


#	C23(1) Further Information Required	C23(4) Reason for requiring further information	Comment
1	Planning		
1.1	Please provide an assessment against Queenstown Lakes District Council strategic documents and the strategic provisions of the District Plan.	<p>QLDC needs to consider if the activity is consistent with the District's strategic documents and the strategic provisions of the District Plan.</p> <p>Note: Parts of the Proposed District Plan are operative, please see Chapter 1 Provision 1.1B.</p> <p>The assessment should include Chapter 5 of the PDP.</p> <p>This statement of evidence may also assist in providing some clarity in assessing which strategic provisions are operative within the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>An assessment of the Operative District Plan District Wide provisions is included in the Section 32 Evaluation (DOCUMENT 4). The other relevant strategic documents were addressed in the application documentation (Spatial Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Attachment A for an assessment against Proposed District Plan Chapter 3 – Strategic Direction.</p> <p>Refer to Attachment B for an assessment against Proposed District Plan Chapter 5 – Tangata Whenua.</p>
1.2	Please assess an additional option where NIL provides access to sticky forest without the expansion of residential land.	Council would like to know more about why the area had a building restriction area and what has changed to now make the area suitable for development.	<p>Patch Landscape Architecture has advised that the Structure Plan was drafted with very limited contour data, using photographs and aerials to set out Activity Areas. The design thinking behind the Building Restriction Area (BRA) on the Northlake Special Zone western boundary was to protect against building being visible against the skyline as viewed from a distance to the east, including near Ruby Island. There is a subtle ridge around the Northlake - Kirimoko - Sticky Forest area which creates the eastern rim of the 'bowl' that holds Wanaka proper and the overall Roys Bay landscape. Until 2017 this was clad in mature conifers on the Kirimoko site and is still clad in mature conifers on the Sticky Forest site. Now that detailed contour LIDAR information is available of all of Wanaka and surround, it is clear the subtle ridge the BRA was addressing is significantly farther away from the 'site' than cautiously determined when we set the BRA in 2013 (refer to image below). The future development within proposed Activity Area B6 will not be visible from the Wanaka / Roys Bay landscape and the intention of the BRA will be addressed.</p>  <p>There are a number of reasons why the area is now suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulk earthworks have been undertaken; • The reservoir has been constructed within Activity Area E1 and requires vehicular access;

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QLDC are proposing further water infrastructure adjacent to the Building Restriction Area on the Allenby Farms land; An Access Deed (as required by Condition 47(c) of the Fast-Track Consent) has been executed by the requestor and lodged with Council. <p>The applicant acknowledges that access could be provided without the expansion of residential land, however given the comments by Patch above the land to which Activity Area B6 is being applied is suitable for development and it would be inefficient use of land for it to remain in Activity Area E1.</p>
1.3	Please advise there is any there is any boundary treatment / buffer planed between Northlake and Sticky Forest, or reason for its removal?	Council would like to have a better understanding of the rationale from the earlier private plan change which included the building restriction area and what resource management role or outcomes it was intended to perform and why.	No boundary / buffer is proposed between Northlake and Sticky Forest as the applicant is aware of Sticky Forest's development aspirations for Low Density development to the boundary. Additionally, there is an easement on the Sticky Forest side of that boundary for the purposes of conveying water. This easement area is 5m wide and clear of any vegetation. QLDC uses the easement for the main water intake for Wanaka and therefore clearance is maintained for vehicular access (including excavators).
1.4	Please confirm if any climate change effects have been considered for plan change.	Council is required to make decisions which ensure urban environments are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change.	Yes, climate change effects have been considered and the stormwater design considers RCP8.5 (2081 – 2100) as discussed in the Infrastructure Report submitted with the Plan Change (DOCUMENT 7).
1.5	Please provide digital files of the updated Northlake Structure Plan in an approved format (geodatabase, shapefile, etc).	Council keeps digital copies of all structure plans within the District Plan GIS system. Note, if there are any changes to the structure plan through this process Council will require updated files.	Refer to Attachment C .
1.6	Has the neighbouring landowner (Sticky Forest) been consulted on this application?	Council would like to understand if the sticky forest landowners are satisfied with the positioning and sizing of the proposed access way prior to any public notification of the request.	<p>Consultation with the "... <i>neighbouring landowner (Sticky Forest)</i> ..." is difficult in a legal sense. The neighbouring landowner is the Crown, but the Crown holds the land in trust for a large group of beneficiaries, some of whom have not yet been identified. When this Plan Change is publicly notified, it should be served on the Crown (contact details can be provided) so that the Crown can respond appropriately.</p> <p>The Council will be aware that the zoning of Sticky Forest is currently subject to Environment Court mediation proceedings in the case <i>ENV-2018-CHC-069 Bunker & Rouse v QLDC</i>. This access issue has been discussed during the mediation proceedings (which are currently adjourned). The Requester cannot provide advice in this forum relating to matters discussed at that Environment Court mediation, because those discussions are privileged. However the Council is also involved in those mediation proceedings so the Council will be aware of discussions during that mediation relating to this access issue.</p> <p>The Council will also be aware that the Sticky Forest Access Deed, executed by the Requester, has been provided to both the Council and the Crown (the latter as landowner of Sticky Forest) for review, comment, and execution. The Requester understands that the Crown is currently obtaining legal advice in relation to the Access Deed.</p> <p>This is not an issue which needs to be resolved prior to public notification of the Plan Change Request. The Request includes provision of legal access to Sticky Forest. If the Sticky Forest landowner has any view in relation to that proposed access, the Sticky Forest landowner will be able to provide that view through the submission process.</p>
1.7	Has Allenby farms been consulted on this request?	Council would like to get a better understanding of the consultation undertaken to date.	No. The roading network has been designed to be consistent with Allenby Farms' approved Outline Development Plan. Water infrastructure and other services have been designed to achieve Councils future water supply requirements which will benefit Allenby Farms land.
1.8	Please provide further commentary on the proposal how / if the proposal will improve housing affordability. Will the request enable homes that meet the needs of the community in terms of price, and location, of different households?	Council is required to make decisions which improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets. Council would like to understand if the Plan Change request is consistent with ODP Chapter 4. A useful resource to consider when determining if the proposal contributes toward meeting the needs of the community in terms of price, and location, of different households is the Queenstown Lakes District Housing Development Capacity Assessment completed in 2021.	The proposal will contribute to improving housing affordability through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional supply of residential land to add to market competition; and Diversity of product, taking into account that there could be single house lots and duplexes.
1.9	Please confirm is the plan change proposal will affect the terms of the Northlake Housing Stakeholders Deed.	Council would like to understand the impact of the plan change on existing agreements.	The proposal will not affect the terms of the Northlake Housing Stakeholders Deed.

1.10	Please provide a plan of Northlake Structure Plan (including Allenby's farm) for areas which have been constructed, are under construction, or have been consented, or going through the consent process. This should include the roading network.	This will help council better understand the request in relation to the surrounding area.	Refer to Attachment D .
1.11	Significant earthworks have been carried out throughout the site including the previous building restriction area, please confirm what future consents may be required to fulfil the outcomes sought by the plan change.	Council would like to understand if there are works required to develop the site.	Limited earthworks will be required in association with the future installation of services and construction of roads. Subdivision consents will also be required to create future residential lots.
2	Infrastructure		
2.1	Potable Water		
2.1.1	Based on the information provided as part of the plan change application it is accepted that the level of the 'high level' reservoir is such that fire fighting pressures can be achieved for the proposed plan change area. The information provided where the 'high level' reservoir is able to provide residential pressures to part of the subject area is accepted; however, for the parts that are not able to be serviced with adequate residential pressures Council would require the 'high level' reservoir to be raised to enable it to provide adequate pressures or a secondary higher reservoir will need to be included to supply the upper areas. The above is accepted as being a feasible solution with the details to be worked through at the time of detailed design.	Council wants to understand that NIL is aware of the constraint and is prepared to address the issue at a later detailed design stage.	This is acknowledged.
2.2	Wastewater		
2.2.1	The infrastructure report notes that modelling is being undertaken by QLDC with regard to wastewater, this has now been completed, the conclusion of this report is that there is sufficient capacity within the network to accommodate the additional flows expected should this Plan change go through, no upgrades are required.	FYI, no response required.	This is acknowledged.
2.3	Stormwater		
2.3.1	Council would like to request a peer review of the stormwater component of the infrastructure report, as well as reviewing the proposal Council would also want it to specifically confirm that the downstream network has sufficient capacity to deal with the increased stormwater runoff without causing adverse effects.	Council needs to be satisfied that the proposed plan change request will not result in any adverse stormwater effects. Council will arrange for a peer review to be carried out and will be in touch soon regarding fee estimates.	This is acknowledged.
3	Transportation		
3.1	Please confirm if the proposed access provided is sufficient to accommodate several potential development options, including the potential	Although the sticky forest site is currently zoned rural there is a high chance there may be residential development on the site, the plan change request should consider this in the transportation assessment.	It is not possible to respond on this point in relation to possible future development within Sticky Forest without any knowledge of the detail of the extent and nature of such future development. If and when that

	harvesting of the trees and any possible future residential or other development of the sticky forest land. It is unclear from the application as to whether those options have been assessed and the access road design considered appropriate?		<p>detail becomes available, and if that occurs during this PPC process, this issue will be able to be addressed at that time.</p> <p>As far as harvesting of trees is concerned, any response would depend upon the size (particularly length) of the relevant trucks, which in turn may depend upon the length of the relevant logs and traffic management considerations. For example, a truck of a certain length, carrying logs of a certain length, may not be able to get around a particular corner while remaining within the left side carriageway but might be able to get around that corner if traffic on the road is temporarily stopped so that the truck can use the entire road carriageway when turning that corner.</p> <p>The practical reality is that the trees in Sticky Forest will be able to be harvested provided any logs are cut to an appropriate length to enable them to be transported along the access route, using appropriately sized trucks plus traffic management techniques if necessary.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that Sticky Forest shares a very long boundary with QLDC land to the west, where the topography and adjoining roading network (through Peninsula Bay and beyond) is much more accommodating of large logging trucks.</p>
3.2	Once the additional assessment matters have been completed QLDC would like to commission a peer review.	Council does not currently have any inhouse transportation specialists to review the transportation assessment.	This is acknowledged.
4	Parks and Reserves		
4.1	How will the Plan Change address the current fire risks, being immediately adjacent to an existing forest? Eg what consideration has been given to a firebreak?	Council needs to consider if there are any natural hazard risks to the site and any mitigation measures.	As discussed above in response to point 1.3, no boundary treatment is proposed, and the applicant is aware of Sticky Forest's development aspirations for Low Density development to the boundary. There is a firebreak on the Sticky Forest land that is 5m wide and maintained for vehicular access as previously discussed.
4.2	Parks will assess requirements for Reserve Land and/or Reserve Land Development Contributions during pre-applications for subdivision consent. Note Parks will be making the assessment as to whether more reserve land is required.	FYI, no response required.	As discussed in the Assessment of Environmental Effects (DOCUMENT 3) the most recent Development Contribution Notice confirm that Northlake has a credit of 592.23 Dwelling Equivalents available to Northlake for further Reserve Land development.
5	Landscape		
5.1	Council would like to commission a peer review report on landscape.	Northlake is considered to have high landscape values, which council needs to ensure won't be compromised by the plan change or the removal of the building restriction area.	This is acknowledged.
6	Cultural		
	QLDC has had a hui with relevant iwi authorities who had the following comments		
6.1	Please provide an assessment against the relevant iwi management plans. Please consider how the application will have regard to the iwi management plans for this area.		<p>When preparing or changing a district plan, Section 74(2A)(a) of the Act requires Councils to 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.</p> <p>Te Tangi a Tauria (The Cry of the People) Ngai Tahu ki Murihiku 2008 encompasses the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment and is the iwi management plan relevant to this Change. The policies in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment in relation to land use are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. To encourage the adoption of sound environmental practices, adopted where land use intensification occurs. 10. To promote sustainable land use in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment. 11. To encourage all consents related to subdivision and lifestyle blocks are applied for at the same time including, land use consents, water consents, and discharge consents. 12. To require reticulated community sewerage schemes that have the capacity to accommodate future population growth. <p>Policy 9 is relevant to the Change in that the Change proposes land use intensification, and sound environmental practices will be adopted at the stage of subdivision and development, in accordance with</p>

			<p>the settled earthworks and subdivision provisions of the plan, and the relevant codes of practice for construction works.</p> <p>Policy 10 is relevant to the Change and is achieved through the sustainable use of land that is suitable for expanded residential development.</p> <p>Policy 11 is not relevant.</p> <p>Policy 12 is relevant to the Change in that expanded residential development will connect to the reticulated scheme which has sufficient capacity.</p>
6.2	Please consult with the relevant iwi authorities regarding this Plan Change Request and advise on the outcome. Please advise if any cultural values or impact assessments are required.	Council is required to take into consideration the position of the relevant iwi authorities in deciding on the request. If you chose not to consult with iwi authorities, council will undertake this and any results will be considered as part of the decisions to accept, adopt or reject.	We have initiated consultation with the relevant iwi authorities and are awaiting responses. We will send these through once received.