

ANNEXURE B – Copy of the Relevant Parts of the Decision

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan
Report 3
Report and Recommendations of Independent Commissioners Regarding
Chapter 3, Chapter 4 and Chapter 6

Commissioners

Denis Nugent (Chair)

Lyal Cocks

Cath Gilmour

Trevor Robinson

Mark St Clair

before us. They also emphasised that their suggested UGB provided for anticipated urban growth.

568. No submitter lodged a further submission opposing that submission and we recommend that it be accepted.

569. The more minor drafting change is that Policy 3.2.2.1.1 as recommended by Mr Paetz refers both to the urban areas in the Wakatipu Basin and to Arrowtown. Clearly Arrowtown is within the Wakatipu Basin. It is not in the same category as Jacks Point that is specifically mentioned for the avoidance of doubt. We recommend that specific reference to Arrowtown be deleted.

570. Accordingly, we recommend that this policy be renumbered (as 3.3.13) and amended to read:

“Apply Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs) around the urban areas in the Wakatipu Basin (including Jacks Point), Wanaka, and Lake Hawea Township.”

571. The second key question is how the PDP treats urban development outside the defined UGBs. There are two sides to this point. The first relates to the smaller townships and settlements of the District, where no UGB is proposed to be fixed. Putting aside Lake Hawea Township which we have recommended be brought within the urban areas defined by UGBs, these are Glenorchy, Kingston, Cardrona, Makarora and Luggate.

572. Policy 3.2.2.1.7 as notified related to these communities and provided:

“That further urban development of the District’s small rural settlements be located within and immediately adjoining those settlements.”

573. NZIA³⁸⁰ sought that urban development be confined to within the UGBs. Queenstown Park Limited³⁸¹ sought amendment of the policy to ensure its consistency with other policies related to UGBs.

574. Mr Paetz recommended that the policy provision in this regard sit inside Chapter 4 and be worded:

“Urban development is contained within existing settlements.”

575. As notified, Policy 4.2.1.5 was almost identical to Policy 3.2.1.7. In that context, NZIA was the only submitter seeking amendment to the Policy; that it simply state:

“Urban development is contained.”³⁸²

576. Clearly Mr Paetz is correct and the duplication between these two policies needs to be addressed³⁸³. We consider, however, that the correct location for this policy is in Chapter 3 because it needs to sit alongside the primary policy on UGBs. Secondly, it needs to be clear that this is a complementary policy. As recommended by Mr Paetz, the policy is in fact

³⁸⁰ Submission 238: Opposed in FS1097, FS1107, FS1157, FS1226, FS1234, FS1239, FS1241, FS1242, FS1248 and FS1249

³⁸¹ Submission 806

³⁸² Opposed in FS1107, FS1226, FS1234, FS1239, FS1241, FS1242, FS1248 and FS1249

³⁸³ Refer the Real Journeys Submission noted on the more general point of duplication

inconsistent with 3.2.2.1 because in the urban areas with UGBs, provision is made to varying degrees for further urban development outside the existing settled areas.

577. In summary, we recommend that the policy be renumbered (as 3.3.15) and read:

“Locate urban development of the settlements where no UGB is provided within the land zoned for that purpose.”

578. We accept that there is an element of circularity in referring to the existing zone provisions in this regard, but we regard this as the most appropriate way to achieve Objectives 3.2.1.8, 3.2.2.1, 3.2.3.1, 3.2.5.1 and 3.2.5.2 (as those objectives bear upon the point) given that the Township Zone provisions are a matter assigned to a subsequent stage of the District Plan review.

579. The last substantive issue that needs to be addressed under this heading is the extent to which urban development is provided for outside UGBs (and outside the other existing settlements).

580. The starting point is to be clear what it is the PDP is referring to when policies focus on *“urban development”*.

581. The definition of urban development in the PDP as notified reads:

“Means any development/activity within any zone other than the rural zones, including any development/activity which in terms of its characteristics (such as density) and its effects (apart from bulk and location) could be established as of right in any zone; or any activity within an urban boundary as shown on the District Planning maps.”

582. At first blush, this definition would suggest that any development within any of the many special zones of the PDP constitute *“urban development”* since they are not rural zones and the qualifying words in the second part of the definition do not purport to apply to all urban development. Similarly, no development of any kind within the rural zones is defined to be urban development. Given that one of the principal purposes of defining urban growth boundaries is to constrain urban development in the rural zones, the definition would gut these policies of any meaning.

583. This definition is largely in the same terms as that introduced to the Operative Plan by Plan Change 50. The Environment Court has described it, and the related definition of *“Urban Growth Boundary”* in the following terms³⁸⁴:

“A more ambivalent and circular set of definitions would be hard to find.”

584. The Court found that urban development as defined means:

“... any development/activity which:

- a. Is of an urban type, that is any activity of a type listed as permitted or controlled in a residential, commercial, industrial or other non-rural zone; or*
- b. Takes place within an “Urban Growth Boundary” as shown on the District’s Planning Maps.”*

³⁸⁴ *Monk v Queenstown-Lakes District Council* [2013] NZEnvC12 at [20]

585. The Court also commented that a definition is not satisfactory if it relies on an exercise of statutory interpretation³⁸⁵.

586. We entirely agree.

587. When counsel for the Council opened the Stream 1A and 1B hearing, we asked Mr Winchester to clarify for us what the definition really meant. He accepted that it was unsatisfactory and undertook to revert on the subject. As part of the Council's reply, both counsel and Mr Paetz addressed the issue. Mr Paetz suggested, supported by counsel, that a revised definition adapted from the definition used in the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (as notified) should be used, reading as follows:

"Means development that by its scale, intensity, visual character, trip generation and/or design and appearance of structures, is of an urban character typically associated with urban areas. Development in particular special zones (namely Millbrook and Waterfall Park) is excluded from the definition."

588. This recommendation is against a background of a submission from Millbrook Country Club³⁸⁶ seeking that the definition be revised to:

"Means develop and/or activities which:

- a. Creates or takes place on a site of 1500m² or smaller; and*
- b. Is connected to reticulated Council or community water and wastewater infrastructure; and*
- c. Forms part of ten or more contiguous sites which achieve both (a) and (b) above; but*
- d. Does not includes resort style development such as that within the Millbrook Zone."*

589. We also note MacTodd's submission³⁸⁷ seeking that the definition be amended in accordance with the Environment Court's interpretation of the existing definition, as above.

590. Although counsel for Millbrook referred to the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan definition of urban activities (as notified³⁸⁸) as part of his submissions³⁸⁹, it appears that Millbrook's formal submission had been drafted with an eye to the definition in the then Operative Auckland Regional Policy Statement that reads:

"Urban development – means development which is not of a rural nature. Urban development is differentiated from rural development by its scale, density, visual character, and the dominance of built structures. Urban development may also be characterised by a reliance on reticulated services (such as water supply and drainage), by its generation of traffic and includes activities (such as manufacturing), which are usually provided for in urban areas."

591. We also had the benefit of an extensive discussion with counsel for Millbrook, Mr Gordon, assisted by Mr Wells who provided planning evidence in support of the Millbrook submission, but not on this specific point.

³⁸⁵ See paragraph [24]

³⁸⁶ Submission 696

³⁸⁷ Submission 192

³⁸⁸ Noting that the Independent Hearing Panel recommended deletion of that definition, apparently on the basis that it did no more than express the ordinary and natural meaning of the term, and Auckland Council accepted that recommendation in its decisions on the Proposed Plan

³⁸⁹ As did counsel for Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd and Others

592. A large part of that discussion was taken up in trying to identify whether the Millbrook development is in fact urban development, and if not, why not. Mr Gordon argued that Millbrook was something of a special case because it provides for activities that are neither strictly urban nor rural. He distinguished Jacks Point, which is contained within an existing UGB because it has provision in its structure planning for facilities like childcare, kindergartens, schools, convenience stores and churches, as well as being of a much larger scale than Millbrook.
593. We also had input from counsel for Darby Planning LP, Ms Baker-Galloway, on the point. She submitted that the definition should not be a quantitative approach, e.g. based on density, but should rather be qualitative in nature. Beyond that, however, she could not assist further.
594. We agree that quantitative tests such as those suggested by Millbrook are not desirable. Among other things, they invite developments that are designed around the quantitative tests (in this case, multiple 9 section developments or developments on sites marginally over 1500m²). We also note the example discussed in the hearing of houses on 2000-3000m² sites in Albert Town that are assuredly urban in every other respect.
595. We also have some difficulties with the definition suggested by Mr Paetz because some types of development are typically associated with urban areas, but also commonly occur in rural areas, such as golf courses and some industries. We think that there is value in the suggestion from Millbrook (paralleled in the referenced Operative Auckland Regional Policy Statement definition in this regard) that reference might be made to connections to water and wastewater infrastructure, but we do not think they should be limited to Council or community services. It is the reticulation that matters, rather than the identity of its provider. Jacks Point, for instance, has its own water and wastewater services, whereas Millbrook is connected to Council water supply and wastewater services.
596. Insofar as Millbrook sought an exclusion for “*resort style development*”, that rather begs the question; what is a resort?
597. Having regard to the submissions we heard from Millbrook, we think that the key characteristics of a resort are that it provides temporary accommodation (while admitting of some permanent residents) with a lower average density of residential development than is typical of urban environments, in a context of an overall development focused on on-site visitor activities. Millbrook fits that categorisation, but Jacks Point does not, given a much higher number of permanent residents, the geographical separation of the golf course from the balance of the development and the fact that the overall development is not focussed on on-site visitor activities. It is in every sense a small (and growing) township with a high-quality golf course.
598. The last point we have to form a view on is whether, as Mr Paetz recommends, the Waterfall Park Zone should similarly be excluded from the definition of urban development. Mr Paetz’s reply evidence accepted that the density of a permitted development within the Waterfall Park Zone would be closer to urban development and made it clear that the entire Waterfall Park Zone is an anomaly; in his words:

“The sort of sporadic and ad hoc urban intensity zoning in the middle of the countryside that Council is looking to discourage through the PDP”³⁹⁰.

³⁹⁰ M Paetz, Reply Evidence at 6.16

599. The Waterfall Park Zone has not been implemented. We have no evidence as to the likelihood that it will be implemented and form part of the 'existing' environment in future. Certainly, given Mr Paetz's evidence, we see no reason why a clearly anomalous position should drive the wording of the PDP policies on urban development going forward.

600. For these reasons, we do not consider special recognition of Waterfall Park is required.

601. A separate Hearing Panel (Stream 10) will consider Chapter 2 (Definitions) of the PDP. That Hearing Panel will need to form a view on the matters set out above and form a final view in the light of the submissions and evidence heard in that stream, what the recommendation to Council should be.

602. For our part, however, we recommend to the Stream 10 Hearing Panel that the definition of urban development be retained to provide clarity on the appropriate interpretation of the PDP³⁹¹ and amended to read:

"Means development that is not of a rural character and is differentiated from rural development by its scale, intensity, visual character and the dominance of built structures. Urban development may also be characterised by a reliance on reticulated services such as water supply, wastewater and stormwater and by its cumulative generation of traffic. For the avoidance of doubt, a resort development in an otherwise rural area does not constitute urban development".

We further recommend that a new definition be inserted as a consequence of our recommendation as above:

"Resort" – means an integrated and planned development involving low average density of residential development (as a proportion of the developed area) principally providing visitor accommodation and forming part of an overall development focussed on on-site visitor activities."

603. We have proceeded on the basis that when the objectives and policies we have to consider use the term 'urban development', it should be understood as above.

604. Turning then to the more substantive issue, whether urban development, as defined, should be avoided or merely discouraged outside the UGBs and other existing settlements, Mr Paetz's recommendation that Policy 3.2.5.3.1 be amended to provide the latter appears inconsistent with his support for Policy 4.2.2.1 which reads:

"Urban Growth Boundaries define the limits of urban growth, ensuring that urban development is contained within those identified boundaries, and urban development is avoided outside of those identified boundaries."

605. Mr Paetz did not explain the apparent inconsistency, or indeed, why he had recommended that Policy 3.2.5.3.1 should be amended in this way.

³⁹¹ The need for clarity as to the classification of Millbrook and other similar resorts that might be established in future causes us to take a different view on the need for a definition than that which the Auckland Independent Hearings Panel came to.

606. Ultimately, we view this as quite a simple and straightforward question. Mr Clinton Bird, giving urban design evidence for the Council, aptly captured our view when he told us that you have either got an urban boundary or not. If you weaken the boundary, you just perpetuate urban sprawl.
607. This is the same approach that is taken in the Proposed RPS, which provides³⁹² that where UGBs are identified in a District Plan, urban development should be avoided beyond the UGB.
608. It follows that we favour a policy of avoidance of urban development outside of the UGB's, as provided for in the notified Policy 3.2.2.1.2. Our view is that any urban development in rural areas should be the subject of the rigorous consideration that would occur during a Plan Change process involving extension of existing, or creation of new, UGBs.
609. The revised definition we have recommended to the Stream 10 Panel provides for resort-style developments as being something that is neither urban nor rural and therefore sitting outside the intent of this policy.
610. In summary, and having regard to the amendments recommended to relevant definitions, we recommend retention of Policy 3.2.2.1.2 as notified (but renumbered 3.3.14) as being the most appropriate way, in the context of a package of high-level policies, in which to achieve Objectives 3.2.1.8, 3.2.2.1, 3.2.3.1, 3.2.5.1 and 3.2.5.2.

3.6. Section 3.2.2.2. Policies – Natural Hazards

611. As notified, policy 3.2.2.2.1 read:

“Ensure a balanced approach between enabling higher density development within the District’s scarce urban land resource and addressing the risks posed by natural hazards to life and property.”

612. The sole submission specifically on it³⁹³ sought its deletion or in the alternative, amendment *“for consistency with the RMA”*. The word *“addressing”* was the subject of specific comment – the submitter sought that it be replaced by *“mitigated”*.
613. Although Mr Paetz recommended that this Policy be retained in Chapter 3 as notified, for the same reasons we have identified that the relevant objective should be amalgamated with other objectives relating to urban development, we think that this policy should be deleted from Chapter 3, and the substance of the issue addressed as an aspect of urban development in Chapter 4. We think this is the most appropriate way in the context of a package of high-level policies to achieve the objectives of the plan related to urban development.

3.7. Section 3.2.3.1 Policies – Urban Development

614. The policies all relate to a quality and safe urban development. As such, while Mr Paetz recommends that they remain in Chapter 3, for the same reasons as the more detailed urban development policies have been deleted and their subject matter addressed as part of Chapter 4, we recommend that the three policies in Section 3.2.3.1 all be deleted, and their subject matter be addressed as part of Chapter 4, that being the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the plan related to urban development.

3.8. Section 3.2.3.2 Policy – Heritage Items

³⁹² Proposed RPS, Policy 4.5.2

³⁹³ Submission 806

in order that the chapter can be read as a whole. Lastly, we consider that understanding of the layout of the policies would be assisted by insertion of headings to break up what would otherwise be a list of 35 policies on diverse subjects. We have therefore inserted headings intended to capture the various groupings of policies.

4. PART B RECOMMENDATIONS

822. Attached as Appendix 1 is our recommended Chapter 3.

823. In addition, as discussed in our report, we recommend to the Stream 10 Hearing Panel that the following new and amended definitions be included in Chapter 2:

***"Nature Conservation Values** – means the collective and interconnected intrinsic values of indigenous flora and fauna, natural ecosystems (including ecosystem services), and their habitats.*

***Regionally significant infrastructure** - means:*

- a. Renewable electricity generation activities undertaken by an electricity operator; and*
- b. The National Grid; and*
- c. Telecommunication and radio communication facilities; and*
- d. State Highways; and*
- e. Queenstown and Wanaka airports and associated navigation infrastructure.*

***Urban Development** – means development which is not of a rural character and is differentiated from rural development by its scale, intensity, visual character and the dominance of built structures. Urban development may also be characterised by a reliance on reticulated services such as water supply, wastewater and stormwater and by its cumulative generation of traffic. For the avoidance of doubt, a resort development in an otherwise rural area does not constitute urban development.*

***Resort-** means an integrated and planned development involving low average density of residential development (as a proportion of the developed area) principally providing temporary visitor accommodation and forming part of an overall development focused on on-site visitor activities."*

824. Lastly, as discussed in the context of our consideration of Objective 3.2.5.2, if the Council intends that provisions related to the Rural Character Landscape apply in the Wakatipu Basin, and more generally, outside the Rural Zone, we recommend Council notify a variation to the PDP to make that clear.

PART E: OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

1400. For the reasons we have set out above, we recommend to the Council that:
- a. Chapter 3 be adopted in the form set out in Appendix 1;
 - b. Chapter 4 be adopted in the form set out in Appendix 2;
 - c. Chapter 6 be adopted in the form set out in Appendix 3; and
 - d. The relevant submissions and further submissions be accepted, accepted in part or rejected as set out in Appendix 4.
1401. We also recommend to the Stream 10 Hearing Panel that the definitions discussed above of the terms:
- a. nature conservation values;
 - b. regionally significant infrastructure;
 - c. urban development;
 - d. resort;
 - e. subdivision and development; and
 - f. trail

be included in Chapter 2 for the reasons set out in our report.

For the Hearing Panel



Denis Nugent, Chair
Date: 16 March 2018