



## **Section 32 Evaluation Report**

### **Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone**

#### **Contents**

Section 32 Evaluation Report: Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone.....	2
1. Strategic Context .....	2
2. National Planning Documents .....	2
3. Regional Planning Documents .....	3
4. Iwi Management Plans .....	3
5. Section 32 Evaluation .....	4
6. Resource Management Issues.....	4
7. Purpose and Options .....	5
8. Evaluation of proposed Objectives - Section 32 (1) (a).....	6
9. Evaluation of broad options for achieving Objectives Section 32 (1) (b)(i) .....	8
10. Scale and Significance Evaluation – Section 32(1)(c).....	14
11. Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32 (1)(b)(ii).....	14
12. Efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions .....	30
13. The risk of not acting.....	30
14. References.....	30

# Section 32 Evaluation Report: Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone

## 1. Strategic Context

Council is preparing a new District Plan under Section 74 of the Resource Management Act 1991(RMA or the Act). Section 74(1) of the RMA sets out matters which are to be considered by territorial authorities when preparing or changing district plans. That section states that any change to district plans must be in accordance with the functions for territorial authorities set out in section 31, the provisions of Part 2, the duties under section 32, and any regulations.

Section 74(2) of the Act requires that when preparing or changing a district plan, a territorial shall have regard to:

- (a) *any –*
  - (i) *Proposed regional policy statement; or*
  - (ii) *Proposed regional plan of its region in regard to any matter of regional significance or for which the regional council has primary responsibility under Part 4; and*
  
- (b) *any-*
  - (i) *Management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts; and*
  - (ii) *Repealed*
  - (ia) *Relevant entry [on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Korero required by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014]; and*
  - (iii) *Regulations relating to ensuring sustainability, or the conservation, management, or sustainability of fisheries resources (including regulations or bylaws relating to taiapure, mahinga mataitai, or other non-commercial Maori customary fishing),— to the extent that their content has a bearing on resource management issues of the district; and*
  
- (c) *The extent to which the district plan needs to be consistent with the plans or proposed plans of adjacent territorial authorities.*

Section 74(2A) requires that when preparing or changing a district plan a territorial authority 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.*

Section 75 of the Act details the requirements for the content of district plans. Section 75 of the Act states that:

- (3) *A district plan must give effect to –*
  - (a) *any national policy statement; and*
  - (b) *any New Zealand coastal policy statement; and*
  - (c) *any regional policy statement.*
  
- (4) *A district plan must not be inconsistent with -*
  - (a) *a water conservation order; or*
  - (b) *a regional plan for any matter specified in section 30(1).*

Consideration has been given to the matters detailed in sections 74 and 75 of the Act, as outlined in Sections 2 to 5 below.

## 2. National Planning Documents

### National Policy Statements

There are currently four operative national policy statements which the District Plan must give effect to. These include:

- The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010
- The National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011
- The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011
- The National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008

It has been determined that none of these policy statements are relevant to the proposed Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone chapter.

### **National Environmental Standards**

National environmental standards are regulations made under section 43 of the RMA. They can prescribe technical standards, methods or other requirements for environmental matters. In some circumstances, local authorities can impose stricter standards. There is one national environmental standard which is relevant to the proposed chapter, the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2012 (NES).

The proposed chapter does not impose a greater prohibition or restriction on an activity to which this NES already imposes. Therefore, no further evaluation of this NES is required for this evaluation (section 32(4)).

## **3. Regional Planning Documents**

### **Regional Policy Statement**

Otago's Regional Policy Statement ("RPS") promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources by giving an overview of the resource management issues facing Otago, and by setting policies and methods to manage Otago's natural and physical resources. The RPS is currently under Review itself, and may be further advanced in that process by the time the District Plan Review is notified. Amendments to this evaluation may be required to accommodate that change. The District Plan must *give effect* to the Operative RPS and must *have regard* to the Proposed RPS.

The Operative RPS contains a number of objectives and policies that are relevant to this review, namely Objectives 5.4.1 to 5.4.2 and associated Policies 5.5.3 to 5.5.5, and Objectives 9.4.1 to 9.4.3 (inclusive) and associated policies 9.5.2 and 9.5.3. As outlined in detail in **Attachment 1**, the proposed chapter is consistent with, and gives effect to, the relevant operative RPS provisions.

### **Regional Plans**

There are four operative regional plans within the Otago Region relating to air, water, coast and waste. The purpose of the Otago Regional Plan: Air is to promote the sustainable management of the air resource in the Otago region. The Otago Regional Plan: Water is for the use, development and protection of Otago's rivers, lakes, aquifers and wetlands. The Otago Regional Plan: Coast is relevant to the coastal marine area. The Otago Regional Plan: Waste applies to solid waste management, including waste minimisation, contaminated sites, hazardous substances and hazardous wastes and landfills. This chapter does not seek to address any matters that are managed under the Otago Regional Plans for Air, Water and the Coast. The management of Hazardous Substances is addressed in proposed provisions, therefore the Regional Plan: Waste is relevant to this chapter. The provisions recognise that the management of hazardous substances is governed by the Regional Plan: Waste and the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996.

## **4. Iwi Management Plans**

### **Kai Tahu Ki Otago Resource Management Plan**

The Kai Tahu Ki Otago Resource Management Plan (2005) (NRMP) is the principal planning document for Kai Tahu Ki Otago (KTKO) ((KTKO is used to describe the four Papatipu Runanga and associated whanau and ropu of the Otago Region). Chapter 5 of the NRMP identifies issues, objectives and policies for the Otago Region as a whole, and includes the following objectives:

- The rakātirataka and kaitiakitaka of Kāi Tahu ki Otago is recognised and supported.*
- Ki Uta Ki Tai management of natural resources is adopted within the Otago region.*
- The mana of Kāi Tahu ki Otago is upheld through the management of natural, physical and historic resources in the Otago Region.*

- iv. *Kāi Tahu ki Otago have effective participation in all resource management activities within the Otago Region.*
- v. *The respective roles and responsibilities of Manawhenua within the Otago Region are recognised and provided for through the other objectives and policies of the Plan.*

Chapter 10 sets out objectives and policies as they are relevant to the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment, in which Queenstown Airport is contained. Given the proposed chapter affects and is within the confines of Frankton's existing built environment, and access to existing servicing is available in this area, the provisions are not directly relevant to the proposed chapter.

### **Ngai Tahu Ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan (2008)**

The Ngai Tahu Ki Murihiku Natural Resources and Environmental Iwi Management Plan (Murihiku Plan) was issued in 2008 and consolidates Ngai Tahuki Murihiku values, knowledge and perspectives on natural resources and environmental management issues. The Murihiku Plan identifies kaitiakitanga, environmental and social, economic, health and wellbeing outcomes that need to be recognised when considering the proposed chapter. The proposed chapter will not offend any of the relevant objectives and policies.

## **5. Section 32 Evaluation**

All District Plan changes must be evaluated as directed by section 32 of the RMA. Section 32(1) and (2) specifies what the evaluation must examine.

- (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.*

Section 32(3) relates to "amending proposals". As Council is issuing a new proposed District Plan, this section is not considered relevant.

## **6. Resource Management Issues**

Queenstown Airport provides facilities for the transportation of people and freight and is a key asset to the District in terms of supporting the tourism industry and the needs of local and business travellers. The Airport acts as an essential gateway to the District and facilitates access and economic activity in the local and broader regional economies. It is also a provider of emergency services and is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. It is therefore essential that the current and future operations of the Airport are safeguarded through the District Plan Review.

Queenstown Airport has experienced a sustained period of passenger growth. To the year ending June 2014, the Airport accommodated approximately 1.25m passengers. This represented a 4.2% increase in

passengers from the previous year. Passenger growth projections undertaken by Market Economics (refer to **Attachment 2**) anticipate this figure to increase to 1.78m passenger per year by 2025 and 2.57m per year by 2037.

In order to accommodate this growth, the Queenstown Airport Corporation (QAC), needs the flexibility to respond to changes and growth in the tourism market. Increasingly, modern airports are also demanding a greater diversity and range of activities to provide for their passengers, and to assist in the efficient operation and functioning of the Airport. In the context of Queenstown Airport, which is surrounded by a range of land use activities, meeting the changing and evolving needs of the Airport will need to be carefully balanced with achieving appropriate environmental outcomes for the immediately surrounding zones.

The resource management issues set out in this section have been identified from the following sources:

- Review of the operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan (the operative District Plan), including the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone and the Queenstown Airport Corporation Designations (Designations D1- Aerodrome Purposes, D.2 – Air Noise Boundary Controls, and D.3 – Airport Approach and Land Use Controls);
- Consultation with the Queenstown Airport Corporation (QAC);
- Councillor workshops;
- Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited Statement of Intent 2015-2017 (**Attachment 2**);
- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Economic Assessment, Market Economics, November 2014 (**Attachment 3**);
- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Acoustical review of proposed District Plan Provisions, Marshall Day Acoustics, November 2014 (**Attachment 4**).

The key resource management issues include:

- The operative Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone does not reflect the extent of the overlying Aerodrome Purposes designation (Designation D.1). The majority of the Aerodrome Purposes designation has an underlying Rural General zone which does not anticipate airport related activities. The operative District Plan therefore does not adequately recognise the entirety of Queenstown Airport land as a strategic transportation hub and centre of economic activity.
- Only the requiring authority having the financial responsibility for a project or work (in this case, Queenstown Airport) can rely on the Aerodrome Purposes designation to establish activities which support, complement or enhance the efficient operation of the Airport.
- Queenstown Airport and its immediate surrounds provide an important gateway to the District and wider region. The operational imperatives of Queenstown Airport therefore need to be maintained whilst balancing the amenity and preservation of the gateway to the District.
- The Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone has not been reviewed since the District Plan became operative in 11 October 2003. Subsequent changes to the surrounding zones have resulted in inconsistencies in the built form anticipated in the adjacent Frankton Flats and Remarkables Park Zone. The Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone therefore requires amendments to create consistency with these planning frameworks.

## **7. Purpose and Options**

The overarching purpose of the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone is to enable the sustainable management and growth of Queenstown Airport.

Under the operative District Plan, approximately 25 ha of Queenstown Airport is currently zoned Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. The remaining 99 ha is zoned Rural General. Currently airport related activities are also provided for by the Airport's designations. The designations enable the safe and efficient operation of the Airport by providing for the activities undertaken by QAC as the requiring authority for Queenstown Airport under section 166(g) of the RMA.

The proposed chapter will provide for the activities currently, and that are anticipated to occur at Queenstown Airport over the next planning period. The following sections of this report (Sections 8 to 13) have been provided in order to fulfil the statutory requirements of section 32 of the RMA.

## 8. Evaluation of proposed Objectives - Section 32 (1) (a)

Section 32(1)(a) of the RMA requires the evaluation to examine the extent that a new objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. Two new objectives are proposed as part of this proposed chapter. This section of the report considers the new objectives in the context of the purpose of the Act.

The purpose of the Act demands an integrated planning approach and direction:

### **Section 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.*

The remaining provisions in Part 2 of the Act, particularly section 7, provide a framework within which objectives are required to achieve the purpose of the Act and provisions are required to achieve the relevant objectives. Section 7 (abbreviated below) is particularly relevant to this proposed chapter:

### **Section 7 Other Matters**

*In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and power under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protecting of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to –*

- (b) *the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:*
- (c) *the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:*
- (f) *maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:*

The following objectives serve to address the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone issues identified in Section 6.

<b>Proposed Objective</b>	<b>Appropriateness</b>
<p><b>Objective 17.2.1</b></p> <p><b>Queenstown Airport is recognised as a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits.</b></p>	<p>This objective acknowledges the national and regional strategic importance of Queenstown Airport and its contribution to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>Queenstown Airport is an important, existing strategic asset to the Queenstown Lakes District and Otago Region. It provides a national and international transport link for the local, regional and international community and has a major influence on the Region's economy.</p> <p>Queenstown Airport serves as an important link to the economies of Queenstown and facilitates tourism spending (VA) of between \$592m and \$638m (refer to <b>Attachment 3</b>) sustaining between 14,855 and 15,948 jobs. Tourism is a crucially important industry</p>

	<p>to the New Zealand economy as a whole. It is evident that the on-going ability of Queenstown Airport to function and grow is essential to the tourism industry, both regionally and nationally.</p> <p>This objective recognises and provides for the airport as a physical resource now and for future generations. The land subject to the proposed rezoning is not highly valued in terms of its rural productivity or landscape value. Therefore there will be no adverse effects on the life supporting capacity of soils, land or water resource.</p> <p>The surrounding Frankton Flats area contains several industrial/commercial developments, and the ongoing use and development of the Airport is considered to be consistent with this and is appropriate in the receiving environment.</p> <p>Heritage features currently identified in the operative District Plan will remain and be protected by provisions relating specifically to their management. This is consistent with the key initiatives of the requiring authority, which seeks to protect QAC owned heritage buildings as set out in its Statement of Intent (<b>Attachment 2</b>).</p> <p>This objective is therefore considered to be consistent with section 5 of the Act. Any section 6 matters will also not be adversely affected by the proposed objective.</p> <p>The proposed objective enables the Airport to grow in the most efficient way and addresses the resource management issues described in section 6 of this report. It is therefore consistent with relevant section 7 matters. The objective is also consistent with Objective 3.2.1.5 of Goal 3.2.1 of the Strategic Directions chapter, and enables the Airport to provide for future passenger and tourism growth.</p> <p>The objective also gives effect to RPS objectives 5.4.1 and 9.4.1 to 9.4.2 and RPS policies 9.5.4 and 9.5.2 to 9.5.3 (refer to <b>Attachment 1</b> for an assessment of the proposed chapter against these provisions).</p>
<p><b>Objective - 17.2.2</b></p> <p><b>Provision for the requirements of Queenstown Airport is balanced with achieving an acceptable level of amenity for those using the airport and for those residing on neighbouring land.</b></p>	<p>This objective sets a broad expectation that the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone will maintain high quality outcomes when providing for new development. Urban design plays an important role in managing the amenity of Queenstown Airport as a gateway to the District, whilst meeting the strict operational requirements of a functioning international airport.</p> <p>This objective also acknowledges that appropriate limits must be placed on the effects generated by the airport or airport related activities to enable a mix of uses to occur without any one use being inappropriately compromised by the effects of another. This objective, along the associated provisions which will seek to avoid, remedy or</p>

	<p>mitigate any adverse effects on the environment is consistent with section 5 of the Act.</p> <p>The proposed objective applies to land that is already designated for aerodrome purposes. The majority of the land although zoned rural, is not considered to be an outstanding natural feature or landscape.</p> <p>A portion of the airport zone will extend into the Shotover River delta, which has been deemed to be outstanding in the operative District Plan. While the active river bed displays natural character and landscape value, its margins have been substantially modified by existing airport activities (RESA), industrial activities and river flood protection works.</p> <p>In terms of heritage values it is noted that there are a number of protected heritage features in the operative District Plan within the land designated for Aerodrome Purposes. These features will remain as part of the proposed rezoning and the provisions relating to heritage will apply and therefore sufficiently protect any significant heritage values.</p> <p>Any relevant section 6 matters are therefore recognised and provided for and will not be adversely affected by the proposed objective.</p> <p>Achieving the proposed objective will result in a more efficient use of resources than the current zoning provides for and will result in the development of the Airport in a way that will result in the maintenance of amenity values and environmental quality.</p> <p>There are no known Treaty principles that will be affected by this objective. The proposed objective is not contrary to the Kai Tahu ki Otago resource management plan or the Ngai Tahu Ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan.</p> <p>This objective is consistent with Goal 3.2.3 of the Strategic Directions chapter.</p> <p>This objective also gives effect to RPS objectives 5.4.2, 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and RPS policies 5.5.3 and 9.5.4 (refer to <b>Attachment 1</b> for an assessment of the proposed chapter against these provisions).</p>
--	---

The above objectives have been considered against Part 2 of the Act, the RPS, and the draft Strategic Directions chapter of the proposed plan. When compared against the objectives of the operative District Plan, the proposed objectives are considered the most appropriate method of achieving the purpose of the Act, as they identify and give direction as to the how the specific issues that pertain to the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone are to be addressed.

## 9. Evaluation of broad options for achieving Objectives Section 32 (1) (b)(i)

As required by section 32(1)(b)(i) RMA, the following section considers various broad options considered to address the issues identified in Section 6 of this report and are therefore considered the most appropriate way of achieving the new objectives. Recommendations are made as to the most appropriate course of action in each case. For the purposes of this assessment, the issues have been broadly grouped into two categories:

*Issue 1: Providing for long term sustainable management of Queenstown Airport;*

In addressing Issue 1, Option 1 generally seeks to retain the operative District Plan provisions as they stand. Option 2 seeks to amend and improve the operative District Plan provisions, whilst retaining the operative District Plan Zoning (including the retention of the operative Queenstown Airport Mixed Use and Rural General Zoning). Option 3 would not significantly depart from the operative District Plan provisions, however additional activities to meet the demands and needs of the Airport would be included. The entirety of the land that is subject to the Aerodrome Designation would also be included in the revised zone.

*Issue 2: Balancing the operational requirements of the Queenstown Airport with residential amenity and outlook, including the Airport as a key strategic gateway to the District.*

In addressing Issue 2, Option 1 again seeks to retain the operative District Plan provisions as they stand. Option 2 seeks to amend and improve the operative District Plan provisions, by creating consistency with the development standards of neighbouring zones (where appropriate), while considering the adoption of non-statutory guidelines. Option 3 comprises a complete review of the existing standards, including the mandatory implementation of urban design guidelines.

**Broad options considered to for achieving the objectives (Section 32(1)(b)(i))**

Issue 1: Long term growth and sustainable management of the Airport (Objective 17.2.1)

Option 1: Retain the provisions and zoning of the operative District Plan.

Option 2: Amend and improve the operative District Plan provisions, whilst retaining operative District Plan zoning.

Option 3: Amend and improve the operative District Plan provisions, and explore options to enable further development opportunities which complement the efficient operation of Queenstown Airport. Consider amendments to the operative District Plan zone boundaries to establish consistency with the Aerodrome Purposes Designation (Designation D.1).

	<b>Option 1:</b> <b>Status quo/ No change</b>	<b>Option 2:</b> <b>Amend operative provisions whilst retaining existing zoning</b>	<b>Option 3:</b> <b>Comprehensive review that enables activities that complement the Airport (including zone boundaries)</b>
<b>Cons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistency in the nature, scale and intensity of activities anticipated by the Aerodrome Purposes designation and the underlying zones.</li> <li>• The Airport will not be able to adequately provide for its anticipated growth and development, having a corollary effect on the growth of the local and regional economy.</li> <li>• The existing Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone provides for a limited area of Airport related activity. This restricts growth of the Airport and will have a detrimental effect on the economic wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>• Uncertainty and delays for third parties requiring consent for activities which are anticipated within the designation, but not within the zone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation).</li> <li>• Inconsistency in the nature, scale and intensity of activities anticipated by the Aerodrome Purposes designation and the underlying zones.</li> <li>• Limited opportunities for other parties to operate complementary or ancillary activities within the Airport surrounds.</li> <li>• Resource consents would be required for future development of airport related activities within the Rural General zone. Airport related activities are not anticipated in this zone, resulting in consenting uncertainty, delays and costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of some rural land (however this is owned by QAC and typical farming activities are not anticipated within operational airport areas).</li> <li>• Activities that are incompatible with airport operations and do not relate to the efficient operation of the airport would be prohibited, potentially creating loss of economic opportunities.</li> <li>• Financial costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation).</li> </ul>

<b>Pros</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retains the established approach which parties are familiar with.</li> <li>Low cost for Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within appropriately zoned areas it will provide for the types of activities demanded of modern airports and provides certainty around their establishment.</li> <li>Retains but improves the approach parties are familiar with.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provisions and zoning which meet the long term demand for the airport will provide significant economic benefits to the region.</li> <li>New industries and business opportunities corollary to the primary airport functioning will be better enabled.</li> <li>Ensures Queenstown Airport is recognised as a strategic and significant physical asset.</li> <li>Creates consistency between activities anticipated by the Aerodrome Purposes designation and the underlying zones.</li> <li>Potential streamlining opportunities, with QAC managing the overall zone management and development.</li> </ul>
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Option 1 would generally allow the familiarity of users of the zone provisions to remain but would not address the resource management issues identified in Section 6.

Option 2 recognises that some of the existing provisions of the operative District Plan are effective, however there are amendments which could further improve their effectiveness. Option 2 does not adequately protect or provide for the Airport (in its entirety) as a significant physical resource.

Option 3 would not significantly depart from the operative District Plan provisions or those that would be amended via Option 2, however the changes to the zoning would enable activities ancillary and necessary to the functioning of an effective and efficient airport to establish within the wider Airport environs. Option 3 would also streamline the provisions of the zone with the overlying Aerodrome Purposes designation (Designation D.1). Option 3 is therefore the most reasonably practicable option for achieving the objectives and addressing the resource management issues identified in Section 6.

Option 3 is considered the most reasonably practicable option for achieving the objectives of the proposed chapter.

Issue 2: Balancing the operational requirements of Queenstown Airport with maintaining residential and visual amenity and “gateway” to the District (Objective 17.2.2)

Option 1: Retain the provisions of the Operative District Plan.

Option 2: Review the operative bulk and location standards (in light of the nature and scale of activities anticipated by Queenstown Airport’s Aerodrome Designation (Designation D1) and consider combination of statutory and non-statutory methods.

Option 3: Comprehensive review and development of operative bulk and location performance and urban design standards.

	<b>Option 1: Status quo/ No change</b>	<b>Option 2: Statutory and non-statutory methods</b>	<b>Option 3: Comprehensive bulk and location development standards and urban design requirements</b>
<b>Cons</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The operative policies do not adequately recognise the balance between providing for airport growth and achieving acceptable levels of amenity.</li> <li>• The operative standards do not reflect the bulk and location anticipated at the airport, or in neighbouring zones resulting in loss of comparable development opportunities.</li> <li>• QAC undertakes extensive master and urban planning exercises. There is no reference to, or encouragement of, adherence to these documents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation).</li> <li>• Would result in a change from the status quo – Plan users would need to become familiar with new provisions.</li> <li>• No ability for the Council to enforce non-statutory methods.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation).</li> <li>• Opens up some parts of the plan which are currently settled.</li> <li>• Providing statutory weight to urban design guidelines would result in a requirement for a plan change each time the guidelines are updated.</li> <li>• Would result in a change from the status quo – Plan users would need to become familiar with new provisions.</li> <li>• Implementing stringent urban design requirements may result in a ‘one size fits all’ approach, and may lead to a lack of diversity in buildings.</li> </ul>

<b>Pros</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains the established approach which parties are familiar with.</li> <li>• Low cost for Council.</li> <li>• Some provisions of the operative District Plan are working well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-statutory methods encourage creative, site-specific responses.</li> <li>• Opportunity to review and update the methods without entering into a plan change process.</li> <li>• Some provisions of the operative District Plan are working well, but could be improved with further minor amendments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance standards provide certainty and the ability to avoid the resource consent process.</li> <li>• Ability to avoid the resource consent process means potential for reduced financial and time costs, and avoids risk of notification or appeal.</li> <li>• Resource consent process would still apply for developments exceeding performance standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Ranking</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

Option 1 would generally allow the familiarity of users of the zone provisions to remain but would not address the resource management issues identified in Section 6.

Option 2 is recognises that some of the existing provisions are effective, however further amendments and implementation of non-statutory methods could further enhance the zone.

Option 3 would require the implementation of extensive urban design standards which may result in overregulation and would result in a plan change each time the urban design guidelines were amended. QAC undertakes extensive urban design and master planning exercises to identify the best development options for the airport over the longer term. Given their overarching management of the zone due to their role as the primary landowner and requiring authority, Option 3 would result in unnecessary regulation.

Option 2 is considered the most reasonably practicable option for achieving the objectives of the proposed chapter.

## 10. Scale and Significance Evaluation – Section 32(1)(c)

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 the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone chapter. In making this assessment, regard has been had to the following, namely whether the objectives and provisions:

- Result in a significant variance from the existing baseline (Section 32(3)).
- Have effects on matters of national importance.
- Adversely affect those with specific interests, e.g., Tangata Whenua.
- Involve effects that have been considered implicitly or explicitly by higher order documents.
- Impose increased costs or restrictions on individuals, communities or businesses.

## 11. Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32 (1)(b)(ii)

Under section 32 (2)(a) an assessment under section 32(2)(1)(b)(ii) must 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 (section 32(2)(a)).*

With respect to this proposed chapter the following assessments have been commissioned:

- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Economic Assessment (refer **Attachment 3**);
- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Acoustical review of proposed District Plan provisions (**Attachment 4**).
- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Transportation Assessment (**Attachment 5**)

The necessary assessment of the proposed policies, rules and other methods under sections 32(1)(b)(ii) and (2)(a), is provided below. The policies, rules and other methods that are specific to the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use zone have been assessed for their appropriateness in achieving the proposed objectives for the zone and the overarching Strategic Directions chapter of the proposed plan.

The proposed new policies outlined in this section seek to replace and improve on the operative policies of the District Plan. Many of the methods of the proposed chapter do not significantly depart from those of the operative District Plan.

*(See also Table detailing broad options considered in Section 6, above)*

**Issue 1: Enabling provisions for long term growth and sustainable management of the Airport**

**Proposed Objective 17.2.1: Queenstown Airport is recognised as a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits**

**(Strategic Directions Chapter)**

**Proposed Objective 3.2.1.1 Recognise, develop and sustain the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas as the hubs of New Zealand's premier alpine resorts and the District's economy.**

**Proposed Objective 3.2.1.2: Recognise, develop and sustain the key local service and employment functions served by commercial centres and industrial areas outside of the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas in the District.**

**Proposed Objective 3.2.1.5: To maintain and promote the efficient operation of the District's infrastructure, including designated Airports, key roading and communication technology networks.**

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Enabling opportunities for third party operators to undertake aviation related activities which are anticipated within the Aerodrome Purposes designation.
- Enabling opportunities for activities to establish which are corollary to the primary operational imperatives of the Airport.
- Providing sufficient land to meet the foreseeable future requirements of the Airport, and recognition of the Airport and its associated infrastructure within the District Plan provisions.

**Issue 2: Balancing the operational requirements of Queenstown Airport with maintaining residential and visual amenity and "gateway" to the District.**

**Proposed Objective 17.2.2: Provision for the requirements of Queenstown Airport is balanced with achieving an acceptable level of amenity for those using the airport and for those residing on neighbouring land.**

**(Strategic Directions Chapter)**

**Proposed Objective 3.2.3.1: To achieve a built environment that ensures our urban areas are desirable and safe places to live, work and play.**

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised development standards which reflect the nature, scale and intensity of development with the Aerodrome Designation (Designation D.2) and to the surrounding zone requirements.</li> <li>Promotion of urban design principles.</li> </ul>			
<b>Proposed provisions</b>	<b>Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural Costs</b>	<b>Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural Benefits</b>	<b>Effectiveness, Efficiency &amp; Appropriateness</b>
<p><b>Policy</b></p> <p>17.2.1.1</p> <p><i>Provide for those aviation activities necessary to enable Queenstown Airport to operate in a safe and efficient manner.</i></p>	<p>Providing for an increase in land based aviation related activities by third party operators (i.e. not the requiring authority) may result in a perceived acoustic amenity cost for surrounding zones. Marshall Day Acoustics have reviewed the land based noise requirements of the zone to ensure their appropriateness and currency relative to the surrounding zones (<b>Attachment 4</b>). The recommendations of Marshall Day Acoustics have been adopted to mitigate potential noise effects. Aircraft noise would continue to be managed via the Air Noise Boundary designation.</p> <p>Aviation related activities within the zone will continue to be secondary to the operational imperatives of Queenstown Airport. Civil Aviation Authority regulations will also prevail within the zone.</p>	<p>This policy ensures that existing and future aviation activities and infrastructure are recognised and provided for within the District Plan.</p> <p>The assessment prepared by Market Economics (refer <b>Attachment 3</b>) has quantified the contribution the airport makes to the wider economy. Queenstown Airport facilitates tourism spending with a total effect to of between \$592 and \$638m (value added effect) within the Queenstown Lakes District, sustaining in the order of 14,885 to 15,948 jobs. Specific provision for aviation activities within the zone therefore reinforces the significance of Queenstown Airport as a significant contributor to the local and regional economy, which, inherently provides for the social wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>The clarity provided by the specific provision of aviation activities also reduces the opportunity costs of uncertainty in the regulatory environment. The policy provides certainty for aviation activities to be undertaken by parties who cannot currently rely upon the requiring authority's Aerodrome Purposes designation (Designation D.1) or the operative District Plan provisions to operate (with respect to the current Rural</p>	<p>The policy is effective in achieving the objective as it recognises that the Airport is a key physical resource that requires flexibility to develop and grow to meet passenger growth demands in a safe and efficient manner.</p> <p>The policy is an efficient means of implementing the objectives, providing for an organised and holistic approach for utilising the Airport as a physical resource, without undue regulation.</p> <p>The policy is appropriate for achieving proposed Objectives 6.3.1 and 3.2.15.</p>

		General Zoning – refer to Policy 6.3.1.3 below).	
<p><b>Policy</b></p> <p><b>17.2.1.2</b></p> <p><i>Provide for a range of airport related service, business, industrial and commercial activity to support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.</i></p>	<p>Economic costs could result from an oversupply of commercial and/or industrial opportunities within the wider Frankton Flats area. Given the aviation focus of the zone, and the limited supply of land available for aviation related activities, only those activities that are ancillary to and require or significantly benefit from an airport location are anticipated within the zone, with oversight of the QAC as the primary landowner as to their appropriateness in meeting the demands of the Airport.</p> <p>The inclusion of permitted airport related activities (including industry, commercial activities, , office accommodation and land transport facilities) which previously had some level of control within the operative District Plan have the potential to give rise to acoustic and reverse sensitivity effects both within and beyond the zone. Marshall Day Acoustics have reviewed the land based noise requirements of the zone to ensure their appropriateness and currency relative to the surrounding zones (<b>Attachment 4</b>). The recommendations of Marshall Day Acoustics have been adopted to mitigate potential noise effects. Aircraft noise would continue to be managed via the Air Noise Boundary designation.</p> <p>In terms of effects on the transportation network, Carriageway Consulting have undertaken a transportation assessment for the proposed chapter (<b>Attachment 5</b>).</p>	<p>This policy enables those activities which complement the efficient operation of Queenstown Airport.</p> <p>Modern airports demand a diverse range of activities to provide for their efficient operation. This policy establishes the framework for methods to meet this demand by providing for new support and complementary activities previously not provided for within the zone, including farming, visitor accommodation, commercial activities and industry. Such activities would be corollary to the primary functioning of the Airport.</p> <p>Permitting activities which support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport creates economic efficiencies through the removal of unnecessary consenting requirements. This also provides certainty for ancillary activities which support or complement the efficient operation of Queenstown Airport whom cannot rely upon the requiring authority’s Aerodrome Purposes designation to operate. The report prepared by Market Economics (<b>Attachment 3</b>) sets out opportunity cost associated with uncertainty. This analysis revealed that economic value (value added) of a year’s delay is \$53.4m and 780 jobs-years.</p> <p>Market Economics have set out a notional development scenario of land use activities within the revised zone extent, based on the</p>	<p>This policy will be effective in achieving the objective as it provides for those activities that contribute to the successful functioning of the airport, and benefit from an airport location.</p> <p>The policy is efficient as it will enable a range of airport related activities to establish as permitted activities within the Queenstown Airport zone. This will assist the growth and development of the airport as a whole which will further realise the benefits associated with the Airport.</p> <p>The policy is the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.</p>

	<p>Carriageway Consulting considers that the requirement for activities to be aviation related, or to complement the functioning of the airport, means that the extent of any additional traffic generation will be limited. This is compared to the existing baseline established by the operative District Plan provisions.</p>	<p>types and ratios of activities occurring at airports throughout New Zealand. The economic contribution (impacts and flow on effects) of enabling the activities outlined was estimated at \$53.4m (VA), supporting approximately 780 jobs (refer to <b>Attachment 3</b>). Provision for ancillary and complementary activities will therefore contribute to economic and social wellbeing of the community, creating both direct and indirect employment opportunities.</p>	
<p><b>Policy</b></p> <p><b>17.2.1.3</b></p> <p><i>Zone sufficient land to meet the foreseeable future requirements of activities that support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.</i></p> <p>District Planning Maps – Proposed amendments to Planning Maps 31 and 33 to rezone the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Land within the Aerodrome Designation currently zoned Rural General will be rezoned Queenstown Airport Mixed Use. There will not be any loss of agricultural opportunities, as farming will continue to be provided for as an activity which is ancillary to the efficient functioning of Queenstown Airport (i.e. maintenance and use of vacant land resource).</p> <p>The provision of additional land for development of aviation related or complementary activities may have effects on the provision of services, both utilities and roading. Both the NZ Transport Agency (as the road controlling authority for State Highway 6), and the Queenstown Lakes District Council (as the provider of local roads and three waters infrastructure) are currently investigating the capacity of these networks, with the intent for future upgrades.</p> <p>While the effects of the proposed chapter on these services is difficult to quantify at this stage, it is anticipated that development contributions and rates obtained from</p>	<p>The areas proposed to be rezoned (<b>Attachment 6</b>) represent the logical expansion of the zone, being entirely consistent with the extent of the Aerodrome Purposes designation which provides for Aerodrome activities, including both operational and landside facilities.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning will provide recognition of Queenstown Airport and its associated infrastructure on Frankton Flats, and protect its future development and use as a strategic transportation and economic hub.</p> <p>The assessment prepared by Market Economics (refer <b>Attachment 3</b>) has determined that the potential economic contribution from the proposed rezoning is in the order of approximately \$53.4m (value added), supporting approximately 780 jobs. These economic and employment opportunities cannot be realised without appropriate zoning of this land. Such economic benefits will also have inherent social benefits in terms of household incomes.</p>	<p>The policy and associated changes to the District Plan maps address an identified need to provide additional capability for airport related activities to establish within the wider Airport environs. This will be effective in sustaining and enhancing growth at Queenstown Airport, which is vital to the District's tourism industry.</p> <p>The changes will also result in economic efficiencies, whereby the regulatory framework will anticipate such aviation and aviation related activities within the zone (as opposed to the Rural General Zone). Additional efficiencies will accrue from the consistency in the Aerodrome Designation and zone extent.</p> <p>The new policy is the most appropriate for achieving the objective.</p>

	<p>activities occurring within the zone would provide for new and ongoing maintenance and repair of such assets. It is noted that operational imperatives will mean less than 20% of the proposed zone could be used for landside activities, with obstacle limitation surfaces further reducing the ability of this land to be developed. Further, the proposed chapter does not deviate significantly from the existing level of development that is anticipated via the Aerodrome Purposes designation. This is confirmed in the assessment prepared by Carriageway Consulting (refer <b>Attachment 5</b>).</p> <p>Enabling larger areas of land to be developed for land use activities may result in an increase in noise effects from land based activities. The acoustic effects with respect to the proposed zone are discussed with respect to Policy 6.3.1.1 and 6.3.1.2, please refer above and Attachment 4.</p>	<p>Market Economic have also identified that additional economic benefits will accrue from the investment certainty created by the proposed rezoning (<b>Attachment 3</b>). Significant investment certainty arising from the clarity of the proposed provisions is valued at between \$41.8m and \$172m across six different development delay scenarios.</p> <p>As set out by Market Economics (refer to <b>Attachment 3</b>), Queenstown Airport is experiencing rapid passenger growth, with passenger numbers projected to rise from 1.25m the year ending June 2014 to 1.78m by 2025 and 2.57m by 2037. Based on Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment tourism forecasts and passenger growth rates, total tourism spending in projected to increase by between 3.4 and 3.9 percent per annum. This is expected to take the total tourism spending facilitated by Queenstown Airport to between \$1.1bn and \$1.4bn.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning will therefore provide for the long term needs of Queenstown Airport in responding to such passenger and tourism spending growth, providing for the economic wellbeing of the community.</p>	
<p><b>Policy</b> <b>17.2.2.1</b> <i>Maintain Queenstown Airport as a memorable and attractive gateway to</i></p>	<p>There may be additional construction costs arising from the implementation of this policy, via the requirement for quality urban design principles to be adopted throughout the entire zone.</p>	<p>Queenstown Airport accommodated 1.25m passenger movements to year ending June 2014. With these numbers forecast to grow significantly by 2025 (1.78m), this policy recognises the significant role of the Airport in providing a memorable gateway to the District.</p>	<p>The proposed policy is effective in providing clear guidance to plan users and decision makers that the zone is to be developed to a high standard in order to provide an iconic and memorable first and lasting impression of the District.</p> <p>This proposed policy is considered to be</p>

<p><i>the District.</i></p>		<p>The Airport is a key gateway into the District and a high level of external amenity and visual coherence in terms of development must be maintained. In this regard, development standards with respect to building design, coverage, and height are proposed to control the visual amenity effects from beyond the zone boundary. Additional standards around signage and landscaping are also proposed along the public interface with the zone.</p> <p>This policy will also beneficial environmental and social outcomes, through the management of adverse amenity effects.</p>	<p>efficient in terms of District Plan administration through providing clear guidance of the expected environmental outcomes for the zone.</p> <p>The proposed policy has been assessed the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Policy</b></p> <p><b>17.2.2.2</b></p> <p><i>Manage adverse effects on amenity values arising from the on-going development, use and maintenance of Queenstown Airport.</i></p>	<p>There costs of including this new policy are similar to those discussed under the costs of Policy 6.3.2.1, please refer above.</p> <p>This policy may also give rise to amenity effects both within and beyond the zone. As discussed in relation to Policy 6.3.2.1, development standards have been adopted to manage these effects. This is also set out in the vision statement of the QAC, which seeks to “<i>Seize the challenge to make Queenstown easy to get to, with an airport experience that leaves a wonderful first and last impression</i>” (<b>Attachment 2</b>).</p>	<p>This policy is proposed to facilitate development in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone that accords with best practice urban design principles, maintains the amenity of the zone.</p> <p>This policy recognises that in some instances however, there are functional and operational imperatives of the airport that necessitate a certain approach to the built form and function. These may be somewhat utilitarian in appearance, however with good urban design, the effects can be minimised and contained within the zone. In this regard QAC undertakes extensive urban design and master planning exercises which set out the development framework to balance the operational requirements of the Airport with the amenity of the key gateway to the District. As the primary landowner within the zone, it has been determined that QAC can exercise a degree of control, ensuring the built form is consistent with its long term vision and</p>	<p>The proposed policy gives effect to the objective through clear recognition that amenity values within the zone will need to be balanced with the functional requirements of the airport.</p> <p>This policy is effectively complemented by Policy 17.2.2.1 which seeks to maintain Queenstown Airport as a memorable gateway to the District. External amenity values will therefore be protected as far as possible via Policy 17.2.2.1, while this policy seeks to recognise that internal amenity values may be somewhat constrained by functional or technical requirements of airport, or aviation related operations.</p> <p>The policy will assist the efficient development, use and maintenance of Queenstown Airport.</p> <p>The efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed policy will assist in achieving the</p>

		operational requirements.  Non statutory methods will further encourage an appropriate balance between managing amenity effects and the built form of the Airport.	proposed objective.  The proposed policy has been assessed the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.
<p><b>Policy 17.2.2.3</b></p> <p><i>Avoid the establishment of activities that are incompatible with the ongoing operation and functioning of Queenstown Airport.</i></p>	<p>This policy sets out the framework to retain the prohibited activity status for incompatible activities which are currently prohibited within the operative District Plan. No significant costs have therefore been identified.</p>	<p>Incompatible land use activities which have the potential to adversely affect the long term sustainable use and development of the airport will be prevented from establishing with the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. This is consistent with the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>In preventing the establishment of sensitive activities within the zone (such as residential activities), this policy will also protect the health and safety and wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>Associated methods seek to retain the prohibited activity status for many activities which are currently prohibited in the operative District Plan. Minor drafting amendments have consolidated the list to reflect how the activities are defined.</p>	<p>These provisions will be effective in limiting the development of activities that are incompatible or conflict with airport operations. This will assist to protect the ongoing operation of the airport and sustainably manage its future growth.</p> <p>The proposed policy has been assessed the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Activity 17.4.1</b></p> <p><i>Any airport activity or airport related activity or farming activity which complies with all the relevant rules in section 6.5 shall be Permitted Activity.</i></p>	<p>The costs and effects of retaining (and slightly amending) this operative District Plan rule are similar to those discussed under the costs of Policy 17.2.2.2, please refer above.</p>	<p>The benefits of retaining (and slightly amending) this operative District Plan rule are similar to those discussed under the benefits of Policy 6.3.1.2, please refer above.</p> <p>In addition to the benefits outlined with respect to Policies 6.3.1.1 and 6.3.1.2, these methods complement QAC's mission statement as set out in the Statement of Intent 2015-2017 which seeks "to provide airport and related facilities in the district and</p>	<p>The retention of the operative rule is considered to be an efficient and effective means to give effect to the objectives.</p> <p>The inclusion of additional activities previously not permitted in the zone is effective at implementing the objective, but is also generally more consistent with enabling the range of activities currently occurring and provided for within the Aerodrome Designation. This structure creates</p>

		<p><i>meet the growing needs for airport services to the Lakes District, to the highest quality in an economically sustainable manner and in the best interests of the community” (Attachment 2).</i></p>	<p>consistency and efficiency between the designation and the zone provisions.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Activity</b></p> <p><b>17.4.2</b></p> <p><i>Any non-airport related activity which is not listed as Prohibited, with Council’s discretion restricted to:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>Design, external appearance and siting of buildings and structures;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Traffic generation, vehicle parking, site access and servicing, including provision for an integrated transport assessment;</i></p> <p>(c) <i>Landscaping and screening of any outdoor storage;</i></p> <p>(d) <i>The extent to which the activity benefits from an Airport location.</i></p>	<p>This rule creates potential opportunity cost of uncertainty for activities that want to establish within the zone, but are not directly airport related.</p>	<p>This rule enables Council to retain some discretion around the necessity or otherwise of activities establishing in an Airport locale that are not entirely dependent or reliant on an Airport location.</p> <p>The matters of discretion provide an ability for the Council to consider the potential environmental and economic effects of the activity.</p>	<p>The rule is effective in recognising that there may be activities that are not dependent upon an Airport location, however contribute positively to the economic hub of the Airport.</p> <p>The rule is efficient as it retains a level of control which will enable more detailed consideration of the wider impacts of non-airport related activities establishing within the zone.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>

<p><b>Rules</b></p> <p><b>17.4.3 to 17.4.9 (inclusive)</b></p> <p><i>Forestry, Factory Farming, Mining Activities, Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act, Residential Activities, Community Activities, Day Care Facilities</i></p>	<p>This rule seeks to retain the prohibited activity status for many activities which are currently prohibited within the operative District Plan. There costs of retaining these rules are similar to those discussed under the costs of Policy 6.3.2.3, please refer above.</p>	<p>This rules seeks to retain the prohibited activity status for many activities which are currently prohibited in the operative District Plan. Minor drafting amendments have consolidated the list.</p> <p>The benefits of including this new policy are similar to those discussed under the costs of Policy 6.3.2.3, please refer above.</p>	<p>This rule is an effective and efficient and is continues to prohibit the establishment of incompatible land use activities within the zone.</p> <p>This approach will continue to secure the operational and functional requirements of the airport by avoiding the establishment of incompatible land use activities within close proximity to the Airport, and is therefore considered the most appropriate means of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Rule</b></p> <p>17.5.1</p> <p>Site coverage</p>	<p>No significant costs have been identified.</p>	<p>The currently operative maximum building coverage requirements have been retained.</p> <p>The benefits of including this rule are similar to those discussed under the benefits of amending Policies 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2, please refer above.</p>	<p>Operational requirements result in a large areas of the zone being free from development. This site coverage provides for the efficient use of land where operational constraints allow.</p> <p>The retention of the site coverage standard provides an appropriate balance between retaining amenity and providing sufficient land for airport and airport related activities within the zone.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Rule</b></p> <p><b>17.5.2</b></p> <p>Minimum Building Setback</p>	<p>Amending the operative setback of buildings from adjacent residential zones from 10m to 5m, other adjacent zones from 10m to 3m) and from adjacent roads from 6m to 5m will result in buildings being located closer to property boundaries. These effects will be limited however, by</p>	<p>Amending the operative setback requirements will enable greater development opportunities and use of a limited land resource.</p> <p>Additional benefits of retaining this standard are also similar to those discussed under the</p>	<p>This standard is clear and easily interpreted and is an efficient method for managing the effects of buildings and in particular the effects on streetscape and adjoining activities.</p> <p>This rule will be effective in providing</p>

	<p>building height controls, which will further be restricted by the obstacle limitation surface.</p> <p>The rule creates a restriction on the use of sites at the interface with adjacent zones. Where a development does not achieve the setbacks, resource consent will be required for a discretionary activity. It is considered that the costs associated with this rule are minor, and are outweighed by the benefits.</p>	<p>benefits of amending Policies 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2, please refer above.</p> <p>The proposed setback standard will also result in built outcomes that are consistent with adjoining zones, noting that Remarkables Park Zone has a 1.5m building setback, and the adjacent Frankton Flats (B) Activity Area D has no side or rear boundary setbacks, with setbacks within this area only applying where a boundary adjoins the Rural General zone or a road boundary. Note, the establishment of buildings within these zones however is subject to a controlled activity consent.</p>	<p>management of the siting of buildings along the boundary of the zone.</p> <p>The setback requirement coupled with other building and urban design controls will ensure that the effects on amenity values are appropriately managed.</p> <p>The proposed will assist in achieving the objectives and is considered appropriate for managing the effects of built development along the interface of the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone with adjacent zones.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Rule</b></p> <p><b>17.5.3</b></p> <p>Maximum Building Height</p>	<p>Increasing the maximum permitted building height may result in shading effects in some areas. The height may also impinge of vistas towards the Remarkables.</p> <p>The actual building height throughout much of the zone will be significantly less than the 12m proposed due to the presence of the obstacle limitation surface. These surfaces limit the construction of any structure or facility which may inhibit the safe and efficient operation of Queenstown Airport. This includes plant and machinery that may be required during construction.</p>	<p>These proposed provisions establish a revised maximum building height from 9m to 12m. These height limits increase the permitted height from the status quo. This will result in benefits in terms of the efficient use of the site, where the obstacle limitation surface enables.</p> <p>The building height has also been evaluated in context of surrounding land uses. The height limits are consistent with those permitted within Activity Area 5 of the adjacent Remarkables Park Zone. Permitted buildings to a height of 12m is consistent with the current and future level of development in the Frankton area.</p>	<p>Height limits are an effective tool for managing the effects of built development while providing for the efficient use of land.</p> <p>The proposed provisions are effective in maximising the efficient use of the land while managing the effects of this use.</p> <p>Taking into account efficiency and effectiveness of this provision, the rule is considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Rule</b></p> <p><b>17.5.4</b></p>	<p>The requirement to provide minimum site landscaping of 10% has been removed. The minimum landscaping strip depth of 4m has also been reduced to 3m. This could</p>	<p>These rules are largely consistent with the requirements of the Operative District Plan, with minor amendments proposed.</p> <p>Landscaping, other than well maintained</p>	<p>Providing minimum landscaping requirements is an effective tool for managing the effects of built development.</p>

Landscaping	potentially result in the establishment of larger areas of impermeable space, with an overall reduction in landscaped area and amenity.	<p>grass, is often inappropriate at airports for operational and safety reasons. The removal of the 10% landscaping requirement provides recognition of this. The urban design guidelines prepared and implemented by the QAC will identify areas where high quality landscaping is appropriate.</p> <p>It is important to provide well landscaped areas along the roading interface of the Airport and Lucas Place and Hawthorne Drive. The proposed 1m reduction in the average landscaping strip width will enable greater development opportunities near these boundaries, whilst maintaining the amenity along these road frontages.</p>	<p>The proposed provisions are effective in maximising the efficient use of the land while maintaining a level of amenity within the zone.</p> <p>The revised landscaping standards provide an appropriate balance between the operational requirements of the Airport and the visual amenity of the zone. The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<b>Rule</b> <b>17.5.5</b> Building Design and Glare	No significant costs have been identified.	<p>Amendments to the rule are proposed to create clarity and certainty for plan users. Some elements of the operative rule have also been deleted for clarity.</p> <p>The benefits of including this new standard is similar to those discussed under the benefits of Policy 6.3.2.1, please refer above. The reflectivity standards proposed are also in line with Environment Court recommendations with regards to building reflectivity in the vicinity of Queenstown Airport.</p>	<p>Minimum standards are an effective tool at managing adverse glare and lighting effects.</p> <p>The rules create efficiencies in the District Plan by focusing of the key areas of glare and lighting that require management in the context of an airport setting. Avoiding over prescriptive lighting requirements will ensure the Airport can response to any changes in operational and/or health and safety requirements without the need for plan change.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<b>Rule</b> <b>17.5.6</b> Maximum Noise –	Enabling longer operational hours for land based activities within the zone may impact on amenity of nearby residential properties. Marshall Day Acoustics have provided recommended land based noise limits for	The adoption of these noise standards is intended to ensure that an appropriate level of acoustic amenity is maintained for those using land and residing on land within the adjacent zone, including for the owners and	<p>This rule is effective in managing adverse noise effects that may arise from new activities establishing within the zone.</p> <p>This standard will enable the efficient use of</p>

<p>Land Activities</p>	<p>Based</p> <p>the zone (<b>Attachment 4</b>) to mitigate these effects. These recommendations have been adopted.</p>	<p>occupiers of adjacent land.</p> <p>Marshall Day Acoustics (<b>Attachment 4</b>) have reviewed the land based noise limits for consistency and currency with surrounding zones and the operational hours of Queenstown Airport. The revised rules provide for airport related activities which service the airport.</p>	<p>the zone through the specific management of land based noise effects.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to facilitate land use activities within the zone, by appropriately managing noise effects.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Rule</b></p> <p>HSNO</p>	<p>No significant costs have been identified.</p>	<p>Hazardous substances are regulated under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. In addition to this Act, the Civil Aviation Authority sets out regulations around the storage and use of such substances within Airport Environs. The Regional Plan: Waste also sets out rules and regulations around the management and use of hazardous substances.</p> <p>The proposed rule creates economic efficiencies by avoiding unnecessary duplication of controls provided for under other statutes and regulations.</p>	<p>The rule is both effective and efficient at providing for aviation related activities, whilst avoiding undue regulation which is provided for by other means.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Rule</b></p> <p><b>17.5.8</b></p> <p>Visitor Accommodation</p>	<p>Marshall Day Acoustics have identified that reverse sensitivity and adverse noise effects would need to be adequately managed within the zone in order to accommodate visitor accommodation (<b>Attachment 4</b>). Acoustic insulation building design and operational parameters are proposed to manage these effects.</p> <p>The acoustic insulation standards are proposed to address these matters. With respect to operational parameters, the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Provision for short term visitor accommodation within the zone will create efficiencies and conveniences for airport passengers. Typically such people would expect and be sympathetic to a degree of noise from the airport. Acoustic insulation requirements are still considered necessary however, to meet a satisfactory internal noise environment.</p>	<p>The standard is considered to be an effective means of mitigating reverse sensitivity effects associated with visitor accommodation within the zone.</p> <p>The rule is efficient as it sets out the minimum requirements for Visitor Accommodation. Additional operational restrictions on such activities can also be implemented by QAC (as the primary landowner within the zone), who will maintain a degree of control over such uses via either direct ownership or lease</p>

	<p>primarily includes land owned by or designated for QAC, therefore QAC can exercise a degree of control around the construction, management and location of such facilities. Notwithstanding this, it is anticipated that visitor accommodation within this zone would only provide for short term stays, primarily for people in transit.</p> <p>There are financial costs associated with adhering to this provision (noise insulation) which will be borne by the developer. This is considered appropriate.</p>		<p>arrangements. It is not efficient to duplicate those management requirements here.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
Minimum Car Parking	No significant costs have been identified.	<p>Car parking requirements in and around airports involves a set of unique considerations, in that many of the visitors to the airport utilise public transport, taxis or shuttles to reach the airport. Applying district wide rules to activities associated with the airport terminal building facilities would therefore likely result in an oversupply of parking and an inefficient use of the land resource.</p> <p>With the exception of activities undertaken with the airport terminal building, car parking is proposed to be in accordance with the District Wide Transportation rules. The assessment completed by Carriageway Consulting (<b>Attachment 5</b>) has confirmed that this approach is appropriate.</p>	<p>This rule is effective as it recognises the unique parking requirements of Airport. It also provides for the efficient use of Airport land.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
Signs	<p>This rule potentially enables a proliferation of signage throughout the zone, impacting on the amenity of the District's Gateway.</p> <p>As outlined in relation to Policies 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2, QAC and QLDC are aware that</p>	The Queenstown Airport has functional and operational imperatives that necessitate a certain degree of signage. This rule recognises these requirements and provides for signage as a permitted activity where the effects of are internalised within the zone.	The rule is effective at achieving the objective as it recognises the unique signage requirements of the Airport, whilst maintaining amenity beyond the zone boundary.

	<p>the Airport is a key gateway into the District. This is managed via the retention of District Wide signage provisions within 20m of the boundary.</p>	<p>This creates economic efficiencies through the removal of consent requirements for signage within the zone where the effects are internalised and managed by QAC.</p> <p>The amenity effects associated with signage at Airports are unique in that visitors are often unfamiliar with the surroundings, therefore require an additional level of instructional and directional signage. This rule also provides for these circumstances, yet maintains amenity beyond the zone by applying the District Wide signage rules where a sign is located within 20m of the zone boundary.</p>	<p>The rule is efficient as it removes undue consent requirements, particularly where the effects of the activity are internal to the site.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Non Regulatory Methods</b></p> <p><b>17.7.1</b></p> <p><b>17.7.2</b></p> <p><b>17.7.3</b></p>	<p>Costs associated with complying with the urban design requirements.</p>	<p>These provisions further enable Queenstown Airport to be a vibrant gateway to the District.</p> <p>The use of non-regulatory urban design methods will influence the amenity of the zone. QAC undertakes extensive urban design and master planning exercises which will be used to create a built form and character which maintains the Airport and its surrounds as an attractive gateway to the District. This approach encourages diversity in form and function, without undue regulatory constraints.</p> <p>The urban design guidelines prepared by QAC will be applicable for the entire zone.</p>	<p>These provisions are effective and efficient as they give effect to the various objectives by placing appropriate controls on Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone activities, whilst continuing to enable the establishment of a diverse range of activities.</p> <p>The non-statutory methods enable high quality urban design to be implemented within the zone, without creating an overly prescriptive “one size fits all” approach to land use development. This is considered to be an effective and efficient method to achieving positive amenity and visual outlook outcomes, with QAC regulating its implementation.</p> <p>The method is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>

<p><b>Non-notification of applications</b></p> <p>17.6</p>	<p>Costs associated with the affected parties not being involved in the consent process.</p>	<p>This rule provides for the non-notification of resource consent applications within the zone.</p> <p>This creates economic efficiencies through the avoidance of consent delays. All activities which cannot achieve the permitted activity requirements default to a fully discretionary activity, therefore decision makers have the ability to decline consent should the effects be considered too great.</p>	<p>This provision is considered effective as it provides certainty around notification, however does not preclude the decision makers consideration of effects on other parties.</p> <p>The rule is efficient in that it removes potential delays in the consenting process.</p> <p>The method is considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Definition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Airport Activity</i></li> <li>• <i>Airport related activity</i></li> <li>• <i>Critical Listening Environment</i></li> <li>• <i>Hangar</i></li> <li>• <i>Indoor Design Sound Level</i></li> <li>• <i>Landside</i></li> <li>• <i>Outer Control Boundary</i></li> </ul>	<p>No significant costs have been identified.</p>	<p>The new definitions are considered necessary to ensure consistent interpretation of the objectives, policies and rules of the draft chapter.</p> <p>With the exemption of airport activity and related activity, the definitions include those that have been through a recent and rigorous Environment Court process, and are considered to be the most appropriate means to describe nature of the activities occurring in and around Queenstown Airport.</p> <p>With respect to airport and airport related activities, the definition provides clear direction as to the types and range of activities that are permissible within the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. The activities are generally consistent with those provided by the Aerodrome designation.</p>	<p>The proposed definitions will assist with the efficient administration of the District Plan by clearly defining the activities to which they relate. It will be effective in determining the activity status of an activity.</p> <p>The definitions have been largely set out by the Environment Court, and are therefore considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>The provision is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>

## 12. Efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions

The above provisions are drafted to specifically address the resource management issues identified with the current provisions, and to enhance those provisions that already function well. A number of areas of the existing chapter have been removed to aid the readability of the Plan by keeping the provisions at a minimum, whilst still retaining adequate protection for the resource. The overlying Aerodrome Designation sets out a second and more onerous level control for land use activities within this zone, ensuring the airport meets Civil Aviation regulations.

By simplifying the objectives, policies and rules (the provisions), the subject matter becomes easier to understand for users of the Plan both as applicant and processing planner. Removal of technical or confusing wording, also encourages correct use. With easier understanding, the provisions create a more efficient consent process by reducing the number of consents required and by expediting the processing of those consents. Activities within this zone will continue to require QAC approval in accordance with Section 176(1)(b) of the RMA.

## 13. The risk of not acting

Section 32(2)(c) of the Act requires, in the evaluation of the proposed policies and methods, the consideration of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter. of the policies, rules or other methods.

The risk of not acting in this case is the stifling of growth at Queenstown Airport as a result of the existing Plan provisions and zoning extent not protecting the Airport as a key physical resource or providing for its future growth. This would result in significant opportunity costs and delays for future business and employment opportunities for the community.

As noted above, the report prepared by Market Economics Limited has identified the significant role of Queenstown Airport in facilitating the future growth and prosperity of the Queenstown Lakes District and the local and regional economy. While the revised District Plan provisions do not differ significantly from the currently operative District Plan, they provide greater certainty in the types of activities anticipated by the QLDC in this area. The value added to the economy cannot be realised within the partial rezoning of land within this area

It is noted that under the status quo option, or by “not acting”, resource consents would be required for a number of activities at Queenstown Airport which could hinder or delay possible development opportunities. Resource consents within the currently rural general zoned land could be difficult to obtain under the objective and policy framework of the Rural General Zone. It is concluded that the revised chapter is necessary, as the risk of not acting would not address the need for Queenstown Airport’s landholdings to be zoned for airport related purposes.

Overall, the risk of not acting would be of far greater consequence than the risk of acting.

## 14. References

**Attachment 1** - Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 Assessment - [Link](#)

**Attachment 2** - Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited Statement of Intent 2015-2017 - [Link](#)

**Attachment 3** - Queenstown Airport: Mixed Used Zone Economic Assessment, November 2014 - [Link](#)

**Attachment 4** - QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE Acoustical review of proposed District Plan provisions - [Link](#)

**Attachment 5** - Review of Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone, Carriageway Consulting - [Link](#)

**Attachment 6** - Proposed Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Extension - [Link](#)