



FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION

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



Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



TO // Queenstown Lakes District Council

Name of submitter [full name]



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

I AM [state whether you are]

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

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

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

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

The local authority for the relevant area.



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

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



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

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

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

[give reasons]

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

[give precise details]

I wish / do not wish* to be heard in support of my further submission.I will / will not* consider presenting a joint case with others presenting similar submissions.

* Select one.

 **SIGNATURE******Signature**

[or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter]

Date

*** A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.***YOUR DETAILS** // Our preferred methods of corresponding with you are by **email**

Electronic address for service of submitter [email]

Telephone [work]

[home]

[mobile]

Postal Address

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

Post code

Contact person [name and designation, if applicable]

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

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

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



The submission of Dot and Hans Arnestedt is as follows:

- [1] This is a further submission from Dot and Hans Arnestedt ('Arnestedts') in response to submissions made on the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Variation to the Proposed District Plan ('Variation').
- [2] The Arnestedts oppose the following submission:
 - (a) Submission 107, Anna Hutchinson, Tim Hutchinson and John Tavendale, as trustees of the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (prepared by Werner Murray, The Property Group).
- [3] The Arnestedts oppose Submission 107 in its entirety, for the reasons set out below.
- [4] The Variation is being assessed using the Streamlined Planning Process. As part of the application to the Minister to direct the use of the Streamlined Planning Process, QLDC submitted masterplan documents that had already been through consultation and expert review processes. The 'area of focus' for the Variation did not include the Extension Area in Submission 107, and as such, the submission is considered outside of the scope of the Variation area directed by the Minister.
- [5] There has been no consultation with the public, iwi or any other statutory bodies about the additional area being included.
- [6] Given all of the above, there is no jurisdiction to accept this submission as the same is not deemed to be ON the Variation.
- [7] If the Commissioners accept there is jurisdiction for Submission 107, then the following should be considered as reasons for opposing the submission.
- [8] The Arnestedts are the landowners of 82 Spence Road. The Arnestedts' land is currently used for residential and rural uses, including stock grazing. Their property directly neighbours the land that is the subject of Submission 107.
- [9] The Arnestedts consider the proposed extension of the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone and Urban Growth Boundary to the west to include the land owned by submitter 107 ('Extension Area') is inappropriate and will contribute to urban sprawl.
- [10] The Extension Area is not a logical extension of the Ladies Mile Variation and there is no defensible edge of the Extension Area to the west. Inclusion of the Extension

Area in the Variation would isolate the land owned by the Arnestedts and neighbouring properties that are adjacent to, but not part of, the Extension Area. The Arnestedts have no intention for their property to become part of the Extension Area.

- [11] The Arnestedts land and the Extension Area are currently zoned Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct in the Proposed District Plan. This zoning enables residential living and provides for farming activities that exist on the site. The Arnestedts submit that the existing zoning is appropriate for the activities undertaken on the site and rural character of the area as farmland and rural living adjoining the Shotover River.
- [12] Submission point OS107.21 seeks to include a minimum density requirement of 30-35 residential units per hectare in the Medium Density Residential Precinct Sub-Area K, adjoining the Arnestedts. Development of this density in close proximity to the Arnestedts property will generate adverse effects on the Arnestedts, including landscape and visual effects due to the topography of the terraces and amenity effects as a result of large-scale growth.
- [13] The Arnestedts submit that the Extension Area is not suitable for development. The roading and related infrastructure will not support the scale and intensity of development proposed in the Variation, let alone an additional Extension Area. The existing infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the projected development capacity.
- [14] The Arnestedts property is accessed by Spence Road, which connects to Lower Shotover Road. There are no alternative road transport options for access to/from State Highway 6 for the Arnestedts than via Lower Shotover Road.
- [15] The Arnestedts have significant concerns regarding transport effects of the Extension Area, including safety impacts on the network with increased demand.
- [16] The Arnestedts wish to be heard in its submission.
- [17] The Arnestedts have an interest greater than the public interest as they are an affected landowner as a result of Submission 107.

Dated: 3 August 2023



.....
Graeme Todd / Charlotte Clouston

Schedule 1: Further Submission Point

| Submission No. | Submitter | Support/Oppose | Relevant Part of Submission | Reasons for Support/Opposition | Decision Sought |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| OS107 | Anna Hutchinson, Tim Hutchinson and John Tavendale, as trustees of the Anna Hutchinson Family Trust (Werner Murray, The Property Group) | Oppose | Entire submission. | <p>The Arnestedts oppose the expansion of the area included in the Variation and the Urban Growth Boundary. The additional area has not been through an adequate process, including consultation, and is outside the 'area of focus' put forward by QLDC in the Streamlined Planning Process.</p> <p>Inclusion of the Extension Area in the Variation would generate adverse effects to the Arnestedts that are more than minor.</p> | This submission is disallowed. |