towards public and active transport;</li> <li>(d) Able to be developed without compromising natural values, including, in particular, appreciation of the Wakatipu's outstanding natural landscapes and features;</li> <li>(e) Able to provide social amenities to serve the local population (existing and future).</li> </ul> <p>Given that the TPLM land has all of these attributes, development of the land to the densities enabled by the current zonings would be an inefficient use of that land and a significant loss of opportunity for urban expansion to accommodate population growth.</p> |
| <p><b>Issue 4 – Existing satellite residential suburbs</b></p> | <p>Previous residential development in the area, namely Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country, have been developed largely as 'satellite' suburbs, where residential activity is the predominant activity and residents are currently required to travel outside their residential communities for opportunities for work, community facilities, schooling and day-to-day needs. Due to the limited public bus service that currently operates, this travel tends to be via private vehicle. While limited facilities exist (Shotover Primary School, Lake Hayes retail area, Kawarau Park) the lack of a high school, grocery retailer, and community facilities mean that vehicle trips are required outside the suburbs, particularly for those residents with children.</p>   |

### 4.3. OUTCOMES

Based on the resource management issues discussed above, in the context of urban growth in the Queenstown / Wakatipu Basin area, the following outcomes are apparent, for enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety, while addressing the matters in s5(2)(a) – (c) of the Act:

- (a) Additional land to accommodate significant population growth, in an area where land suitable for urban development is scarce;
- (b) Provision of housing choice, diversity and affordability;
- (c) Achieving a transport modal shift by promoting and facilitating better public transport options and bringing about a change in everyday travel behaviours;
- (d) Integration of new urban development with existing adjacent urban areas, and complementing these areas by providing new social infrastructure and amenities for the existing and future communities;
- (e) Recognition of key Kai Tahu values, including whanaukataka and haere whakamua, and avoiding discharge to awa; and
- (f) Ensuring that development respects nature conservation values including landscape and ecological values.

These outcomes inform the planning options for the TPLM land.

## 5. BROAD OPTIONS CONSIDERED

This section identifies and evaluates the broad options considered to address the issues and the needs addressed above.

The broad options considered are as follows:

- Option 1:** The status quo, comprising mostly of a mix of Rural and Rural Lifestyle Zones. This would see the existing PDP zonings retained.
- Option 2:** Rezone to a mix of existing PDP zones (including the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone, Medium Density Zone, and High Density Residential Zone). This would rezone the land and apply the existing provisions within these zones to the land.
- Option 3:** Rezone to a Special Zone within the Urban Growth Boundary. This would involve a new zone for urban purposes, including new location-specific objectives, policies and rules to address development, and shifting the current location of the UGB.
- Option 4:** Rezone to a Future Urban Zone/Deferred zoning. This would involve protecting the land for its current uses until such a time (either by specified date or circumstances) is reached in which the land can be rezoned for urban purposes.

The benefits and costs of each of the broad options are outlined in the table below.

| Option  | Benefits   | Costs   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Option 1:</b><br><b>The status quo.</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention of open space and ruralness when viewed from State Highway 6;</li> <li>• Maintenance of current landscape and amenity values;</li> <li>• Limited traffic generation due to limited development capacity;</li> <li>• Retention of productive land for rural purposes.</li> <li>• Retention of the existing Rural Lifestyle Zone, which is a sought-after density.</li> </ul>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would not significantly contribute to urban development capacity within the District (enabling approximately 120 residential units);</li> <li>• Fragmentation of the land may impede future intensification proposals when implementing the Spatial Plan strategic growth at a later date;</li> <li>• Limited amount of housing enabled would unlikely be affordable due to large land area required by zoning and high land values;</li> <li>• Potential for ad-hoc development through promotion of individual resource consents or private plan change;</li> <li>• Inefficient use of land resources;</li> <li>• Potential for other, more valuable, areas of productive land to be lost as a result of expansion elsewhere;</li> <li>• Failure to reflect the findings of the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Study which finds the site has high potential to absorb development;</li> <li>• Would not provide for social infrastructure and amenities that would benefit existing nearby residential areas.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Option 2:</b><br><b>Rezone to existing PDP zones</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides for increased development capacity and housing choice for residents;</li> <li>• Reflects the findings of the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Study that the landscape is capable of absorbing urban development;</li> <li>• Contributes to the District's economy through significant construction projects;</li> <li>• Would not add to the length or complexity of the PDP.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape change from rural to urban in nature;</li> <li>• Would add significant complexity and repetition to the existing PDP Chapters to insert location-specific provisions that address the resource management issues that are specific to this location;</li> <li>• Potential for missed opportunities for more intensification and the benefits of intensification including reaching a critical mass of population to enhance the viability of public transport and social infrastructure, and hence would not achieve a transport modal shift;</li> </ul>   |

| Option   | Benefits   | Costs   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for key features or development targets to be lost through the application of generic provisions</li> <li>• Would not provide for social amenities such as a local or town centre;</li> <li>• Potential for key features or development targets to be lost through the application of generic provisions.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Option 3: Rezone to a Special Zone</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would enable a comprehensive, co-ordinated, master-planned urban development that takes into account and integrates with landscape values, ecological values, and existing suburban development, and based on a comprehensive analysis of appropriate locations of infrastructure, community facilities and social amenities, and residential development</li> <li>• Would enable the retention of identified key features, such as specimen trees, and would ensure the protection and establishment of key development targets;</li> <li>• Provides for significant increase in development capacity and housing choice for residents but able to be reflective of infrastructure constraints where these exist;</li> <li>• Contributes to the District's economy through significant construction projects and by enabling a range of non-residential activities to support the primary residential purpose of the Zone;</li> <li>• Allows for efficient use of the land and reflects the findings of the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Study;</li> <li>• Provides certainty that urban development will occur and creates urgency in responding to the transport issues including the need for physical transportation works and other non-regulatory actions;</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape change from rural to urban in nature;</li> <li>• Added plan complexity / length through the inclusion of a new chapter and subsequent amendments to existing chapters.</li> </ul>  |



| Option   | Benefits   | Costs  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of a specific suite of provisions provides greater strength for the Council to consider the location-specific issues for this land;</li> <li>• Ability to utilise elements of a deferred zoning by incorporating actions to be undertaken prior to development occurring, but retaining the certainty and urgency that rezoning the land to urban now immediately provides;</li> <li>• Ability to cross reference to existing provisions in the PDP as needed, to reduce repetition and the length of the plan;</li> <li>• Would meet the requirements of the Zone Framework Standard of the National Planning Standards for Special Purpose Zones (see Appendix 2A for this assessment).</li> </ul>  |  |
| <p><b>Option 4: Rezone to a Future Urban Zone/ Deferred zoning</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would prevent any development of the land that would impede future urban development, by essentially sterilising the land from development until such time as a plan change is initiated in accordance with strategic provisions detailing how a plan change to urban zoning is to occur without affecting the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.</li> <li>• If applying the zoning from a specified future date, this option would provide certainty by giving transport-related agencies a timeframe for which to prepare for urban development at this location.</li> <li>• If applying the zoning on the implementation of a particular action or actions including for example the completion of transport infrastructure, this option would provide certainty by ensuring transport solutions are achieved prior to urban development occurring.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant delay in achieving the development of the land for urban purposes, and the flow-on effects that this would have for accommodating population growth.</li> <li>• Lack of certainty regarding the timeframe for achieving urban development.</li> <li>• Would require two plan changes: one to apply the Future Urban Zone to hold the land in its current state, and another to achieve the urban zoning strategically signalled through the Spatial Plan.</li> <li>• Where the zoning was deferred to a particular future date, this would not provide certainty that solutions to transport issues had been found and implemented prior to this time.</li> <li>• Where the zoning was deferred until a particular action or actions had occurred and where this involved third party agencies (for physical transportation works and other non-regulatory actions (including, for example, bus routes and bus frequencies), delaying the effect of the provisions until such actions had been undertaken would:</li> </ul> |

| Option | Benefits | Costs  |
|--------|----------|--|
|        |          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create uncertainty about whether the rezoning would occur; and</li> <li>- place the control of whether the rezoning would occur or not, and the timing of it, on outside agencies.</li> <li>• Where the zoning was deferred until a particular action or actions had occurred, difficulties in mobilising outside agencies where there is no certainty of urban development occurring in the near future.</li> <li>• The delay would potentially enable ad hoc development and fragmentation to occur in the interim before the provisions come into effect, potentially losing the ability to implement the co-ordinated master-planned urbanisation of the area.</li> </ul> |

Overall, from the costs and benefits identified above, the options are ranked as follows:

- Rank 1:** Option 3: Rezone to a Special Zone for urban purposes with location-specific provisions.
- Rank 2:** Option 4: Future Urban Zone/Deferred zoning.
- Rank 3:** Option 2: Rezone to a mix of existing PDP zones.
- Rank 4:** Option 1: Status quo.

The preferred option is therefore **Option 3**.

## 6. SCALE AND SIGNIFICANCE

The level of detailed analysis undertaken for the evaluation of the proposed objectives and provisions has been determined by an assessment of the scale and significance of the implementation of the proposed provisions. In making this assessment, regard has been had to the following, namely whether the proposed objectives and provisions:

- (a) Result in a significant variance from the existing baseline in the existing PDP provisions.
- (b) Have effects on matters of national importance.
- (c) Adversely affect those with specific interests.
- (d) Involve effects that have been considered implicitly or explicitly by higher order documents.
- (e) Impose increased costs or restrictions on individuals, communities or businesses.

The level of detail in this evaluation report corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

In this case, the scale and significance is considered to be moderate-high because the proposed TPLM Zone contains resources of strategic importance to the District. Many elements build on existing approaches in the PDP, but the variation represents a significant change to the status quo and there is a significant change in policy direction from the status quo for the enablement of urban development on this land.

The existing PDP residential and town centre provisions (Chapters 7-9 and 11-13) have been used as a base for the revised provisions, with the most notable changes within the proposed rules being those relating to the staging of development with infrastructure and those relating to density and typology of residential development. The objectives and policies have been drafted to provide clarity regarding the desired environmental outcomes as identified in Section 4.5 above.

The format and structure of the PDP has not been continued in relation to the new TPLM Zone, rather the structure has been developed to be in accordance with the National Planning Standards (first set) 2019. The results in a departure from the PDP, particularly the way in which activities and standards are grouped. While a departure from the current PDP format, it is consistent with national direction and the remainder of the PDP will be required to implement the National Planning Standards in accordance with the statutory timeframes of that document, therefore the proposed new Zone and the remainder of the PDP will be consistent in due course.

The proposed amendments to other PDP chapters as a result of the inclusion of the new TPLM Zone have remained in the PDP format, with these to be converted to the National Planning Standards in due course.

The assessment that follows takes account of the low/moderate/high scales and significance by considering the proposed objectives against the status quo and an alternative. Each of these three options are then considered against the following:

- (a) Their consistency with the strategic provisions of the PDP;
- (b) The extent to which they address the resource management issues identified in Section 4.2 above;
- (c) The extent to which they support the Council in undertaking its functions under s31;
- (d) The extent to which they give effect to the relevant national and regional documents;
- (e) The extent to which they are consistent with tāngata whenua values and identified community outcomes;

- (f) The extent to which they guide decision making and which they meet best practice for objectives;
- (g) Whether they will or will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community or parts of the community;
- (h) Whether they represent an unacceptable level of uncertainty and risk; and
- (i) The extent to which they are realistically able to be achieved.

## 7. EVALUATION OF PROPOSED OBJECTIVES

Section 32(1)(a) requires an examination of the extent to which the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. The purpose of the Act is the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, as set out in section 5.

There are two parts to the assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives of this proposal:

1. The objectives have been assessed against the strategic objectives and policies of the PDP, which themselves achieve the purpose of the Act.
2. The objectives have been assessed for their relevance, usefulness, reasonableness and achievability for achieving sustainable management, compared to the status quo and alternative objectives.

These two assessments are summarised below in the following tables. Note that objectives have been grouped according to theme where possible.

|  |   |                |
|--|---|----------------|
| <b>Proposed Objective 27.2.24:</b>   |   |                |
| <b>Objective – Urban development comprising a mix of medium and high density housing, commercial centres, schools, parks and open spaces for active and informal recreation, and a network of walkways and cycleways, that:</b>  |   |                |
| a) complements and integrates with existing urban development and the surrounding landscapes; and  |   |                |
| b) brings about a significant modal shift away from reliance on the private car to enhanced use of public and active transport and creates a community with a strong sense of place.   |   |                |
| <b>Proposed Objective 49.2.1:</b>  |   |                |
| <b>Objective – Development complements and integrates with adjoining urban development at Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile and development south of State Highway 6.</b>  |   |                |
| <b>General intent:</b>   |   |                |
| Objective 27.2.24 identifies the key activities anticipated within the TPLM Structure Plan area, including medium and high density residential activity, commercial activities, community activities and educational facilities. The objective sets clear goals for the outcome of development in this area. Similarly, Objective 49.2.1 requires that development outcomes result in an urban area that integrates with existing development, both urban and rural-residential. |   |                |
| <b>Alternative</b>   |   |                |
| Status quo: Retention of existing rural / rural lifestyle zonings and associated provisions  |   |                |
| Alternative: Use of existing residential zonings and associated provisions   |   |                |
| <b>Other relevant objectives in the Plan:</b>  |   |                |
| Objective 27.2.1<br>Objective 27.2.2<br>Objective 27.2.4<br>Objective 27.2.5   | These objectives in Chapter 27 also seek to ensure development (through subdivision) achieves quality outcomes throughout the District, such as ensuring quality environments, providing benefits for all, incorporating and enhancing existing features and values, and the provision of infrastructure. |                |
| <b>Assessment against the Strategic Chapters of the PDP</b>  |   |                |
| <b>Applicable provision</b>  | <b>Consistent?</b>  | <b>Comment</b> |
| <b>3. Strategic Direction</b>  |   |                |

|                           |     |  |
|---------------------------|-----|--|
| SO 3.2.1                  | Yes | The provision of additional housing and contribution to the local economy through construction activities during development and the ongoing operations of the proposed commercial areas.  |
| SO 3.2.2                  | Yes | The objectives provide for urban development in an appropriate location and contributes to the strategic and integrated management of urban growth in the District. The objective provides for integration of the new Zone with existing urban areas, with shared roading and servicing, and open space connections.   |
| SO 3.2.2.1                | Yes | Urban development will be logical, as the objectives ensure: a compact, well design urban form that integrates with the adjoining urban areas to the south; complementing the existing urban areas west of the Shotover River; a desirable, healthy and safe place is achieved in a manner which minimises natural hazard and climate change risks; development is not sporadic or sprawling by adjoining existing urban areas in a compact area within a proposed UGB; the provision of a mix of housing opportunities at the higher end of the density spectrum; a high quality network of open spaces and integration with existing and planned infrastructure. |
| SO 3.2.3                  | Yes | The objectives provide for a quality built environment that takes into account the character of the wider area, particularly the importance of the wider views of the Remarkables and Slope Hill in particularly, while recognising that the urban development of this land will necessarily result in changes to the natural character.   |
| SO 3.2.4 and SO 3.2.4.1   | Yes | The objectives protect the natural environment through reflecting the spatial planning and sensitive design undertaken during the Masterplanning process, reflected through the provisions, to maintain the values of nearby waterways (Lake Hayes and Shotover River) and their associated ecosystems.  |
| SO 3.2.4.3 and SO 3.2.4.4 | Yes | The objectives preserve and enhance the nature conservation values of lakes, rivers and wetlands by sensitively locating new urban development and managing potential impacts on those values.   |
| SO 3.2.4.5                | Yes | The objectives support public access to the margins of waterbodies by providing for connections to existing trails.  |
| SO 3.2.5 and SO 3.2.5.6   | Yes | The location can absorb the development in the form proposed in a manner which supports the retention of views of the distinctive landscapes of the Remarkables and Slope Hill.  |
| SO 3.2.6                  | Yes | The objectives contribute to peoples' and communities' wellbeing by providing for housing and related amenities in an area where development can be absorbed.  |
| SP 3.3.14 and SP 3.3.15   | Yes | The proposal includes the extension of the existing Urban Growth Boundary at Shotover Country/Lake Hayes Estate around the TPLM Zone, and provisions to enable the urban development of this land. Land outside the UGB would remain as per the status quo.  |



|   |     |   |
|---|-----|---|
| SP 3.3.20                                       | Yes | The objectives protect the natural environment through reflecting the spatial planning and sensitive design undertaken during the Masterplanning process, reflected through the provisions, to maintain the values of nearby waterways (Lake Hayes and Shotover River) and their associated ecosystems.   |
| SP 3.3.31                                       | Yes | The location can absorb the development in the form proposed in a manner which supports the retention of views of the distinctive landscapes of the Remarkables and Slope Hill.   |
| <b>4. Urban Development</b>                     |     |   |
| Objective 4.2.1<br>Policies 4.2.11 –<br>4.2.1.6 | Yes | <p>The TPLM Zone will be incorporated into the extension of the existing adjacent UGB to provide a distinct and defensible urban edge to the contained urban development within the Zone. The UGB contains development capacity and urban opportunities to contribute to meeting anticipated demand for urban development in the Wakatipu Basin, particularly in the affordable housing area, in a manner that contributes to ensuring there is sufficient plan-enabled capacity and supply of housing typologies that meet demand through appropriate urban zoning. It requires development to be undertaken in a strategic and comprehensive manner consistent with the spatial planning work that has been completed to ensure a compact and efficient urban form which takes into account the constraints, particularly on infrastructure, at this location.</p> <p>The implementation of the objectives will result in a minor loss of productive potential of this land, however the efficient use of this land for urban purposes will support the protection of other land with productive potential. The objectives are consistent with the identification of this land as part of the eastern corridor priority area for future growth in the Spatial Plan (noting that the Spatial Plan is not a plan prepared under the NPS-UDC or its successor the NPS-UD). Particular regard has been had to the open space values of this area through the considered location of open spaces areas, and the setback of development from the State Highway.</p> |
| Policy 4.2.2.2                                  | Yes | The TPLM Zone Structure Plan allocates land in areas that are reflective of the appropriate land use, particularly as they relate to connectivity and integration within the new TPLM development, with existing development, and by convenient linkages with public transport.   |
| Policy 4.2.2.4                                  | Yes | The TPLM Zone Structure Plan ensures the provision of its own recreation spaces and linkages as well as connections to existing ones.   |
| Policy 4.2.2.5                                  | Yes | This is achieved through the Structure Plan design that takes into account infrastructure, street, linkages and open space location and design.   |
| Policy 4.2.2.13                                 | Yes | The UGB is defined on the planning maps and expands the existing urban areas of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country while avoiding the Outstanding Nature Feature of Slope Hill.   |
| <b>5. Tangata Whenua</b>                        |     |   |

|  |     |   |
|--|-----|---|
| Objective 5.3.1<br>Policies 5.3.1.1 –<br>5.3.1.2 | Yes | The spatial planning work that preceded and supported the plan variation was undertaken in consultation with tāngata whenua. Tāngata whenua feedback has been incorporated into the provisions.   |
| <b>6. Landscapes – Rural Character</b>           |     |   |
| Policy 6.3.1.3                                   | Yes | The majority of the land affected is located within the Rural Residential Zone, therefore the landscape categories do not apply.  |
| Policy 6.3.2.6                                   | Yes | The objectives are consistent with the support and encouragement of development to promote indigenous biodiversity regeneration, through the spatial planning work undertaken in relation to open spaces and onsite stormwater management. The objectives will necessarily result in the retirement of farm land. |
| Policy 6.3.2.7                                   | Yes | The land is in proximity to the Slope Hill Outstanding Natural Feature. The land within the Zone has been allocated into uses and managed to ensure that views of Slope Hill are retained.  |
| Policy 6.3.4.9                                   | Yes | The spatial planning response includes the setback of development from the State Highway to support the retention of views and a sense of openness when arriving from the east.   |

| Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1   | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Relevance:</b>   |  |  |  |
| Addresses a relevant resource management issue<br>[these issues are set out at Section 4.2 above] | <p>The objective addresses the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The objective provides for medium and high density housing, supporting population growth and affordable housing goals;</li> <li>Issue 2: The objectives seek a modal shift to public and active transport to reduce effects on the efficiency of the transport network;</li> <li>Issue 3: The objectives seek medium and high residential density in conjunction with a range</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo addresses the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The status quo addresses population growth in a very limited way, by providing for approximately 120 additional residential units, however these would unlikely be affordable housing due to the large lot areas required by the zonings;</li> <li>Issue 2: The status quo somewhat addresses the efficiency of the transport network by limiting the development (and therefore</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative would address the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The alternative would go some way to addressing Issue 1 by providing housing in accordance with the density standards of the Residential Zones;</li> <li>Issue 2: The alternative fails to address Issue 2 as it would enable a significant level of traffic generation with no way to address alternative modes or improvements to infrastructure;</li> </ul> |

| Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1                            | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>of facilities and activities to support an independent community in that location;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 4: The objectives seek integration with existing urban development to ensure the use of the range of facilities and activities is available to existing communities that do not currently have access to such facilities without travel to other urban areas.</li> </ul>            | <p>additional traffic generation) on this land but does not address alternative modes or improvements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 3: The status quo fails to address Issue 3 as it would retain the inefficient use of this land by providing very limited residential supply and no other facilities (which could not be justified on the basis of such a limited population);</li> <li>Issue 4: The status quo fails to address Issue 4 as facilities for community purposes, employment, education or day to day needs of residents are not provided for.</li> </ul>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 3: The alternative somewhat addresses Issue 3 as it would enable more efficient use of the land for residential activity than the status quo, but would not provide as efficient as use as the proposed objective and does not provide for other compatible and efficient land uses in any meaningful way;</li> <li>Issue 4: The alternative fails to address Issue 4 as facilities for community purposes, employment, education or day to day needs of residents are not provided for, or only in a very limited way.</li> </ul> |
| Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 | <p>The proposed objectives assist the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They manage the effects of the development of land for urban purposes in an integrated manner;</li> <li>They do the above while contributing in a meaningful way to the development capacity in respect of housing and the efficient use of the TPLM land.</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It manages some effects of the development of land however it does not specifically require development be integrated and would result in very low density development of a rural / rural residential nature which would result in inefficient use of land that is suitable for urban expansion;</li> <li>It would contribute to residential development capacity in only a very limited way, and would not contribute to the efficient use of the</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It manages some effects of the development of land however it does not specifically require development be integrated and could result in ad hoc development without specific provision to manage the particular resource management issues relevant in this location;</li> <li>It does the above while contributing somewhat to the development capacity in respect of housing, but only very limited activities that</li> </ul> |

| Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1                 | Preferred objective   | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|---|---|--|---|
|   |   | <p>TPLM land by failing to provide for any activities that might support the existing urban communities beyond rural or rural residential.</p>   | <p>might support the proposed and existing communities.</p>   |
| <p>Gives effect to higher order documents</p> | <p>The proposed objectives give effect to higher level documents as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They coordinate urban development with efficient use of land for a variety of activities while integrating with adjoining environments (PORPS19, Objective 4.5);</li> <li>• They will give effect to the significant amount of strategic planning that has been undertaken by the Council (through both the Spatial Plan and Masterplan processes) in a manner which provides for significant development capacity particularly as it relates to typologies that are more likely to be affordable (PRPS21, UFD-O3, UFD-P1, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• They will support improvements in housing affordability by providing additional land-intensive development to the market and provide benefits of urban development that are consistent with a well-functioning urban development such as a range of</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo does not give effect to the higher order documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It does not provide an efficient use of land, taking into account the various attributes of the subject land that make it more suitable for urban development than other locations (PORPS19, Policy 4.5.1)</li> <li>• It will result in inefficient and sporadic patterns of settlement and residential growth by enabling only very limited residential activity adjacent to existing urban development and would not extend to considering or improving existing residential areas through improved services and facilities available to these communities (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P1, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• It does not support improvements in housing affordability by retaining the land for the development only of large residential land-holdings and would not reflect the strategic planning that has been undertaken to date (NPS-UD, Objective 2, Policy 6).</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative generally gives greater effect to higher level documents than the status quo, although to a lesser extent than the proposed objectives, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides for urban development in a manner which provides for some efficiencies in terms of housing, but would be limited in the ability to ensure the urban development was integrated with adjoining environments (PORPS19, Objective 4.5);</li> <li>• It would enable some housing capacity and therefore go some way to providing for efficient land use, but would not extend to considering or improving existing residential areas through improved services and facilities available to these communities (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P1, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• It goes some way to supporting improvements in housing affordability by enabling residential development at an urban scale but would not reflect the strategic planning that has been undertaken</li> </ul> |

| Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1                                    | Preferred objective   | Status quo  | Alternative  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  | services, activities, and travel modes (NPS-UD, Objective 2, Policy 6).   |   | during the TPLM Masterplanning process (NPS-UD, Objective 2, Policy 6).  |
| Consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes | <p>No identified tāngata whenua values are affected in relation to these objectives.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that urban development on this land, particularly the resultant potential for an increase in congestions/delays on State Highway 6, and the loss of the current amenity levels, are key community concerns.</p> <p>The proposed objectives are consistent with the community outcomes to the extent reasonably practicable when enabling urban development in a location that is currently rural / rural-residential.</p> | <p>No identified tāngata whenua values are affected.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that urban development on this land, particularly the resultant potential for an increase in congestions/delays on State Highway 6, and the loss of the current amenity levels, are key community concerns.</p> <p>The status quo is consistent with the community outcomes sought.</p> | <p>No identified tāngata whenua values are affected.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that urban development on this land, particularly the resultant potential for an increase in congestions/delays on State Highway 6, and the loss of the current amenity levels, are key community concerns.</p> <p>The alternative is less consistent with the community outcomes sought than both the proposed objectives and the status quo as it would result in traffic generation and amenity effects without any benefits to the existing communities.</p> |
| <b>Usefulness:</b>   |   |   |  |
| Guides decision-making   | The proposed objective guides decision-making by providing a clear and directive outcome for the resultant urban development and would support greater consistency in decision-making on applications.  | The status quo provides guidance to decision-makers on how to develop the land for rural / rural residential purposes, but would provide no guidance on the manner in which the land should be developed for urban purposes. Given the context and history of the subject land, there is a risk that applications could seek greater intensity than that enabled as of right under the status quo but without the         | The alternative provides limited guidance on how urban development should be achieved – this would be limited to applying zoning(s), which could then be implemented as a permitted activity subject to any standards. Given the context and history of the subject land, there is a risk that applications could seek greater intensity than that enabled as of right under the alternative but without the   |

| Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1  | Preferred objective   | Status quo  | Alternative   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  |   | ability (given the objectives of the status quo) to consider or require a comprehensive and strategic response to development in this area.   | ability (given the objectives of the alternative) to consider or require a comprehensive and strategic response to development in this area.  |
| Meets best practice for objectives   | <p>The proposed objectives are consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are outcome focused, by stating the goal for integration and strategic development, while being tailored to the TPLM environment;</li> <li>• They are specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate compliance with strategic planning that has been undertaken;</li> <li>• Relate directly to identified issues;</li> <li>• Use consistent terminology (in terms of the proposed new zone); and</li> <li>• Are capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo is generally consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal (to provide only for limited activities (rural, or rural and residential));</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to meet the outcome;</li> <li>• Relates to an issue (Issue 2), but only due to not addressing any of the other issues relating to housing or efficient land use;</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative is generally consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal (to provide for residential activity and other small-scale activities consistent with the amenity provided for);</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate that it will meet the outcome;</li> <li>• Relates directly to an issue (Issue 1) but to a lesser extent than the proposed objectives and in a manner which has the potential to adversely affect other issues (e.g. Issue 2);</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Reasonableness:</b>   |   |   |   |
| Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community / parts of the community | The proposed objectives impose a cost on part of the community, namely the developers of the land, to comply with the strategic planning already undertaken by way of the development   | The status quo imposes a cost on the community as a whole, by limiting use of the subject land to rural and rural residential purposes when its attributes make it suitable for urban development that could provide significant housing capacity and supporting activities to  | The alternative imposes a cost on the community as a whole, by enabling the land to be used for urban development but in an ad hoc manner. While this would contribute to the housing supply/cost issues currently faced by the community, this would be  |

| Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1                   | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | <p>of the Structure Plan (in turn based on the masterplanning work undertaken).</p> <p>This cost is justifiable given developers will directly benefit from the change of zoning, and is offset by the ability to undertake urban development, notwithstanding that they must develop according to the strategic planning work already undertaken.</p> <p>The proposed objectives impose an intangible cost from the urbanisation of rural and rural lifestyle land and the resulting loss of rural and rural lifestyle character. This cost is justifiable given the more prevailing need for further land for urban development to accommodate population growth and promote affordable housing.</p> | <p>service new and existing residential areas.</p>   | <p>counterbalanced by the costs of lack of strategic planning including lack of supporting activities/ facilities and additional traffic generation.</p> <p>The alternative would impose an intangible cost from the urbanisation of rural and rural lifestyle land and the resulting loss of rural and rural lifestyle character. This cost is justifiable given the more prevailing need for further land for urban development to accommodate population growth and promote affordable housing.</p> |
| <p>Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk</p> | <p>The proposed objectives rely on landowners / developers to implement the zoning. There is a risk that if they choose not to give effect to the activities and development enabled (for example, by retaining the current land use), the outcomes of the objectives will not occur.</p>  | <p>There is a level of uncertainty in the status quo due to the lack of guidance for decision-makers in managing or declining development proposals that differs from that sought via the status quo objectives. However, there is a risk that development proceeds on an individual property / case-by-case basis, meaning the ability to achieve a comprehensive and strategically planned development across the wider area would be compromised.</p> | <p>There is a level of uncertainty in the alternative in that it relies on landowners / developers to implement the zoning. There is a risk that if they choose not to give effect to the residential activity enabled there would be no benefits to the housing supply market. Conversely, applications that do not comply with the alternative standards would be considered on a case-by-case basis, meaning the ability to achieve a comprehensive and strategically planned development</p>       |



| Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1   | Preferred objective   | Status quo  | Alternative  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   |   |   | across the wider area could be compromised.  |
| <b>Achievability:</b>   |   |   |  |
| Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources                       | The proposed objectives are capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to include policies and methods that ensure future development reflects the strategic planning work that has already been undertaken.  | The status quo is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to manage development of rural / rural residential activity, however the ability of Council to manage the effects of, or decline, proposals for urban development in this location will be considered on a case-by-case basis, meaning the ability to achieve a comprehensive and strategically planned development across the wider area would be comparatively weak.   | The alternative is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to impose standards relating to the development of residential activity. However, there is a risk that development proceeds on an individual property / case-by-case basis, meaning the ability to achieve a comprehensive and strategically planned development across the wider area would be comparatively weak.  |
| <b>Conclusion</b>   |   |   |  |
| <i>The extent to which the objectives achieves / is neutral / fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA</i> | The proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because they enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being by enabling efficient urban growth in an integrated, cohesive and strategic manner with a specific response to the specific issues for the TPLM location. | The status quo is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objectives. It provides little in the way of a meaningful contribution to Plan-enabled residential capacity. The status quo would not address the community outcomes sought for TPLM in that it would not enable urban development, and it would fail to address any of the resource management issues. | The alternative is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objectives. While it provides for some Plan-enabled capacity it does not require development to be comprehensive and could therefore result in a less efficient use of the land than the proposed objectives. As the alternative has been drafted to address various locations district-wide rather than targeting the specific issues affecting TPLM, it does not specifically |

| Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 | Preferred objective | Status quo | Alternative                                     |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------|---|
|                               |                     |            | address the community outcomes sought for TPLM. |
| <b>Ranking</b>                | <b>1</b>            | <b>3</b>   | <b>2</b>  |

**Overall conclusion:** The proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 32(1)(a).

|   |                    |   |
|---|--------------------|---|
| <b>Proposed objective 49.2.2:</b>   |                    |   |
| <b>Objective – Development achieves a range of residential intensity and diversity of housing choice to promote affordable homes, a self-sustaining community, and efficient use of urban land.</b>                                   |                    |   |
| <b>General intent:</b>  |                    |   |
| Objective 49.2.2 seeks to provide affordable housing typologies to the housing supply market and establish a density that will support the range non-residential activities proposed and the public and active transport mode shifts. |                    |   |
| <b>Alternative</b>  |                    |   |
| Status quo: Retention of existing rural / rural lifestyle zonings and associated provisions   |                    |   |
| Alternative: Use of existing residential zonings and associated provisions  |                    |   |
| <b>Other relevant objectives in the Plan:</b>   |                    |   |
| NA  | NA                 |   |
| <b>Assessment against the Strategic Chapters of the PDP</b>   |                    |   |
| <b>Applicable provision</b>   | <b>Consistent?</b> | <b>Comment</b>  |
| <b>3. Strategic Direction</b>   |                    |   |
| SO 3.2.2.1  | Yes                | The objective ensures the provision of a mix of housing opportunities at the higher end of the density spectrum, contributing to affordability. |
| <b>4. Urban Development</b>   |                    |   |

|  |     |  |
|--|-----|--|
| Policy 4.2.1.4                         | Yes | While the existing zoned land is sufficient in terms of supply, there is still a shortfall in affordable housing <sup>19</sup> . The objective supports the provision of affordable housing through requiring densities at the higher end of the density spectrum, which necessitates smaller land areas per residential unit, and therefore supports affordability. |
| Policy 4.2.2.2                         | Yes | The land within the UGB has been allocated into areas based on land use, which for those areas which have the primary purpose of residential activity includes areas for low, medium and high density, thereby providing a mix of housing densities and forms.   |
| <b>5. Tangata Whenua</b>               |     |  |
| NA                                     | NA  | NA   |
| <b>6. Landscapes – Rural Character</b> |     |  |
| NA                                     | NA  | NA   |

| Objective 49.2.2  | Preferred objective   | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Relevance:</b>   |   |  |  |
| Addresses a relevant resource management issue<br>[these issues are set out at Section 4.2 above] | <p>The objectives address the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The objective provides for increased residential density and high density housing which is more land intensive, supporting population growth and affordable housing goals;</li> <li>Issue 2: The objective goes some way to addressing the efficiency of the transport network by requiring a residential intensity that will support the viability of public transport, and facilitate active travel modes;</li> <li>Issue 3: The objective provides for increased residential density and a</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo addresses the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The status quo addresses population growth in a very limited way, by providing for approximately 120 additional residential units, however these would unlikely be affordable housing due to the large land areas required by the zonings;</li> <li>Issue 2: The status quo somewhat addresses the efficiency of the transport network by limiting the development (and therefore additional traffic generation) on this</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative would address the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The alternative would go some way to addressing Issue 1 by providing housing in accordance with the density standards of the existing Residential Zones;</li> <li>Issue 2: The objective goes some way to addressing the efficiency of the transport network by requiring a residential intensity that will go further to supporting the viability of public transport than the status quo, but not to the same extent as the proposed objective;</li> </ul> |

<sup>19</sup> Page 212, Housing Development Capacity Assessment 2021 Main Report ([link](#))

| Objective 49.2.2   | Preferred objective   | Status quo  | Alternative   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p>variety of typologies to ensure the most efficient use of the land for residential housing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 4: The objective provides for a level of density that would support a range of non-residential activities that also contribute to how the existing residential communities can be “well-functioning”.</li> </ul>  | <p>land but does not address alternative modes or improvements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 3: The status quo fails to address Issue 3 as it would retain the inefficient use of this land by providing very limited residential supply and no other facilities (which could not be justified on the basis of such a limited population);</li> <li>Issue 4: The status quo fails to address Issue 4 as facilities for community purposes, employment, education or day to day needs of residents are not provided for and would not be supported on the basis of the residential density enabled.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 3: The alternative somewhat addresses Issue 3 as it would enable more efficient use of the land for residential activity than the status quo, but would not provide as efficient use as the proposed objective;</li> <li>Issue 4: The alternative fails to address Issue 4 as facilities for community purposes, employment, education or day to day needs of residents (both future and existing) are not provided for, or only in a very limited way.</li> </ul> |
| Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.   | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.   | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.   |
| Gives effect to higher order documents                   | <p>The proposed objective gives effect to higher order documents as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It provides for urban development which improves housing choice and quality and provides capacity for a shortage identified in the Housing Capacity Assessment (affordable housing) (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P10);</li> <li>It will support improvements in housing affordability by providing</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo gives effect / does not give effect to the higher order documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It does not provide an efficient use of land, taking into account the various attributes of the subject land that make it more suitable for urban development than other locations but would continue to provide for rural activities on land which is identified as having significant soils (PORPS19, Policy 4.5.1);</li> </ul>   | <p>The alternative generally gives greater effect to higher level documents than the status quo, although to a lesser extent than the proposed objective, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It provides for urban development in a manner which provides for some efficiencies in terms of housing, but not to the same extent as the proposed objective (PORPS19, Objective 4.5);</li> <li>It would enable some housing capacity and therefore go some way</li> </ul>                     |

| Objective 49.2.2  | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   | <p>additional development to the market (NPS-UD, Objective 2).</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will result in inefficient and sporadic patterns of settlement and residential growth by enabling only very limited residential activity adjacent to existing urban development (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• It does not support improvements in housing affordability by retaining the land for the development only of large rural residential land-holdings (NPS-UD, Objective 2, Policy 6).</li> </ul> | <p>to providing for efficient land use (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P1, UFD-P4); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It goes some way to support improvements in housing affordability by enabling residential development at an urban scale but not to the same extent as the proposed objective (NPS-UD, Objective 2, Policy 6).</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes</p> | <p>The proposed objective is consistent with the Kāi Tahu values including whanaukataka and haere whakamua, by providing shelter and protection for current and future generations.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that urban development on this land, at an increased residential density, are key community concerns due to their potential impacts on traffic congestion and amenity values.</p> <p>The proposed objective is consistent with the community outcomes to the extent reasonably practicable when enabling urban development in a location that is currently rural / rural-residential.</p> | <p>See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.</p>   | <p>No identified tāngata whenua values are affected, although the alternative would be consistent (although not to the same extent as the proposed objective) with Kāi Tahu values including whanaukataka and haere whakamua, by providing shelter and protection for current and future generations.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that urban development on this land, particularly the resultant potential for an increase in congestions/delays on State Highway 6, and the loss of the current amenity levels, are key community concerns.</p> <p>The alternative is less consistent with the community outcomes sought than both the proposed objectives and the status quo as it would result in traffic generation</p> |

| Objective 49.2.2                         | Preferred objective   | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  |   |  | and amenity effects without any benefits to the existing communities.   |
| <b>Usefulness:</b>                       |   |  |   |
| Guides decision-making                   | The proposed objective guides decision-making by providing a clear and directive outcome for the resultant urban development including the housing typologies and affordability.  | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.  | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.   |
| Meets best practice for objectives       | <p>The proposed objective is consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the housing outcomes to be achieved;</li> <li>• It is specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate how housing variety and affordability will be achieved;</li> <li>• Relates directly to Issue 1;</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology with the PDP; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo is generally consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal to provide only for limited activities (rural, or rural and residential);</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to meet the outcome;</li> <li>• Addresses Issue 2 but only by virtue of not addressing any of the other issues relating to housing or efficient land use;</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative is generally consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal (to provide for residential activity and other small-scale activities consistent with amenity values experienced by existing / historic residential development);</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate that it will meet the outcome;</li> <li>• Relates directly to an issue (Issue 1) but to a lesser extent than the proposed objective and in a manner which has the potential to adversely affect other issues (e.g. Issue 2);</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Reasonableness:</b>                   |   |  |   |
| Will not impose unjustifiably high costs | The proposed objectives impose a cost on part of the community, namely the  | The status quo imposes a cost on the community as a whole, by retaining the  | The alternative would contribute to the housing supply/cost issues currently  |

| Objective 49.2.2  | Preferred objective  | Status quo  | Alternative  |
|---|--|---|--|
| on the community / parts of the community   | <p>developers of the land, to achieve the residential intensity required.</p> <p>This cost is justifiable given developers will benefit from the change of zoning and is offset by the ability to undertake urban development and the benefits to the wider community by the increased provision of housing.</p> <p>The proposed objectives impose an intangible cost from the urbanisation of rural and rural lifestyle land and the resulting loss of rural and rural lifestyle character. This cost is justifiable given the more prevailing need for further land for urban development to accommodate population growth and promote affordable housing.</p> | subject land for rural and rural residential purposes when its attributes make it suitable for urban development that could provide significant housing capacity and supporting activities.   | <p>faced by the community, however due to the alternative not addressing the other resource management issues specific to the TPLM land it could impose a cost on parts of the community that would be affected by the inefficient operation of the transport network that could result under the alternative.</p> <p>The alternative would impose an intangible cost from the urbanisation of rural and rural lifestyle land and the resulting loss of rural and rural lifestyle character. This cost is justifiable given the more prevailing need for further land for urban development to accommodate population growth and promote affordable housing.</p> |
| Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk  | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.  | There is a risk that urban development proceeds on an individual property / case-by-case basis under the status quo, meaning the ability to achieve a range of typologies at a density that would support both non-residential activities and public transport viability would be affected. | There is a level of uncertainty in the alternative in that it relies on landowners / developers to implement the zoning. There is a risk that if they choose not to give effect to the residential activity enabled there would be no benefits to the housing supply market.   |
| <b>Achievability:</b>   |  |   |  |
| Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources | The proposed objective is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to include policies and methods that ensure urban development achieves a prescribed density and variety.  | The status quo is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to manage development of rural / rural residential activity, however the ability of Council to manage the effects of, or decline, proposals for urban development in this location will be considered on a       | The alternative is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to impose standards relating to the development of residential activity however these place limits on the density and typology that can be implemented.  |



| Objective 49.2.2   | Preferred objective   | Status quo  | Alternative   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  |   | case-by-case basis, meaning the ability to achieve an efficient residential use of the land is limited.   |   |
| <b>Conclusion</b>  |   |   |   |
| <i>The extent to which the objective achieves / is neutral / fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA</i> | The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it enables people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being by enabling efficient urban growth while sustaining the natural and physical resources of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the TPLM area;</li> <li>○ adjacent urban areas;</li> <li>○ other parts of the district less suited for development, and in a manner that avoids adverse effects on the environment; and</li> <li>○ infrastructure, including, in particular, the state highway.</li> </ul> | The status quo is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objective. It provides little in the way of a meaningful contribution to the housing market. The status quo would address the community outcomes sought for TPLM in that it would not enable urban development, but it would fail to address any of the resource management issues. | The alternative is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objective. As the alternative has been drafted to address various locations district-wide rather than targeting the specific issues affecting TPLM, it does not specifically address the community outcomes sought for TPLM. |
| <b>Ranking</b>   | <b>1</b>  | <b>3</b>  | <b>2</b>  |

The proposed objective is considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 32(1)(a).

**Proposed Objective 49.2.3:**

**Objective - The Commercial Precinct is compact, convenient and accessible for meeting the needs of local residents**

**Proposed Objective 49.2.4:**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Objective - The Glenpanel Precinct provides for non-residential activities that complement the role of the Commercial Precinct with development which responds to the character of the area.</b>                                |  |  |
| <b>Proposed Objective 49.2.5:</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Objective - A range of compatible activities are provided for within the Zone.</b>  |  |  |
| <b>General intent:</b>   |  |  |
| Objective 49.2.3 seeks to enable non-residential activities to concentrate within a particular part of the TPLM land that support the development of the land for urban purposes.  |  |  |
| Objective 49.2.4 seeks to enable non-residential activities to concentrate within a particular part of the TPLM land with particular characteristics related to the existing listed heritage feature known as Glenpanel Homestead. |  |  |
| Objective 49.2.5 seeks to provide for other non-residential activities across the Zone where these are compatible with the purpose of the Zone.  |  |  |
| <b>Alternative</b>   |  |  |
| Status quo: Retention of existing rural / rural lifestyle zonings and associated provisions  |  |  |
| Alternative: Use of existing commercial centre zonings and associated provisions   |  |  |
| <b>Other relevant objectives in the Plan:</b>  |  |  |
| Objective 26.3.1<br>Objective 26.3.2<br>Objective 26.3.3<br>Objective 26.3.4<br>Objective 25.2.1<br>Objective 27.2.4   | The provisions of the PDP relating to Historic Heritage will continue to apply to activities that affect the Glenpanel Homestead (including land use activities within the setting, subdivision, and alterations to the building itself). The relevant objectives seek to protect historic heritage by managing activities that may affect the historic heritage values of the listed feature. |  |
| <b>Assessment against the Strategic Chapters of the PDP</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Applicable provision</b>  | <b>Consistent?</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
| <b>3. Strategic Direction</b>  |  |  |
| SO 3.2.1.2   | Yes  | The limiting of the type and scale of non-residential activities provided for in the Zone will protect the role of the Queenstown and Wanaka town centres as the hubs of the District's economy. |

|  |     |   |
|--|-----|---|
| SO 3.2.1.3                             | Yes | The limiting of the type and scale of non-residential activities provided for in the Zone, and the overall size of the land available for this purpose, will protect the Frankton urban area's role as the major commercial and industrial service centre for the Wakatipu Basin. |
| SO 3.2.3 and SO 3.2.3.2                | Yes | The objectives are consistent with achieving quality built form. Objective 49.2.4 in particular specifically seeks the existing character of the area surrounding Glenpanel Homestead is considered when new development is proposed.   |
| SO 3.2.3.1 and SP 3.3.17               | Yes | The existing historic heritage feature that is Glenpanel Homestead will continue to be protected under the provisions of Chapter 26 and the area-specific objective for the Glenpanel Precinct.   |
| SO 3.2.6.2 and SO 3.2.6.3              | Yes | The provision of non-residential activities to support the primary purpose of the Zone is consistent with recognising that these facilities are important to achieving a sustainable community.   |
| <b>4. Urban Development</b>            |     |   |
| Policies 4.2.1.4 and 4.2.2.2           | Yes | The existing constraint that the historic heritage feature of Glenpanel Homestead places on development has been recognised and provided for, and a range of community and other non-residential activities and facilities enabled.   |
| Policy 4.2.2.9 and 4.2.2.10            | Yes | A high level of design quality is required by the objectives dealing with design in the non-residential areas.  |
| <b>5. Tangata Whenua</b>               |     |   |
| Objective 5.3.2 and Policy 5.3.2.1     | Yes | The ability to incorporate iwi values into built design forms part of a quality built form.   |
| <b>6. Landscapes – Rural Character</b> |     |   |
| NA                                     | NA  | NA  |

| Objective 49.2.3 – 49.2.5  | Preferred objectives   | Status quo  | Alternative  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Relevance:</b>  |  |   |  |
| Addresses a relevant resource management issue [these issues are set out at Section 4.2 above] | The objectives address the issues as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The objectives do not specifically address Issue 1, although some residential use would</li> </ul> | The status quo addresses the issues as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The status quo addresses population growth in a very limited way, by providing for approximately</li> </ul> | The alternative would address the issues as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The alternative does not specifically address Issue 1,</li> </ul> |

| Objective 49.2.3 – 49.2.5                                | Preferred objectives  | Status quo  | Alternative  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  | <p>be enabled in the zones proposed to achieve the objective;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue 2: The objectives go some way to addressing the efficiency of the transport network by enabling services and activities within the proposed urban development to reduce the need for existing and future residents to travel in a vehicle along State Highway 6 to tend to their various needs;</li> <li>• Issue 3: The objectives do not specifically address Issue 3 but would support the efficient use of the land for residential development;</li> <li>• Issue 4: The objectives provide for non-residential activities which could be utilised by not only the future residents of the TPLM Zone but also as intended by the methods for integration with the surrounding urban area, the existing residents at the suburban residential communities of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country, and further afield such as those residences to the east along State Highway 6 and provide much needed services and social amenities.</li> </ul> | <p>120 additional residential units, however these would be unlikely to be affordable housing due to the large land areas required by the zonings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue 2: The status quo somewhat addresses the efficiency of the transport network by limiting the development (and therefore additional traffic generation);</li> <li>• Issue 3: The status quo fails to address Issue 3 as it would retain the inefficient use of this land by providing very limited residential supply and no other facilities;</li> <li>• Issue 4: The status quo fails to address Issue 4 as facilities for community purposes, employment, education or day to day needs of residents are not provided for and would not be supported through the status quo, resulting in the existing residential communities needing to travel longer distances to meet their needs.</li> </ul> | <p>although some residential use would be enabled;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue 2: The alternative goes some way to addressing the efficiency of the transport network by enabling services and activities within the proposed urban development to reduce the need for both existing and future residents to travel in a vehicle along State Highway 6 to tend to their various needs;</li> <li>• Issue 3: The alternative addresses Issue 3 as it would enable more efficient use of the land for non-residential activities;</li> <li>• Issue 4: The alternative provides for non-residential activities which could be utilised by not only the future residents of the TPLM Zone but also the existing residents at the suburban residential communities of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country, and further afield such as those residences to the east along State Highway 6 and provide much needed services and social amenities.</li> </ul> |
| Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 | The proposed objectives assist the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:  | The status quo assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:  | The alternative assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:  |

| Objective 49.2.3 – 49.2.5              | Preferred objectives  | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They manage the effects of the development of land for urban purposes;</li> <li>• Particularly they protect the role and function of other centres by limiting the scale and type of non-residential activities provided for to those that support the residential activity proposed.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It manages some effects of the development of land for rural / rural residential purposes but does not address the resource management issues;</li> <li>• It would not contribute to the efficient use of the TPLM land by failing to provide for any activities that might support the existing urban communities.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would fail to protect the role and function of other centres by enabling activities that would directly compete with those centre.</li> </ul>   |
| Gives effect to higher order documents | <p>The proposed objectives give effect to higher level documents as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They require a high level of urban design while providing for a diverse range of commercial, social and cultural activities (PORPS19, Policy 4.5.3);</li> <li>• They provide a variety and scale of commercial activities in locations that will be highly accessible by public and active transport and which shall be of a scale and type appropriate to service local community needs (PRPS21, UFD-P5);</li> <li>• They are consistent with enabling more people to live in and businesses and community services to be located in an area which will be anticipated to be accessible by planned public transport and there is demand for these services from</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo gives effect / does not give effect to the higher order documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While it does provide for rural production activities it does not provide an efficient use of land, taking into account the various attributes of the subject land that make it more suitable for urban development than other locations (PORPS19, Policy 4.5.1);</li> <li>• It will result in inefficient and sporadic patterns of settlement and residential growth by enabling only very limited residential activity adjacent to existing urban development (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• It does not support the “well-functioning” of the existing urban areas of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country by limiting</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative generally gives greater effect to higher level documents than the status quo, although to a lesser extent than the proposed objective, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides for urban development in a manner with a diverse range of commercial, social and cultural activities (PORPS19, Policy 4.5.3);</li> <li>• It provides a variety and scale of commercial activities in a location that will be highly accessible by public and active transport but will not be as appropriate in servicing local needs as the proposed objective (PRPS21, UFD-P5);</li> <li>• It is consistent with enabling more people to live in and businesses and community services to be located in an area which will be anticipated to be accessible by planned public transport and there is demand for these services from existing</li> </ul> |

| Objective 49.2.3 – 49.2.5  | Preferred objectives  | Status quo  | Alternative  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  | existing residential communities (NPS-UD, Objective 3, Policy 1).   | accessibility between housing, jobs, and community servicing. (NPS-UD, Objective 3, Policy 1).  | residential communities (NPS-UD, Objective 3, Policy 1).   |
| Consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes | No identified tāngata whenua values are affected.<br>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that the provision of a range of services and facilities is an aspect of the urban development of this land that is supported.   | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.   | No identified tāngata whenua values are affected.<br>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that the provision of a range of services and facilities is an aspect of the urban development of this land that is supported.  |
| <b>Usefulness:</b>   |   |   |  |
| Guides decision-making   | The proposed objectives guide decision-making by providing a clear and directive outcome for non-residential activities to be located within a specified area and of a scale/type that supports the servicing of locals.  | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.   | The alternative provides guidance on how commercial development and its built form should be achieved but it would enable a wide range of activities to establish.   |
| Meets best practice for objectives                               | The proposed objectives are consistent with best practice as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are outcome focused, by stating the activities to be enabled;</li> <li>• They are specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate how activities will achieve good urban design;</li> <li>• Relate directly to Issue 4;</li> </ul> | The status quo is generally consistent with best practice as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal to provide only for limited activities (rural, or rural residential);</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to meet the outcome;</li> </ul> | The alternative is generally consistent with best practice as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal to provide for a range of commercial activities;</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate that it will meet the outcome;</li> </ul> |

| Objective 49.2.3 – 49.2.5  | Preferred objectives  | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use consistent terminology with the PDP; and</li> <li>Are capable of being assessed.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses Issue 2 but only by virtue of not addressing any of the other issues;</li> <li>Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relates directly to an issue (Issue 4) but to a lesser extent than the proposed objective and in a manner which has the potential to adversely affect other issues (e.g. Issue 2);</li> <li>Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Reasonableness:</b>   |   |  |   |
| Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community / parts of the community | The proposed objectives will not impose an unjustifiably high cost on the community or any part of it.  | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.  | The alternative would contribute to the lack of facilities and services available to the community, however due to the alternative not addressing the other resource management issues specific to the TPLM land it could impose a cost on parts of the community that would be affected by the inefficient operation of the transport network that could result under the alternative.   |
| Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk   | The proposed objectives rely on landowners / developers to implement the zoning. There is a risk that if they choose not to give effect to the urban development enabled (for example, by retaining the current land use), the outcomes of the objectives relating to the provision of facilities and services to support locals would be lost. | The status quo would not give rise to an acceptable level of uncertainty or risk.  | There is a level of uncertainty in the alternative in that it relies on landowners / developers to implement the zoning. There is a risk that if they choose not to give effect to the commercial activity enabled there would be no benefits to the existing and future communities. Additionally, the lack of controls on the type and scale of activities could result in effects (transport, amenity or retail distribution) that would not arise under the proposed objective. |
| <b>Achievability:</b>  |   |  |   |



| Objective 49.2.3 – 49.2.5  | Preferred objectives   | Status quo  | Alternative   |
|--|--|---|---|
| Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources                      | The proposed objectives are capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to include policies and methods that ensure non-residential activities are limited to those that primarily serve the needs of locals.   | The status quo is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to manage development of rural / rural residential activity.   | The alternative is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to implement existing policies and methods in relation to building design, although given the range of permitted activities provided for, the ability to control the range of activities would be limited.  |
| <b>Conclusion</b>  |  |   |   |
| <i>The extent to which the objective achieves / is neutral / fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA</i> | The proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because they enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being by enabling efficient urban growth while sustaining the natural and physical resources, particularly by sustaining the role and function of the existing commercial centres within the District. | The status quo is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objective. It provides little in the way of a meaningful contribution to the housing market. The status quo would address the community outcomes sought for TPLM in that it would not enable urban development, but it would fail to address any of the resource management issues. | The alternative is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objective. As the alternative has been drafted to address various other locations district-wide rather than targeting the specific issues affecting TPLM, it does not specifically address the community outcomes sought for TPLM. |
| <b>Ranking</b>   | <b>1</b>   | <b>3</b>  | <b>2</b>  |

**Overall conclusion:** The proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 32(1)(a).

**Proposed Objective 49.2.6:**

**Objective - Development in the Zone minimises the generation of additional vehicle trips along State Highway 6, and reduces, as far as practicable, vehicle trips along State Highway 6 generated by the adjoining residential areas at Ladies Mile.**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>General intent:</b>  |  |   |
| Objective 49.2.7 seeks to avoid additional traffic generation on State Highway 6 that would contribute to existing congestion issues at peak hours. |  |   |
| <b>Alternative</b>  |  |   |
| Status quo: Retention and utilisation of existing district-wide transport provisions.   |  |   |
| Alternative: Alternative wording of the objective that seeks to minimise or avoid adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of State Highway 6   |  |   |
| <b>Other relevant objectives in the Plan:</b>   |  |   |
| Objective 29.2.1<br>Objective 29.2.2<br>Objective 29.2.3<br>Objective 29.2.4  | These objectives in the Transport Chapter all seek to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, including through promotion of active and public transport alternatives. |   |
| <b>Assessment against the Strategic Chapters of the PDP</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Applicable provision</b>   | <b>Consistent?</b>   | <b>Comment</b>  |
| <b>3. Strategic Direction</b>   |  |   |
| SO 3.2.1.9 (subject to ongoing discussions)   | Yes  | The proposed objective is consistent with ensuring that infrastructure is efficiently and effectively maintained to meet community needs by ensuring urban growth does not reduce the existing level of service provided by that infrastructure.  |
| SO 3.2.2  | Yes  | The proposed objective is consistent with managing urban growth in an integrated matter, particularly with infrastructure, through ensuring that land use must demonstrate a minimised number of additional vehicle trips on the state highway.   |
| SO 3.2.2.1 (h)  | Yes  | The proposed objective is consistent with urban development occurring in a manner that ensures effects on infrastructure is appropriately managed by placing an onus on applicants to demonstrate how their proposal will minimise vehicle trips. |
| <b>4. Urban Development</b>   |  |   |
| Objective 4.2.2A  | Yes  | The proposed objective is consistent with ensuring that the development of the land for urban purposes is coordinated with the operation of existing infrastructure, namely the state highway.  |

|  |     |  |
|--|-----|--|
| Policy 4.2.2.1                         | Yes | The proposed objective ensures that the development of the land for urban purposes is only done where it can demonstrate that it will generate the smallest number of traffic generation and contribute to a reduction in the trips along the state highway generated by existing residential development. |
| Policy 4.2.2.2 (g)                     | Yes | The proposed objective has regard to the land use effects on the efficient operation of infrastructure by requiring land use to demonstrate how it will minimise the generation of vehicle trips.  |
| <b>5. Tangata Whenua</b>               |     |  |
| Policy 5.3.1.1                         | Yes | Rūnaka have been engaged in the Masterplan and Plan Variation process through development, including on matters that affect Kai Tahu values.   |
| <b>6. Landscapes – Rural Character</b> |     |  |
| NA                                     | NA  | NA   |

| Objective 49.2.6  | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Relevance:</b>   |  |  |  |
| Addresses a relevant resource management issue<br>[these issues are set out at Section 4.2 above] | <p>The objective addresses the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The objective does not prevent growth (and complements other objectives that facilitate growth), but does require that growth occurs (in the TPLM area) in a manner that does not contribute to existing congestion problems on State Highway 6 at peak hours;</li> <li>Issue 2: The objective sets a goal (minimising additional vehicle trips) that specifically engages with the imperative of promoting an efficient transport network;</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo addresses the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The status quo seeks to provide for future growth while maintaining a safe and efficient transport network, however it does not specifically engage with the traffic implications arising from past and future growth in the Ladies Mile area;</li> <li>Issue 2: The status quo has a strong focus on providing a safe and efficient transport network through a range of methods;</li> <li>Issue 3: The status quo does not prevent an efficient utilisation of land, including through medium and high</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative addresses the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The alternative does not prevent growth, but requires that this be done in a manner that does not generate adverse effects on State Highway 6;</li> <li>Issue 2: The alternative requires that development minimise or avoid adverse effects to ensure a safe and efficient transport network;</li> <li>Issue 3: The alternative fails to address Issue 3 as an effects-based assessment is more likely to result in lower density development to avoid</li> </ul> |

| Objective 49.2.6   | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 3: The objective does not prevent an efficient utilisation of land, including through medium and high residential density (and complements other objectives that specifically promote land use efficiency for residential growth), but requires that growth occurs in a manner that avoids additional traffic generation on State Highway 6 beyond the existing baseline;</li> <li>Issue 4: The objective enables development where this would reduce vehicle trips on State Highway 6 generated by existing residential areas, such as by providing for activities and facilities that would otherwise necessitate these trips.</li> </ul> | <p>residential density, but does not specifically address transport implications of such growth;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 4: The status quo fails to address Issue 4 as it does not address effects on the transport network generated by existing development in the Ladies Mile area and further afield.</li> </ul>  | <p>affecting the efficiency of the transport network;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 4: The alternative fails to address Issue 4 as it does not address effects on the transport network generated by existing development.</li> </ul>   |
| Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 | <p>The proposed objective assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It manages the effects of development of land and associated physical resources of the district (the roading network), and in particular it focuses on managing adverse effects – by remediating existing adverse effects from congestion and mitigating potential future adverse effects on the network</li> <li>It does the above while contributing in a meaningful way to the development</li> </ul>  | <p>The status quo assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It manages the effects of development of land and associated physical resources of the district (the roading network) however it does not specifically engage with the identified existing and potential future traffic problems of congestion on SH6 in this area;</li> <li>To the extent that it could manage the adverse effects of traffic, it would contribute to residential development</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It manages the effects of development of land and associated physical resources of the district (the roading network) however may not specifically engage with the identified existing and potential future traffic problems of congestion on SH6 in this area;</li> <li>It does the above while contributing somewhat to the development capacity in respect of housing, but</li> </ul> |

| Objective 49.2.6                       | Preferred objective  | Status quo  | Alternative   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | capacity in respect of housing and the efficient use of the TPLM land.   | capacity, although not to the same extent that the proposed objective does, and without the specific, tailored TPLM focus.  | this would be limited to housing that could be developed without giving rise to adverse effects on an at-capacity transportation network, and would likely lead to an inefficient use of the TPLM land resources.   |
| Gives effect to higher order documents | <p>The proposed objective gives effect to higher level documents as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It coordinates urban development with the functional needs of infrastructure in an efficient and effective way by ensuring bottom lines in relation to the operation of the state highway (PORPS19, Objective 4.5);</li> <li>• Improves connectivity within the new urban area and to the existing residential areas through active and public transport by requiring development to minimise vehicle trips (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P1, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• Achieves integrated land use and infrastructure planning through direct consultation with infrastructure providers, who have been extensively engaged with and whose feedback has been acted on (NPS-UD, Policy 10).</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo generally gives effect to higher level documents, although to a lesser extent than the proposed objective, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinates urban development with the functional needs of infrastructure, but in a less effective way than the proposed objective due to the difficulties in assessing cumulative effects on the state highway (PORPS19, Objective 4.5);</li> <li>• Improves connectivity within the new urban area by encouraging active and public transport within the new area, but would not extend to considering or improving existing residential areas through improved services and facilities available to these communities ((PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P1, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• Achieves a level of integrated land use and infrastructure planning through setting desired outcomes (safe and efficient transport network). The direct consultation with infrastructure providers would be</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative generally gives effect to higher level documents, although to a lesser extent than the proposed objective, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinates urban development with the functional needs of infrastructure, but in a less efficient way than the proposed objective due to the alternative supporting an urban development of significantly lower density and which is less likely to provide the critical mass required to achieve the public transport outcomes needed (PORPS19, Objective 4.5);</li> <li>• Does not promote improved connectivity within new urban areas or to existing residential areas by encouraging a first-in, first-served approach to vehicle trips enabled (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P1, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• Achieves a level of integrated land use and infrastructure planning through setting desired outcomes (minimising or avoiding adverse</li> </ul> |

| Objective 49.2.6   | Preferred objective   | Status quo  | Alternative  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  |   | achieved through the general District Plan review process already undertaken, but would not give effect to the specific feedback received on the current proposal (NPS-UD, Policy 10).  | effects on the transport network). The direct consultation with infrastructure providers would be achieved but not to the same extent as the proposed objective, which provides for more stringent bottom lines (NPS-UD, Policy 10).   |
| Consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes | <p>No identified tāngata whenua values are affected.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that effects on the transport network, particularly the potential for increase in congestion/delays on State Highway 6, is one of the key community concerns.</p> <p>The proposed objective is consistent with the community outcome sought through ensuring that development minimises or reduces vehicle trips along State Highway 6.</p> | <p>No identified tāngata whenua values are affected.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that effects on the transport network, particularly the potential for increase in congestion/delays on State Highway 6, is one of the key community concerns.</p> <p>The status quo (a safe and efficient transport network) is consistent with the community outcome but is less specific and measurable than the proposed objective which responds to the particular issue raised by the community (congestion/delays) and is less able to be assessed in respect of the cumulative effects on the safety and efficiency of the transportation network.</p> | <p>No identified tāngata whenua values are affected.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that effects on the transport network, particularly the potential for increase in congestion/delays on State Highway 6, is one of the key community concerns.</p> <p>The alternative objective, for minimising or avoiding adverse effects on the transport network, is consistent with the community outcome but is less likely to give effect to an efficient use of land for urban purposes that would support the critical mass of population necessary to make improvements to the existing network feasible. It is less able to be assessed in respect of the cumulative effects on the safety and efficiency of the transportation network.</p> |
| <b>Usefulness:</b>   |   |   |  |
| Guides decision-making   | The proposed objective guides decision-making by providing a clear objective outcome (as discussed further below) than the status quo or alternative, and   | The status quo guides decision-making by providing an ultimate outcome (see below) but provides flexibility in how the decision-maker would interpret this as   | The alternative guides decision-making by requiring an effects assessment in most if not all cases (depending on methods). This would be unhelpful to  |

| Objective 49.2.6                          | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   | <p>would result in greater consistency in decision-making on applications. This further clarity on the objective outcome, in conjunction with the more general status quo (which will continue to be applicable on a district wide basis) will provide greater certainty and clarity for applicants, decision-makers and the community in what is expected for subdivision and land use proposals and outcomes.</p>  | <p>being achieved. This flexibility could result in inconsistent decision-making, in relation to TPLM, because it lacks the specificity of the outcomes sought for TPLM, and would not provide sufficient clarity and certainty of outcomes for the stakeholders</p>   | <p>decision-makers considering applications under section 104D of the Act, as the answer to both limbs of the 'gateway' test then require an effects assessment, Because of this lack of direction and specificity in the context of TPLM, this option provides the least guidance for plan users and decision-makers.</p>  |
| <p>Meets best practice for objectives</p> | <p>The proposed objective is consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal (minimising (or reducing in existing communities) vehicle trips), being tailored to the TPLM environment;</li> <li>• It is specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate that it will meet the outcome (via the non-complying status for proposals that do not meet specific standards that have been crafted to give effect to the objective);</li> <li>• Relates directly to an issue (Issue 2);</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology (in terms of the proposed new zone); and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo is generally consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal (a safe and efficient transport network), however it lacks the specificity required for the growth and transport outcomes sought for TPLM;</li> <li>• Relates to an issue (Issue 2), but not as specifically as the proposed objective;</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed, but without reference to measurable outcomes there is more uncertainty regarding the variables that might affect this assessment.</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative is generally consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is outcome focused, by stating the goal (minimising or avoiding adverse effects on the transport network), but does not engage with the specific TPLM imperative of integrating growth with infrastructure;</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate that it will meet the outcome;</li> <li>• Relates directly to an issue (Issue 2);</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Reasonableness:</b></p>             |  |  |   |



| Objective 49.2.6  | Preferred objective   | Status quo  | Alternative  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community / parts of the community</p> | <p>The proposed objective imposes a cost on part of the community, namely the developers of the land, to minimise vehicle trips generated by their development and reduce vehicle trips generated by existing residential areas (through the methods assessed in Section 7 below) and through any other means that they may propose in an application.</p> <p>This cost is justifiable given developers will directly benefit from the change of zoning, and is offset by the ability to generate some vehicle trips, notwithstanding they must demonstrate how they have minimised them to their smallest number possible.</p>                     | <p>The status quo imposes a cost on the developers of the land, to demonstrate a safe and efficient transport network but this cost is smaller than that required by the proposed objective. However, this is counterbalanced with a potential cost to other parts of the community, in this instance, the other users of the state highway (such as residents of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country) of a transportation network that may not operate safely and efficiently due to the risk of cumulative congestion effects not being directly addressed (as discussed further below).</p> | <p>The alternative imposes a cost on developers of the land, to demonstrate that adverse effects on the transportation network will be minimised or avoided, likely on a case by case and ad hoc manner. However, this is counterbalanced with a potential cost to other parts of the community, in this instance, the other users of the state highway (such as residents of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country) of a transportation network that may not operate safely and efficiently due to the risk of cumulative congestion effects not being addressed (as discussed further below).</p> |
| <p>Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk</p>   | <p>There is a level of uncertainty in the outcomes sought using the words of the proposed objective of to “minimise” in the case of new development and “reduce” in terms of existing development, rather than specifying, for example, an overall limit to the number of additional vehicle trips generated. As a result, each application will be required to demonstrate, either through compliance with the rules or through alternative measures, how it has minimised or reduced vehicle trip generation. As such, the risk of adverse effects on the state highway associated with this level of uncertainty is medium, and is offset by</p> | <p>There is a level of uncertainty in the status quo due to the limited ability to consider cumulative effects when considering applications under this objective. Each application will be required to demonstrate that it will result in a safe and efficient transportation network on a case-by-case basis, with a greater risk of ad hoc proposals without a wider cumulative assessment. As such, there is a higher risk than the proposed objective of reducing the safety and efficiency of the transportation network associated with this level of uncertainty.</p>                     | <p>There is a level of uncertainty in the alternative due to the limited ability to consider cumulative effects when considering applications under this objective. Each application will be required to demonstrate that it will not have adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the transportation network on a case-by-case basis, with a greater risk of ad hoc proposals without a wider assessment. As such, there is a higher risk than the proposed objective of adverse effects on the state highway associated with this level of uncertainty.</p>                                |

| Objective 49.2.6   | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | the benefits provided through the degree of flexibility or innovation open to applicants when designing their proposals to achieve the proposed objective.   |  |   |
| <b>Achievability:</b>  |  |  |   |
| Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources                      | The proposed objective is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to include policies and methods that ensure future development minimises vehicle trips (see assessment in Section 7 below) and reduces, as far as practicable, existing vehicle trips | The status quo is generally capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to encourage alternative modes of transport to ensure the maintenance of the safety and efficiency of the transport network, impose standards relating to the formation of new parts of the network, and through the requiring of consent (and therefore transportation assessments) for activities where these may impact the safety and efficiency of the transport network.<br><br>However, there is a risk that development proceeds on a case-by-case basis, and a transport assessment will conclude that that traffic generated by that particular development will not affect the safety and efficiency of the network, but fail to consider overall traffic effects on a cumulative basis. | The alternative is generally capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to encourage alternative modes of transport, impose standards relating to the formation of new parts of the network, and through the requiring of consent (and therefore transportation assessments) for activities where these may give rise to adverse effects on the transportation network.<br><br>However, there is a risk that development proceeds on a case-by-case basis, and a transport assessment will conclude that that traffic generated by that particular development will not adversely affect the transportation network, but fail to consider it on a cumulative basis. |
| <b>Conclusion</b>  |  |  |   |
| <i>The extent to which the objective achieves / is neutral / fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA</i> | The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it enables people and the community to provide for their social,  | The status quo is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for  | The alternative is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for  |

| Objective 49.2.6 | Preferred objective  | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|------------------|--|--|--|
|                  | economic and cultural well-being by enabling efficient urban growth while sustaining the efficient operation of infrastructure, particularly the state highway. It is a specific response to the specific issue for the TPLM location, and responds directly to community outcomes sought. | their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objective. It does not address existing issues with infrastructure (the state highway) and would enable future growth to occur while struggling to take into account cumulative effects on the efficient operation of infrastructure. Being an objective intended to apply district wide, it does not specifically address the community outcomes sought for TPLM. | their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objective. It does not address existing issues with infrastructure (the state highway) and would enable future growth to occur but would encourage lower densities, and result in a less efficient use of the land. Being an objective focused on effects rather than targeting the specific issues affecting TPLM, it does not specifically address the community outcomes sought for TPLM. |
| Ranking          | 1  | 3  | 2  |

**Overall conclusion:** The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 32(1)(a).

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Proposed Objective 49.2.7:</b><br/> <b>Objective – An attractive built environment that positively responds to streets and open spaces, provides a high level of residential and neighbourhood amenity, achieves high quality urban design outcomes.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Objective 49.2.8:</b><br/> <b>Objective – Development that supports resilience to the current and future effects of climate change.</b></p> <p><b>General intent:</b><br/>           Objectives 49.2.7 and 49.2.8 seek to ensure a high standard of urban design is achieved.</p> <p><b>Alternative</b><br/>           Status quo: Retention of existing rural / rural lifestyle zonings and associated objectives<br/>           Alternative: Use of existing residential zone provisions, including existing design guidance.</p> |
|---|

| Other relevant objectives in the Plan:               |             |  |
|--|-------------|--|
| NA   | NA          |  |
| Assessment against the Strategic Chapters of the PDP |             |  |
| Applicable provision                                 | Consistent? | Comment  |
| 3. Strategic Direction                               |             |  |
| SO 3.2.3 and SO 3.2.3.2                              | Yes         | The objectives are consistent with achieving quality built form. |
| 4. Urban Development                                 |             |  |
| Policy 4.2.2.9 and 4.2.2.10                          | Yes         | A high level of design quality is required by the objectives.    |
| 5. Tangata Whenua                                    |             |  |
| NA   | NA          | NA   |
| 6. Landscapes – Rural Character                      |             |  |
| NA   | NA          | NA   |

| Objective 49.2.7 and 49.2.8  | Preferred objectives   | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Relevance:</b>  |  |  |  |
| Addresses a relevant resource management issue [these issues are set out at Section 4.2 above] | <p>The objectives address the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The objectives go some way to addressing Issue 1 by requiring residential built form to be of a high quality, and high quality built form is likely to result in a more desirable place to live, thus contributing in a significant way to housing supply;</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo addresses the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The status quo addresses population growth in a very limited way, by providing for approximately 120 additional residential units, however these would be unlikely to be affordable housing due to the large land areas required by the zonings;</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative would address the issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 1: The alternative would go some way to addressing Issue 1 by requiring a certain level of built form requiring residential development to meet standards for permitted activities, and where these aren't met, consider the design in more detail. A decent</li> </ul> |

| Objective 49.2.7 and 49.2.8                              | Preferred objectives   | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 2: The objectives go some way to addressing Issue 2 by enabling the design of sites and buildings, including the provision of onsite carparking and provision for alternative modes (such as cycling) to be considered;</li> <li>Issue 3: The objectives do not specifically address Issue 3 but would support the efficient use of the land for high-quality urban development;</li> <li>Issue 4: Not relevant to this objective.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 2: The status quo somewhat addresses the efficiency of the transport network by limiting the development of the land for residential activity (and therefore additional traffic generation);</li> <li>Issue 3: The status quo fails to address Issue 3 as it would retain the inefficient use of this land by providing very limited residential supply and no other facilities;</li> <li>Issue 4: Not relevant to this objective.</li> </ul>                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>built form is more likely to result in a desirable place to live, thus contributing to housing supply;</li> <li>Issue 2: The alternative goes some way to addressing Issue 2 by enabling the design of sites and buildings, including the provision of onsite carparking and provision for alternative modes (such as cycling) to be considered;</li> <li>Issue 3: The alternative does not specifically address Issue 3 but would support the efficient use of the land for high-quality residential development to a greater extent than the status quo;</li> <li>Issue 4: Not relevant to this objective.</li> </ul> |
| Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 | <p>The proposed objectives assist the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They recognise and provide the basis for a policy framework to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of built form on the environment.</li> <li>They are consistent with the intent of the section in providing an integrated approach to managing the multiple effects of land development.</li> </ul>                           | <p>The status quo assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It manages some effects of the development of land for rural / rural residential purposes but does not address detailed design matters due to its reliance on large land areas per residential unit to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects;</li> <li>It would not contribute to the efficient use of the TPLM land by restricting increases in density.</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative assists the Council to undertake its functions under section 31 (1) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It recognises and provides the basis for a policy framework to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of built form on the environment.</li> <li>It is consistent with the intent of the section in providing an integrated approach to managing the multiple effects of land development, but to a lesser extent than the proposed objective due to the design</li> </ul>  |

| Objective 49.2.7 and 49.2.8            | Preferred objectives  | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   |  | standards not aimed at the level of density required and the ability for development to proceed as a permitted activity.   |
| Gives effect to higher order documents | <p>The proposed objectives give effect to higher level documents as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They require a high level of urban design to achieve good outcomes in terms of liveability and accessibility (PORPS19, Policy 4.5.3);</li> <li>• They are consistent with improving housing quality and liveability, and delivering good urban design outcomes from the outset through location-specific and density-specific controls (PRPS21, UFD-O2);</li> <li>• They are consistent with the concept that amenity values can change over time in response to changing needs over time (NPS-UD, Objective 4, Policy 6).</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo gives effect / does not give effect to the higher order documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While it does provide for rural production activities it does not provide an efficient use of land, taking into account the various attributes of the subject land that make it more suitable for urban development than other locations (PORPS19, Policy 4.5.1);</li> <li>• It will result in inefficient and sporadic patterns of settlement and residential growth by enabling only very limited residential activity adjacent to existing urban development (PRPS21, UFD-O2, UFD-P4); and</li> <li>• It does not support the improvement of housing affordability by requiring significant levels of amenity for residential units based on large land areas (NPS-UD, Objective 2).</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative generally gives greater effect to higher level documents than the status quo, although to a lesser extent than the proposed objective, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It requires a good level of urban design to achieve outcomes in terms of liveability and accessibility, but not the same extent as the proposed objective due to the district-wide applicability of the alternative (PORPS19, Policy 4.5.3);</li> <li>• It is consistent with improving housing quality and liveability, and delivering good urban design outcomes from the outset, but not the same extent as the proposed objective due to the district-wide applicability of the alternative (PRPS21, UFD-O2);</li> <li>• It is consistent with the concept that amenity values can change over time in response to changing needs (NPS-UD, Objective 4, Policy 6).</li> </ul> |

| Objective 49.2.7 and 49.2.8   | Preferred objectives   | Status quo   | Alternative   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>Consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes</p> | <p>The proposed objectives are consistent with the Kāi Tahu values including whanaukataka and haere whakamua, by providing shelter and protection for current and future generations.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified effects on the environment of urban development on this land, particularly on height of buildings, is a key community concern due to potential impacts on views and amenity values.</p> <p>The proposed objectives are consistent with the community outcomes to the extent reasonably practicable, when enabling urban development in a greenfield area.</p> | <p>See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.</p> | <p>The proposed objective is consistent with the Kāi Tahu values including whanaukataka and haere whakamua, by providing shelter and protection for current and future generations.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that the provision of a range of services and facilities is an aspect of the urban development of this land that is supported.</p> <p>The consultation with the community undertaken to date has identified that urban development on this land, particularly the loss of the current amenity levels, is a key community concern.</p> <p>The alternative is more consistent with the community outcomes sought than the proposed objective, due to the design standards being based on a significantly lower density (district-wide) as opposed to the proposed objective.</p> |
| <b>Usefulness:</b>  |  |  |   |
| <p>Guides decision-making</p>   | <p>The proposed objectives guide decision-making by providing a clear and directive outcome for the result urban development including the built form.</p>   | <p>See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.</p> | <p>The alternative provides guidance on how commercial development and its built form should be achieved but it would enable a wide range of activities to establish.</p>   |



| Objective 49.2.7 and 49.2.8  | Preferred objectives   | Status quo   | Alternative  |
|--|--|--|--|
| Meets best practice for objectives   | <p>The proposed objectives are consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are outcome focused, by stating the outcome (quality design) to be enabled;</li> <li>• They are specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate how activities will achieve good urban design;</li> <li>• They do not relate directly to an issue but contributes to Issue 1 and Issue 3 the most, by ensuring liveability and efficient use of land by the built form;</li> <li>• They use consistent terminology with the PDP; and</li> <li>• They are capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> | <p>The status quo is generally consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal to provide only for limited activities (rural, or rural residential);</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to meet the outcome;</li> <li>• Addresses Issue 2 but only by virtue of not addressing any of the other issues relating to housing or efficient land use;</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> | <p>The alternative is generally consistent with best practice as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outcome focused, by stating the goal (to achieve a good level of urban design consistent with the district-wide response);</li> <li>• Is specific and achievable, by requiring development to demonstrate that it will meet the outcome;</li> <li>• Does not relate directly to an issue, but contributes most to Issue 1 by ensuring liveability of housing;</li> <li>• Uses consistent terminology; and</li> <li>• Is capable of being assessed.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Reasonableness:</b>   |  |  |  |
| Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community / parts of the community | <p>The proposed objectives will impose a cost on part of the community, namely the developers of the land, to achieve the design outcome sought.</p> <p>This cost is justifiable given the benefits the proposed objective defers on future residents by increasing the liveability of their future homes and environment.</p>   | See analysis for Objectives 27.2.24 and 49.2.1 above.  | The alternative would impose a cost on part of the community, namely the developers of the land, to achieve the design outcome sought. These costs are likely to be lower than the proposed objective, which reflects site and Zone specific issues, whereas the alternative is more general due to its applicability district-wide.   |
| Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk   | The proposed objectives rely on landowners / developers to implement   | There is a risk that urban development might proceed on an individual basis  | There is a level of uncertainty in the alternative in that it relies on  |

| Objective 49.2.7 and 49.2.8  | Preferred objectives   | Status quo  | Alternative   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | the zoning. There is a risk that if the design outcomes for the land are too aspirational, they may choose not to give effect to it, or consistently seek consent not to meet them.  | under the status quo provisions, meaning the ability to achieve good design outcomes for urban development in a rural-residential zone might be challenging to enforce.   | landowners / developers to implement the zoning, but this risk is likely to be lower than the proposed objective given the greater level of generality in design matters in the alternative.  |
| <b>Achievability:</b>  |  |   |   |
| Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources                      | The proposed objectives are capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to include policies and methods to ensure urban development achieves a high level of design.  | The status quo is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to manage development of rural / rural residential activity, however the ability of Council to manage the effects of, or decline, proposal for urban development in this location will be considered on a case-by-case basis, meaning the ability to achieve a high quality urban design is limited.   | The alternative is capable of being achieved through the ability of Council to impose standards relating to the development of built form.  |
| <b>Conclusion</b>  |  |   |   |
| <i>The extent to which the objective achieves / is neutral / fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA</i> | The proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because they enables people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being by enabling efficient and high quality urban growth while sustaining the natural and physical resources of the surrounding environment to the greatest extent possible without undermining the other proposed objectives. | The status quo is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objective. The status quo would address the community outcomes sought for the TPLM land in that it would avoid the level of built form enabled by the proposed objective, but it would fail to address Issue 1 and Issue 3 in particular. | The alternative is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it does not enable people and the community to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being to the same extent as the proposed objective. As the alternative has been drafted to address various other locations district-wide rather than targeting the specific issues affecting TPLM, it does not specifically effects on the natural and physical resources of the environment to the same extent as the proposed objective. It would address |

| Objective 49.2.7 and 49.2.8 | Preferred objectives | Status quo | Alternative   |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|------------|---|
|                             |                      |            | the community outcomes sought for the TPLM land to a greater extent than the proposed objective would by reducing the level of built form, but it would not address Issue 1 and Issue 3 to the same extent. |
| <b>Ranking</b>              | <b>1</b>             | <b>3</b>   | <b>2</b>  |

**Overall conclusion:** The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 32(1)(a).

## 8. EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, BENEFITS, COST, RISK

The following tables evaluate whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives. In doing so, the costs and benefits of the proposed provisions, and whether they are effective and efficient at achieving the objectives, are evaluated. For the purposes of this evaluation the proposed provisions are grouped by objective (where relevant these have been grouped into themes).

| <p><b>Proposed Objective 27.2.24: Objective – Urban development comprising a mix of medium and high density housing, commercial centres, schools, parks and open spaces for active and informal recreation, and a network of walkways and cycleways, that:</b></p> <p>a) complements and integrates with existing urban development and the surrounding landscapes; and</p> <p>b) brings about a significant modal shift away from reliance on the private car to enhanced use of public and active transport and creates a community with a strong sense of place.</p> |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Proposed Objective 49.2.1: Objective – Development complements and integrates with adjoining urban development at Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile and development south of State Highway 6.</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p>The methods proposed to achieve the objective and address the issue include policies and methods that:</p> <p>(a) Identify Precincts on the District Plan Maps for different land uses;</p> <p>(b) Inclusion of a Structure Plan detailing key features such as open space, collector roads, and intersections;</p> <p>(c) Require that development be undertaken consistent with the Structure Plan or seek a resource consent for a Non-Complying Activity.</p>  |   |  |
| <i>Proposed provisions</i>  | <i>Costs / Benefits</i>   |  |
|   | <i>Costs</i>  | <i>Benefits</i>  |
| <p><b>Policies</b></p> <p>49.2.1.1<br/>4.2.2.21<br/>27.3.24.1<br/>27.3.24.3 – 27.3.24.4<br/>27.3.24.7</p> <p><b>Rules</b></p> <p>49.4 – Table 1 (particularly 49.4.1)<br/>49.5.15, 49.5.37, 49.5.53<br/>27.7.28.1 – 27.7.28.3</p> <p><b>Other methods</b></p> <p>District Plan Maps<br/>Structure Plan<br/>Assessment matters 27.9.8 and 27.9.8.1</p>   | <p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be costs arising from adverse effects on the environment of urban development in this location, particularly a change to landscape values from rural to urban. Urban development on the land will be highly visible from within the site, from State Highway 6 (that part within the Ladies Mile terrace), parts of the Lake Hayes slopes east of Lake Hayes (LCU13)<sup>20</sup>, parts of the urban areas of Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate, parts of the eastern edge of the Frankton Flats, parts of the urban areas of Quail Rise, and the Remarkables Road. Urban development in this location will necessarily change the varied degree of openness currently experienced, and noting that the rural elements have already been eroded by the construction of Stalker Road roundabout and the approval of the Queenstown Country Club;</li> <li>The long range views to Mt Nicholas and the short range views of the Bayonets, Cecil and Walter Peaks, when viewed from State Highway 6 (particularly from Stalker Roundabout heading west) are identified as an existing visual amenity value<sup>21</sup> and as worthy of protection (such as by a maximum height plane). No additional height restriction is proposed in this area, due to the recently constructed and planted-out bund (consented under RM190553) located adjacent to State Highway 6 which now affects this view;</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be infrastructure costs arising from urban development of the land on the northern side of State Highway 6 as new reticulation will be required. The costs will not be known in detail until the preferred option for servicing is identified, which will require additional investigation which will be borne by the landowners / developers at the time of subdivision and/or development.</li> </ul> | <p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adhering to the Structure Plan will ensure visual access to Slope Hill will be retained through the use and placement of key intersections collector roads and open spaces. These have been strategically placed and retained through the use of the Structure Plan and associated rules to maintain views through the urban area to Slope Hill. This spatial planning will open views toward the Slope Hill where they are not currently enjoyed, particularly north of Howards Drive. Overall the wider landscape character effects of the development will be limited to very low.</li> <li>The views from the highway across land south of the highway to The Remarkables will be maintained by the setback of buildings from the highway.</li> <li>The Structure Plan coordinates the development and removes the potential for ad hoc location of activities, roads, and open spaces. Along with the adoption of the urban growth boundary around the new urban area, these measures provide a defensible urban boundary that will protect the surrounding rural areas from further ad-hoc urban subdivision and development, as well as adjoining areas of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes;</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant masterplanning and urban design input has contributed to the spatial layout of activities as shown on the Structure Plan, and the provisions, to ensure that urban development is implemented in the most effective manner;</li> <li>The provisions provide more certainty for landowners / developers contemplating activities and development within the Zone;</li> </ul> |

<sup>20</sup> Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study March 2017 ([link](#))

<sup>21</sup> Landscape Assessment Report Te Putahi Ladies Mile Masterplan April 2021 (Appendix 3A)

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a cost to landowners / developers for providing the open spaces and other infrastructure identified on the Structure Plan, however these costs are common to all development (reserve contributions);</li> <li>• The provisions will constrain flexibility in developing the land for urban purposes in relation to the key features (however this potential cost is remedied somewhat by providing for some flexibility in the specific location of Structure Plan features as part of the rules package);</li> <li>• The provisions will constrain flexibility for market-led density, with higher capital costs associated with high-density housing;</li> <li>• To amend the Structure Plan requires a further plan change;</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landowners / developers will incur costs to obtain resource consents to ensure consistency with the Structure Plan, thereby ensuring that development overall in the Zone is comprehensive and integrated;</li> <li>• Potential for further loss of long range views to Mt Nicholas and the short range views of the Bayonets, Cecil and Walter Peaks when viewed from State Highway 6 that contribute peoples' and community's well-being, however this has already been significantly affected by the consented bund under RM190553;</li> </ul> | <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-Complying Activity status for non-compliance with the Structure Plan elements gives certainty for the community that the outcomes of the Structure Plan will be achieved;</li> <li>• Maintaining the key landscape views from State Highway 6 to Slope Hill and the Remarkables will provide for peoples' and the community's well-being by not limiting the impacts on the enjoyment of these landscapes beyond what is reasonably required to achieve urban development;</li> <li>• More certainty for landowners / developers with regard to locations suited or not suited for particular activities.</li> </ul> |
| Reasonably practicable options to achieve the objective | Removal of the Structure Plan, or providing wider tolerance for spatial layout outcomes to be achieved through the subdivision process, are alternatives. These options are discounted on the grounds that they may result in piecemeal, flow-on effects for integration over the entire land area and risk that connections between development across different landholdings are not adequately provided for.<br>The Structure Plan method is the most practicable and beneficial to achieve the objectives.   |   |
| Effectiveness and efficiency                            | <p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The provisions package provide for the appropriate spatial layout of activities and the coordination of land uses within the TPLM area to achieve an integrated, connected and high quality environment. On a land area that incorporates a range of landowners and land parcels, this is an effective method of achieving integrated development.</p> <p><b>Efficiency</b></p> <p>The policies and rules require compliance with the Structure Plan. It is efficient to utilise the significant masterplanning and urban design effort that has been undertaken in the development of the Structure Plan, and establish clear parameters for the establishment of urban development in a greenfield area.</p>  |   |

**Proposed Objective 49.2.2: Objective – Development achieves a range of residential intensity and diversity of housing choice to promote affordable homes, a self-sustaining community, and efficient use of urban land.**

The methods proposed to give effect to the objective and address the issue/s include policies and methods that:

- Identify Precincts on the District Plan Maps as being for Low, Medium or High Density;
- In the Low Density Precinct, providing for one residential unit per site with a minimum allotment size of 450m<sup>2</sup>;
- In the Medium and High Density Precincts, avoiding standalone (one residential unit per site) typologies unless these are attached to residential units on other sites (e.g. terraced housing) by making these a Non-Complying Activity;
- Requiring residential development in the Medium and High Density Residential Precincts to meet minimum density requirements (40 units per hectare and 60 units per hectare respectively);
- Requiring Restricted Discretionary resource consent for multi-unit development, with a matter of discretion included relating to diversity of housing choice including size, typology and affordability;
- Requiring Restricted Discretionary resource consent for subdivision in the Zone, with matters of discretion included relating to achievement of the residential density in the Zone and the methods proposed for ensuring that building typologies will provide a diversity of housing choice;
- Avoiding Visitor Accommodation and Residential Visitor Accommodation as a Non-Complying Activity;
- Imposing no restrictions on minimum lot size in the Medium and High Residential Precincts.

|                 | <b>Costs</b>         | <b>Benefits</b>      |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Policies</b> | <i>Environmental</i> | <i>Environmental</i> |



|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>49.2.2.1 – 49.2.2.4<br/>49.2.5.5<br/>4.2.2.21 – 4.2.2.22<br/>27.3.24.2</p> <p><b>Rules</b><br/>49.4.1 - 49.4.7<br/>49.5.11<br/>49.5.16<br/>27.6<br/>27.7.28.1 (c), (d)</p> <p><b>Other methods</b><br/>District Plan Maps<br/>Structure Plan<br/>Assessment matters 27.9.8.1<br/>(c)(i)(a), (d), (e)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirement to achieve the density specified will result in comprehensively designed, but necessarily larger, built form than a lower density would need, meaning greater building heights and building bulk (and the associated effects of this on visual and landscape character) can be anticipated. However, this is offset by the ability to respond more comprehensively to open space and outdoor living in association with larger built form, and could result in better outcomes in relation to efficient use of built form than other typologies (such as zero-lot housing);</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be greater costs to landowners / developers through the avoidance of standalone housing in the provisions, as this typology tends to require the least financial capital to develop, and the requirement for more comprehensive development of multi-unit typologies, which require higher upfront planning and building costs than standalone;</li> <li>Landowner feedback on early drafts of the High Density Residential Precinct density requirements revealed concerns that commercial and market feasibility issues would prevent the achievement of a density of 70 units per hectare (this has been addressed through the reduction in the minimum density required to 60 units per hectare (the minimum required to achieve the density mass to support public transport initiatives) but with a higher range (+20%) to enable an increase in density where there is the appetite for it;</li> <li>A potential lost opportunity cost to provide larger rural residential sections, but this cost is outweighed by the need for more efficient use of land to maximise residential yield, in an environment where there is limited spatial opportunity for urban expansion into rural areas, and rural residential development opportunities are enabled through other PDP zones, including the Wakatipu Rural Lifestyle Rural Amenity Zone and Landscape Precinct;</li> <li>Landowners / developers will incur costs to obtain resource consents for all residential buildings to ensure these are of high quality urban design given the more intense densities required;</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less flexibility for landowners / residents in using their properties when compared to other residential areas of the District through the listing of Residential Visitor Accommodation as a Non-Complying Activity, although noting that Homestay (where visitors share a residential unit with the occupiers) will still be available and that future property owners / residents will have the option to purchase elsewhere in the District should they wish to undertake Residential Visitor Accommodation or use the residential unit as a holiday home / second dwelling;</li> <li>Landowners / developers will need to comply with design controls when building (see assessment in relation to Objectives 49.2.7 and 49.2.8 below) which will limit their design and typology options.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An indirect environmental benefit of the provisions is that the efficient use of this land for maximising residential yield and enhancing affordability through achievement of the density provisions, will reduce the need for other greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes, therefore protecting the landscape character and rural production values of those areas;</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual proposals (both subdivision and land use) will demonstrate, overall residential yields consistent with the densities required in the particular Precinct, which themselves reflect a significant amount of masterplanning and testing during the formulation of the TPLM Masterplan and plan provisions;</li> <li>The lack of minimum lot sizes and the minimum density requirements (combined with the ability to go up to 20% higher) provides maximum flexibility for landowners / developers to respond creatively to the density requirements, enabling building parameters to be taken into account, consistent with the national direction provided for in the NPS-UD;</li> <li>The landuse provisions provide certainty for landowners / developers that applications for buildings will not require notification or written approvals where these meet all the associated standards, but less certainty regarding the resultant yields that the provisions and resultant development would deliver;</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions will provide for a range of typologies and give the best opportunity (without inclusionary zoning or other more regulatory methods) for better affordability and enhancing opportunities for more people to enter the housing market;</li> <li>The avoidance of Visitor Accommodation and Residential Visitor Accommodation in the Residential Precincts will ensure that the land and housing stock is retained for the primary purpose of housing fulltime residents of the District, rather than supporting the visitor accommodation industry;</li> <li>The quality of information and assessment required by the provisions will lead to better decision-making and physical outcomes.</li> </ul> |
| <p>Reasonably practicable options to achieve the objective</p>  | <p>Removing any restriction or direction on density in this location, and allowing the market to dictate the typologies of housing provided, is an alternative option. The risk with this option is that it would provide for an inefficient use of the land for housing purposes as the market is likely to respond with standalone dwelling typologies (and the larger land areas that these require) as these are the simplest to consent and sell. This would not provide a diversity in housing typology from the existing supply in the urban areas at Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country (which is primarily standalone housing) and would not contribute to enhancing housing affordability or promote efficient use of the land resource.</p> <p>At the other end of the spectrum, more regulatory methods for requiring housing to be affordable (such as inclusionary zoning) were considered. Given the significant amount of work undertaken through the Council's inclusionary zoning workstream as a separate plan change which is yet to be notified, and the current intent for these to apply district-wide, no additional affordability provisions have been included in this plan variation. Instead, this plan variation gives effect to the affordability through the considerable supply it will contribute to the housing market, and particularly in the typologies it provides for and the density required to be achieved.</p>  |  |
| <p>Effectiveness and efficiency</p>   | <p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The provisions promote variety in residential unit types and sizes to achieve a range of housing options, while avoiding those typologies that tend to fetch higher prices such as typologies with a large land holding per unit. All buildings for residential activity require restricted discretionary resource consent. The matters of discretion are necessary for the assessment of proposals so that all of the building and site design elements of the proposal can be considered and determined as to their appropriateness, to ensure a high level of liveability for future residents. The matters themselves are effective as they cover the categories of effects that are relevant to buildings, their context in the neighbourhood, and the extent to which they support the purpose of the TPLM Zone. While a</p>  |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>Controlled Activity status for residential buildings would provide applicants greater certainty, the activity status of Restricted Discretionary is more effective for influencing design outcomes and provides the ability to decline a proposal with poor design outcomes, which is more appropriate in this instance given the levels of density required.</p> <p>Likewise, requiring consent for a restricted discretionary subdivision is appropriate to ensure Council have sufficient control over important infrastructure and design matters, and again, to ensure that the subdivision is consistent with the purpose of the TPLM Zone in providing for a range and diversity of housing (including typologies, size and number of bedrooms, etc.).</p> <p><b>Efficiency</b></p> <p>The proposed provisions restrict the grounds for discretion for a resource consent, providing a clear range of controls to achieve the objectives and policies, which in turn seek to achieve a variety of typologies and a high quality of urban design. The list of matters that the Council exercises discretion over is necessary for efficient administration of both the land use and subdivision rules. The matters efficiently assist in ensuring appropriate and intended subdivision and land use outcomes. The proposed provisions restrict the ability for applications for residential buildings that comply with standards to be notified, providing greater certainty for applicants.</p> |
|--|---|

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Proposed Objective 49.2.3: Objective - The Commercial Precinct is compact, convenient and accessible for meeting the needs of local residents, and achieves high quality urban design outcomes.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Objective 49.2.4: Objective - The Glenpanel Precinct provides for non-residential activities that complement the role of the Commercial Precinct with development which responds to the character of the area.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Objective 49.2.5: Objective - A range of compatible activities are provided for within the Zone.</b></p> <p>The methods proposed to give effect to the objective and address the issue/s include policies and methods that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify Precincts on the District Plan Maps for non-residential activities that will support the residential focus of the Zone;</li> <li>In the Commercial and Glenpanel Precincts, enabling a range of commercial activities including retail and offices, that will be utilised by the new TPLM community as well as the existing communities at Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country;</li> <li>In the Residential Precincts, avoiding (through the use of Non-Complying or Prohibited activity status) activities other than for residential activity, except for very small-scale commercial activities and activities associated with the residential use of the property such as Homestay and Home Occupation;</li> <li>Providing for Educational Activities across the Residential Precincts to enable a primary school and high school to establish to support the primary residential purpose of the TPLM Zone, but with limits on the scale of Educational Activities in the Commercial Precinct to ensure sufficient land is available for commercial activities;</li> <li>Avoid activities, including Industrial Activities and Large Format Retail Activities (through the use of Non-Complying or Prohibited activity status) that either give rise to effects that are not compatible with residential activity or would result in redistribution of these activities from other centres.</li> </ol> |   |   |
|  | <b>Costs</b>  | <b>Benefits</b>   |
| <p><b>Policies</b></p> <p>49.2.3.1 – 49.2.3.6<br/>49.2.4.1 – 49.2.4.2<br/>49.2.5.1 – 49.2.5.4</p> <p><b>Rules</b></p> <p>49.4.8 – 49.4.17, 49.4.20 – 49.4.38<br/>49.5.34 – 49.5.35, 49.5.38, 49.5.39,<br/>49.5.43, 49.5.44, 49.5.48</p> <p><b>Other methods</b></p> <p>District Plan Maps</p>  | <p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commercial and educational uses can necessarily result in larger volumes of built form, with the associated effects that these buildings can have on landscape character and amenity values, however the activities that tend to require the biggest amount of built form (Large Format Retail (other than a single supermarket in the Commercial Precinct) and Industrial Activities) are not permitted in the TPLM Zone (note that the specific effects of built form are addressed in relation to Objective 49.2.7 below);</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The restriction on the type and scale of some activities will reduce the flexibility of landowners / developers within these areas in providing for some activities;</li> <li>Dependent on the level of existing demand, the commercial activities enabled may not proceed until there is a level of additional residential development to support it;</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> | <p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Commercial Precinct provides an appropriate area (in size and in scale) for these activities while not having adverse effects on other centres or adjoining residential activity;</li> <li>Limiting the scale of commercial activities within the Residential Precincts to no more than 100m<sup>2</sup> will protect the residents of these areas from effects (such as noise, visual effects from signage etc.) that are not compatible with residential activity;</li> <li>The requirement to provide acoustic insulation where residential and non-residential activity occurs within the same building will ensure adverse effects on residential amenity are mitigated;</li> <li>Limiting residential activity to above ground floor level in the Commercial Precinct ensures that the vibrancy and vitality of this Precinct is retained;</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced transaction costs through the use of Permitted Activity status for a range of commercial activities in the Commercial and Glenpanel Precincts (noting that consent would still be required for buildings (see assessment of Objective 49.2.7 below));</li> <li>The ability to provide residential activity within the Commercial Precinct enables flexibility for landowners / developers to respond to market needs over time;</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> |



|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no requirement for the commercial activities enabled to be given effect to prior to residential development, meaning residential development could occur without these facilities in place;</li> <li>To access some activities (such as Industrial or Large Format Retail (other than the single supermarket provided for)) residents will still need to travel from their community, however future residents of the TPLM Zone will be aware of this prior to selecting this as their home, and for existing residents at Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country there will be no change as this is already the case for them.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Commercial Precinct has been located centrally within the wider area to provide for the day-to-day needs of those living not only in the TPLM Zone but also those living in Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate to meet the needs of those residents also;</li> <li>Inclusion of activities such as retail (including a single supermarket), café and restaurants, and office / commercial service activities supports the creation hub which will contribute to the health and wellbeing of the TPLM Zone residents and existing communities at Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country.</li> </ul> |
| Reasonably practicable options to achieve the objective | <p>Other options available include no restriction on the types or sizes of non-residential activities that may establish in the TPLM Zone, but this has been discounted as it will likely result in adverse effects on distribution of activities and the vitality and function of other centres as set out in the RDG Retail Assessment (<b>Appendix 3A</b>).</p> <p>It is highly desirable for Educational Activity to locate within the TPLM Zone, and educational activities have been an integral part of the masterplanning process for the area, which would suggest a Permitted Activity status could be justified to enable it. However, as at the time of preparing this evaluation, no site had been secured for a state school, therefore it is not possible to specifically identify which area/s of the TPLM Zone it should be permitted in and manage the effects of the activity through spatial location rather than the resource consent process. The Ministry of Education has been involved in the masterplanning process.</p> |   |
| Effectiveness and efficiency                            | <p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The limits on the types and sizes of non-residential activities are necessary to signal, and to discourage, larger floor area tenancies to ensure the Precincts remain for the purpose for which they are intended and protect the amenity and vitality of other centres, including the town centres (Queenstown, Arrowtown and Wanaka) and the service and retail centre at Frankton Flats.</p> <p><b>Efficiency</b></p> <p>Where activities are provided for but where effects may need to be managed (such as Educational Activities) it is efficient to utilise a Restricted Discretionary activity status to indicate that these are appropriate to support the TPLM Zone and therefore anticipated, but retain control over specified aspects of the activity.</p>  |   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Proposed Objective 49.2.6: Development in the Zone minimises the generation of additional vehicle trips along State Highway 6, and reduces, as far as practicable, vehicle trips along State Highway 6 generated by the adjoining residential areas at Ladies Mile.</b></p>   |   |  |
| <p>The methods proposed to give effect to the objective and address the issue include policies and methods that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require a residential yield within the Zone to ensure a population mass that can support (in conjunction with the existing residential areas) a frequent public transport service;</li> <li>Provide for a range of facilities and activities within the Zone that reduce the need for residents within the Zone and residents in the existing residential areas to travel west along State Highway 6;</li> <li>Require the establishment of an active travel network within the Zone in locations that promote connections to existing networks;</li> <li>Encourage public and active modes of transportation through requiring cycle parking and facilities for a range of activities and limiting carparking through imposing onsite maximums;</li> <li>Require key transport infrastructural works be in place prior to development occurring within the Zone; and</li> <li>Require travel plans.</li> </ol> |   |  |
| <b>Proposed provisions</b>  | <b>Costs / Benefits</b>   |  |
|   | <b>Costs</b>  | <b>Benefits</b>  |
| <p><b>Policies</b></p> <p>49.2.2.1 – 49.2.2.5 (addressed in relation to Objective 49.2.2 above)</p> <p>49.2.6.1 – 49.2.6.6</p> <p>27.3.24.5</p> <p>27.3.24.6</p> <p><b>Rules</b></p> <p>49.4.19</p>   | <p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adhering to a Structure Plan potentially inhibits flexibility when locating the transport infrastructural works which may result in less desirable outcomes for connectivity (although this is remedied by providing a degree of flexibility in the location of Structure Plan features);</li> <li>The completed development (circa 2400 residential units) will result in a small increase in flows over Shotover Bridge (4%) when compared to the 1100 residential units that were provisionally approved under the central government's HIF funding, although noting that both scenarios are marginally over the Shotover Bridge capacity and overseas research indicates that at least 40 to 60 units per hectare are needed to support a viable public transport network. A viable public transport network will not be achieved with 1100 units (approximately 20 units per hectare);</li> </ul> | <p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provision of adequate infrastructure that supports alternative travel modes, and is available from the very beginning of development is an integral part of achieving the minimisation or reduction in vehicle trips along State Highway 6;</li> <li>Having access to range of activities and facilities including convenience needs, employment opportunities, schooling and community facilities in proximity to residential areas removes the need for people to travel in their cars altogether, or alternatively remove the need for car-based travel to occur west along State Highway 6;</li> <li>The combination of strategies proposed in conjunction with the development of 2400 units will achieve a mode shift target of up to 50% of external trips, resulting in a reduction of 950</li> </ul> |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>49.4.1 – 49.4.17, 49.4.19 – 49.4.38 (addressed in relation to Objectives 49.2.3 - 49.2.5 above)</p> <p>49.5.10, 49.5.11, 49.5.33, 49.5.50, 49.5.56</p> <p>27.7.28.1 (h) and (i)</p> <p>29.5.12A</p> <p>29.10</p> <p><b>Other methods</b></p> <p>District Plan Maps</p> <p>Structure Plan</p> <p>Assessment matter 49.7.2</p> | <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions require infrastructural works that support public transport services and walking/cycling connections between the two sides of the state highway to be in place prior to development of the land occurring. The large financial costs associated with this (not quantifiable at the time of preparing this evaluation due to the flexibility provided to design an appropriate response) will be borne by developers, although there are funding opportunities available to private persons and statutory organisations (such as the roading authority) that could bear some of the costs.</li> <li>There are additional consenting requirements for those landowners within the Crossing Curtilage Overlay Areas, but this is limited to one matter of discretion only (integration of development with the relevant crossing). As buildings in all precincts except the Low Density Precinct already require consent, any additional costs are likely to be small.</li> <li>There are additional information requirements for some activities to provide travel plans that include methods to address travel behaviour change. While there will be an additional cost to those activities, this is offset by the potential environmental benefits (additional 10% reduction in car use over and above that achieved through infrastructure alone).</li> <li>Less flexibility for landowners when compared to other residential areas of the District in providing for a Residential Flat and its associated income, however future property owners will have the option to purchase elsewhere in the District should they wish to undertake this activity, and offset by the necessary limitations on the total number of residences provided in the Zone and the associated traffic generation.</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for the transport infrastructural works to delay development of housing, with ongoing effects on the supply and cost of housing for Queenstown residents.</li> </ul> | <p>(AM peak westbound) and 322 (PM peak eastbound) trips when compared to if the strategies were not implemented<sup>22</sup>;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provisions requiring integration of development within the Crossing Curtilage Area Overlay with crossings will provide for better design outcomes, particularly within high volume/use areas such as the Commercial Precinct and Open Space Precinct, to support the integration of the two sides of State Highway 6;</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezoning for urban purposes clearly signals to the transport organisations the urbanisation of the TPLM area, giving certainty of the long-term approach to this area and supporting these organisations' decision-making on the planning and investment and enabling development to occur in a structured way as transport solutions are realised;</li> <li>The provisions to provide for early-stage development works (the granting of subdivision consent and the installation of utilities) to occur prior the transport infrastructural works being completed, with this flexibility supporting the ongoing housing market;</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Certainty for the existing residential communities that development cannot occur (unless Non-Complying resource consent is sought and obtained) prior to the completion of the transport infrastructural works that will support the use of alternative modes of transport and reduce impacts on State Highway 6;</li> <li>The provision of a Commercial Precinct and community facilities, including, in all likelihood, schools, with strong connectivity between the two, will form a social hub for both the future and existing residential areas.</li> </ul> |
| <p>Effectiveness and efficiency</p>   | <p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>A Prohibited Activity status is a possible alternative activity status to Non-Complying Activity for development that occurs prior to the transport infrastructural works, however this is generally used when an activity is not contemplated (such as an activity that is fundamentally incompatible with a zone's purpose). A Non-Complying activity status poses a high test for breaches, but still provides a consenting pathway for alternative methods while still achieving the objective and policies. This is supported by an "Avoid" policy which is qualified to enable alternative methods to the transport infrastructure works provided these will avoid future and cumulative adverse effects from additional traffic movements. In addition, the transport infrastructural works are not based on an assumed quantity of development but rather what is needed to support the delivery of development in a particular area (utilising Sub-Areas) in order to achieve the mode shift required to achieve the objective. This enables the staged progression of development as the transport infrastructure works are progressed.</p> <p>The provisions are effective in that they strike an appropriate balance between setting stringent requirements in order to support a reduction in private vehicle trip generation from when development of the Zone commences, including through mode shift to public and active transport, while still recognising that urban development is anticipated where it is integrated with these transport strategies.</p> <p><b>Efficiency</b></p>  |   |

The provisions are an efficient method of enabling development to progress in a manner which integrates with the transport infrastructural works necessary to ensure public and active transport options are made available. While the implementation of the provisions will result in costs, primarily for the developers of the land, these are necessary to achieve the objective, and are outweighed by the benefits to the efficiency of the operation of the roading network. The policy direction for the Zone in relation to this issue is a departure from the status quo, and reflects the specific issues for the development of this land that necessitates a Special Purposes Zone and also responds to significant community feedback received. Overall, the proposed provisions, when considered in their totality, are efficient as the benefits outweigh the costs and alternative options would inevitably result in exacerbating the existing congestion problems on State Highway 6.

**Proposed Objective 49.2.7: Objective – An attractive built environment that positively responds to streets and open spaces, provides a high level of residential and neighbourhood amenity, achieves high quality urban design outcomes.**

**Proposed Objective 49.2.8: Objective - Development that supports resilience to the current and future effects of climate change.**

The methods proposed to give effect to the objective include policies and methods that:

- (a) Require resource consents for Restricted Discretionary activities for all buildings in the TPLM Zone except for residential units in the Low Density Residential Precinct (subject to compliance with standards);
- (b) Require development to comply with a range of bulk and location standards;
- (c) Require residential development to comply with a range of standards relating to residential amenity;
- (d) Provide a range of assessment matters for Council to take into account aspirational built form responses including sustainability and accessibility.

|  | <b>Costs</b>  | <b>Benefits</b>   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Policies</b><br/>49.2.3.5, 49.2.3.7, 49.2.3.7<br/>49.2.4.3<br/>49.2.7.1 – 49.2.7.14<br/>49.2.8.1 – 49.2.8.3<br/>27.3.24.4</p> <p><b>Rules</b><br/>49.4.4, 49.4.18<br/>49.5.1 – 49.5.9, 49.5.12<br/>49.5.17 – 49.5.32, 49.5.36<br/>49.5.40 – 49.5.42, 49.5.45 – 49.5.47,<br/>49.5.49, 49.5.51 – 49.5.52, 49.5.54 –<br/>49.5.564, 49.5.57<br/>49.6.1 – 49.6.2<br/>27.7.28.1<br/>29.5.24 – 29.5.25<br/>31.14<br/>36.5.2</p> <p><b>Other methods</b><br/>Assessment matters 49.7.1 (a) – (g)<br/>Assessment matters 27.9.8.1 (a) – (b)<br/>, (e) - (g)</p> | <p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The building design standards will necessarily result in a change to the existing rural and landscape character of the land;</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement for resource consent for buildings will result in additional transaction costs for landowners / developers, however this is outweighed by the need to ensure quality design;</li> <li>• Uncertain consenting process where there is a potential for a consent to be declined (although this uncertainty is reduced by the inclusion of rules preventing buildings that comply with the standards from being notified or requiring written approvals;</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessing the external appearance of buildings and the design of sites can involve subjective judgement.</li> </ul> | <p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The matters of discretion enable the Council to address anticipated effects that arise from development so that all of the building and site design elements of the proposal can be focused on, contemplated, and determined as to their appropriateness. This results in a more robust assessment of design, which is likely to yield better individual designs;</li> <li>• The standards ensure that there is sufficient space between buildings, access to outdoor living spaces, outlook space and restrictions on fence heights to ensure high levels of residential amenity (relative to the densities required) and passive surveillance of streets and open spaces;</li> <li>• The inclusion of provisions relating to boundary treatments on the edge of the TPLM Zone (including reduced densities, buffer planting, and height limits) will reduce adverse effects of urban development on adjoining zones;</li> <li>• Careful planning of the effects of built form (for example, the locating of greater height limits further from the State Highway and Building Restriction Areas) will minimise the visual effects of built form when viewed from outside the TPLM Zone;</li> </ul> <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of limited matters of discretion and a set of assessment matters to narrow and better guide the value judgements by Council planners, as well as those providing advice to those developing buildings, reduces the uncertainty of the Restricted Discretionary activity status;</li> </ul> <p><i>Social and cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of common parameters for buildings included in rules gives certainty to future residents about the levels of amenity they can expect in both their own and adjoining residential developments;</li> <li>• Assessment matters provide guidance to Plan users in what is supportive of effective urban design.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Reasonably practicable options to achieve the objective | <p>A Permitted or Controlled Activity status for buildings which comply with standards is an alternative option to the proposed Restricted Discretionary activity regime. These have been discounted due to the higher potential for poor urban design outcomes in the TPLM Zone given the density of development anticipated, and the lack of these two activity statuses to have any real “teeth” to effectively deal with design matters to achieve Objective 49.2.7.</p> <p>The reliance on the existing design guidance for the existing High Density Residential Zone is another option, but again, the density of development proposed in the TPLM Zone is not reflected in that document and therefore it has limited ability to improve the design of the types of development anticipated. It is open for the Council to look at developing design guidance for higher densities in the future.</p> <p>Another option would be to not provide any assessment matters. Being non-statutory they have limited weighting and are not widely used in the PDP, however they do provide significant guidance to applicants and Council processing officers as to the range of matters that should be addressed, providing additional certainty.</p> |
| Effectiveness and efficiency                            | <p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>It is appropriate that common parameters of the buildings for both residential and non-residential activities are included in the rules (height, building coverage, residential amenity standards etc.) to ensure a minimum level of amenity. The matters of discretion and assessment matters are effective as they cover the categories of effects that are relevant to buildings and their context in the neighbourhood.</p> <p><b>Efficiency</b></p> <p>It is efficient to require assessment through a Restricted Discretionary activity regime. Although resource consent is required, the nature and scale of the development in the TPLM Zone justify the additional oversight provided through the matters of discretion, and to a lesser extent, the assessment matters.</p>   |

## 9. CONCLUSIONS

The above evaluation has examined the proposed TPLM Zone under section 32 of the Act. The broad conclusions from that evaluation are that:

- a. Under section 32(1)(a), the objectives of the TPLM Zone are necessary and the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act, taking into account the existing higher order provisions of the PDP and the Regional Policy Statement;
- b. The policies and methods are the most appropriate way to achieve the TPLM Zone objectives, taking into account the locational context, the background reports, the design methodology and resulting masterplan and Structure Plan for the Zone;
- c. The TPLM Zone provisions will be efficient and effective in achieving the objectives, taking into account their costs and benefits including the environmental, social and economic costs and benefits;
- d. There is no risk of acting given that the provisions manage effects of the activities on the wider environment; there is no uncertainty in or insufficiency of the information about the subject matter of the provisions. There is risk of not acting as the finite land resource could be lost to inefficient land uses.

Overall, for the reasons expressed above, the TPLM Zone will achieve the higher order objectives of the PDP and the purpose and principles of the Act.

## APPENDIX 1

### APPENDIX 1A - PROPOSAL

## **APPENDIX 2**

**APPENDIX 2A - STATUTORY CONTEXT**

**APPENDIX 2B - PLANNING CONTEXT**



## APPENDIX 2A - STATUTORY CONTEXT

### Resource Management Act 1991

- 1.1. The Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA” or “the Act”), requires an integrated planning approach and direction to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Section 5 of the act sets out the purpose and principles of the act. Section 5 is given further elaboration in, sections 6, 7 and 8 of Part 2 of the Act. Sections 6, 7 and 8 supplement the core purpose of sustainable management by stating the particular obligations of those administering the RMA in relation to the various matters identified:

#### **5 Purpose**

- (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.*

- 1.2. Section 6 of the RMA sets out a number of matters of national importance that are to be recognised and provided for. The following section 6 matters are relevant:

- (a) *the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (b) *the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (c) *the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:*
- (d) *the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:*

- 1.3. Section 7 lists “other matters” that Council shall have particular regard to and those most relevant to the TPLM Zone Chapter include the following:

- (a) *kaitiakitanga:*
  - (aa) *the ethic of stewardship:*
  - (b) *the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:*
    - (ba) *the efficiency of the end use of energy:*
    - (c) *the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:*
    - (d) *intrinsic values of ecosystems:*
    - (f) *maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:*
    - (g) *any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:*
    - (i) *the effects of climate change:*

1.4. Section 8 requires that Council take into account the principles of the Te Tiriti o Waitangi or Treaty of Waitangi (“the Treaty”). The principles as they relate to resource management derive from the treaty itself and from resource management case law and practice. They can be summarised as follows:

- a) The active protection of the **Partnership** between the two parties;
- b) The **Protection** of resources of importance to tangata whenua from adverse effects;
- c) The active **Participation** by tangata whenua in resource management decision making;
- d) The obligation to reasonably, honourably and in good faith towards each other; and
- e) The obligation to make informed decisions on matters that affect the interests of Māori.

1.5. Section 31 of the RMA states:

*31 Functions of territorial authorities under this Act*

*(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district:*

- (a) 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:*
- (aa) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in respect of housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the district:*
- (b) the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of—*
  - (i) the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards; and*
  - (ii) [Repealed]*
  - (ia) the prevention or mitigation of any adverse effects of the development, subdivision, or use of contaminated land:*
  - (iii) the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity:*
    - (c) [Repealed]*
    - (d) the control of the emission of noise and the mitigation of the effects of noise:*
    - (e) the control of any actual or potential effects of activities in relation to the surface of water in rivers and lakes:*
    - (f) any other functions specified in this Act.*
- (2) The methods used to carry out any functions under subsection (1) may include the control of subdivision*

Section 32 of the RMA states:

*(1) An evaluation report required under this Act must—*

- (a) examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and*
- (b) examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by—*
  - (i) identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives;*
  - and*

- (ii) *assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and*
    - (iii) *summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and*
  - (c) *contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.*
- (2) *An assessment under subsection (1)(b)(ii) must—*
- (a) *identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for—*
    - (i) *economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and*
    - (ii) *employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and*
  - (b) *if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to in paragraph (a); and*
  - (c) *assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.*
- (3) *If the proposal (an **amending proposal**) will amend a standard, statement, national planning standard, regulation, plan, or change that is already proposed or that already exists (an **existing proposal**), the examination under subsection (1)(b) must relate to—*
- (a) *the provisions and objectives of the amending proposal; and*
  - (b) *the objectives of the existing proposal to the extent that those objectives—*
    - (i) *are relevant to the objectives of the amending proposal; and*
    - (ii) *would remain if the amending proposal were to take effect.*
- (4) *If the proposal will impose a greater or lesser prohibition or restriction on an activity to which a national environmental standard applies than the existing prohibitions or restrictions in that standard, the evaluation report must examine whether the prohibition or restriction is justified in the circumstances of each region or district in which the prohibition or restriction would have effect.*
- (4A) *If the proposal is a proposed policy statement, plan, or change prepared in accordance with any of the processes provided for in [Schedule 1](#), the evaluation report must—*
- (a) *summarise all advice concerning the proposal received from iwi authorities under the relevant provisions of [Schedule 1](#); and*
  - (b) *summarise the response to the advice, including any provisions of the proposal that are intended to give effect to the advice.*
- (5) *The person who must have particular regard to the evaluation report must make the report available for public inspection—*
- (a) *as soon as practicable after the proposal is made (in the case of a standard, regulation, national policy statement, or New Zealand coastal policy statement); or*
  - (b) *at the same time as the proposal is notified.*
- (6) *In this section,—*
- objectives** *means,—*
- (a) *for a proposal that contains or states objectives, those objectives:*
  - (b) *for all other proposals, the purpose of the proposal*
- proposal** *means a proposed standard, statement, national planning standard, regulation, plan, or change for which an evaluation report must be prepared under this Act*
- provisions** *means,—*

- (a) *for a proposed plan or change, the policies, rules, or other methods that implement, or give effect to, the objectives of the proposed plan or change:*
- (b) *for all other proposals, the policies or provisions of the proposal that implement, or give effect to, the objectives of the proposal.*

1.6. The proposed provisions help to achieve the integrated management of natural and physical resources by identifying the resource management issues and objectives for the land and providing provisions that address the issues and implement the objectives.

### **Local Government Act 2002**

1.7. Section 14 of the Local Government Act 2002 is also of relevance in terms of policy development and decision making:

- (a) *a local authority should—*
  - (i) *conduct its business in an open, transparent, and democratically accountable manner; and*
  - (ii) *give effect to its identified priorities and desired outcomes in an efficient and effective manner:*
- (b) *a local authority should make itself aware of, and should have regard to, the views of all of its communities; and*
- (c) *when making a decision, a local authority should take account of—*
  - (i) *the diversity of the community, and the community's interests, within its district or region; and*
  - (ii) *the interests of future as well as current communities; and*
  - (iii) *the likely impact of any decision on the interests referred to in section 10:*
- (d) *a local authority should provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to its decision-making processes:*
- (e) *a local authority should actively seek to collaborate and co-operate with other local authorities and bodies to improve the effectiveness and efficiency with which it achieves its identified priorities and desired outcomes; and*
- (f) *a local authority should undertake any commercial transactions in accordance with sound business practices; and*
- (fa) *a local authority should periodically—*
  - (i) *assess the expected returns to the authority from investing in, or undertaking, a commercial activity; and*
  - (ii) *satisfy itself that the expected returns are likely to outweigh the risks inherent in the investment or activity; and*
- (g) *a local authority should ensure prudent stewardship and the efficient and effective use of its resources in the interests of its district or region, including by planning effectively for the future management of its assets; and*
- (h) *in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority should take into account—*
  - (i) *the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and*
  - (ii) *the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and*
  - (iii) *the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.*

1.8. The proposal is consistent with Section 14 as follows:

- (a) The views of the community have been collected and had regard to in the formulation of the proposal, noting that a large portion of the feedback received was from current communities rather than future communities;
- (b) The formulation of the proposal has included iwi input on a regular basis through representation on the Project Working Group;
- (c) The proposal is an example of the Council ensuring stewardship of a strategic area of land to ensure its efficient and effective use through future planning;
- (d) In promulgating a plan variation, the Council is taking a sustainable development approach that takes into account the social, economic and cultural interests of its communities (both current and future), the protection of the quality of the environment and the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.

1.9. Having regard to these provisions, the approach through this review is to provide a balanced framework in the District Plan to manage these resources appropriately. Furthermore, no less important is the need to ensure the provisions are presented in a manner that is clearly interpreted to facilitate effective and efficient District Plan administration.

### **National Planning Standards**

- 1.10. In April 2019 the Government released a set of National Planning Standards (**planning standards**) that require all regional policy statements, regional plans and district plans to have a nationally consistent structure and format. The planning standards also prescribe certain definitions, noise and vibration metrics, and requirements for electronic functionality and accessibility. The planning standards have been introduced to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning system, rather than seeking to alter the outcomes of policy statements or plans.
- 1.11. The TPLM Zone Chapter has been drafted to be consistent with the planning standards, including the format, structure and terminology. The exception to this is the amendments to the existing provisions of the PDP. These have been drafted consistent with the PDP existing style to avoid confusion about which existing provisions are subject to amendment or where additions are proposed in the PDP.
- 1.12. The provisions have been developed into a single Special Purpose Zone rather than dispersed throughout the PDP using the existing zoning framework. A new Special Purpose Zone (beyond those eight listed in Table 13 of standard 8(5)) can only be created when the proposed land use activities or anticipated outcomes of the additional zone meet all of the following criteria<sup>23</sup>:
- (a) Are significant to the district, region or country
  - (b) Are impractical to be managed through another zone
  - (c) Are impractical to be managed through a combination of spatial layers.
- 1.13. The TPLM Zone meets these criteria as follows:
- (a) The TPLM area is one of only two identified priority development areas under the Spatial Plan. Its development therefore represents a critical part of the response to the District's housing and affordability issues (as set out in Section 4.2);
  - (b) The utilisation of the existing PDP zones will not result in the best outcome for the development of the land due to the particular issues the planning provisions will need to respond to at this location and if implemented, would result in not the most appropriate outcomes for the land; and

---

<sup>23</sup> National Planning Standards Framework 2019, Standard 8(3)

- (c) The location-specific issues to be addressed are not covered by existing spatial layers. The creation of new spatial layers to address the issues would be inefficient, and result in increased Plan complexity.

**Other National Legislation or Policy Statements**

- 1.14. When preparing district plans, local authorities must give effect to any National Policy Statement (NPS) and National Environmental Standard (NES).
  
- 1.15. The following NPSs are currently in effect:
  - (a) NPS on Urban Development (NPS-UD)
  - (b) NPS for Freshwater Management (NPS-FW)
  - (c) NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation (NPS-REG)
  - (d) NPS on Electricity Transmission (NPS-ET)
  - (e) New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement
  
- 1.16. Work is currently underway on a proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and a proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.
  
- 1.17. The following NESs are currently in effect:
  - (a) NES for Air Quality;
  - (b) NES for Sources of Drinking Water;
  - (c) NES for Telecommunication Facilities;
  - (d) NES for Electricity Transmission Activities;
  - (e) NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health;
  - (f) NES for Plantation Forestry; and
  - (g) NES for Freshwater.
  
- 1.18. The proposal does not seek to change the overall policy direction of the PDP and does not introduce provisions that would be inconsistent with any of the NES or NPS. The NPS-UD is discussed in detail below.

***National Policy Statement on Urban Development***

- 1.19. The Council is a tier 2 local authority under the NPS-UD. The relevant provisions are set out in the table below.

| <b>National Policy Statement on Urban Development: Provisions</b>  |
|--|
| <b>Objective 1:</b> New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.  |
| <b>Objective 2:</b> Planning decisions improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets.   |
| <b>Objective 3:</b> Regional policy statements and district plans enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, areas of an urban environment in which one or more of the following apply: |

| <b>National Policy Statement on Urban Development: Provisions</b>  |
|--|
| <p>(a) the area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities</p> <p>(b) the area is well-serviced by existing or planned public transport</p> <p>(c) there is high demand for housing or for business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment.</p>  |
| <p><b>Objective 4:</b> New Zealand's urban environments, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations.</p>  |
| <p><b>Objective 5:</b> Planning decisions relating to urban environments, and FDSs, take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).</p>   |
| <p><b>Objective 6:</b> Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are:</p> <p>(a) integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions;</p> <p>(b) and strategic over the medium term and long term; and</p> <p>(c) responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity</p>   |
| <p><b>Objective 7:</b> Local authorities have robust and frequently updated information about their urban environments and use it to inform planning decisions.</p>  |
| <p><b>Objective 8:</b> New Zealand's urban environments:</p> <p>(a) support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and</p> <p>(b) are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy 1:</b> Planning decisions contribute to well-functioning urban environments, which are urban environments that, as a minimum:</p> <p>(a) have or enable a variety of homes that:</p> <p>(b) meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households; and</p> <p>(c) (enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms; and</p> <p>(d) have or enable a variety of sites that are suitable for different business sectors in terms of location and site size; and</p> <p>(e) have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport; and</p> <p>(f) support, and limit as much as possible adverse impacts on, the competitive operation of land and development markets; and</p> <p>(g) support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;</p> <p>(h) and are resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy 2:</b> Tier 1, 2, and 3 local authorities, at all times, provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and for business land over the short term, medium term, and long term.</p>  |
| <p><b>Policy 5:</b> Regional policy statements and district plans applying to tier 2 and 3 urban environments enable heights and density of urban form commensurate with the greater of:</p> <p>(a) the level of accessibility by existing or planned active or public transport to a range of commercial activities and community services;</p> <p>(b) or relative demand for housing and business use in that location</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy 6:</b> When making planning decisions that affect urban environments, decision-makers have particular regard to the following matters:</p> <p>(a) the planned urban built form anticipated by those RMA planning documents that have given effect to this National Policy Statement</p>   |



| <b>National Policy Statement on Urban Development: Provisions</b>   |
|---|
| <p>(b) that the planned urban built form in those RMA planning documents may involve significant changes to an area, and those changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by other people, communities, and future generations, including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types; and</li> <li>(ii) are not, of themselves, an adverse effect</li> </ul> <p>(c) the benefits of urban development that are consistent with well-functioning urban environments (as described in Policy 1)</p> <p>(d) any relevant contribution that will be made to meeting the requirements of this National Policy Statement to provide or realise development capacity</p> <p>(e) the likely current and future effects of climate change.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy 7:</b> Tier 1 and 2 local authorities set housing bottom lines for the short-medium term and the long term in their regional policy statements and district plans.</p>   |
| <p><b>Policy 8:</b> Local authority decisions affecting urban environments are responsive to plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments, even if the development capacity is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) unanticipated by RMA planning documents; or</li> <li>(b) out-of-sequence with planned land release.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Policy 9:</b> Local authorities, in taking account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) in relation to urban environments, must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) involve hapū and iwi in the preparation of RMA planning documents and any FDSs by undertaking effective consultation that is early, meaningful and, as far as practicable, in accordance with tikanga Māori; and</li> <li>(b) when preparing RMA planning documents and FDSs, take into account the values and aspirations of hapū and iwi for urban development; and</li> <li>(c) provide opportunities in appropriate circumstances for Māori involvement in decision-making on resource consents, designations, heritage orders, and water conservation orders, including in relation to sites of significance to Māori and issues of cultural significance; and</li> <li>(d) operate in a way that is consistent with iwi participation legislation.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Policy 10:</b> Tier 1, 2, and 3 local authorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) that share jurisdiction over urban environments work together when implementing this National Policy Statement; and</li> <li>(b) engage with providers of development infrastructure and additional infrastructure to achieve integrated land use and infrastructure planning; and</li> <li>(c) engage with the development sector to identify significant opportunities for urban development.</li> </ul>  |

1.20. The Council has prepared a Housing Development Capacity Assessment (HCA) in 2021 to satisfy the requirements of the NPS-UD, which requires all local authorities with medium or high growth urban areas to carry out a housing and business development capacity assessment.

1.21. The following is an evaluation of the NPS-UD as it relates specifically to the variation, and is structured around the following themes of the NPS-UD.

***Well-functioning urban environments***

1.22. The proposal is consistent with meeting Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD as it provides the following:

- (a) A positive contribution to the accessibility of the existing urban area of Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country by providing for facilities and activities that are not currently provided for in these areas, and reducing the need for residents of these areas to travel elsewhere to access facilities;
- (b) A positive contribution toward meeting the needs, in terms of the type, price and location, of smaller household typologies to complement the existing standalone housing typologies provided for at Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country;
- (c) A positive contribution towards limiting possible adverse effects on the competitive operation of land and development markets, by the added opportunity for an increase in the contribution of urban residential land to the market; and
- (d) A positive contribution to limiting greenhouse gas emissions, through the provision of accessible facilities to both the existing residents and future residents, and the encouragement and support provided for public and active modes of transportation, to reduce the need for vehicle trips elsewhere within the Wakatipu Basin to work and play.

### **Housing affordability**

- 1.23. Objective 2 requires planning decision to improve housing affordability. There are no policies that directly relate to housing affordability, although the theme of the NPS-UD is to encourage affordability through the provision of new urban environments, the intensification of existing urban environments and encouragement of greater competitiveness in the market.
- 1.24. The proposal is generally consistent with the NPS-UD in that it supports housing affordability through supply as the primary means, and places the obligation on local authorities to monitor housing affordability, supply and diversity to meet demand.
- 1.25. The HCA 2021 modelling indicates that housing demand is likely to change as follows:
  - (a) Increases in the number of older households, with those in the 60+ and above categories more than doubling over the medium to long term. Younger age groups (including children) start to make up only a relatively small proportion of the future population;
  - (b) Increases in one person and couple households, with one person and couple households accounting for around three-quarters of the total household growth in the medium term, and in the long term; and
  - (c) Lower and lower-middle income households are expected to account for a greater share of future housing demand (20% currently increasing to 25% long term).
- 1.26. This analysis indicates that affordability issues are going to become progressively more important for non-owner households in the middle and later years, as lifetime earning potential reduces, and ability to access housing finance often reduces and that these changes should translate into market supply, in theory, over the medium to long term, of dwelling types decreasing in both size and cost.
- 1.27. The HCA finds that at a total urban environment level, there is sufficient development capacity (just) to meet projected long-term demand (inclusive of a margin)<sup>24</sup>. While housing numbers are increasing, housing affordability has been steadily decreasing, with the average median house price in the District increasing from \$873,469 in June 2017 to \$1,018,250 in March 2021. This is a significant issue for the District, as analysis shows that currently over 83% of our first-home buyer households and 37% of renters are spending more than 30% of their income on housing costs<sup>25</sup>.
- 1.28. The HCA finds that there is a current shortfall of housing in price bands below \$500,000 (-2,350 affordable dwellings in 2020 for first home buyers, with the majority of these households in rental accommodation)<sup>26</sup>. These housing affordability shortfalls are set to worsen if there are no interventions by 2050 to help first home buyers get into the housing market. There could be a shortfall of 6,960 affordable dwellings affecting dwelling value bands all the way up to \$1.2m<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>24</sup> Page 7, Housing Development Capacity Assessment Main Report 2021  
<sup>25</sup> Page 13, Housing Development Capacity Assessment Main Report 2021  
<sup>26</sup> Page 5, Housing Development Capacity Assessment Main Report 2021  
<sup>27</sup> Page 198, Housing Development Capacity Assessment Main Report 2021

- 1.29. The HCA recommendations include that further supply of land are unlikely in and of themselves to increase the rate of supply of housing by the development sector in the lower value bands and that specific effort and initiatives will be important to ensure a more affordable price range for dwellings. Initiatives may include inclusionary zoning, investment by Kainga Ora, and other measures to reduce building costs, complexity and time delays.
- 1.30. Of the recommendations, the measures available as part of this plan variation would be inclusionary zoning. However, Council is currently undertaking a separate workstream on affordable housing provisions to incorporate into the PDP. Non-statutory public consultation was undertaken in the third quarter of 2021 on draft inclusionary zoning provisions to potentially be included in the PDP by way of plan variation. These provisions were drafted to have a district-wide applicability, and included strategic provisions, objectives, policies and rules that apply to any residential development within the Urban Growth Boundaries, or residential development outside the Urban Growth Boundaries but within listed zones. Residential development in the TPLM Zone would fall under the scope of the provisions (assuming that the criteria remained the same in the future version of the variation).
- 1.31. The consultation on the inclusionary zoning provisions indicated support generally. Written submissions on the Homes Strategy<sup>28</sup> which was consulted on at the same time included feedback on the following themes:
- (a) Need for more housing diversity (including pensioners, workers accommodation, and restrict the ability for developer to provide large sections);
  - (b) Provide and retain green space and protect the natural environment;
  - (c) Support and encourage decreased car reliance and use;
  - (d) Limit short term letting and unoccupied homes;
  - (e) Infrastructure needs to go in first;
  - (f) Accessible housing should be specifically provided for; and
  - (g) Limit additional requirements that may add to cost of building.
- 1.32. The TPLM Zone is consistent with each of the feedback themes as follows:
- (a) The provisions require a specified density to be achieved, with the ability to provide for a range of typologies in achieving that density;
  - (b) The provision of green spaces has been carefully considered through the Masterplanning process and is reflected with certainty in the Structure Plan;
  - (c) A suite of objectives and policies support the integrated development of the Zone to encourage public and active transport modes as first choice for residents, and maximum onsite parking requirements further discourage private vehicle use;
  - (d) Residential Visitor Accommodation is avoided;
  - (e) Development must demonstrate that specific transport infrastructural works are in place prior to be undertaken;
  - (f) All buildings require resource consent for design matters and the Council has the ability to consider accessibility, including encouraging a target for the units within a development; and
  - (g) While resource consent is required for buildings to ensure quality design given the densities and typologies involved, the standards that apply have been carefully considered through the masterplanning process to ensure a balance between good living outcomes for future residents without significantly affecting the affordability of the end product.
- 1.33. The Housing Strategy was adopted by Council in December 2021, and work continues on the inclusionary zoning workstream as at the time of writing. Given the significant amount of work undertaken through this workstream, and the current intent for these to apply district-wide, no additional affordability provisions have been built into this plan variation. Instead, this plan

<sup>28</sup>

Meeting of the Queenstown Lakes District Council 16 December 2022 Item 11 ([link](#))

variation gives effect to the affordability directions of the NPS-UD through the considerable supply it will contribute to the housing market, particularly in the typologies it provides for.

- 1.34. The Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan (Grow Well Whaiora)<sup>29</sup> has been prepared to be consistent with the direction of the NPS-UD to provide sufficient development capacity and achieve well-functioning urban environments. It is intended for this Spatial Plan to inform and be built-on when a Future Development Strategy is prepared in 2024.

#### ***Amenity values of urban environments***

- 1.35. Objective 4, implemented by Policy 6, recognises that amenity values in urban environments (as defined) develop and change over time and are not in and of themselves an adverse effect. These provisions are directly relevant to the proposed variation, which will result in the urbanisation of land which has previously experienced more open and rural character due to its rural lifestyle zoning. This land is identified as within the Long Term Urban Environment (Indicative Future Expansion Area) in the HCA<sup>30</sup>.
- 1.36. While a change in amenity values will necessarily be experienced as urban development of the land is undertaken, the integrated and strategic planning that has occurred through the masterplanning of the land and detail of the provisions enables significant amenity through the provision of open spaces, high quality design of sites and buildings (including the use of controls on heights and setbacks), and maintenance (or in some cases, improvement) of important views.

#### ***National Policy Statement on Freshwater***

- 1.37. The National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) came into effect in September 2020 and together with its associated National Environmental Standard and regulations requires freshwater to be managed in a way that gives effect to Te Mana o te Wai to improve or maintain water and seek to avoid any further loss or degradation of wetlands and streams.
- 1.38. The consistency of the TPLM Zone with the provisions of the NPS-FM can be summarised as follows:
  - (a) The land is suitable for onsite treatment and disposal of stormwater. Water sensitive design is promoted to ensure Te Mana o te Wai is given effect to;
  - (b) The Council has consulted with tāngata whenua; and
  - (c) The onsite stormwater management and open spaces provide opportunities to enhance indigenous ecosystems to enhance the diversity of flora and fauna.
- 1.39. The key objectives of the NPS-FM are therefore achieved by the proposal.

---

<sup>29</sup> Queenstown Lakes Spatial Plan (Grow Well Whaiora) July 2021 ([link](#))

<sup>30</sup> Figure 1.8 page 26, Housing Development Capacity Assessment Main Report 2021

## APPENDIX 2B - PLANNING CONTEXT

### Iwi Management Plans

1.40. When preparing or changing a district plan, Section 74(2A)(a) of the Resource Management Act (“the Act” or “RMA”) states that Councils must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district.

1.41. The following iwi management plans are relevant:

| <b>The Cry of the People, Te Tangi a Taurira: Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Provision</b>   | <b>Discussion</b>   |
| <b>3.1 Huringa Ahua o Te Rangī Climate Change Issues</b>   |   |
| Activities within Murihiku are contributing to the cumulative effects of greenhouse gas emission.  | This suite of provisions generally has a broader application than the District Plan, but the TPLM Zone takes these into account through the proposed TPLM provisions which:<br>(a) Seek to reduce private vehicle trips through limiting onsite carparking and encouraging public and active transport modes; and<br>(b) Encourage sustainability initiatives in building and site design.  |
| Increased population and urban development contribute to increased levels of vehicle emissions.  |   |
| Effective solutions to address greenhouse emissions need to be managed at all levels.  |   |
| <b>Ngā Kaupapa – Policy</b>  |   |
| 2. Actively engage and work with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu by contributing local rūnanga principles and views toward the formation of tribal policy in respect to climate change.   | Again, this suite of provisions has a broad application. They are addressed as follows:<br>(a) Runaka engagement has occurred throughout the masterplanning process (which in turn lead to the plan variation) and feedback from runaka on the provisions has been incorporated;<br>(b) The development of the land for urban purposes, in conjunction with previous loss of habitat from earlier urban development, could have an adverse effect on indigenous species (black-billed gull and black-fronted tern) known to be in the area. However, the proposed urban development includes significant areas of open space and will require onsite stormwater management. The ecological peer review ( <b>Appendix 3A</b> ) recommends that the urban development of the land represents an opportunity to incorporate indigenous vegetation on the margins of open spaces to provide habitat for indigenous species, interagency monitoring of the gull and tern populations and the development of a Biodiversity Strategy. The TPLM provisions include policies and assessment matters encouraging the use of indigenous vegetation from the ecological district in landscaping. The |
| 5. Ensure that sustainable management and climate change policy does not lead to adverse environmental effects on indigenous species and ecosystems. Policy should support the continuation of activities and encourage the restoration and sustainable management of indigenous ecosystems. |   |
| 9. Support sustainable energy systems (for houses, water and transport) to meet social and cultural needs while minimising environmental impacts.  |   |

**The Cry of the People, Te Tangi a Tauira: Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008**

| Provision   | Discussion   |
|---|--|
|   | <p>Council is currently developing a Climate and Biodiversity Plan. Noting that regional councils have a mandate under Part 2 of the Biosecurity Act 1993 to provide pest management leadership, with the Regional Pest Management Plan prepared under that Act. Given the mandate, the regional council is best placed to impose any restrictions on any harmful species (such as domestic cats) to protect indigenous species, but noting that Council is responsible for managing pests on its own land and will therefore be responsible for managing pests on any vested land in the development<sup>31</sup>.</p> <p>(c) The existing districtwide PDP provisions provide for energy generation, and would apply to the TPLM Zone. The TPLM Zone provisions would encourage such sustainability initiatives in building and site design.</p> |
| <b>3.5.13 Water Quality Policy</b>  |  |
| <p>5. Avoid the use of water as a receiving environment for the direct, or point source, discharge of contaminants. Generally, all discharge must first be to land.</p> | <p>Urban development in the TPLM Zone can be serviced by the existing reticulated wastewater network therefore there will be no discharge to land or direct discharge to water.</p>  |
| <p>6. Avoid impacts on water as a result of inappropriate discharge to land activities.</p>   | <p>Stormwater management will be done onsite through low impact design. A consolidated approach to stormwater management is preferred ahead of a site-by-site assessment, however this requires significant cooperation and investment by both Council and landowners and is being investigated as part of a separate workstream. The provisions for the TPLM Zone include requirements for stormwater treatment to adopt low impact design methods to ensure adverse effects from stormwater discharges are avoided.</p>  |

**Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005**

| Provision   | Discussion  |
|---|---|
| <b>5.3.3 Wai Māori General Objectives</b>   |   |
| <p>iii. There is no discharge of human waste directly to water.</p>                   | <p>Urban development in the TPLM Zone can be serviced by the existing reticulated wastewater network therefore there will be no discharge to land or direct discharge to water.</p> |
| <p>iv. Contaminants being discharged directly or indirectly to water are reduced.</p> |   |

<sup>31</sup> Actions of the draft Climate Action and Biodiversity Strategy 2022 ([link](#)) are consistent with these recommendations, including Action 6.2, which seeks to partner with iwi, central government and the community to achieve biodiversity outcomes; Action 6.3 which provides direction on planting and pest control programmes, and Action 6.4, which looks to investigate new technologies to reduce the use of agricultural chemicals to control pests.



| <b>Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Provision</b>  | <b>Discussion</b>  |
|   | Stormwater management will be done onsite through low impact design. A consolidated approach to stormwater management is preferred ahead of a site-by-site assessment, however this requires significant cooperation and investment by both Council and landowners and is being investigated as part of a separate workstream. The provisions for the TPLM Zone include requirements for stormwater treatment to adopt low impact design methods to ensure adverse effects from stormwater discharges are avoided. |
| <b>10.2.3 Wai Māori Policies in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment Land use</b>   |  |
| 9. To encourage the adoption of sound environmental practices, adopted where land use intensification occurs.         | The TPLM Zone represents sustainable land use as it provides for efficient urban development in a location where it can be adequately serviced, and the effects of urban development managed. In doing so, it will protect other land within the catchment.  |
| 10. To promote sustainable land use in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment.  |  |
| 12. To require reticulated community sewerage schemes that have the capacity to accommodate future population growth. |  |

### Regional Policy Statements

- 1.42. Section 74 of the Act requires that a district plan prepared by a territorial authority must “give effect to” any operative Regional Policy Statement. The Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 (**PORPS 19**) and the Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021 (**PRPS 21**) are the relevant regional policy statements to be given effect to within the PDP.
- 1.43. The objectives and policies from the PORPS19 in the table below are relevant. They key relevant provisions relate to: economic, social and cultural wellbeing; integrated management of resources; quality of natural resources and ecosystems; landscapes; urban growth and development; and rural economic production. The TPLM Zone responds to these matters as follows:
- (a) The TPLM Zone provides for economic and social wellbeing of people by enabling the use of the land resources for urban living in a way that potential adverse effects can be adequately managed, it can contribute to the housing needs in a typology/price range for which there is a shortage, and it can contribute through economic growth and diversification of the economy through the construction and ongoing use of the land for urban purposes;
  - (b) The TPLM Zone integrates with and is a continuation of urban character of Lake Hayes Estate / Shotover Country (albeit at a significantly greater density and delivering greater typology diversity than those areas) and provides for parks and open space linkages, social amenities and facilities, and strategically locates development;
  - (c) The TPLM Zone will promote mechanisms for safeguarding water quality and related ecological values of awa and Lake Hayes through reticulated servicing of wastewater and avoiding direct discharge of stormwater to these waterbodies;
  - (d) The TPLM Zone is located where it can be absorbed into the landscape while maintaining the wider values of the area while avoiding significant adverse effects through the locating of development and other mechanisms including setbacks and controls on built development;
  - (e) The TPLM Zone is strategic urban development as it coordinates with roading and reticulated servicing, the public trail network, and contributes to the land supply for urban



development for which there is a shortage (affordable), and is consistent with the identification of this as a Priority Development Area in the Spatial Plan and works in conjunction with the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct, where rural residential densities are provided for in appropriate locations;

- (f) The TPLM Zone will result in some loss of productive soils, noting that this was already limited by its use for rural residential purposes, but the efficient use of this land for urban purposes will support the protection of other areas of productive soil (as detailed through the work undertaken on the Spatial Plan).

| <b>Partially Operative Regional Policy Statement 2019</b>     |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Reference</b>  | <b>Detail</b>   |
| <b>Chapter 1 - Resource management in Otago is integrated</b> |   |
| <b>Objective 1.1</b>  | <b>Otago's resources are used sustainably to promote economic, social, and cultural wellbeing for its people and communities</b>  |
| Policy 1.1.1  | <p><b>Economic wellbeing</b></p> <p>Provide for the economic wellbeing of Otago's people and communities by enabling the resilient and sustainable use and development of natural and physical resources.</p>   |
| Policy 1.1.2  | <p><b>Social and cultural wellbeing and health and safety</b></p> <p>Provide for the social and cultural wellbeing and health and safety of Otago's people and communities when undertaking the subdivision, use, development and protection of natural and physical resources by all of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Recognising and providing for Kāi Tahu values;</li> <li>b) Taking into account the values of other cultures;</li> <li>c) Taking into account the diverse needs of Otago's people and communities;</li> <li>d) Avoiding significant adverse effects of activities on human health;</li> <li>e) Promoting community resilience and the need to secure resources for the reasonable needs for human wellbeing;</li> <li>f) Promoting good quality and accessible infrastructure and public services.</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Objective 1.2</b>  | <b>Recognise and provide for the integrated management of natural and physical resources to support the wellbeing of people and communities in Otago</b>  |
| Policy 1.2.1  | <p><b>Integrated resource management</b></p> <p>Achieve integrated management of Otago's natural and physical resources, by all of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Coordinating the management of interconnected natural and physical resources;</li> <li>b) Taking into account the impacts of management of one natural or physical resource on the values of another, or on the environment;</li> <li>c) Recognising that the value and function of a natural or physical resource may extend beyond the immediate, or directly adjacent, area of interest;</li> <li>d) Ensuring that resource management approaches across administrative boundaries are consistent and complementary;</li> <li>e) Ensuring that effects of activities on the whole of a natural or physical resource are considered when that resource is managed as subunits.</li> <li>f) Managing adverse effects of activities to give effect to the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement.</li> <li>g) Promoting healthy ecosystems and ecosystem services;</li> </ol> |

| <b>Partially Operative Regional Policy Statement 2019</b>                  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Reference</b>   | <b>Detail</b>  |
|  | h) Promoting methods that reduce or negate the risk of exceeding sustainable resource limits.  |
| <b>Chapter 3 – Otago has high quality natural resources and ecosystems</b> |  |
| <b>Objective 3.1</b>   | <b>The values (including intrinsic values) of ecosystems and natural resources are recognised and maintained, or enhanced where degraded</b>   |
| Policy 3.1.1   | <p><b>Fresh water</b></p> <p>Safeguard the life-supporting capacity of fresh water and manage fresh water to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Maintain good quality water and enhance water quality where it is degraded, including for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Important recreation values, including contact recreation; and,</li> <li>ii. Existing drinking and stock water supplies;</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) Maintain or enhance aquatic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Ecosystem health;</li> <li>ii. Indigenous habitats; and,</li> <li>iii. Indigenous species and their migratory patterns.</li> </ul> </li> <li>c) Avoid aquifer compaction and seawater intrusion;</li> <li>d) Maintain or enhance, as far as practicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Natural functioning of rivers, lakes, and wetlands, their riparian margins, and aquifers;</li> <li>ii. Coastal values supported by fresh water;</li> <li>iii. The habitat of trout and salmon unless detrimental to indigenous biological diversity; and</li> <li>iv. Amenity and landscape values of rivers, lakes, and wetlands;</li> </ul> </li> <li>e) Control the adverse effects of pest species, prevent their introduction and reduce their spread;</li> <li>f) Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of natural hazards, including flooding and erosion; and,</li> <li>g) Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on existing infrastructure that is reliant on fresh water.</li> </ul> |
| Policy 3.1.2   | <p><b>Beds of rivers, lakes, wetland, and their margins</b></p> <p>Manage the beds of rivers, lakes, wetlands, their margins, and riparian vegetation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Safeguard the life supporting capacity of fresh water;</li> <li>b) Maintain good quality water, or enhance it where it has been degraded;</li> <li>c) Maintain or enhance bank stability;</li> <li>d) Maintain or enhance ecosystem health and indigenous biological diversity;</li> <li>e) Maintain or enhance, as far as practicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Their natural functioning and character; and</li> <li>ii. Amenity values;</li> </ul> </li> <li>f) Control the adverse effects of pest species, prevent their introduction and reduce their spread; and,</li> </ul>   |

| <b>Partially Operative Regional Policy Statement 2019</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Reference</b>  | <b>Detail</b>   |
|   | g) Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of natural hazards, including flooding and erosion.  |
| Policy 3.1.13   | <p><b>Environmental enhancement</b></p> <p>Encourage, facilitate and support activities that contribute to the resilience and enhancement of the natural environment, by where applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Improving water quality and quantity;</li> <li>b) Protecting or restoring habitat for indigenous species;</li> <li>c) Regenerating indigenous species;</li> <li>d) Mitigating natural hazards;</li> <li>e) Protecting or restoring wetlands;</li> <li>f) Improving the health and resilience of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Ecosystems supporting indigenous biological diversity;</li> <li>ii. Important ecosystem services, including pollination;</li> </ul> </li> <li>g) Improving access to rivers, lakes, wetlands and their margins, and the coast;</li> <li>h) Buffering or linking ecosystems, habitats and areas of significance that contribute to ecological corridors;</li> <li>i) Controlling pest species.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Objective 3.2</b>                                      | <b>Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified and protected, or enhanced where degraded</b>   |
| Policy 3.2.2  | <p><b>Managing significant indigenous vegetation and habitats</b></p> <p>Protect and enhance areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, by all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) In the coastal environment, avoiding adverse effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. ...</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) Beyond the coastal environment, and in the coastal environment in significant areas not captured by a) above, maintaining those values that contribute to the area or habitat being significant;</li> <li>c) Avoiding significant adverse effects on other values of the area or habitat;</li> <li>d) Remedying when other adverse effects cannot be avoided;</li> <li>e) Mitigating when other adverse effects cannot be avoided or remedied;</li> <li>f) Encouraging enhancement of those areas and values that contribute to the area or habitat being significant;</li> <li>g) Controlling the adverse effects of pest species, preventing their introduction and reducing their spread.</li> </ul> |
| Policy 3.2.6  | <p><b>Managing highly valued natural features, landscape and seascapes</b></p> <p>Maintain or enhance highly valued natural features, landscapes and seascapes by all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Avoiding significant adverse effects on those values that contribute to the high value of the natural feature, landscape or seascape;</li> <li>b) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects;</li> </ul>   |

| <b>Partially Operative Regional Policy Statement 2019</b>               |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Reference</b>  | <b>Detail</b>  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Encouraging enhancement of those values that contribute to the high value of the natural feature, landscape or seascape.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Chapter 4 – Communities in Otago are resilient, safe and healthy</b> |  |
| <b>Objective 4.2</b>  | <b>Otago’s communities are prepared for an able to adapt to the effects of climate change</b>  |
| Policy 4.2.2  | <p><b>Climate change</b></p> <p>Ensure Otago’s people and communities are able to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change, over no less than 100 years, by all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Taking into account the effects of climate change, including by using the best relevant climate change data;</li> <li>b) Applying a precautionary approach when assessing and managing the effects of climate change where there is scientific uncertainty and potentially significant or irreversible effects;</li> <li>c) Encouraging activities that assist to reduce or mitigate the effects of climate change.</li> <li>d) Encouraging system resilience.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Objective 4.5</b>  | <b>Urban growth and development is well designed, occurs in a strategic and coordinated way, and integrates effectively with adjoining urban and rural environments</b>  |
| Policy 4.5.1  | <p><b>Providing for urban growth and development</b></p> <p>Provide for urban growth and development in a strategic and co-ordinated way, including by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Ensuring future urban growth areas are in accordance with any future development strategy for that district.</li> <li>b) Monitoring supply and demand of residential, commercial and industrial zoned land;</li> <li>c) Ensuring that there is sufficient housing and business land development capacity available in Otago;</li> <li>d) Setting minimum targets for sufficient, feasible capacity for housing in high growth urban areas in Schedule 6</li> <li>e) Coordinating the development and the extension of urban areas with infrastructure development programmes, to provide infrastructure in an efficient and effective way.</li> <li>f) Having particular regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Providing for rural production activities by minimising adverse effects on significant soils and activities which sustain food production;</li> <li>ii. Minimising competing demands for natural resources;</li> <li>iii. Maintaining high and outstanding natural character in the coastal environment; outstanding natural features, landscapes, and seascapes; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

| <b>Partially Operative Regional Policy Statement 2019</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Reference</b>  | <b>Detail</b>   |
|   | <p>areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna;</p> <p>iv. Maintaining important cultural or historic heritage values;</p> <p>v. Avoiding land with significant risk from natural hazards;</p> <p>g) Ensuring efficient use of land;</p> <p>h) Restricting urban growth and development to areas that avoid reverse sensitivity effects unless those effects can be adequately managed;</p> <p>i) Requiring the use of low or no emission heating systems where ambient air quality is:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Below standards for human health; or</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. Vulnerable to degradation given the local climatic and geographical context;</p> <p>j) Consolidating existing coastal settlements and coastal urban areas where this will contribute to avoiding or mitigating sprawling or sporadic patterns of settlement and urban growth.</p>   |
| Policy 4.5.2  | <p><b>Integrating infrastructure with land use</b></p> <p>Achieve the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use, by undertaking all of the following:</p> <p>a) Recognising and providing for the functional needs of infrastructure;</p> <p>b) Locating and designing infrastructure to take into account all of the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Actual and reasonably foreseeable land use change;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. The current population and projected demographic changes;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iii. Actual and reasonably foreseeable change in supply of, and demand for, infrastructure services;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iv. Natural and physical resource constraints;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">v. Effects on the values of natural and physical resources;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">vi. Co-dependence with other infrastructure;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">vii. The effects of climate change on the long-term viability of that infrastructure;</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">viii. Natural hazard risk.</p> <p>c) Coordinating the design and development of infrastructure with land use change in growth and redevelopment planning.</p> |
| Policy 4.5.3  | <p><b>Urban design</b></p> <p>Design new urban development with regard to:</p> <p>a) A resilient, safe and healthy community;</p> <p>b) A built form that relates well to its surrounding environment;</p> <p>c) Reducing risk from natural hazards;</p> <p>d) Good access and connectivity within and between communities;</p> <p>e) A sense of cohesion and recognition of community values;</p> <p>f) Recognition and celebration of physical and cultural identity, and the historic heritage values of a place; ]</p> <p>g) Areas where people can live, work and play;</p> <p>h) A diverse range of housing, commercial, industrial and service activities;</p>   |

| Partially Operative Regional Policy Statement 2019 |  |
|--|--|
| Reference  | Detail   |
|  | i) A diverse range of social and cultural opportunities  |
| Policy 4.5.4                                       | <b>Low impact design</b><br>Encourage the use of low impact design techniques in subdivision and development to reduce demand on stormwater, water and wastewater infrastructure and reduce potential adverse environmental effects. |
| Policy 4.5.5                                       | <b>Warmer buildings</b><br>Encourage the design of subdivision and development to reduce the adverse effects of the region's colder climate, and higher demand and costs for energy, including maximising passive solar gain.        |
| Policy 4.5.6                                       | <b>Designing for public access</b><br>Design and maintain public spaces, including streets and open spaces, to meet the reasonable access and mobility needs of all sectors.   |

1.44. Section 74(2) of the RMA requires that a district plan prepared by a territorial authority shall *have regard to* any proposed regional policy statement. The PRPS21 was notified for public submissions on 21 July 2021.

1.45. The objectives and policies from the PRPS21 in the table below are relevant. In summary, the PRPS21 identifies eleven significant resource management issues for the region and explains how national direction will be applied in the Otago context. The eleven issues can be broken down into natural asset-based issues, place-based issues, and those issues relating to economic and domestic pressures, cumulative impacts and resilience. The key relevant provisions relate to: Integrated Management; Freshwater; Land and Soil; Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity; and Urban Form and Development. The TPLM Zone will address these as follows:

- (a) The TPLM Zone will integrate with the adjoining urban area and support the well-being of present and future generations by providing for the most efficient use of the land for housing to meet the needs of the community;
- (b) The TPLM Zone will improve housing choice and provision of services while contributing to the maintenance of a well-functioning urban development. It avoids sprawling or sporadic urban development by locating development adjacent to existing areas of urban development in a manner that would not have potential adverse effects on the potential for rural production on any nearby rural land (in accordance with the work undertaken on the development of the Spatial Plan).

| Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021 |   |
|---|---|
| Reference                               | Detail  |
| <b>Part 2- Integrated Management</b>    |   |
| Objective<br>IM-O1                      | <b>Long term vision</b><br>The management of natural and physical resources in Otago, by and for the people of Otago, including Kāi Tahu, and as expressed in all resource management plans and decision making, achieves healthy, resilient, and safeguarded natural systems, and the ecosystem services they offer, and supports the well-being of present and future generations, mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei. |
| Objective                               | <b>Ki uta ki tai</b>  |

| Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021 |  |
|---|--|
| Reference                               | Detail   |
| IM-O2                                   | Natural and physical resource management and decision making in Otago embraces <i>ki uta ki tai</i> , recognising that the environment is an interconnected system, which depends on its connections to flourish, and must be considered as an interdependent whole.   |
| Objective IM-O3                         | <b>Environmentally sustainable impact</b><br>Otago's communities carry out their activities in a way that preserves environmental integrity, form, function, and resilience, so that the life-supporting capacities of air, water, soil, ecosystems, and indigenous biodiversity endure for future generations.  |
| Objective IM-O4                         | <b>Climate change</b><br>Otago's communities, including Kāi Tahu, understand what climate change means for their future, and climate change responses in the region, including adaptation and mitigation actions, are aligned with national level climate change responses and are recognised as integral to achieving the outcomes sought by this RPS.  |
| Policy IM-P2                            | <b>Decision priorities</b><br>Unless expressly stated otherwise, all decision making under this RPS shall: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) firstly, secure the long-term life-supporting capacity and mauri of the natural environment,</li> <li>2) secondly, promote the health needs of people,</li> <li>3) thirdly, safeguard the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, now and in the future.</li> </ol>   |
| Policy IM-P3                            | <b>Providing for <i>mana whenua</i> cultural values in achieving integrated management</b><br>Recognise and provide for Kāi Tahu's relationship with natural resources by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) enabling <i>mana whenua</i> to exercise <i>rakatirataka</i> and <i>kaitiakitaka</i>,</li> <li>2) facilitating active participation of <i>mana whenua</i> in resource management decision making,</li> <li>3) incorporating <i>mātauraka Māori</i> in decision making, and</li> <li>4) ensuring resource management provides for the connections of Kāi Tahu to <i>wāhi tūpuna</i>, <i>water</i> and <i>water bodies</i>, the coastal environment, <i>mahika kai</i> and habitats of taoka species.</li> </ol> |
| Policy IM-P4                            | <b>Setting a strategic approach to ecosystem health</b><br>Healthy ecosystems and ecosystem services are achieved through a planning framework that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) protects their <i>intrinsic values</i>,</li> <li>2) takes a long-term strategic approach that recognises changing <i>environments</i>,</li> <li>3) recognises and provides for ecosystem complexity and interconnections, and</li> <li>4) anticipates, or responds swiftly to, changes in activities, pressures, and trends.</li> </ol>   |
| Policy IM-P5                            | <b>Managing environmental interconnections</b><br>Coordinate the management of interconnected <i>natural and physical resources</i> by recognising and providing for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) situations where the value and function of a <i>natural or physical resource</i> extends beyond the immediate, or directly adjacent, area of interest,</li> <li>2) the effects of activities on a <i>natural or physical resource</i> as a whole when that resource is managed as sub-units, and</li> <li>3) the impacts of management of one <i>natural or physical resource</i> on the values of</li> </ol>  |



| Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021 |  |
|---|--|
| Reference                               | Detail   |
|   | another, or on the <i>environment</i> .  |
| Policy IM-P6                            | <b>Acting on best available information</b><br>Avoid unreasonable delays in decision-making processes by using the best information available at the time, including but not limited to mātauraka Māori, local knowledge, and reliable partial data.   |
| Policy IM-P8                            | <b>Climate change impacts</b><br>Recognise and provide for <i>climate change</i> processes and <i>risks</i> by identifying <i>climate change</i> impacts in Otago, including impacts from a te ao Māori perspective, assessing how the impacts are likely to change over time and anticipating those changes in resource management processes and decisions.   |
| Policy IM-P9                            | <b>Community response to climate change impacts</b><br>By 2030 Otago's communities have established responses for adapting to the impacts of <i>climate change</i> , are adjusting their lifestyles to follow them, and are reducing their <i>greenhouse gas</i> emissions to achieve net-zero carbon emissions by 2050.   |
| Policy IM-P10                           | <b>Climate change adaptation and mitigation</b><br>Identify and implement <i>climate change</i> adaptation and mitigation methods for Otago that:<br><ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) minimise the effects of <i>climate change</i> processes or <i>risks</i> to existing activities,</li> <li>2) prioritise avoiding the establishment of new activities in areas subject to <i>risk</i> from the effects of <i>climate change</i>, unless those activities reduce, or are resilient to, those <i>risks</i>, and</li> <li>3) provide Otago's communities, including Kāi Tahu, with the best chance to thrive, even under the most extreme <i>climate change</i> scenarios.</li> </ol>  |
| Policy IM-P11                           | <b>Enhancing environmental resilience to effects of climate change</b><br>Enhance environmental resilience to the adverse effects of <i>climate change</i> by facilitating activities that reduce human impacts on the <i>environment</i> .  |
| Policy IM-P13                           | <b>Managing cumulative effects</b><br>Otago's environmental integrity, form, function, and <i>resilience</i> , and opportunities for future generations, are protected by recognising and specifically managing the cumulative effects of activities on natural and physical resources in plans and explicitly accounting for these effects in other resource management decisions.  |
| <b>LF-WAI- Te Mana o te Wai</b>         |  |
| <b>Objective</b><br><b>LF-WAI-O1</b>    | <b>Te Mana o te Wai</b><br>The mauri of Otago's water bodies and their health and well-being is protected, and restored where it is degraded, and the management of land and water recognises and reflects that:<br><ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) water is the foundation and source of all life – na te wai ko te hauora o ngā mea katoa,</li> <li>2) there is an integral kinship relationship between water and Kāi Tahu whānui, and this relationship endures through time, connecting past, present and future,</li> <li>3) each water body has a unique whakapapa and characteristics,</li> <li>4) water and land have a connectedness that supports and perpetuates life, and</li> <li>5) Kāi Tahu exercise rakatirataka, manaakitaka and their kaitiakitaka duty of care and attention over wai and all the life it supports.</li> </ol> |

| <b>Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Reference</b>                               | <b>Detail</b>  |
| Policy<br>LF-WAI-<br>P1                        | <p><b>Prioritisation</b></p> <p>In all management of fresh water in Otago, prioritise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) first, the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, te hauora o te wai and te hauora o te taiao, and the exercise of mana whenua to uphold these,</li> <li>2) second, the health and well-being needs of people, te hauora o te tangata; interacting with water through ingestion (such as drinking water and consuming harvested resources) and immersive activities (such as harvesting resources and bathing), and</li> <li>3) third, the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, now and in the future.</li> </ol>  |
| Policy<br>LF-WAI-<br>P2                        | <p><b>Mana whakahaere</b></p> <p>Recognise and give practical effect to Kāi Tahu rakatirataka in respect of fresh water by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) facilitating partnership with, and the active involvement of, mana whenua in freshwater management and decision-making processes,</li> <li>2) sustaining the environmental, social, cultural and economic relationships of Kāi Tahu with water bodies,</li> <li>3) providing for a range of customary uses, including mahika kai, specific to each water body, and</li> <li>4) incorporating mātauraka into decision making, management and monitoring processes</li> </ol>  |
| Policy<br>LF-WAI-<br>P3                        | <p><b>Integrated management/ki uta ki tai</b></p> <p>Manage the use of fresh water and land in accordance with tikaka and kawa, using an integrated approach that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) recognises and sustains the connections and interactions between water bodies (large and small, surface and ground, fresh and coastal, permanently flowing, intermittent and ephemeral),</li> <li>2) sustains and, wherever possible, restores the connections and interactions between land and water, from the mountains to the sea,</li> <li>3) sustains and, wherever possible, restores the habitats of mahika kai and indigenous species, including taoka species associated with the water body,</li> <li>4) manages the effects of the use and development of land to maintain or enhance the health and well-being of fresh water and coastal water,</li> <li>5) encourages the coordination and sequencing of regional or urban growth to ensure it is sustainable,</li> <li>6) has regard to foreseeable climate change risks, and</li> <li>7) has regard to cumulative effects and the need to apply a precautionary approach where there is limited available information or uncertainty about potential adverse effects.</li> </ol> |
| <b>LF-VM- Visions and management</b>           |  |
| <b>Objective</b><br><b>LF-VM-O2</b>            | <p><b>Clutha Mata-au FMU vision</b></p> <p>In the Clutha Mata-au FMU:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) management of the FMU recognises that:</li> </ol>  |

**Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021**

| Reference                           | Detail   |
|-------------------------------------|--|
|                                     | <p>(a) the Clutha Mata-au is a single connected system ki uta ki tai, and</p> <p>(b) the source of the wai is pure, coming directly from Tawhirimatea to the top of the mauka and into the awa,</p> <p>2) fresh water is managed in accordance with the LF–WAI objectives and policies,</p> <p>3) the ongoing relationship of Kāi Tahu with wāhi tūpuna is sustained,</p> <p>4) water bodies support thriving mahika kai and Kāi Tahu whānui have access to mahika kai,</p> <p>5) indigenous species migrate easily and as naturally as possible along and within the river system,</p> <p>6) the national significance of the Clutha hydro-electricity generation scheme is recognised,</p> <p>7) in addition to (1) to (6) above:</p> <p>(a) in the Upper Lakes rohe, the high quality waters of the lakes and their tributaries are protected, recognising the significance of the purity of these waters to Kāi Tahu and to the wider community,</p> <p>(b) in the Dunstan, Manuherehia and Roxburgh rohe:</p> <p>(i) flows in water bodies sustain and, wherever possible, restore the natural form and function of main stems and tributaries to support Kāi Tahu values and practices, and</p> <p>(ii) innovative and sustainable land and water management practices support food production in the area and reduce discharges of nutrients and other contaminants to water bodies so that they are safe for human contact, and</p> <p>(iii) sustainable abstraction occurs from main stems or groundwater in preference to tributaries,</p> <p>(c) in the Lower Clutha rohe:</p> <p>(i) there is no further modification of the shape and behaviour of the water bodies and opportunities to restore the natural form and function of water bodies are promoted wherever possible,</p> <p>(ii) the ecosystem connections between freshwater, wetlands and the coastal environment are preserved and, wherever possible, restored,</p> <p>(iii) land management practices reduce discharges of nutrients and other contaminants to water bodies so that they are safe for human contact, and</p> <p>(iv) there are no direct discharges of wastewater to water bodies, and</p> <p>8) the outcomes sought in (7) are to be achieved within the following timeframes:</p> <p>(a) by 2030 in the Upper Lakes rohe,</p> <p>(b) by 2045 in the Dunstan, Roxburgh and Lower Clutha rohe, and</p> <p>(c) by 2050 in the Manuherehia rohe.</p> |
| <b>LF-FW- Fresh Water</b>           |  |
| <b>Objective</b><br><b>LF-FW-08</b> | <p><b>Fresh water</b></p> <p>In Otago’s water bodies and their catchments:</p> <p>1) the health of the wai supports the health of the people and thriving mahika kai,</p> <p>2) water flow is continuous throughout the whole system,</p> <p>3) the interconnection of fresh water (including groundwater) and coastal waters is recognised,</p>   |

| <b>Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Reference</b>                               | <b>Detail</b>   |
|  | 4) native fish can migrate easily and as naturally as possible and taoka species and their habitats are protected, and<br>5) the significant and outstanding values of Otago's outstanding water bodies are identified and protected.   |
| <b>Objective</b><br><i>LF-FW-O10</i>           | <b>Natural character</b><br>The natural character of wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins is preserved and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.   |
| Policy<br>LF-FW-P7                             | <b>Fresh water</b><br>Environmental outcomes, attribute states (including target attribute states) and limits ensure that:<br>1) the health and well-being of water bodies is maintained or, if degraded, improved,<br>2) the habitats of indigenous species associated with water bodies are protected, including by providing for fish passage,<br>3) specified rivers and lakes are suitable for primary contact within the following timeframes:<br>(a) by 2030, 90% of rivers and 98% of lakes, and<br>(b) by 2040, 95% of rivers and 100% of lakes, and<br>4) mahika kai and drinking water are safe for human consumption,<br>5) existing over-allocation is phased out and future over-allocation is avoided, and<br>6) fresh water is allocated within environmental limits and used efficiently.  |
| Policy<br>LF-FW-P15                            | <b>Stormwater and wastewater discharges</b><br>Minimise the adverse effects of direct and indirect discharges of stormwater and wastewater to fresh water by:<br>1) except as required by LF-VM-O2 and LF-VM-O4, preferring discharges of wastewater to land over discharges to water, unless adverse effects associated with a discharge to land are greater than a discharge to water, and<br>2) requiring:<br>(a) all sewage, industrial or trade waste to be discharged into a reticulated wastewater system, where one is available,<br>(b) all stormwater to be discharged into a reticulated system, where one is available,<br>(c) implementation of methods to progressively reduce the frequency and volume of wet weather overflows and minimise the likelihood of dry weather overflows occurring for reticulated stormwater and wastewater systems,<br>(d) on-site wastewater systems to be designed and operated in accordance with best practice standards,<br>(e) stormwater and wastewater discharges to meet any applicable water quality standards set for FMUs and/or rohe, and<br>(f) the use of water sensitive urban design techniques to avoid or mitigate the potential adverse effects of contaminants on receiving water bodies from the subdivision, use or development of land, wherever practicable, and<br>(g) promoting the reticulation of stormwater and wastewater in urban areas. |
| <b>UFD- Urban form and development</b>         |   |
| <b>Objective</b><br><b>UFD-O1</b>              | <b>Form and function of urban areas</b><br>The form and functioning of Otago's urban areas:   |

| <b>Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Reference</b>                               | <b>Detail</b>  |
|  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) reflects the diverse and changing needs and preferences of Otago's people and communities, now and in the future, and</li> <li>2) maintains or enhances the significant values and features identified in this RPS, and the character and resources of each urban area.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Objective UFD-O2</b>                        | <p><b>Development of urban areas</b></p> <p>The development and change of Otago's urban areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) improves housing choice, quality, and affordability,</li> <li>2) allows business and other non-residential activities to meet the needs of communities in appropriate locations,</li> <li>3) respects and wherever possible enhances the area's history, setting, and natural and built environment,</li> <li>4) delivers good urban design outcomes, and improves liveability,</li> <li>5) improves connectivity within urban areas, particularly by active transport and public transport,</li> <li>6) minimises conflict between incompatible activities,</li> <li>7) manages the exposure of risk from natural hazards in accordance with the HAZ–NH – Natural hazards section of this RPS,</li> <li>8) results in sustainable and efficient use of water, energy, land, and infrastructure,</li> <li>9) achieves integration of land use with existing and planned development infrastructure and additional infrastructure and facilitates the safe and efficient ongoing use of regionally significant infrastructure,</li> <li>10) achieves consolidated, well designed and located, and sustainable development in and around existing urban areas as the primary focus for accommodating the region's urban growth and change, and</li> <li>11) is guided by the input and involvement of mana whenua.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Objective UFD-O3</b>                        | <p><b>Strategic planning</b></p> <p>Strategic planning is undertaken in advance of significant development, expansion or redevelopment of urban areas to ensure that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) there is sufficient development capacity supported by integrated infrastructure provision for Otago's housing and business needs in the short, medium and long term,</li> <li>2) development is located, designed and delivered in a way and at a rate that recognises and provides for locationally relevant regionally significant features and values identified by this RPS, and</li> <li>3) the involvement of mana whenua is facilitated, and their values and aspirations are provided for.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Objective UFD-O4</b>                        | <p><b>Development in rural areas</b></p> <p>Development in Otago's rural areas occurs in a way that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) avoids impacts on significant values and features identified in this RPS,</li> <li>2) avoids as the first priority, land and soils identified as highly productive by LF–LS–P19 unless there is an operational need for the development to be located in rural areas,</li> <li>3) only provides for urban expansion, rural lifestyle and rural residential development and the establishment of sensitive activities, in locations identified through</li> </ol>  |

| <b>Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Reference</b>                               | <b>Detail</b>  |
|  | <p>strategic planning or zoned within district plans as suitable for such development; and</p> <p>4) outside of areas identified in (3), maintains and enhances the natural and physical resources that support the productive capacity, rural character, and long-term viability of the rural sector and rural communities.</p>   |
| <p><b>Objective</b><br/><b>UFD-O5</b></p>      | <p>Urban development and climate change</p> <p>The impacts of climate change are responded to in the development and change of Otago's urban areas so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the contributions of current communities and future generations to climate change impacts are reduced,</li> <li>2) community resilience increases,</li> <li>3) adaptation to the effects of climate change is facilitated,</li> <li>4) energy use is minimised, and energy efficiency improves, and</li> <li>5) establishment and use of small and community-scale distributed electricity generation is enabled.</li> </ol>   |
| <p>Policy<br/><b>UFD-P1</b></p>                | <p><b>Strategic planning</b></p> <p>Strategic planning processes, undertaken at an appropriate scale and detail, precede urban growth and development and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ensure integration of land use and infrastructure, including how, where and when necessary development infrastructure and additional infrastructure will be provided, and by whom,</li> <li>2) demonstrate at least sufficient development capacity supported by integrated infrastructure provision for Otago's housing and business needs in the short, medium and long term,</li> <li>3) maximise current and future opportunities for increasing resilience, and facilitating adaptation to changing demand, needs, preferences and climate change,</li> <li>4) minimise risks from and improve resilience to natural hazards, including those exacerbated by climate change, while not increasing risk for other development,</li> <li>5) indicate how connectivity will be improved and connections will be provided within urban areas,</li> <li>6) provide opportunities for iwi, hapū and whānau involvement in planning processes, including in decision making, to ensure provision is made for their needs and aspirations, and cultural practices and values,</li> <li>7) facilitate involvement of the current community and respond to the reasonably foreseeable needs of future communities, and</li> <li>8) identify, maintain and where possible, enhance important features and values identified by this RPS.</li> </ol> |
| <p>Policy<br/><b>UFD-P2</b></p>                | <p><b>Sufficiency of development capacity</b></p> <p>Sufficient urban area housing and business development capacity in urban areas, including any required competitiveness margin, is provided in the short, medium and long term by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) undertaking strategic planning in accordance with UFD-P1</li> <li>2) identifying areas for urban intensification in accordance with UFD-P3,</li> <li>3) identifying areas for urban expansion in accordance with UFD-P4,</li> </ol>   |

| <b>Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Reference</b>                               | <b>Detail</b>  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4) providing for commercial and industrial activities in accordance with UFD–P5 and UFD–P6</li> <li>5) responding to any demonstrated insufficiency in housing or business development capacity by increasing development capacity or providing more development infrastructure as required, as soon as practicable, and</li> <li>6) requiring Tier 2 urban environments to meet, at least, the relevant housing bottom lines in APP10.</li> </ul>  |
| Policy<br>UFD-P4                               | <p><b>Urban expansion</b></p> <p>Expansion of existing urban areas is facilitated where the expansion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) contributes to establishing or maintaining the qualities of a well-functioning urban environment,</li> <li>2) will not result in inefficient or sporadic patterns of settlement and residential growth,</li> <li>3) is integrated efficiently and effectively with development infrastructure and additional infrastructure in a strategic, timely and co-ordinated way,</li> <li>4) addresses issues of concern to iwi and hapū, including those identified in any relevant iwi planning documents,</li> <li>5) manages adverse effects on other values or resources identified by this RPS that require specific management or protection,</li> <li>6) avoids, as the first priority, highly productive land identified in accordance with LF–LS–P19,</li> <li>7) locates the new urban/rural zone boundary interface by considering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) adverse effects, particularly reverse sensitivity, on rural areas and existing or potential productive rural activities beyond the new boundary, and</li> <li>(b) key natural or built barriers or physical features, significant values or features identified in this RPS, or cadastral boundaries that will result in a permanent, logical and defensible long- term limit beyond which further urban expansion is demonstrably inappropriate and unlikely, such that provision for future development infrastructure expansion and connectivity beyond the new boundary does not need to be provided for, or</li> <li>(c) reflects a short or medium term, intermediate or temporary zoning or infrastructure servicing boundary where provision for future development infrastructure expansion and connectivity should not be foreclosed, even if further expansion is not currently anticipated.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| Policy<br>UFD-P5                               | <p><b>Commercial activities</b></p> <p>Provide for commercial activities in urban areas by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) enabling a wide variety and scale of commercial activities, social activities and cultural activities in central business districts, town centres and commercial areas, especially if they are highly accessible by public transport and active transport,</li> <li>2) enabling smaller local and neighbourhood centres and rural settlements to accommodate a variety of commercial activities, social activities and cultural activities of a scale appropriate to service local community needs,</li> <li>3) providing for the expansion of existing areas or establishment of new areas identified in (1) and (2) by first applying UFD–P1 and UFD–P2, and outside the areas described in (1) and (2), allow for small scale retail and service activities,</li> </ul>   |



| <b>Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Reference</b>                               | <b>Detail</b>  |
|  | home occupations and community services to establish within or close to the communities they serve.  |
| Policy<br>UFD-P7                               | <p><b>Rural Areas</b></p> <p>The management of rural areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) provides for the maintenance and, wherever possible, enhancement of important features and values identified by this RPS,</li> <li>2) outside areas identified in (1), maintains the productive capacity, amenity and character of rural areas,</li> <li>3) enables primary production particularly on land or soils identified as highly productive in accordance with LF-LS-P19,</li> <li>4) facilitates rural industry and supporting activities,</li> <li>5) directs rural residential and rural lifestyle development to areas zoned for that purpose in accordance with UFD-P8,</li> <li>6) restricts the establishment of residential activities, sensitive activities, and non-rural businesses which could adversely affect, including by way of reverse sensitivity, the productive capacity of highly productive land, primary production and rural industry activities, and</li> <li>7) otherwise limits the establishment of residential activities, sensitive activities, and non-rural businesses to those that can demonstrate an operational need to be located in rural areas.</li> </ol>  |
| Policy<br>UFD-P10                              | <p><b>Criteria for significant development capacity</b></p> <p>'Significant development capacity' is provided for where a proposed plan change affecting an urban environment meets all of the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the location, design and layout of the proposal will positively contribute to achieving a well- functioning urban environment,</li> <li>2) the proposal is well-connected to the existing or planned urban area, particularly if it is located along existing or planned transport corridors,</li> <li>3) required development infrastructure can be provided effectively and efficiently for the proposal, and without material impact on planned development infrastructure provision to, or reduction in development infrastructure capacity available for, other feasible, likely to be realised developments, in the short-medium term,</li> <li>4) the proposal makes a significant contribution to meeting a need identified in a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, or a shortage identified in monitoring for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) housing of a particular price range or typology, particularly more affordable housing,</li> <li>(b) business space or land of a particular size or locational type, or</li> <li>(c) community or educational facilities, and</li> </ol> </li> <li>5) when considering the significance of the proposal's contribution to a matter in (4), this means that the proposal's contribution: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) is of high yield relative to either the forecast demand or the identified shortfall,</li> <li>(b) will be realised in a timely (i.e. rapid) manner,</li> <li>(c) is likely to be taken up, and</li> <li>(d) will facilitate a net increase in district-wide up-take in the short to medium term.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |

### Proposed District Plan - Notified 26 August 2015

- 1.46. The following objectives and policies (or parts thereof) of the PDP (Part 2 Strategic) are relevant to urban development, and the TPLM Zone Chapter should take into account and give effect to these provisions. Note that the proposed objectives under section 32(1)(a) have also been assessed against these provisions in Section 7.
- 1.47. The Strategic Direction Chapter (Chapter 3) of the PDP seek to enable development while protecting the valued natural and physical resources of the District. The TPLM Zone Chapter is required to give effect to these obligations. It does this as follows:
- The TPLM Zone promotes urban development in an appropriate location and contributes to the strategic and integrated management of urban growth;
  - It integrates with existing urban areas, with shared roading and servicing, open space connections and can achieve a built environment that provides desirable, healthy and safe places to live, work and play;
  - The location can absorb the development, the Slope Hill ONF is protected and the wider landscape values of the Wakatipu Basin will be maintained<sup>32</sup>; and
  - The TPLM Zone will contribute to peoples' and communities' wellbeing by providing housing and related amenities and facilities.

| Chapter 3: Strategic Direction |  |                      |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Reference                      | Detail   | Decision             |
| SO 3.2.1                       | The development of a prosperous, resilient and equitable economy in the District.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 29  |
| SO 3.2.1.2                     | The Queenstown and Wānaka town centres are the hubs of New Zealand's premier alpine visitor resorts and the District's economy.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 29  |
| SO 3.2.1.3                     | The Frankton urban area (including the Remarkables Park mixed use centre) functions primarily as a major commercial and industrial service centre, and provides community facilities, for the people of the Wakatipu Basin.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 29  |
| SO 3.2.1.5                     | Local service and employment functions served by commercial centres and industrial areas outside of the Queenstown and Wānaka town centres, Frankton and Three Parks, are sustained.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 29  |
| SO 3.2.1.6                     | Diversification of the District's economic base and creation of employment opportunities through the development of innovative and sustainable enterprises.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 29  |
| SO 3.2.1.8                     | Diversification of land use in rural areas beyond traditional activities, including farming, provided that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the landscape values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are protected;</li> <li>the landscape character of Rural Character Landscapes is maintained and their visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced; and</li> <li>significant nature conservation values and Ngāi Tahu values, interests and customary resources, are maintained.</li> </ol> | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155 |

<sup>32</sup>

Landscape Assessment Report Te Putahi Ladies Mile Masterplan April 2021 (Appendix 3A)

| Chapter 3: Strategic Direction |   |   |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Reference                      | Detail  | Decision                                |
| SO 3.2.1.9*                    | Infrastructure in the District that is operated, maintained, developed and upgraded efficiently and effectively to meet community needs and to maintain the quality of the environment.   | <i>[subject to ongoing discussions]</i> |
| <b>SO 3.2.2</b>                | Urban growth is managed in a strategic and integrated manner.   |   |
| SO 3.2.2.1                     | Urban development occurs in a logical manner so as to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. promote a compact, well designed and integrated urban form;</li> <li>b. build on historical urban settlement patterns;</li> <li>c. achieve a built environment that provides desirable, healthy and safe places to live, work and play;</li> <li>d. minimise the natural hazard risk, taking into account the predicted effects of climate change;</li> <li>e. protect the District's rural landscapes from sporadic and sprawling urban development;</li> <li>f. ensure a mix of housing opportunities including access to housing that is more affordable for residents to live in;</li> <li>g. contain a high quality network of open spaces and community facilities; and</li> <li>h. be integrated with existing, and proposed infrastructure and appropriately manage effects on that infrastructure.</li> </ul> | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| <b>SO 3.2.3</b>                | A quality built environment taking into account the character of individual communities.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| SO 3.2.3.1                     | The District's important historic heritage values are protected by ensuring development is sympathetic to those values.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| SO 3.2.3.2                     | Built form integrates well with its surrounding urban environment.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| <b>SO 3.2.4</b>                | The distinctive natural environments and ecosystems of the District are protected.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| SO 3.2.4.1                     | Development and land uses that sustain or enhance the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems, and maintain indigenous biodiversity.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| SO 3.2.4.2                     | The spread of wilding exotic vegetation is avoided.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| SO 3.2.4.3                     | The natural character of the beds and margins of the District's lakes, rivers and wetlands is preserved, or enhanced where possible, and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| SO 3.2.4.4                     | The water quality and functions of the District's lakes, rivers and wetlands are maintained or enhanced.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| SO 3.2.4.5                     | Public access to the natural environment is maintained or enhanced.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |
| SO 3.2.4.6                     | The values of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are protected.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                    |

| <b>Chapter 3: Strategic Direction</b>   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Reference</b>  | <b>Detail</b>   | <b>Decision</b>                             |
| SO 3.2.4.7  | The survival chances of rare, endangered, or vulnerable species of indigenous plant or animal communities are maintained or enhanced.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                        |
| <b><i>Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes</i></b> |   |   |
| <b>SO 3.2.5</b>   | The retention of the District's distinctive landscapes.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                        |
| SO 3.2.5.1  | The District's Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes and their landscape values and related landscape capacity are identified.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                        |
| SO 3.2.5.2  | Within the Rural Zone, new subdivision, use and development is inappropriate on Outstanding Natural Features or in Outstanding Natural Landscapes unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. where the landscape values of Priority Areas of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are specified in Schedule 21.22, those values are protected; or</li> <li>b. where the landscape values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are not specified in Schedule 21.22, the values identified according to SP 3.3.45 are protected.</li> </ul> | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                        |
| SO 3.2.5.3  | In locations other than in the Rural Zone, the landscape values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                        |
| SO 3.2.5.4  | In each Exception Zone located within or part within Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes, any application for subdivision, use and development is provided for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. to the extent anticipated by that Exception Zone; and</li> <li>b. on the basis that any additional subdivision, use and development not provided for by that Exception Zone protects the landscape values of the relevant Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape.</li> </ul>  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                        |
| <b><i>Rural Character Landscapes</i></b>                                      |   |   |
| SO 3.2.5.5  | Within Rural Character Landscapes, adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values from subdivision, use or development are anticipated and effectively managed, through policies and rules, so that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. landscape character is maintained; and</li> <li>b. visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced.</li> </ul>  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                        |
| SO 3.2.5.6  | In Rural Character Landscapes, new subdivision, use and development in proximity to any Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape does not compromise the landscape values of that Feature or Landscape.   | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155                        |
| <b>SO 3.2.6</b>   | The District's residents and communities are able to provide for their social, cultural and economic wellbeing and their health and safety.   | Decisions<br>Version<br>dated 7 May<br>2018 |

| <b>Chapter 3: Strategic Direction</b>                         |  |                                    |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>Reference</b>  | <b>Detail</b>  | <b>Decision</b>                    |
| SO 3.2.6.1  | The accessibility needs of the District's residents and communities to places, services and facilities are met.  | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| SO 3.2.6.2  | A diverse, resilient and well-functioning community where opportunities for arts, culture, recreation and events are integrated into the built and natural environment.  | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| SO 3.2.6.3  | The contribution that community social, recreational and cultural facilities and activities make to identity and sense of place for residents of the District is recognised and provided for through appropriate location and sound design.  | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| <b>SO 3.2.7</b>   | The partnership between Council and Ngāi Tahu is nurtured.   | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| SO 3.2.7.1  | Ngāi Tahu values, interests and customary resources, including taonga species and habitats, and wāhi tūpuna, are protected.  | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| SO 3.2.7.2  | The expression of kaitiakitanga is enabled by providing for meaningful collaboration with Ngāi Tahu in resource management decision making and implementation  | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| <b>Strategic Policies</b>                                     |  |                                    |
| <b>Visitor Industry</b>                                       |  |                                    |
| SP 3.3.1  | Make provision for the visitor industry to maintain and enhance attractions, facilities and services within the Queenstown and Wānaka town centres and elsewhere within the District's urban areas and settlements at locations where this is consistent with objectives and policies for the relevant zone. | [2021] NZEnvC 29                   |
| <b>Town Centres and other Commercial and Industrial Areas</b> |  |                                    |
| SP 3.3.4  | Avoid new commercial zoning of land that is likely to undermine the role of the Queenstown and Wānaka town centres as the primary focus for the District's economic activity.  | [2021] NZEnvC 29                   |
| SP 3.3.7  | Avoid additional commercial zoning that is likely to undermine the function and viability of the Frankton commercial areas as the key service centre for the Wakatipu Basin, or which will undermine increasing integration between those areas and the industrial and residential areas of Frankton.        | [2021] NZEnvC 29                   |
| SP 3.3.11   | Avoid commercial rezoning that is likely to undermine the key local service and employment function role that the centres outside of the Queenstown and Wānaka town centres, Frankton and Three Parks fulfil.  | [2021] NZEnvC 29                   |

| <b>Chapter 3: Strategic Direction</b>  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Reference</b>   | <b>Detail</b>  | <b>Decision</b>                             |
| SP 3.3.12  | Provide for a wide variety of activities and sufficient capacity within commercially zoned land to accommodate business growth and diversification.  | [2021]<br>NZEvc 29                          |
| <b>Climate Change</b>  |  |   |
| SP 3.3.13  | Encourage economic activity to adapt to and recognise opportunities and risks associated with climate change.  | [2021]<br>NZEvc 29                          |
| <b>Urban Developments</b>  |  |   |
| SP 3.3.14  | Apply Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs) around the urban areas in the Wakatipu Basin (including Queenstown, Frankton, Jack's Point and Arrowtown), Wānaka and where required around other settlements.  | Consent<br>Order dated<br>20 August<br>2020 |
| SP 3.3.15  | Apply provisions that enable urban development within the UGBs and avoid urban development outside of the UGBs.  | Consent<br>Order dated<br>20 August<br>2020 |
| SP 3.3.16  | Locate urban development of the settlements where no UGB is provided within the land zoned for that purpose.   | Consent<br>Order dated<br>20 August<br>2020 |
| <b>Heritage</b>  |  |   |
| SP 3.3.17  | Identify heritage items and ensure they are protected from inappropriate development.  | Decisions<br>Version<br>dated 7 May<br>2018 |
| <b>Natural Environment</b>   |  |   |
| SP 3.3.19  | Protect SNAs and encourage enhanced indigenous biodiversity outcomes.  | Consent<br>order dated<br>25 March<br>2020  |
| SP 3.3.20  | Manage subdivision and / or development that may have adverse effects on the natural character and nature conservation values of the District's lakes, rivers, wetlands and their beds and margins so that their life-supporting capacity is safeguarded; and natural character is maintained or enhanced as far as practicable. | Consent<br>order dated<br>25 March<br>2020  |
| <b>Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Rural Character Landscape</b> |  |   |
| SP 3.3.30  | Protect the landscape values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.   | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155                         |
| SP 3.3.31  | Avoid adverse effects on the landscape values of the District's Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes from residential subdivision, use and development where there is little capacity to absorb change.   | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155                         |

1.48. Chapter 4 applies to urban development. It is relevant to the TPLM Zone as follows:

- (a) The plan variation includes the extension of the existing Urban Growth Boundary at Lake Hayes Estate / Shotover Country around the new TPLM Zone, to provide a distinct and defensible edge to the urban development within the Zone;
- (b) The TPLM Zone and provisions contribute to the Council's effort in providing ongoing availability of a competitive land supply for urban purposes while taking into account the constraints on development by carefully considering the total development capacity provided for and its effects on the safe and efficient functioning of State Highway 6;
- (c) It will support the integration of urban development within the Urban Growth Boundary by providing detailed spatial layouts, taking into account key landscape and amenity values, connectivity and integration with existing urban development, public and active transport links, and constraints on infrastructure.

| <b>Chapter 4: Urban Development</b> |  |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>Reference</b>                    | <b>Detail</b>  | <b>Decision</b>                    |
| <b>Objective 4.2.1</b>              | Urban Growth Boundaries used as a tool to manage the growth of urban areas within distinct and defensible urban edges.   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.1.1                      | Define Urban Growth Boundaries, where required, to identify the areas that are available for the growth of urban settlements.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.1.2                      | Focus urban development primarily on land within and adjacent to the existing larger urban areas and to a lesser extent, within and adjacent to smaller urban towns and rural settlements.   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.1.3                      | Ensure that urban development is contained within the defined Urban Growth Boundaries, and that aside from urban development within existing towns and rural settlements, urban development is avoided outside of those boundaries.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.1.4                      | <p>Ensure Urban Growth Boundaries encompass, at a minimum, sufficient feasible development capacity and urban opportunities consistent with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the anticipated medium term demand for housing and business land within the District assuming a mix of housing densities and form;</li> <li>b. ensuring the ongoing availability of a competitive land supply for urban purposes;</li> <li>c. the constraints on development of the land such as its topography, its ecological, heritage, cultural or landscape significance; or the risk of natural hazards limiting the ability of the land to accommodate growth;</li> <li>d. the need to make provision for the location and efficient operation of infrastructure, commercial and industrial uses, and a range of community activities and facilities;</li> <li>e. a compact and efficient urban form;</li> <li>f. avoiding sporadic urban development in rural areas;</li> <li>g. minimising the loss of the productive potential and soil resource of rural land; and</li> <li>h. A future development strategy for the District that is prepared in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity</li> </ul> | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |



| <b>Chapter 4: Urban Development</b> |  |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>Reference</b>                    | <b>Detail</b>  | <b>Decision</b>                    |
| Policy 4.2.1.5                      | When locating Urban Growth Boundaries or extending towns and rural urban settlements through plan changes, protect the values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.1.5a                     | When locating Urban Growth Boundaries or extending towns and rural settlements through plan changes to provide for urban development have particular regard to minimising significant adverse effects on the values of open rural landscapes.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.1.6                      | Review and amend Urban Growth Boundaries, as required, to address changing community needs, respond to monitoring evidence, or to enable appropriate urban development (having regard to Policy 4.2.1.4).  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| <b>Objective 4.2.2A</b>             | A compact and integrated, and well designed urban form within the Urban Growth Boundaries that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. is coordinated with the efficient provision, use and operation of infrastructure and services; and</li> <li>b. is managed to ensure that the Queenstown Airport is not significantly compromised by the adverse effects of incompatible activities.</li> </ul>   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Objective 4.2.2B                    | Urban development within Urban Growth Boundaries that maintains and enhances the environment and rural amenity and protects Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features, and areas supporting significant indigenous flora and fauna. (From Policy 3.3.13, 3.3.17, 3.3.29)   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.1                      | Integrate urban development with existing or proposed infrastructure so that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. urban development is serviced by infrastructure of sufficient capacity; and</li> <li>b. reverse sensitivity effects of activities on regionally significant infrastructure are minimised; and</li> <li>c. in the case of the National Grid, reverse sensitivity effects are avoided to the extent reasonably possible and the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid is not compromised.</li> </ul>  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.2                      | Allocate land within Urban Growth Boundaries into zones which are reflective of the appropriate land use having regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. its topography;</li> <li>b. its ecological, heritage, cultural or landscape significance if any;</li> <li>c. any risk of natural hazards, taking into account the effects of climate change;</li> <li>d. connectivity and integration with existing urban development;</li> <li>e. convenient linkages with public transport;</li> <li>f. the need to provide a mix of housing densities and forms within a compact and integrated urban environment; .</li> <li>fa the level of existing and future amenity that is sought (including consideration of any identified special character areas);</li> </ul> | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |

| <b>Chapter 4: Urban Development</b>     |   |                                    |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>Reference</b>                        | <b>Detail</b>   | <b>Decision</b>                    |
|   | <p>g. the need to make provision for the location and efficient operation of infrastructure and utilities, including regionally significant infrastructure;</p> <p>h. the need to provide open spaces and community facilities that are located and designed to be safe, desirable and accessible;</p> <p>i. the function and role of the town centres and other commercial and industrial areas as provided for in Chapter 3 Strategic Objectives 3.2.1.2 - 3.2.1.5 and associated policies; and</p> <p>j. the need to locate emergency services at strategic locations.</p> |                                    |
| Policy 4.2.2.3                          | Enable an increased density of well-designed residential development in close proximity to town centres, public transport routes, community and education facilities, while ensuring development is consistent with any structure plan for the area and responds to the character of its site, the street, open space and surrounding area.   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.4                          | Encourage urban development that enhances connections to public recreation facilities, reserves, open space and active transport networks.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.5                          | Require larger scale development to be comprehensively designed with an integrated and sustainable approach to infrastructure, buildings, street, trail and open space design.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.6                          | Promote energy and water efficiency opportunities, waste reduction and sustainable building and subdivision design.   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.7                          | Explore and encourage innovative approaches to design to assist provision of quality affordable housing.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.8                          | The values of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are protected.   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.9                          | Ensure Council-led and private design and development of public spaces and built development maximises public safety by adopting "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design".   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.10                         | Ensure lighting standards for urban development avoid unnecessary adverse effects on views of the night sky.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| Policy 4.2.2.11                         | Ensure that the location of building platforms in areas of low density development within Urban Growth Boundaries and the capacity of infrastructure servicing such development does not unnecessarily compromise opportunities for future urban development.   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |
| <b>Wakatipu Basin Specific Policies</b> |   |                                    |
| Policy 4.2.2.13                         | <p>Define the Urban Growth Boundaries for the balance of the Wakatipu Basin, as shown on the District Plan web mapping application that:</p> <p>a. are based on existing urbanised areas;</p>   | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |

| <b>Chapter 4: Urban Development</b> |  |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>Reference</b>                    | <b>Detail</b>  | <b>Decision</b>                    |
|                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. identify sufficient areas of urban development and the potential intensification of existing urban areas to provide for predicted visitor and resident population increases over the planning period;</li> <li>c. enable the logical and sequenced provision of infrastructure to and community facilities in new areas of urban development;</li> <li>d. protect the values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes;</li> <li>e. avoid sprawling and sporadic urban development across the rural areas of the Wakatipu Basin.</li> </ul> |                                    |
| Policy 4.2.2.20                     | Rural land outside of the Urban Growth Boundaries is not used for urban development until a change to the Plan amends the Urban Growth Boundary and zones additional land for urban development purposes.  | Consent Order dated 20 August 2020 |

1.49. The plan variation gives effect to the relevant Tangata Whenua objectives and policies as it takes into account the relevant iwi management plans (as addressed above) and consultation with iwi has occurred on an ongoing basis during the development of the Masterplan and the plan variation.

| <b>Chapter 5: Tangata Whenua</b> |  |                                    |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>Provision</b>                 | <b>Detail</b>  | <b>Decision</b>                    |
| <b>Objective 5.3.1</b>           | Consultation with tangata whenua occurs through the implementation of the Queenstown Lakes District Plan Policies.   | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| Policy 5.3.1.1                   | Ensure that Ngāi Tahu Papatipu Rūnanga are engaged in resource management decision-making and implementation on matters that affect Ngāi Tahu values, rights and interests, in accordance with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| Policy 5.3.1.2                   | Actively foster effective partnerships and relationships between the Queenstown Lakes District Council and Ngāi Tahu Papatipu Rūnanga.   | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| Policy 5.3.1.3                   | When making resource management decisions, ensure that functions and powers are exercised in a manner that takes into account iwi management plans.  | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| Policy 5.3.1.4                   | Recognise that only tangata whenua can identify their relationship and that of their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, wāhi tapu, tōpuni and other taonga.   | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| <b>Objective 5.3.2</b>           | Ngāi Tahu have a presence in the built environment   | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |
| Policy 5.3.2.1                   | Collaborate with Ngāi Tahu in the design of the built environment including planting, public spaces, use of Ngāi Tahu place names and interpretive material. Enable the sustainable use of Māori land.                                   | Decisions Version dated 7 May 2018 |

- 1.50. From an implementation perspective the landscape categories and policies in Chapter 6 on the ONL/ONF and RCL only apply to land zoned Rural, which in this instance is only applicable to small portions of the subject land (the majority of it being zoned Rural Lifestyle).
- 1.51. The proposal gives effect to Sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the Act and the Landscape and Rural Character Chapter (Chapter 6) by managing the actual and potential adverse effects of the TPLM Zone where these could affect the District's landscape values.

| <b>Landscapes and Rural Character Chapter 6:</b>   |  |                     |
|--|--|---------------------|
| <b>Provision</b>   | <b>Detail</b>  | <b>Decision</b>     |
| <b>Rural Landscape Categorisation</b>  |  |                     |
| Policy 6.3.1.3   | Provide a separate regulatory regime for the Gibbston Valley (identified as the Gibbston Character Zone), Rural Residential Zone, Rural Lifestyle Zone and the Special Zones within which the Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Rural Character Landscape categories and the policies of this Chapter related to those categories do not apply unless otherwise stated. | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155 |
| <b>Managing Activities in the Rural Zone, the Gibbston Character Zone, the Rural Residential Zone and the Rural Lifestyle Zone</b> |  |                     |
| Policy 6.3.2.1   | Avoid urban development and subdivision to urban densities in the rural zones.   | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155 |
| Policy 6.3.2.2   | Ensure that the location and direction of lights does not cause excessive glare and avoids unnecessary degradation of views of the night sky and of landscape character, including of the sense of remoteness where it is an important part of that character.   | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155 |
| Policy 6.3.2.5   | Avoid indigenous vegetation clearance where it would significantly degrade the visual character and qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes.  | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155 |
| Policy 6.3.2.6   | Encourage subdivision and development proposals to promote indigenous biodiversity protection and regeneration where the landscape values and nature conservation values would be maintained or enhanced, particularly where the subdivision or development constitutes a change in the intensity in the land use or the retirement of productive farm land.   | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155 |
| Policy 6.3.2.7   | Ensure that subdivision and development in the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Rural Character Landscapes in proximity to an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape does not compromise the landscape values of that Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape.  | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155 |
| Policy 6.3.2.8   | Encourage any landscaping to be ecologically viable and consistent with the established character of the area.   | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155 |
| <b>Managing Activities on Outstanding Natural Features and in Outstanding Natural Landscapes</b>                                   |  |                     |
| Policy 6.3.3.1   | Recognise that subdivision and development is inappropriate on Outstanding Natural Features or in Outstanding Natural Landscapes unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. landscape values are protected; and</li> </ul>  | [2021]<br>NZEvc 155 |

| <b>Landscapes and Rural Character Chapter 6:</b>         |  |                      |
|--|--|----------------------|
| <b>Provision</b>   | <b>Detail</b>  | <b>Decision</b>      |
|  | b. in the case of any subdivision or development, all buildings and other structures and all changes to landform or other physical changes to the appearance of land will be reasonably difficult to see from beyond the boundary of the site in question.   |                      |
| Policy 6.3.3.2   | Ensure that the protection of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes includes recognition of any values relating to cultural and historic elements, geological features and matters of cultural and spiritual value to Tangata Whenua, including tōpuni and wāhi tūpuna.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155 |
| Policy 6.3.3.5   | Maintain the open landscape character of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes where it is open at present.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155 |
| <b>Managing Activities in Rural Character Landscapes</b> |  |                      |
| Policy 6.3.4.4   | Have particular regard to the potential adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values where further subdivision and development would constitute sprawl along roads.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155 |
| Policy 6.3.4.8   | Avoid adverse effects on visual amenity from subdivision, use and development that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. is highly visible from public places and other places which are frequented by members of the public generally (except any trail as defined in this Plan); or</li> <li>b. forms the foreground for an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape when viewed from public roads</li> </ul> | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155 |
| Policy 6.3.4.9   | In the Wakatipu Basin, avoid planting and screening, particularly along roads and boundaries that would degrade openness where such openness is an important part of its landscape character.  | [2021]<br>NZEnvC 155 |

#### **Other Council Documents Considered**

1.52. The following Council documents and projects have informed this Section 32 evaluation.

- (a) [2021-2031 Long Term Plan Volume 1](#)
- (b) [2021-2031 Long Term Plan Volume 2](#)
- (c) [Economic Development Strategy](#)
- (d) [Parks and Open Space Strategy](#)
- (e) [QLDC Infometrics](#)
- (f) [Queenstown Lake Spatial Plan Whaiora 2021](#)
- (g) [Housing and Business Capacity Assessment 2017](#)
- (h) [Housing Capacity Assessment 2020](#)
- (i) [Homes Strategy 2021](#)
- (j) [Planning for Affordable Housing Consultation 2021](#)
- (k) [Climate Action Plan 2022-2025](#)

- (l) [Transport Strategies](#)

Other documents:

- (m) [Otago Southland Regional Transport Plan 2021-2031](#)
- (n) [New Zealand Urban Design Protocol](#)
- (o) [CPTED](#)

## APPENDIX 3A – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

- i. **LMC Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan Transport Strategy**
- ii. **Candor3 Three Waters Infrastructure Report**
- iii. **Candor3 Stormwater Management Options Memo Rev A with costs April 2022**
- iv. **Geosolve Preliminary Soakage Testing Report May 2021**
- v. **Geosolve Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Dec 2020**
- vi. **e3 Scientific Ladies Mile PSI Contaminated Land assessment - Final January 2021**
- vii. **e3 Scientific Ladies Mile Ecological Assessment – Final September 2021**
- viii. **Natural Solutions for Nature Ltd - Ladies Mile Review – December 2021**
- ix. **RCG Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Commercial Advice Feb 2022**
- x. **Origin Consultants Ladies Mile – Heritage & Archaeological Vales Assessment Final - January 2022**
- xi. **Patch - Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile - Landscape Assessment Report June 2022**