

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan

Report and recommendations of Independent Commissioners
regarding mapping of Wakatipu Basin and Arrowtown
(includes Stage 1 submissions not previously heard)

Report 18.6 - Area D
Lake Hayes

Commissioners
Denis Nugent (Chair)
Rachel Dimery
Trevor Robinson
Quentin Smith

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PRELIMINARY	1
1.2 OVERVIEW	1
1.3 SUBMISSIONS COVERED IN THIS REPORT	2
2. ONL/ONF BOUNDARIES AND OTHER MAP NOTATIONS.....	2
2.1 L TOPP.....	2
2.2 MORVEN HILL – LAKES HAYES TERRACE AND LAKE HAYES SLOPES	3
2.3 FRENCH, FRENCH AND BURT	5
2.4 URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY	6
3. ZONING AMENDMENTS	6
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	6
3.2 NORTH OF LAKE HAYES – LCU 12.....	6
3.3 LCU 13 - LAKE HAYES SLOPES (EXCLUDING AMISFIELD WINERY).....	8
3.3.1 <i>Overview</i>	8
3.3.2 <i>Water quality</i>	9
3.3.3 <i>Landscape</i>	9
3.3.4 <i>Planning</i>	10
3.3.5 <i>Conclusions</i>	11
3.4 AMISFIELD.....	12
4. OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS	13

1. INTRODUCTION



1.1 Preliminary

1. This report needs to be read in conjunction with Reports 18.1 and 18.2. Report 18.1 sets out the overall hearing process for Stream 14 and the approach we have taken to assessing the submissions in terms of the statutory requirements. In addition, it contains the Stream 14 Hearing Panel's recommendations on Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin and the various variations to the text in Stage 1 of the PDP notified in conjunction with Chapter 24.
2. The abbreviations we use in the report are set out in Report 18.1, as is the list of persons heard.
3. Report 18.2 set out the background to the zoning issues dealt with in Stream 14 and explains how we divided the area subject to our deliberations up for the purposes of preparing the recommendation reports.

1.2 Overview

4. This area includes LCUs 12 Lake Hayes Rural Residential, 13 Lake Hayes Slopes and LCU 14 Lake Hayes Terraces. It also includes the eastern half of Lake Hayes and adjoining shore identified as ONF in Stage 1, and the strip of Lower Density Suburban Residential land on the east side of Lake Hayes. To the south, this area includes the western half of the Morven Hill ONL and is bounded by the Kawarau River and part of Hayes Creek to the south. The western edge of LCU 14 is the terrace edge above the true left bank of Hayes Creek. The area boundary follows that line. The area is shown on Figure 1 below.
5. Most of the land to the north of Lake Hayes in LCU 12 was zoned Precinct in Stage 2, as was LCU 14. LCU 13, to the east of Lake Hayes, was zoned Rural Amenity.
6. Reserve areas zoned Nature Conservation Zone, Informal Recreation and Community Purposes are the subject of the Stream 15 hearings.
7. Within the Rural Amenity Zone and the Precinct, rural residential land use predominates, with pockets of other activities such as the Amisfield and Akarua restaurants. Most of the approved building platforms are built or active, with a cluster of approved building platforms to the east of Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road that are yet to be built upon.
8. The notified version of Chapter 24 listed the capability of this area to absorb additional development as follows:

LCU Number	LCU Name	Capability to Absorb Additional Development
12	Lake Hayes Rural Residential	High (Potentially limited by existing building, vegetation and lot patterns)
13	Lake Hayes Slopes	Low
14	Lake Hayes Terrace	Moderate-High



Area D – Lake Hayes

Figure 1: Lake Hayes Area

1.3 Submissions Covered in this Report

9. Section 3 of our report discusses submissions relating to ONL boundaries and other map notations. These related to areas adjoining the Morven Hill ONL (two submissions¹) and the northern extent of the Lake Hayes ONF². The submission³ relating to the Landscape Feature line on the eastern edge of Hayes Creek within LCU 14 is discussed in Report 18.11 (Area I – Ladies Mile).
10. Section 4 discusses the submissions relating to zoning. Most of these related to the land on the slopes above the eastern side of Lake Hayes between Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road and the Bendemeer Special Zone north of the state highway.

2. ONL/ONF BOUNDARIES AND OTHER MAP NOTATIONS

2.1 L Topp

11. This submitter⁴ challenged the ONL boundary of Morven Hill in the vicinity of Alec Robins Road. No evidence was presented in support of the submission.

¹ Submissions 121 and 594

² Submission 2417

³ Submission 451

⁴ Submission 121 and 2254

12. Ms Mellsoy assessed this request. She recommended that the ONL boundary be adjusted to consistently follow a legible topographical boundary; namely, the eastern side of Alec Robins Road.
13. We adopt Ms Mellsoy's conclusions and recommend the ONL boundary is amended as shown by the turquoise line in Figure 2 below.




Figure 2: Amended ONL boundary, as per Figure 7 of Ms Mellsoy's Evidence in Chief

2.2 Morven Hill – Lakes Hayes Terrace and Lake Hayes Slopes

14. A K & R B Robins and Robins Farm Limited⁵ challenged the ONL boundary on the northwest slopes of Morven Hill and requested an amendment to exclude the property at 24 Jean Robins Drive (Lot 5 DP 468905). No evidence was presented in support of the submission.
15. Ms Mellsoy identified that building platforms have been approved on this site and the adjoining property at 18 Jean Robins Drive. She concluded that the character of these properties is no longer sufficiently natural to be included in the Morven Hill ONF and that the ONL boundary should be amended, as shown in by the turquoise line in Figure 3 below.

⁵ Submission 594

16. We note that almost all of the land Ms Mellsop has recommended no longer be subject to the ONL notation is zoned Rural Residential as notified. Applying the ONL notation to Rural Residential land would be inconsistent with the policies in Chapter 6.
17. Ms D MacColl⁶ requested amendment to the ONL boundary to relocate it further up the north-western slopes of Morven Hill. No evidence was presented by submitters in support of this request. However, we did receive evidence from Mr Espie⁷ in relation to the zoning of this land. We discuss the zoning in Section 3.3 below, but at this point record what Mr Espie told us about the history of the ONL boundary. Mr Espie was involved in the Environment Court decision on the ODP and advised us that at that time he was of the view that the ONL line should be lower down Morven Hill.
18. SYZ Investments Limited⁸ sought the ONL line, where it follows the State Highway east of the Morven slopes be moved up the slope. Mr Farrell appeared on the company's behalf but proffered no evidence.
19. Ms Mellsop, for the Council, told us that the natural character and visual coherence of Morven Hill has been reduced by the existing development that has occurred to date. She concluded that relocating the ONL boundary further up the north-western slopes could *'result in a significant additional loss of openness, natural character and visual coherence'*⁹. For this reason, she concluded the ONL boundary should remain unchanged.
20. We adopt Ms Mellsop's conclusions and recommend the ONL boundary is amended as shown in Figure 3 below. We find that any other amendments to the ONL boundary of the north-western faces of Morven Hill would be inappropriate and would fail to give effect to the strategic objectives and policies of the PDP.



Figure 3: Recommended amended ONL boundary south of Jean Robins Drive

⁶ Submission 285
⁷ B. Espie, Evidence in Chief for Submissions 2104, 2163, 2281, 2291, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2378, 2389, 2490, 2517
⁸ Successor of Private Property Limited, Submission 693
⁹ H. Mellsop, Evidence in Chief at 6.55

2.3 French, French and Burt¹⁰

21. These submitters requested that 229 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road, as shown in Figure 4 below, be rezoned Precinct. The property was located within the ONF of Lake Hayes and zoned Rural Residential in Stage 1. Stage 2 did not alter the location of the ONF boundary, but zoned the property Rural Amenity. Ms Gilbert advised that the location of the ONL boundary appears to have been a mapping error.
22. In assessing this request, Mr Langman, relying on the evidence of Ms Gilbert, recommended that the ONF boundary be amended to exclude this property. He advised that Submission 177 provided the scope to make this amendment. We agree. Submission 177 sought the removal of the ONF/ONL notations from all land not zoned Rural. Mr French appeared at the hearing and supported the officers' recommendations.
23. We accept Mr Langman and Ms Gilbert's conclusions for the reasons they provided and recommend the ONF boundary is amended to exclude this property. We consider the zoning of this property in Section 3.2 below.




Figure 4: French, French and Burt property, as shown in Figure 36 of Mr Langman's Section 42A Report

¹⁰ Submission 2417

2.4 Urban Growth Boundary

24. This area contains an area zoned Lower Density Suburban Residential in Stage 1, between Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road and Lake Hayes. This area of urban zoning was not included within an urban growth boundary when notified in Stage 1. Submission 501 sought that urban growth boundaries be applied around land suitable for urban development within the Wakatipu Basin. This land satisfies that criterion and we therefore recommend that an urban growth boundary be applied as this would better give effect to the Strategic Directions of the PDP (which seek to avoid urban development outside of urban growth boundaries) and would correct an anomaly.

3. ZONING AMENDMENTS

3.1 Introduction

25. We have discussed our findings in relation to submissions¹¹ opposed to the Precinct zoning, or any rezoning that would increase levels of development, due to the potential impacts on the water quality of Lake Hayes in Section 2.8 of Report 18.1. In summary, we found that any land not served by a reticulated wastewater treatment scheme within the Lake Hayes Catchment should not be zoned Precinct or any other zoning increasing the development potential.
26. Most of the area the subject of this report is within the Lake Hayes Catchment. The exception is that part of LCU 14 on the terrace above State Highway 6. Keeping this in mind, we turn now to the zoning requests. We have grouped the zoning requests into three subsections: north of Lake Hayes; Morven Hill (Lake Hayes Slopes) and the slopes east of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road; and the Amisfield winery site.
27. Two submissions were lodged in respect of the zoning in LCU 14. One supported the application of the Precinct¹² and one sought the extension of the Precinct¹³. We did not hear from either of those submitters. We therefore have no evidence other than that from the Council and recommend that Submission 398 be accepted and Submission 2254 be rejected. However, there is a small area of land in LCU 14 between the State Highway and Lake Hayes which lies within the lake's catchment. For the reasons set out in Section 2.8 of Report 18.1 we recommend that be zoned Rural Amenity.
28. As noted above in Section 2.2, Mr Farrell appeared for SYZ Investments Limited regarding the company's land within the ONL east of Morven slopes. This submitter sought that, if the ONL boundary were moved as requested, the land outside the ONL be rezoned Rural Residential. Mr Farrell provided no evidence in support of this request. We accept Mr Langman's evidence¹⁴ in relation to this site and recommend that Submission 693 be rejected.

3.2 North of Lake Hayes – LCU 12

29. As discussed in Section 2.3 above, Mr French, Ms French and Ms Burt¹⁵ requested the property at 229 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road be rezoned Precinct.

¹¹ Including submissions 2095, 2150, 2140

¹² Submission 2398

¹³ Submission 2254

¹⁴ M Langman, Section 42A Report, Section 70

¹⁵ Submission 2417

30. The property is within the Lake Hayes Catchment and within the reticulated wastewater scheme boundary. Given our conclusion that this property should be excluded from the Lake Hayes ONF and the previous zoning history which has treated it as part of the rural living area north of Lake Hayes, we find there is no reason for this property to be zoned Rural Amenity Zone.
31. We adopt Mr Langman and Ms Gilbert’s conclusions and recommend this property is zoned Precinct.
32. The only other evidence we heard in respect of the Precinct sub-zone in LCU 12¹⁶ did not seek to alter the zoning, but rather the minimum lot size. This issue is dealt with in Section 4.3 of Report 18.1.
33. Finally, we note that the land in LCU 12 is within the Lake Hayes Catchment and most of this land is within the reticulated wastewater scheme boundary. The exceptions are the properties on Speargrass Flat Road west of Lot 1 DP 382531¹⁷.
34. We find that in LCU 12, the Precinct should be retained as notified, except in respect of
 - a. the French, French and Burt land which is added to the area zoned Precinct; and
 - b. the land outside the reticulated wastewater scheme boundary on Speargrass Flat Road, which, consistent with our findings in Section 2.8 of Report 18.1, we recommend should be rezoned Rural Amenity Zone.
35. Figure 5 below shows the recommended zoning pattern for this area.




Figure 5: Recommended zoning of LCU 12

¹⁶ Mr Brown in support of Submissions 2126 (supported by FS2706, FS2791, FS2745) and 2447 and Ms Jones in respect of Submission 2126

¹⁷ This site is not numbered on the Council GIS but is immediately west of 438 Speargrass Flat Road.

3.3 LCU 13 - Lake Hayes Slopes (excluding Amisfield Winery)

3.3.1 Overview

36. The area of concern in this LCU (excluding Amisfield Winery which we consider below) was the land up the slope from Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road and State Highway 6. As notified, most of this land was zoned Rural Amenity. We have noted above a small area above State Highway 6 and within the ONL as notified which was zoned Rural Residential in Stage 1¹⁸. Mr Brown and Mr Espie provided evidence in support of the submissions seeking that much of this area be rezoned Precinct¹⁹. The submissions also sought site-specific provisions to enable an average density of 4,000m². We have dealt with the issue of densities and minimum and average lot sizes in Report 18.1. The area the subject of these submissions is shown in Figure 6 below.

37. The main issues relate to effects on water quality, landscape and planning.




Figure 6: Location of submissions, as shown in Figure 48 of Ms Gilbert's Evidence in Chief

¹⁸ We note that no submissions provide scope to amend this zoning. We note also that there is also a small area zoned Rural Residential within the ONL as notified that remains within the ONL. Again we have no scope to change either the zoning or the location of the ONL boundary.

¹⁹ Submissions 2104, 2163, 2291 (supported by FS2787, FS2748, FS2750, FS2765, FS2766, FS2783, FS2784), 2314 (supported by FS2783), 2315 (supported by FS2783, FS2787), 2316 (supported by FS2783, FS2787), 2317 (supported by FS2772, FS2787, FS2783), 2318 (supported by FS2783), 2319 (supported by FS2772, FS2783, FS2787), 2389, 2490 (supported by FS2781, FS2708, FS2709, FS2792) and 2517. Mr Espie's evidence supported all of those submissions, Mr Brown's was in support of Submissions 2291, 2314, 2319 and 2315.

3.3.2 Water quality

38. The lower land immediately adjoining Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road is within the reticulated wastewater scheme boundary. The higher land, which adjoins Bendemeer is outside the scheme boundary.²⁰
39. For the reasons discussed in Report 18.1²¹, we do not consider it appropriate to enable intensification of development of land outside of the wastewater reticulation scheme boundaries.

3.3.3 Landscape

40. Mr Espie's evidence recommended changes to LCU 13²² and proposed the land shown outlined in green in Figure 6 below be zoned Precinct. Mr Espie accepted that the development that has occurred on the slopes of Morven Hill, particularly the upper part, has been somewhat unsympathetic, but suggested to us that this was a case of not "*crying over spilt milk*". He concluded that "*The rural living area that would result from this would be contained within logical boundaries, would only slightly exacerbate the effects of existing elements and patterns in the landscape, would not spread into undeveloped areas and would not sully the character of the Wakatipu Basin as a whole.*"²³

²⁰ As shown in the map attached to the Memorandum from S. Scott dated 29 August 2018

²¹ Section 2.8

²² Which we discuss in Section 3.19 of Report 18.1

²³ B. Espie, Evidence in Chief at [5.1]



Figure 7: Extent of Precinct supported by Mr Espie shown with green outline, as per Appendix 1 of Mr Espie's Evidence in Chief

41. Ms Gilbert disagreed and produced two plans to demonstrate the potential yield if Mr Espie's regime was adopted. These plans²⁴ showed what Ms Gilbert described as 'raw potential yield'. Ms Gilbert acknowledged that her calculations may be reduced by 'no build' areas and vegetation covenants.
42. We touched briefly on our discussion with Mr Espie in Section 2.2 above. We add here that when we discussed Ms Gilbert's concerns with Mr Espie about the potential yield, he thought that her assessment was unrealistically high. He was of the view that the additional capacity would be low down on the hillside and emphasized that this led to his conclusion that the relief sought was appropriate.

3.3.4 Planning

43. Mr Brown's evidence described the existing character of the area, which he considered as having been altered to the point it is no longer rural. We discussed this with Mr Brown and asked if this meant it is urban. He told us that was not the case; rather, it is at the low end of ruralness, in that it is not a rural pastoral wide open landscape. He considered that development to a minimum of 6,000m² reflected an existing rule and the existing environment and was therefore the more appropriate outcome.

²⁴ B Gilbert, Rebuttal Evidence, Appendices B and C

44. Mr Langman disagreed with Mr Brown and did not consider that the area had been modified to the extent it was no longer rural. He remained of the view that Rural Amenity Zone is most appropriate and would achieve Strategic Objective 3.2.1.8 and Policy 3.3.24, Objectives 24.2.1 and 24.2.5 and the associated policies.

3.3.5 Conclusions

45. We are concerned about the implications of providing more scope for development in this area.
46. Turning first to the eastern slopes of Lake Hayes, we observed on our site visit that when viewed from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, the area appears open with a few driveways at the southern end. In contrast, when viewed from the Queenstown Trail descending Christine's Hill (on that part of trail that is legal road), the existing development is prominent and has extensive planting around the curtilages. While the lower portions of the sites adjacent to Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road are reticulated, we prefer the evidence of Ms Gilbert and Mr Langman and agree that the area is sensitive to landscape change and for this reason, should remain Rural Amenity Zone.
47. Turning now to the western slopes of Morven Hill, we consider that the visual prominence of existing development and its unsympathetic nature detracts from the landscape character and visual amenity of the area. The steepness and prominence of the upper slopes, combined with 'filling in the gaps' on the lower areas mean additional development potential would make the area more urban in character and that it would appear as a ribbon of development. We agree with Ms Gilbert that there are also a number of gaps further up the western slopes of Morven Hill and that the requested zoning would inevitably lead to greater development that would be difficult to mitigate because of the need for earthworks to enable access and taller mitigation planting to achieve a filtering effect. Lastly, we find that increased development potential would lead to a greater concentration of lights that would detract from experiential quality of night sky.
48. This assessment is consistent with the conclusions reached in the WB Landscape Study for LCU 13. In particular we note the conclusion for Sense of Place:

Generally, the area displays a relatively unsympathetic rural residential character that reads as development sprawl up the hillsides. The exception to this is the older and lower lying, generally more modest development adjacent Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road.²⁵

49. The evidence presented on behalf of the submitters did not lead us to a different conclusion.
50. This area is, in fact, the clearest example we found of the situation discussed in Section 2.1 of Report 18.1, where past planning decisions have had an unsatisfactory outcome and where, in our view, it would be contrary to the purpose of the Act to perpetuate the status quo and facilitate further unsatisfactory outcomes.
51. We also record that to give effect to the relief sought either a new zone or site specific provisions would be required. Section 2.2 of Report 18.1 discusses our findings on requests for increased density in the Precinct sub-zone and our recommended provisions for the Precinct. As we found in

²⁵ WB Landscape Study, Appendix H, page 80

respect of the land to the north of Lake Hayes, we do not consider that there is any good reason to depart from these provisions.

52. Overall, we are satisfied that the Rural Amenity Zone as notified is appropriate.

3.4 AMISFIELD

53. The Lake Hayes Cellar Limited submission²⁶ requested a site-specific overlay to provide for the commercial activities at Amisfield, or in the alternative, the addition of 'Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct' provisions in Chapter 24.
54. Mr Christopher Ferguson gave evidence in support of the submission. He considered that the proposed objectives, policies and rules were necessary to provide recognition of an *'established facility which is not rural in character and will appropriately provide for future development of the site'*.²⁷ Mr Ferguson relied on the Stage 1 evidence lodged by Ms Pflüger, which supported a new rule providing for commercial activities. He summarised Ms Plüger's findings as noting that the neighbouring properties are Low Density Residential Zone; and that building bulk, location, external appearance and landscaping are important considerations to ensure rural amenity experienced from outside the site can be maintained. Ms Pflüger was not available for us to question on this evidence. We also note that while Ms Pflüger's evidence in relation to this submission was lodged prior to Hearing Stream 2 commencing, that evidence was never presented to the Hearing Panel as the submission was transferred from Stream 2 to be heard with the hearings related to mapping of the Wakatipu Basin²⁸. As a result, we can give only limited weight to Ms Pflüger's evidence.
55. Mr Ferguson provided details of the approved resource consents and details of the types of activities that were envisaged on the site. His evidence also set out a section 32 evaluation of the options of: retaining the Rural Zone (as notified in Stage 1), retaining Rural Amenity Zone (as notified in Stage 2), rezoning the site Precinct, or rezoning the site Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct. He acknowledged that the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct would be a spot zoning, but considered that the proposed provisions were well supported by the relevant strategic provisions. He concluded that the Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct would provide the most appropriate way of achieving the relevant objectives of the PDP.
56. Mr Langman and Ms Gilbert disagreed. Ms Gilbert stated that the provisions as attached to Mr Ferguson's evidence could lead to a combined building footprint of 4,000m² and she did not consider this appropriate for a site *'that is visible from a key scenic route and overlooked by several rural residential properties'*²⁹. Ms Gilbert concluded that if the proposed Lake Hayes Cellar Precinct were to be recommended, the provisions should classify activities as restricted discretionary consent at a minimum and include landscape-focused assessment criteria.
57. Mr Langman maintained in his rebuttal evidence that the proposal was not the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives and policies. He described the proposal as resulting in *'a micro-level zoning for a very specific commercial activity in association with objectives, policies and*

²⁶ Submission 2378

²⁷ C. Fergusson, Evidence in Chief at [16]

²⁸ See Minute Deferring Submission Points dated 17 June 2016 deferring Submission 767 prior to hearing any of the evidence

²⁹ B. Gilbert, Rebuttal Evidence at [15.10]

*rules in [sic] for the management of activities within a single 1.68ha site*³⁰. He concluded that Rural Amenity Zone remained the most appropriate.

58. We consider that too great a reliance has been placed on the existing resource consents as an argument to include new provisions that provide for commercial development. In our view, it is not axiomatic that a consent for a specific commercial activity subject to site-specific conditions provides a basis to claim that the site is thereby suitable for any commercial activity. We think that Mr Ferguson downplayed the extent and nature of commercial activities that would be enabled (compared to the existing consented activities) if the zoning he supported were to be applied to this land. We are also not persuaded that controlled activity status is appropriate, given the potential for development to result in adverse landscape and visual effects.
59. We agree with Ms Gilbert’s assessment of the visibility of this site. It is at a prominent corner at the beginning of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. We observed on our site visit that the vineyard allows views across the site and a sense of openness. Overall, we find that the request would not implement the Strategic Direction of the PDP. It would also run contrary to our principles for bespoke zones³¹. Lastly, while not determinative, we note that the property is only partially within the boundary of the wastewater reticulation scheme.

4. OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

60. For the reasons given above, we recommend the submissions and further submissions listed in Appendix 1 be accepted, accepted in part or rejected as set out in the appendix, and that the Planning Maps be amended as follows:
- a. The Morven Hill ONL boundary is amended as shown on Maps D4 and D5 below.
 - b. Move the Lake Hayes ONF boundary to the southern boundary of 229 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road³² and zone the site Precinct as shown on Map D1 below.
 - c. Zone the sites west of Lot 1 DP 382531 Rural Amenity Zone as shown on Map D2 below.
 - d. An Urban Growth Boundary be applied around the land zoned Lower Density Suburban Residential between Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road and Lake Hayes as shown on Map D3 below.
 - e. Rezone land between Lake Hayes and State Highway 6 as Amenity as shown on Map D4 below.
 - f. All other ONL/ONF boundaries are retained as notified.
 - g. That all other land within Area D, except for that subject to a proposed Open Space and Recreation Zone and considered by the Stream 15 Hearing Panel, retain the zoning as notified.

³⁰ M. Langman, Rebuttal Evidence at 19.13

³¹ As discussed in Section 2.2 of Report 18.1


³² Lot 2 DP 15096

For the Hearing Panel




Denis Nugent, Chair


Dated: 15 February 2019



Map D1 – French, French and Burt land north of Lake Hayes



Map D2 – Zoning north of Lake Hayes



Map D3 – Urban Growth Boundary



Map D4 – ONL boundary on Alec Robins Road and zoning adjoining Lake Hayes



Map D5 – ONL boundary Morven Hill near Jean Robins Road

Appendix 1: Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions Heard in Respect of Area D

Part A: Submissions

Submission Number	Recommendation
121	Accept
285	Reject
501	Accept in part
594	Reject
693	Reject
2104	Reject
2126	Reject
2163	Reject
2254	Reject
2281	Reject
2291	Reject
2314	Reject
2315	Reject
2316	Reject
2317	Reject
2318	Reject
2319	Reject
2377	Reject
2378	Reject
2389	Reject
2398	Accept
2417	Accept
2490	Reject
2517	Reject

Part B: Further Submissions

Further Submission Number	Relevant Submission Number	Recommendation
1097	285	Reject
1221	285	Reject
2706	2126	Reject
2708	2490	Reject
2709	2490	Reject
2716	2281	Reject
2745	2126	Reject
2745	2490	Reject
2748	2291	Reject
2750	2291	Reject
2765	2291	Reject
2766	2291	Reject
2769	2281	Reject

2772	2317	Reject
2772	2319	Reject
2781	2490	Reject
2783	2291	Reject
2783	2314	Reject
2783	2315	Reject
2783	2316	Reject
2783	2317	Reject
2783	2318	Reject
2783	2319	Reject
2784	2291	Reject
2787	2291	Reject
2787	2315	Reject
2787	2316	Reject
2787	2317	Reject
2787	2319	Reject
2791	2126	Reject
2795	2281	Reject
2796	2281	Reject