

TABLE OF SUBMISSIONS – PRE-HEARING MEETING – 9TH AND 10TH OCTOBER 2023

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Summary of Submission (no further submissions from the submitters)	S 42A Report References	Areas of Agreement / Disagreement / summary of submission points post the s42A report
7	Sandy Waddingham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide proper walkways and paths (cf some of Stalker Road) – Health and safety issue • Recycling and composting should be addressed in Plan – developers / council should provide bokashi compost bins. • Developers or council should provide compost 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.249] - [11.259] - Theme L - Sustainability / climate change • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development 	<p>Thank you to Vicki Jones, Friend of Submitters</p> <p>Not against growth or urban development. I am about sustainability and this is an opportunity to showcase what sustainability could look like – even as a trial by this Council. Let’s have a look at what sustainability means – an action to do better especially in this place.</p> <p>With regard to Bokashi bins reference to Auckland – e.g. Hobsonville where Council introduced Bokashi for free.</p> <p>Compost waste is huge – 53% (green and food), so this is an opportunity to trial a green waste kerbside pick up service for Ladies Mile. At the moment the use of such systems is prohibitively expensive.</p> <p>Spatial Plan encourages developers to ensure it promotes sustainability through site layout, etc. which is good. This should be part of Ladies Mile, citing example of Auckland where every new build has to have a stormwater collection unit and rainwater collected off roof goes into collection units recycled and used in the toilet and laundry (grey water). The council needs to be a bit more futuristic.</p> <p>Jeff commented that there has been a significant change and approach to stormwater management, in response to submissions to a centralised comprehensive approach. Reference to page 235 of the s42A report.</p>
12	Keryn Malcolm Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose entire variation • Area should remain current zoning, to retain semi-rural approach to Queenstown. • Stop urban creep from Frankton • No necessity for further commercial use and other areas suitable for dense housing 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.158] – 11.161] – Theme F – Commercial precinct uncertainties • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development 	<p>Indicated that there would be no attendance.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.60] - [11.66] - Theme D - sub-theme - Landscape and rural character 	
20	Samuel Belk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High density housing should be in Queenstown central, with the Housing Trust Shotover Bridge cannot support LM, (re) construction of bridge would take years, NZTA already said Shotover Bridge cannot support the traffic and infrastructure Reduces Highly Productive Land even further Destroys ONLs and ONFs 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.99] - [11.149] - Theme E - Alternative locations [11.36] – [11.98] Theme D – appropriateness of TPLM for urban development [11.246] - [11.248] - Theme K - Land productivity [7.25] – [7.35] – NPS-HPL [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects [11.60] - [11.66] - Theme D - sub-theme - Landscape and rural character 	<p>Not reviewed the s42A report due to work commitments but we discussed the importance of including reference to this report in his submission to the Panel.</p> <p>Refers to long term resident - John Alexander – see quote below.</p> <p>Read out expanded version of his written submission – this will be further worked on and he will present this to the Panel in due course</p> <p>Key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic difficult and any expansion is unpleasant Surroundings will be affected by landscape effects of the development Over 2500 homes addresses nothing for increasing housing or addressing housing affordability. Many people will just buy a second dwelling <p>He states that he does not dwell on hard facts and notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queenstown is a global destination e.g. Whistler etc Outdated idea that we need to provide everyone with housing in a NZ sense (many bedrooms, bathrooms, garaging etc) Landscape is outstanding and this would detract from that We risk fouling our nest further with what begins as small incremental changes but over time become fundamental changes like what has already happened <p>He considers that the Ladies Mile variation should be scrapped.</p> <p>He notes that - is this the price we have to live here which is getting higher – he quotes John Alexander 38 year resident – <i>“question I now ask do developers, planners, surveyors and others look back with pride on development or at their back balance?”</i></p> <p>Growth cannot be unfettered.</p>

23	Nadia Lisitsina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend variation so that the development is in line with current infrastructure capacity and commuter behaviour and rural character zoning. • The roading / bridge is inadequate. No evidence to support uptake of mode shift and therefore this should not be taken into account. Commercial activity within the development will increase traffic. • Plan needs to account for future wastewater infrastructure • Multi storey high density is inappropriate in rural / suburban area and undermines rural character. High density (apartments) would work better closer to town where people are more willing to not have vehicles. 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.9] - 11.17] - Theme B - More land not required for urban growth • [11.18] - [11.35] - Theme C - consultation issues 	<p>Did not attend and contact was made and she confirmed that she did not wish to speak</p>
27	<p>Jim Robinson (Jim and Deirdre Robinson)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about effects on the transport network. Submissions gives extensive ideas of how to address traffic effects in general (including those Queenstown is already facing irrespective of the variation). • Does not think the mode shift evidence is realistic 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects 	<p>Noted that he had not yet read the s42A report.</p> <p>Sought clarification of the max number of houses envisaged by the variation. This was confirmed (by Jeff) to be 2400.</p> <p>Jim commented that the increase in accommodation is welcomed as the lack of accommodation is a significant impairment to some businesses – he mentioned health care services and hospitality.</p> <p>However, he considers that the variation will disrupt the lifestyle of those already here with regards to delays etc caused by traffic, noting congestion is a big concern.</p> <p>His primary concern is he considers the at the modal shift envisaged by the variation is overly optimistic.</p>

			<p>He noted that the traffic effects were “downright inconvenient” – in his view he did don’t want any of the scenarios.</p> <p>He did not consider that the change of behaviours were likely to be adopted.</p> <p>He noted that the key area of concern was getting across Kawarau River to town, the CBD, and the highway link south. He noted that there are a lot of people going to the CBD from this area now.</p> <p>He noted that public transport could be improved.</p> <p>He commented that the major bottleneck on SH6 at the 2-lane bridge is in need of upgrading and replacing. He gave example of being a business owner and using this area of road.</p> <p>He could not get his head around the extra 2500 households and the impact this would have.</p> <p>He wondered what the assumption on household occupancy rates were. He had considered the scenario of 4 travelling persons per household. In answer to a question -</p> <p>Jeff noted the assumption of occupancy is an average of 2-3 per household. Vicki noted that the Council’s landuse and subdivision code of practice refers to the sum of 8 vehicle movements per household.</p> <p>He said we need to be considering the extra vehicle movements in addition to existing traffic coming from further afield (e.g. Cromwell-based commuters) and tourist traffic. Public transport improvements should be looking at taking people from Cromwell and Wanaka. Questioned can we realistically do that in a means which is fast and efficient – e.g. light rail or similar.</p> <p>For tourist traffic this is the main link including between ChCh and Dunedin. Maybe tourists use the roads later in day not peak. But he considered how much we are looking to expand tourism, say 5-6%. He noted that many tourists don’t necessarily fly but travel by vehicles.</p> <p>His firm view is that we need to do something with the connection across the river.</p> <p>He has made suggestions about an alternative SH6 bypass/ second bridge and also made reference to the Mayor on this SH6 bypass.</p> <p>He considers that a bypass would be a fabulous improvement and improve to our resilience and earthquake response.</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>He is concerned that the variation could mean that people just decide to move away.</p> <p>He has included some insights into innovative solutions, e.g. cable car and noted that cyclists are not going to brave the existing bridge or use the old bridge over the Shotover for commuting as it is indirect and slow.</p> <p>Need to further analyse the traffic data; a huge amount (say 40%) is tradie traffic including out of towners – eg plumbers, electricians, etc.</p> <p>The variation is looking at an extra 8-10k people moving into the CBD including trade.</p> <p>He thinks what is needed is innovative fast thinking and a huge injection of capital.</p> <p>Jeff notes section 6 and 10 more specifically section 11 themes D, H, F of the s42A and the specialist evidence of Tony Pickard and Colin Shields. They have specified various works proposed on public highway and looking at ways in which this variation can ensure there are as many reasons as possible not to head west.</p> <p>He noted a number of works that must happen before development starts.</p>
33	Crane, Justin (Threepwood Farm Residents Association and the Threepwood Custodians Limited)	<p>Traffic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not clear when the traffic data that informed the Transport Strategy dated 8/3/22 was collected (i.e. during a time where Queenstown was still affected by Covid) Currently can take Threepwood residents over 5 mins to enter state highway (even before LM variation going ahead) <p>Active Travel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 3m of space for active travel network along SH6 (up to the boundary is Threepwood land). Therefore no space of amenity access area pf 10 – 20 m Active travel link connecting to Marshall Ave would compromise Threepwood farm, result in 	S 42A	<p>Threepwood = 50 residents neighbouring the Ladies Mile proposed zone plus a farm of 150 ha; they own the bulk of what is described as an ONF.</p> <p>3 main points plus a general comment on traffic.</p> <p>1. In original information the pump station would be located on one of the front paddocks; being the flattest and most fertile paddocks, without any conversation with us and while mentioned in the s42A report –it is not well covered.</p> <p>2. The active travel link proposed parallel to SH6 is problematic because it is across from the front paddock where the pump station and 2nd flat and fertile paddock are and could not be progressed unless the Public Works Act is used that forces it through. There has been no discussion or approach to us to use our land. Clarifies while Threepwood have provided an easement for a small car park and track to Lake Hayes track this is specific to that carpark and the reason for it. This is not an easement for an additional 10k people. With regards to the opening up of a paper road at the base of Slope Hill obviously the paper road is there and we can't prevent that but creating this as an active link will separate the farm and farm buildings. This is partially covered in the s42A report, and a cattle grid is mentioned but want to point out that such things affect the viability of the farm. The viability of the farm is only way that Threepwood can be</p>

		<p>health and safety issues and degrade ONF</p> <p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pump station: The Three Waters infrastructure report states that pump station will go on a section of land owned by QLDC. However, Threepwood owns this land (there is an easement to QLDC but restricted to certain activities). Therefore cannot rely on locating pump station there. • Stormwater: When masterplan ground frozen overwinter area becomes flooded – excess water will flow towards Lake Hayes through Threepwood causing increased flooding and stormwater issues on Threepwood land 	<p>Stormwater and ecology</p>	<p>custodians of ONF to maintain the ONF. Separating the farm from the farm buildings is problematic for the viability of the farm. In the last year or so the farm has lost 20 sheep to dog activity. These proposed changes will prevent animals on the farm close to the active link. There is also a problem getting heavy equipment across the road. Council experts have said this is easily mitigated. In evidence, the farm manager (of 15 years) will say it is not.</p> <p>3. Stormwater impacts - have photographic evidence of some mitigation – Amy Prestidge says that some bunding or a swale will run across boundary to stop flooding on Threepwood along with planting of the gullies within the catchment. These stormwater catchments would be on our property.</p> <p>In summary, Threepwood is being asked to provide green space and be custodian / maintainer of ONF in circumstances while the best farmland is being taken for an active link, a pump station, and stormwater management. Threepwood doesn't sit well with the process. Threepwood have photographs of areas.</p> <p>Do want to present to Panel. The s 42A has not resolved the above concerns.</p> <p>In terms of the traffic reports Waka Kotahi notes that the Bridge is near or at capacity. Thinks it's far-fetched to think 40% would use public transport and there is no evidence that this is happening. One of the ways of reducing traffic in the variation is by reducing cars by having no carparking. Cars will just park on verges and on the road. Flatmates and tenants have cars so one car per household is not true. This is overly optimistic.</p> <p>Jeff noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the pump station is addressed in the evidence of Amy Prestidge as the optimal place being that land on the paddock. If this doesn't work, then it would have to go somewhere else. Kate mentions that there are Public Works Act (PWA) and Notice of Requirement (NOR)/ Designation processes to follow if this land is needed. - The active travel link is shown as an arrow, and he thought it was intended to be in the highway reserve. Feasibility would have to be calculated if any private land is needed and this would have to follow PWA and NOR processes. In relation to the paper road and active link across the farm, the s42A mentioned cattle stops etc mean trails can coexist with farming practices. Have seen these in operation around the country and work. They can be feasible with minimal impact on farming operations.
--	--	--	-------------------------------	---

				- Regarding stormwater impact – Gardner and Prestidge evidence – strong shift from developer orientated management to a more centralised approach. He does not read the Prestidge evidence as saying that gullies had to be planted up. Stormwater would have to be planned well ahead of development and there is no forcing of planting up. Traffic issues have been brought up by others.
36	Lydia Shirley (Fire and Emergency New Zealand)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire and Emergency requires adequate access to respond to emergencies. For fire appliances to access an emergency, need adequate carriage width, height clearance and road gradient • Need to carefully consider how emergency vehicle access will be provided for new residential development (especially where narrow roads / laneways and if no vehicle access to properties) • Seek various amendments to LM variation provisions 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 188 • Pg 196 • Pg 218 • Pg 234 • Pg 239 <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 18 • Pg 20 • Pg 23 • Pg 40 • Pg 46 • Pg 49 • Pg 53 • Pg 56 • Pg 58 • Pg 67 • Pg 73 • Pg 80 • Pg 94 • Pg 98 • Pg 100 • Pg 104 • Pg 108 • Pg 112 • Pg 140 • Pg 154 • Pg 162 • Pg 170 • Pg 171 • Pg 174 • Pg 177 	Have confirmed that they are not coming. To confirm if they are calling expert evidence

37	Blair Devlin (J and M Dobb)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek that 13 Ada Place currently zoned rural, is rezoned as Medium Density Precinct (to align with LM) or Low Density to align with Lake Hayes Estate / Queenstown Country Club • The site is directly adjacent to the plan change area • Physical access to site from proposed link road 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [9.2] Summary of submissions not in scope • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • Pg 133 – 136 – Rezoning Submission <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 44 • Pg 65 • Pg 92 • Pg 117 	<p>Have confirmed that they are calling expert evidence so are not coming</p>
39	Mike Hanff (Friends of Lake Hayes Society Incorporated)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LM variation area within Lake Hayes topography catchment therefore needs to be fully considered as part of planning process (refer Hydrology report) • Approach for landowners to provide stormwater solution has an increased risk of one or more parts failing • Can avoid risk of degrading Lake Hayes by shifting excess run-off out of the catchment by moving it to the other side of SH6 which acts as a dam (through a new culvert) 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.18] - [11.35] - Theme C - consultation issues • [11.215] - [11.236] - Theme I - Stormwater and ecology Pg 113 <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 37 	<p>Chair of Friends has a science background but is here as a lay person today.</p> <p>Have looked at the s42A report and in terms of response the Friends are looking for 3 answers to the following areas:</p> <p>Stormwater</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acceptance in the s 42A report that the topography combined with damming effect means that stormwater runs into Lake Hayes. 2. Based on evidence, the Friends are wanting an overview from ORC or QLDC of what the impacts will be of nutrient runoff into Lake Hayes. There is long-term recycling effects of nutrients in Lake Hayes after single runoff events – this is the main exacerbator/ issue. 3. QLDC needs to recognise the importance of restoring Lake Hayes and consider how it will improve water quality, citing policy 24.2.4.2 of the PDP. <p>Refers to the regulatory backdrop – NPSFM and NOFs – Regional Council need an action plan to implement standards – Ladies Miles should be consistent with this.</p>

			<p>Friends are disappointed about there being no expert evidence regarding the effects of nutrient pollution into Lake Hayes – including from ORC.</p> <p>Reference to the nature and cost of the projects the Friends are involved in within the catchment.</p> <p>Suggested an answer / alternative which is what if the design is to be done so that any failures of the stormwater system occur outside of the catchment.</p> <p>Noted that the drivers of runoff aren't just rainfall but a variety of factors such as how dry/wet is has been, soil condition etc.</p> <p>Friends want assurance that sediment will not enter the Lake and that while the council's evidence states this, they want to see the data/ science behind this before they will accept it as these events take millions of dollars to fix. No accountability in what is proposed. One or two failures is what causes the main issues in the Lake.</p> <p>Agrees that most of the time the stormwater management system will work but why can't any failure of the system be directed away from the Lake and catchment? He notes that there will always be failures.</p> <p>There needs to be accountability for what is being proposed. The failures either need to be redirected from the catchment or funding provided from the development to deal with the failures</p> <p>Jeff noted that the evidence of John Gardner and Amy Prestidge state that if measures in the rules are implemented there would be improvement in the Lake water quality.</p> <p>The stormwater management approach has been changed substantially from the notified version, from enabling individual systems to a comprehensive stormwater management system set out in section 11 of the s43A theme 1 – question is there any comments from Friends?</p> <p>If you send through suggestions, can send to stormwater experts and see if any other improvements can be made.</p> <p>Kate – noted expert evidence is to be lodged next Friday, not sure if there will be any stormwater evidence but would be worthwhile checking. Recommend reading expert evidence to see what is being proposed from others. Jeff noted that there may be evidence from individual developers who originally wanted own separate systems rather than centralised system.</p>
--	--	--	---

				Helen noted there is an opportunity for the Council team to continue to discuss this with Friends before hearing.
45	Blair Devlin (Caithness Developments Ltd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter owns a 3.7 Ha land on the corner of Stalker Road and SH6. Under the notified variation the site is zoned Low Density Residential Precinct and H1 Submitter seeks to rezone the site as Low Density Suburban Residential per the PDP zone Services stations should not be avoided (should be discretionary) Allow residential flats as a permitted activity in Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential Precincts Remove H density cap (not required as Low Density Suburban Residential achieves the same yield) Concern about delivery of activity travel link to SH and pedestrian cycle crossing being delivered (outside of Council's control) before submitter can develop its land. Address through development contributions 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development [11.202] - [11.214] - Theme H - Infrastructure staging triggers Pg 142 – 144 - Rezoning Submission Pg 142 Pg 187 Pg 193 Pg 197 <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pg 16 Pg 44 Pg 45 Pg 53 Pg 65 Pg 117 Pg 118 	Have confirmed that they are calling expert evidence so are not attending.
56	Heath Copland (AA Southern Lakes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the location of the development and understand once school and shopping hub operational. Will reduce movements on SH and Shotover Bridge 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.39] – [11.59] Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects 	<p>The AA Southern Lakes District Council is very new – been around for about 2 years.</p> <p>The AA put in submission because they wanted a physical presence on behalf of district's 19k members. This represents a good proportion of the membership (road users) of AA.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage further development of a park and ride transport option • Concern about current congestion and the capacity of Shotover Bridge. What is likely uptake of buses and cycles ways? • Construction and location of schools will create further congestion during construction phase • Access for emergency vehicles needs to be considered given high density and minimum street widths • What provisions are in place for parking hubs if limited on street parking (unrealistic residents will choose not to have private vehicles) 	<p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 172 	<p>He noted that he had not read the s42A report.</p> <p>The AA support development on that side of Ladies Mile but are concerned about congestion on SH6 that it will cause and noted/sought that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of accesses onto the highway be increased from the two currently shown, noting that in time the speed limit will be decreased and that this is ok • Park and ride should be investigated • Access for emergency vehicles is important. Understands the idea of modal shift but not sure if it will be achieved. <p>Jeff noted that FENZ submission has a lot about emergency vehicles. Also, the Plan has standards (in Chapter 29, for Transport matters). Parking references - addressed in the s42A report (section 11, Theme D) and Mr Shields evidence – with regards to intersections there will be 3 (not 2) intersections onto the SH.</p>
57	Celine Austin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2020 consultation shows majority of residents do not support LM variation • Housing – there is no inclusionary housing in the variation. Housing Trust not involved. Extra supply will not offer more affordable housing. There is already plenty of available land for housing and keep more open spaces. • How to ensure that the LM residents will not be turned into short term tourist accommodation as the variation specifies? 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.5]-[11.8] Theme A – Growth in District should be stopped/slowed • [11.9] – [11.17] Theme B – More land not required for urban growth 	<p>Has read the s42A report.</p> <p>Theme A - Read it as saying that residents are closing the door to growth. This is not her position; she is not against development. Queenstown should thrive and growth needs to be done in such a way that it doesn't damage brand.</p> <p>Theme B – concern is what happens if development occurs at Ladies mile and development at Frankton Flats doesn't go ahead – we should concentrate efforts around Frankton first from a transport point of view.</p> <p>Theme D - Refer to Rob Burnell's submission (he preceded her). Supports modal shift but that commercial precinct and the school are needed to make it work. However, accepts that there is no ability to make landowner develop. Question is what the Master Plan can deliver in terms of certainty with the MoE.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Transport modelling: mode shift unrealistic. Current bus schedule needs improvement first. Some facts do not support safe and ease active transport shift: Lake Hayes estate residents not close to bus stop, link from Old Shotover Bridge to Frankton crosses private land. MoE have not considered that the High School is being established. No guarantee commercial area will be built first Sustainability – long term recycling and water treatment facilities. Recycling facilities at Glenda Drive at full capacity and Victoria Flats getting full. No green waste collection so why referred to in plan variation. Building sustainability – Variation provisions do not include clear and structured details of sustainability and resilience building compliance. Overall, too many factors QLDC cannot control in order to realise LM plan variation as described. Instead, should develop land already zoned as urban 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.36] – [11.98] Theme D – Appropriateness of area for urban development [11.158]- [11.161] – Theme F – Sub-theme - Commercial precinct uncertainties [11.167] – [11.184] – Theme F – sub theme – Affordable housing [11.249] – [11.259] – Theme L - Sustainability / Climate Change 	<p>Theme L - If the development proceeds as planned this variation will help us to meet our carbon reduction targets. Believe it is beneficial to go further into Master Plan concept – showcase Queenstown sustainability – make it more clear – sustainability of materials, rain gardens, communal gardens, greenwaste. collection and recycling (Note that 53% of home waste could be compostable and reduce waste to landfill).</p> <p>Not convinced that the variation achieves best sustainability outcome for Queenstown.</p> <p>The provisions should be flexible for future changes in technology – can it be changed so only renewable technology for the purpose of sustainability?</p> <p>She noted she supported the increase in the supermarket size.</p> <p>Jeff noted that provisions require resource consent for all buildings. Is restricted discretionary, Council could refuse or impose conditions – include recycling, waste management, embodied energy. Also, an assessment matter for sustainability and resilience, requiring developers to demonstrate attention to those things, but not mandating and specific measures. Specific to this plan change.</p> <p>Kate will follow up on sustainability issues and find out what Council's response is on a wider issue raised by Celine.</p>
61	Anna McCarthy (Shotover Primary School)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern the effect the proposal will have on Shotover Primary School and the pressure it will place on resources Variation area within Shotover Primary enrolment zone. Even without variation 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.36] – [11.98] Theme D – Appropriateness of area for 	<p>She has had a skim of the s42A Report.</p> <p>Main areas of concern are centralised around uncertainty and the ability to operate as a school, which relate to the ability to have an accurate forecast of numbers and have some certainty from MoE that they will be planning for a new primary school.</p>

		<p>being developed, Primary School set to hit capacity by the year 2030</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While MoE have indicated education facilities will be provided within LM development, without insights into timing of this, will put pressure on Shotover Primary in the interim 	<p>urban development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.67], [11.78] – [11.80] – Effects on Shotover • Primary School roll • [11.154] - [11.157] - Theme F - sub theme - Uncertainty schools will eventuate 	<p>Without any confirmed land purchases by MoE that uncertainly has not been addressed.</p> <p>In answer to a question from the facilitator it was noted that the school has the capacity for 900 students but Covid has made it difficult to track. The school is currently at 600 and with the predicted growth each year it is expected to be at capacity by 2030 but with Ladies Mile this could be 2 years earlier.</p> <p>Jeff noted that MoE intend to file a NOR and buy land etc. However, he further noted that this is out of Council's hands and up to the MoE.</p>
66	Ross George	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic – congestion, roading, traffic management – especially roundabout and Shotover Bridge. • Need to be reworked to make Lower Shotover and Lake Hayes more accessible 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.39] – [11.59] Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects 	<p>Did not attend - he confirmed that he did not wish to speak at the prehearing meeting</p>
69	Katherine Forward & Pereen Singh (Airways Corporation of New Zealand Limited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29.5.24.1 – There shall be no direct property access from collector road Type A on the Structure Plan to land located north of the Road. • Has Nav Aid on Slope Hill, required for Airport safety – critical to retain access for maintenance and servicing– Have access via 429 Frankton-LM Highway, 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.260] – [11.270] Theme H – Aviation Issues • Pg 237 	<p>Katherine is an RM lawyer engaged by Airways Corp.</p> <p>Read and considered s42A report and note that it largely deals with the issues raised.</p> <p>Their key focus is to preserve the existing access Nav Aid on Slope Hill given its importance.</p> <p>Notes 42A report generally accepts their submission and it is likely that the recommended changes satisfies Airways Corp subject to tweaks to wording. While she needs to take instructions, her advice is that the wording should be less prescriptive than in the S 42A.</p>

		<p>ACNZ needs to retain some form of access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if the development removes access from 429 Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway, then access will be provided via the newly formed road (collector type A) that runs parallel to Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway and is currently shown as an unformed paper road • Suggested wording for amendment. 		<p>Understands there may be another party who uses the same access route for weather aid but doesn't know who or what.</p> <p>Have some questions on bespoke planning rules.</p> <p>Jeff noted that the timing on the construction of the collector road is dependent on development occurring and that is out of the Council's hands. Jeff noted that development cannot occur until various infrastructure triggers in place on the SH. Timing still unknown.</p> <p>The collector road is long and how many properties access it is unknown, therefore prefer to contain the relief to just the Airways Corporation access.</p> <p>Katherine – will check and confirm whether wording specific to Airways Corporation stays or is altered to ensure any subsequent entity that owns the equipment.</p> <p>Council to investigate who else uses the access, and for what equipment, and consider amending the wording to also accommodate that entity.</p>
71	GW & SE Stalker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitters land appears to be behind LM variation area and their submission appears to seek certain elements to enable their land to be developed • Seek that the stormwater system for any adjoining development will include capacity to handle the Spring bank Grove driveway and associated stormwater catchment • Boundary setbacks no less than 25m and first row of development by Springbank Grove limited to 5m in height (as shown in map in submission) 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] – [11.98] Theme D – Appropriateness of area for urban • Pg 179 – Mapping change of GW and SE Stalker • Pg 216 – Relief <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 94 • Pg 119 	<p>Have confirmed that they are not speaking at the prehearing meeting</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate easement and connection to the boundary provided for the purpose of supplying domestic water (not clear but possible for submitter to connect to system?) • Screen planting along the boundary by Springbank Grove of a minimum 2 metres high in evergreen planting capable of growing 10m in height (and irrigated) 		
74	Philip Blakely (Blakely Wallace Family)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Height - Oppose HDR and height of 24.5m – seek 12m • Adversely effect character of Wakatipu Basin, impact on ONL (Slope hill), detract entrance to Queenstown • Traffic - strategy inadequate. Public transport and cycle lanes will not solve alone – seek roading infrastructure upgrade, including Shotover Bridge. • Building Setback - No setback proposed on northern side of SH6 – should be setback / buffers on both sides of highway. • Landscape - Hawthorn Hedge part of early pastoral and agricultural heritage landscape of LM (plus screening). • 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] – [11.98] Theme D – Appropriateness of area for urban • [11.39] – [11.59] (Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects) • [11.60] – [11.66] – Theme D – sub theme – Landscape and rural character <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 73 <p>Evidence from Bridget and Steve Skelton ... yes managed to scan recommended 75m</p>	<p>Overwhelmed and daunted by process etc for this variation. Concerned a lot of submitters will fall by the wayside.</p> <p>Opposed to the whole variation. Major concerns about whole variation but on the presumption that something is going to happen he has made specific submissions and has now considered whether they have been narrowed / satisfied by the s 42A report:</p> <p><i>Effects on landscape, character, entrance to Qtown.</i></p> <p>Accepts landscape effects beyond the Ladies Mile area/ wider landscape (in particular Slope Hill) are low as per Steve Skelton’s evidence.</p> <p>But there is high effect in terms of the local area and the entranceway into Queenstown. Does not accept that effects on that area will be low. He considers there is inadequate response in the strategic planning and urban development references.</p> <p>Accepts in part the effects on ONF of Slope Hill lower than originally thought.</p> <p><i>High density residential</i></p> <p>His issue with high density residential especially from buildings up to 24 m has not been resolved/ satisfied. Development is incongruous and inappropriate in Wakatipu – it is Auckland planning in Queenstown. The ruralness/ rural character of the Queenstown area so important. What makes Queenstown so different from other resorts around the world. To have this level of development and density at the entrance is incongruous and out of context and wrong.</p>

			setback in LM but not taking forward	<p>S42A justification seems to be to maximise the number of units but this is to the detriment of the environment.</p> <p><i>Traffic</i></p> <p>His traffic issues have not narrowed or clarified. It is unrealistic to have 10k living in this eastern corridor and one needs to question how people will live.</p> <p><i>Buffer</i></p> <p>25m on northern side of SH6 is inadequate.</p> <p>Doesn't think that European cultural landscape has been adequately addressed in the assessment of values. Tree planting and hedge rows are covered in the heritage assessment but (although mainly in relation to Threepwood and Glenpanel) but not in the landscape evidence.</p> <p><i>Quality of soils</i></p> <p>He assumes this has been considered in the s 42A and that the NPS may not be legally relevant but remains of the view that this is some of the most productive land in the basin and noted that it has been used for cereal growing.</p> <p>Kate explained that the NPSHPL does not apply here.</p> <p>Still wrong in his view</p>
76	Maree Wheeler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 32 Flawed – makes assumptions that objectives will be achieved but relies on variables that are outside of Council's control – Masterplan flawed. Stakeholder Engagement – No safeguard for masterplan to be followed by landowners. Objectives rely on landowners/developers to implement the zoning, outcomes of the objectives may not occur. QLDC limited control e.g. LHE – 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.9] – [11.17] – More land is not required for urban growth [11.36] – [11.98] Theme D – Appropriateness of area for urban [11.152] – [11.153] – 	Did not attend

		<p>10 years to get first commercial building, still no community facility. Likely residential developments will occur long before community facilities and services are established.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Affordability – No inclusionary zoning provided for within the current LM Masterplan. No requirement to make community housing contribution to QLCHT. QLDC can't put IZ requirements into LM Masterplan, flawed. QLDC contradictions on how to fix housing affordability. Lake Hayes was meant to be affordable, now \$1.3M. • Ministry of Education – No site secured for state school, no safeguard/triggers for MoE to have a school built / opened. Local primary schools already projected to reach capacity without LM. • Transport – insufficient consideration on transport solutions, modal shift unprecedented and unlikely. No answer on capacity challenges for SH6 especially Shotover Bridge. Bus lane and bike unlikely adequate solution. • Minimises generation of additional vehicle trips (49.2.6) <p>(a) – no commitment from MoE to purchase land, and timeline for education facilities – vehicle trips as</p>	<p>Theme F – sub theme – Uncertainty development will occur</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.158] – [11.161] – Theme F – sub theme – Commercial precinct uncertainties • [11.162] – [11.166] – Theme F – sub theme – structure plan adherence • [11.167] – [11.184] – Theme F – sub theme – Affordable housing • [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects • [11.154] - [11.157] - Theme F - sub theme - Uncertainty schools will eventuate 	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>crossing LM to SC. 1 visitor carpark per 50 students unrealistic.</p> <p>(b) Commercial activities not viable until sufficient residential – additional trips.</p> <p>(c) No community facilities for entire LHE, SC and 516 LM no longer viable option – No present alternative option to serve current community let alone new one. Sportsgrounds only for recreational use. LTP has limited funds set aside. Until developed additional vehicle trips.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Financial Viability – Even if zoned for HD and commercial – QLDC no control. High cost and financial viability has stopped other ‘promised’ commercial development (LHE, SC, Bridesdale) or takes many years.• Financial Viability – Remarkable Park already zoned HD, close to amenities and public transport, capacity for 3,000 units – not developed for 20 years. Economics of building such apartments do not stack.• Financial viability – no safeguards to ensure housing availability and affordability in timely manner. Developers and landowners will do on their own time.• Focus on land already zoned high density.		
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold variation until better guarantee that triggers and safeguards in place over implementation of masterplan. 		
79	Rob Burnell (Lake Hayes Estate Shotover Community Association)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit that the Variation does not meet the objectives of the Variation or the Minister's Expectations Transport: Mode shift target to prevent overwhelming SH is unprecedented and highly unlikely. Effects on Shotover Bridge. Frankton still primary shopping areas, so trips will still occur between LM variation area and Frankton Density: no guarantees for housing typologies, uncertain economic viability, averse visual effects on ONL and Slope Hill Planning: variation's success relies on factors beyond QLDC's control. The masterplan is unprecedented (compared to previous examples where Council collaborates with a single developer). No timeframes for development occurring – unworkable. QLDC no control over increasing Shotover Country capacity, MOE not a participant in the Variation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural greenfield site is an unsuitable location for LM variation project (should 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.154] - [11.157] - Theme F - sub theme - Uncertainty schools will eventuate [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects [11.18] - [11.35] - Theme C - consultation issues [11.60] - [11.66] - Theme D - sub-theme - Landscape and rural character [11.86] - [11.89] - Theme D - sub theme - Higher order objectives [11.158]- [11.161] – Theme F – Sub-theme - 	<p>Has read the s42A and reports.</p> <p>Still concern in the community</p> <p>Lots of concerns haven't gone away.</p> <p>As near neighbours, the Association members are both affected and benefited by the variation.</p> <p>The community's voice is important as a valued opinion, and he considers it has not been valued necessarily in this case to date.</p> <p>Only got the 42A report a few days ago and no access to experts so the feedback if from a lay perspective.</p> <p>Section 42A report good to assist in understanding. It is well written and covered a lot. It has helped our understanding, and we will encourage residents to read it.</p> <p>He refers to Page 68 section 11.6 of the section 42A (re social justice) which includes a reference to the Assn perspective. He considered that it is not an appropriate comment to have attributed to the Assn.</p> <p>The Assn supports growth in the community that is well planned.</p> <p>Points made in submission are varied and wide. Issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport/modal shift Housing Schools <p>Disagreement with Jeff that variation meets the objectives relating to transport.</p> <p>Modal shift important but is the weakest part of the plan.</p> <p>Presentation given by council on Transport solutions at Shotover School in 2021 was woeful.</p> <p>Concerns about traffic modelling.</p>

		<p>locate near existing commercial centres and transport hubs) to incentivise high density in areas already appropriately zoned. LM variation constrained by huge capital costs and uncertainty of the variation work going ahead</p>	<p>Commercial precinct uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.162] - [11.166] - Theme F - sub theme - Structure plan • [11.167] – [11.184] – Theme F – sub theme – Affordable housing 	<p>Assn does not believe people living in the area will not want to own cars. School sports, doctor visits, other visiting etc.</p> <p>Don't agree with Pickard's comment re people won't use cars.</p> <p>Focus on modal shift is uncertain. Agrees mode shift is needed but doesn't believe the predicted mode share will happen.</p> <p>Bus lanes improvements are not enough.</p> <p>Qtown is not a metropolitan and should not be treated as such.</p> <p>Is it true Shields and Pickard basic tenor is that no carparks allowed (no cars) will mean no increase in congestion and no increase in vehicle movements? Is that the expectation?</p> <p>Jeff noted that the focus of Variation is to enable provision of day-to-day amenities and facilities within Ladies Mile to try and avoid the need for people travelling west.</p> <p>Jeff it was not the intention for there to be no cars but will be more restricted – max number of carparks as opposed to min. Cap on carparks per unit.</p> <p>Noted that transport is not covered in enough detail in the s 42a, and it just defers to Shields and Pickard. They are connected to Master Plan and are biased/ have a vested interest and ask why it didn't get outsourced – independent expert input. Traffic management peer reviewed?</p> <p>Kate noted that Council is considering a peer review of the traffic evidence. Reference to Waka Kotahi being very involved and have engaged specialists traffic experts. Their evidence can be considered in a way as a cross check against Council evidence. Watch for the statement that comes out of expert conferencing and the output.</p> <p>Concern that Lakes Hayes and Shotover will become overflow carpark.</p> <p>Housing supply -Concern about this and how all the pieces of the puzzle fit together – where is the compulsion to build? It doesn't knit together. Leads to affordability issues.</p> <p>Schools - what one reads in the report is helpful but need school. To say there is a "strong indication" is not definitive enough. Absolute commitment from MoE needed. Concern that council doesn't have control over the key outcomes.</p> <p>Fear is that we are driven down development road with no certainty.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

				<p>Report helpful but only now that we see detail.</p> <p>Increase in supermarket is a positive thing.</p> <p>Disagree that the variation will encourage trips not to go west.</p>
80 (103)	Tim Allan (Koko Ridge Limited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 49.4.7 - Seek provision for permitted activity status for residential flats up to 70m2 in low density H2 precinct. Should not be non-complying – similar to LDSR Zone in PDP where up to 70m2 is permitted activity. • Policy and OBs – 49.2.6 – Oppose zoning of H1 being conditional on pedestrian over passes of SH6 which are only of some tangential benefit if and when development occurs on North side of SH6. • Standard – 36.5.2 – Provide exception to decibel limits for heat pumps and mechanical ventilation or change limits to provide. Support stricter night time noise, but noise parameters do not provide for these – no resource consent to get these. • 49.7 -Site and building design – Supported in current form. • 49.5 standard – activities in LDR precinct non-compliance – Seek no maximum residential density standard, or maximum residential standard is 350m2 per residential unit. Oppose inclusion of maximum residential standard, and non-complying status. Variety of lot sizes and different 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • [11.202] - [11.214] - Theme H - Infrastructure staging triggers • [11.237] - [11.245] - Theme J - Visitor accommodation • Pg 144 – 147 – Rezoning Submission • Pg 147 –148 – Rezoning submission • Pg 188 • Pg 193 • Pg 197 • Pg 199 • Pg 229 • Pg 237 <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 1 	<p>Had a moderate look at the s42A reports and material.</p> <p>Reason we have made 2 submissions – one is the broader issues and one is landowner-specific ones</p> <p>Not as separate as they should have been - conflated in the summaries.</p> <p>Have been involved from the start.</p> <p>Koko Ridge</p> <p>4 matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Potentially settled</u> <p>Rule 49.1 Zone Purpose was supported without amendment. Nevertheless, the proposed changes are accepted.</p> <p>Rule 49.2.2.4 Provided rule 49.5.11 is amended to an appropriate maximum, then this rule does not need to be amended.</p> <p>Rule 49.2.4 providing for schools, shops and parks continues to be supported.</p> <p>Rule 49.2.7.8 Recommended changes not adopted, however may accept if rule 49.5.11 is amended to an appropriate maximum.</p> <p>Rule 49.4.7 The deletion of Residential Flats as a non-complying activity is accepted.</p> <p>Rule 49.5.1 Recognising the current subdivision of the land into 37 lots, the reduction of the minimum lot area to 300m2 for H2 to assist with practical subdivision and diversity in built form is accepted.</p>

		<p>density clusters good – encourages diversity of residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 49.2.2.4 – support, but change “[total number] of residential units” to “[density] of residential units”. Provision should be made for allotments to be divided into two or 3 allotments/unit titles to assist multi-generational and or extended families to provide for whole of life. • 49.1 Zone Purpose – support, especially integration with lower density residential units. • 49.5.11 Standard – oppose – change activity status to discretionary for H2 to provide for minor further subdivision, change to discretionary. • 49.2.5 – Oppose – Provide for residential visitor accommodation as controlled activity with appropriate conditions in H2 precinct. • 49.2.4 – Support – provisions for schools, shops, parks etc. • Support LM Zone area. • 49.4.5 – Oppose – change provision relating to development not occurring prior to corresponding transport infrastructure to include exception for where subdivision of existing allotment into 2 allotments, or is creation of unit titles for existing building. Linking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 8 • Pg 13 • Pg 18 • Pg 22 • Pg 31 • Pg 44 • Pg 45 • Pg 56 • Pg 62 • Pg 63 • Pg 64 • Pg 65 • Pg 110 • Pg 116 • Pg 122 • Pg 151 • Pg 166 • Pg 167 • Pg 176 • Pg 179 	<p>Rule 49.5.10 The removal of the obligation to wait until public infrastructure on the northern side of State Highway 6 is built before development on H2 could commence is accepted.</p> <p>Clarification: What in practical terms is envisaged by an ‘Active Travel link’ to SH6 bus stops that do not exist?</p> <p>Jeff advised this was a path/route suitable for pedestrians and cyclists to the bus stop. Not a footpath, something less</p> <p>Rule 49.6 continues to provide for the non-notification of applications and remains supported.</p> <p>Rule 49.8 continue to support structure plan [plan drawing] as proposed.</p> <p>Rule 49.8 Recommended change to Low Density Suburban Residential Zone not adopted, however may accept if rule 49.5.11 is amended to an appropriate maximum.</p> <p>2. <u>Issues not addressed where accountability now rests with the Council as promotor of this Plan Change.</u></p> <p>Rule 36.5.2 specifying rural levels of nighttime noise will preclude the use of energy efficient heating such as Heat Pumps.</p> <p>Rule 49.2.1.1 We remain of the view the wording of this policy ‘requiring’ adherence will limited the opportunity to optimise the plan.</p> <p>Rule 49.7 was supported without amendment. Nevertheless, the proposed changes are accepted.</p> <p><u>3. Issues that must be addressed</u></p> <p>Integration and Density</p> <p>Koko Ridge has made repeated representations, submissions and correspondence regards errors and omissions with respect to Integration and Density. One key issue remains to be addressed:</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>development to infrastructure projects problematic, not in developers control. Concerns about delivery by Waka Kotahi and ORC and tied to their budgets. Koko Ridge already subdivided and future applicants will be seeking existing lots into two or seeking consent to unit title existing structure. Adjustment to density minor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 49.6 – Non-notification of applications = supported. • 49.2.7 = Precincts objectives and policies – should allow for variation in lot sizes as well as variation in height, bulk and location of built form. Support low density suburban character, but can be achieved by providing range of lot sizes and densities over H2 zone. • 49.8 Structure Plan – support – retain building area restriction zone to 25m in H2 Precinct, or further reduce. Support building setback for H1 and H2 from top of terrace. • 49.8 Structure plan – change low density residential sub-area H2 to provide for residential flats up to 70m² as permitted activity, or zone Koko Ridge land as LDSR to achieve better integration with Qtown Country Club. • 49.2.1 – Encourage consistency with structure plan, not ‘require’. 		<p>Koko Ridge comprises 8.3ha of developable land is near to Shotover Country and zoned Large Lot Residential A. The property is currently being subdivided into 37 lots under those rules. This is a yield of 4.5 homes per Hectare.</p> <p>It is noted that the nearby Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate are conventional low density residential sub-divisions with an actual residential density of approximately 14 homes per hectare.</p> <p>Sub-areas H1, H2 [Koko Ridge] and I1 are all proposed to be rezoned for very low density residential housing under the TPLM plan change, but are to be constrained by a specified maximum number of homes per zone. The yield for H1 and I1 is approximately 13 homes per hectare and the yield for H2 [Koko Ridge] is inexplicitly just 7.2 homes per hectare.</p> <p>To achieve a consistent residential density of 13 homes per hectare.</p> <p>It is noted that even at this fully developed yield the average section size within Zone 2 would be over 750m².</p> <p><u>4.Essential Changes:</u></p> <p>The table in rule 49.5.11 is to be amended so that the maximum number of residential units achieves a consistent yield for Sub-areas H1,H2 & I1.</p> <p>Jeff advised this is traffic driven but this Tim considers that this cannot be correct as all the Sub-areas are accessed of Stalker Road. Jeff will discuss with the Traffic experts are then call Tim to resolve.</p> <p>Amendments must be made in the car parking rule 29.5 to recognise the current permitted car parking use by owners of the existing 2,000m² sections in zone H2. In particular these homes are large, have more than 3 bedrooms, may operate a home based business and the occupiers have boats, caravans and other high value recreation assets that they keep on their properties. We already have specific covenants on these lots to manage how this is done, as it is an anticipated use on these types of properties.</p> <p>An essential Change:</p> <p>Exempt any lots over 2,000m² from rule 29.5.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29.5.12A – Delete standard specifying maximum carparking – or exception for boats caravans, high value recreational assets. 	<p>This may not be an issue, legal (Kate) to check.</p> <p>It is my view that it is likely that many of the 38 existing Large Lot residential lots will need resource consent when seeking to use their land as envisaged by the approved subdivision. This issue may be wider than just car parking. This issue is unique to Sub-Area H2 as all the other land is currently zoned rural. Jeff is to consider and come back to the submitter with a position.</p> <p>The Carona Trust [#99] has made a submission against the TPLM Plan Change and raised specific matters in respect of parts of the Koko Ridge Land [H2]. Koko Ridge has made further submissions so as to be able to adequately respond.</p> <p>Koko ridge note that the photoshopped photos provided by the Carona Trust are at best mis-leading and that furthermore they could have submitted professional work in their possession but chose not to as it does not support their submission. Nevertheless, this did not stop the Corona Trust referring to a report by Landscape Architects, Isthmus and pretending it supports their position when it does not.</p> <p>Koko Ridge intends to attach evidence from earlier proceedings to its submission at the hearing. Kate advised Tim it would be prudent to seek confirmation from the Panel on reliance of previous expert evidence, i.e. submit any existing expert witness evidence next week and seek leave that the evidence submitted can be accepted without the writers be summoned to the hearing.</p> <p>Mr Lowe, the Councils Urban Design expert witness assessed the substantive issue of overlooking and concluded the 8m overlay is appropriate and a reduction to 5.5m is unnecessary. However, presumably based on the mis-leading photos provided by the submitter (99) and not understanding where the actual title boundary is, suggested that a localised building height reduction to 5.5m near the submitters boundary was appropriate [para 53]. In the section 42a report this is miraculously converted into a doubling of the 2m setback along the entire LLR-A zone boundary to 4m. (New proposed rule 49.5.6.5. on page 152 of s42a report.) AND then it morphs into new rule 49.5.6.5 encompassing the entire Southern boundary of Sub Area H2 (pg 198). This rule is unnecessary as the effects (if any) are less than minor from the existing permitted baseline and as drafted this proposed change is deeply flawed.</p>
--	--	---	--

				<p>Noting that no other landowners have submitted on this issue (and some have made submissions), If this rule was limited to the shared boundary with the Corona Trust land and referenced to the terrace edge (as probably intended) we would at least be able to consider it.</p> <p>As it stands, this new rule is opposed, and this matter will need to be resolved through the hearing at considerable time and cost.</p> <p>Koko Ridge formally request that,as a matter of fair process, they be heard a reasonable time after Corona Trust in the hearing schedule. This is a formal request.</p>
82	Dooley, Bishop Michael (Roman Catholic Bishop of Dunedin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter is an interested party of a block of land with notified zoning medium density residential (prospective purchaser of Lot 2 created by RM220154) • Seeks a bespoke education and places of worship activity area over Lot 2 (to facilitation a school, church and ancillary staff accommodation). And if not used for this purpose, then default Medium Density Precinct Zoning applies • And / or amend rules to provide for some non-residential activities to occur in residential precincts 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • Pg 183 – 184 – Rezoning Submission • Pg 201 <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 10 • Pg 68 • Pg 70 • Pg 71 • Pg 73 • Pg 178 	Confirmed they are not speaking and are intending to call expert planning evidence.
83	Warren Hanley (Otago Regional Council)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grow Well Whaiora Partnership with QLDC, and deliver NPS-UD. • Lake Hayes – Sensitive, existing water quality issues. Supports Policy 24.2.4.2, considers LM can be developed consistent with this and NPS-UD. 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [7.15] – [7.24] – Regional Policy Statements • [11.36] - [11.98] - 	Confirmed that they cannot attend. QLDC will follow up with ORC anything that needs following up

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure planning framework in LM strategically connected with public transport, support multi-modal transport options. • Considers LM can be developed consistent with Regional Policy Statement provisions relating to – <p>Partially operative RPS 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values of ecosystems and natural resources recognised and maintained/enhanced – Freshwater, Air quality, Soil erosion • Natural hazards • Energy resources supply • Energy efficient transport • Urban growth – providing for growth, integrating infrastructure with land use, urban design, low impact design <p>Proposed RPS 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambient air quality • Discharges to air • Te mana o te Wai • Form and function of urban areas • Development of urban areas • Urban development and climate change • Urban expansion • Energy use 	<p>Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.86] - [11.89] - Theme D - sub theme - Higher order objectives • [11.215] - [11.236] - Theme I - Stormwater and ecology • [11.202] - [11.214] - Theme H - Infrastructure staging triggers 	
84	John Hilhorst (FlightPlan 2050)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable civil emergency use of SH6 along Ladies Mile by Hercules aircraft • Seek that the BRA extended across open space precinct and that landscaping be restricted to plants less than 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for 	<p>Group Flightplan 2050 began 5 years ago concerned with the location of Qtown airport. Group has done a number of reports which are on its website. Not a lot of engagement during Covid but that will change.</p> <p>In terms of the variation, it is requesting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retaining 80m setback crucial variation moves to 25m.

		<p>2m high within 30m of the road centreline and 4m for the remainder up to 40m from the road centreline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural Hazard risk to Queenstown, therefore cannot rely on Queenstown Airport only. Variation area is the most appropriate for an emergency runway 	<p>urban development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.260] - [11.270] - Theme M - Aviation issues <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pg 123 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attention paid to landscaping not to include avenue of trees. - Retain potential to use roadway as emergency runway / civil emergency. - Run in conjunction with airport and relates to future discussion. <p>These amendments are easy and come at no cost.</p> <p>11.22.6 recommendation is to not do anything regarding submission. Spoke to Jeff during public consultation on original Ladies Mile only discussion was that he flies into Queenstown reasonably regularly and doesn't want to fly to Tarras and then need to travel to Queenstown. John is dismayed at lens of Jeff's self-interest so that is understandable re his advice. S 42A has undervalued our concerns and dismisses the issue yet it is a key strategic issue.</p> <p>Will take to Panel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District emergency risk Credibility of Tarras airport Potential removal of airport from Frankton Ladies Mile will mean 100 years of zone. Don't agree with Jeff that this will be a much shorter timeframe <p>With regard to the civil emergency aspect, more than just a few helicopters will be needed (eg would need to move 100k people out of Queenstown in short timeframe and months without roading with lots of trucks etc that would have to come by air).</p> <p>Idea that if one piece of infrastructure (the airport or other roads) breaks another will break is not appropriate – there is always merit in having a 2nd option even with an airport in situ.</p> <p>Credibility of Tarras – there is a motivated investor with capacity, capacity issues for Queenstown airport (eg refers to comment of the Chief Operating Officer (now the CEO of Auckland Airport), Christopher Luxton as CE of Air NZ, both the current and previous Mayor of Queenstown has attacked it but that is in-fighting. BRANZ has noted that it needs to be done. Issue is beyond this Council.</p> <p>Climate change is a big hurdle. Queenstown is a big contributor to climate change re tourism effects – air use. Moving of Queenstown airport and having high density at Frankton is the best response to climate change. Enables a more credible strategy.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>Need to investigate if the concern is that, in terms of Frankton flats, this is the best place to address this issue and the Ladies Mile variation doesn't achieve this.</p> <p>Air noise boundary restricts development at Frankton Flats.</p> <p>He considers that Jeff underestimates the proposal of providing an urban campus in the area in significant need of economic diversification. Economy more concentrated in terms of tourism; not less. Should diversify the economy in Queenstown and Frankton Flats is the answer.</p> <p>Council owns the airport - urban development capacity shortfall estimates that the residential capacity will reduce – Frankton Flats should be most dense.</p> <p>Advice to panel misses this point.</p> <p>Jeff noted that the avenue of the Ladies Mile Road is a narrow issue and questioned the broader issue and John's understanding of the political will – John considers it is an issue council is dealing with. Yes some do support proposal.</p> <p>Facilitator noted that the Panel has limited ability in terms of scope to address some of the submission points but understands it is relevant context to this submission.</p>
86	Sarah Hodgson (Ministry of Education)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New primary and secondary school site required – undertook site identification and evaluation exercise for both schools – LM consortium – overall conclusion in 2021 was LM locale could support provision of primary and secondary schools. • MoE invested considerable effort discussing with landowners in the LM Area – ongoing – to understand development timing and potential future locations of land that could be acquired. Not yet acquired any land for education purposes in area. • Area indicates on illustrative 'masterplan' does not align with 	S 42A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • [11.78] - [11.80] - Theme D - sub theme - Shotover Primary school • [11.154] - [11.157] - Theme F - sub theme - Uncertainty 	Not attending because they are calling expert evidence.

		<p>MoE's current preferred position or proposed school site locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoE continue to work with stakeholders and QLDC to identify and acquire suitable land. • Generally supportive of proposed variation and inclusion of educational facilities. • Seeks specific wording changes – • Urban Development - 4.2.2.21 – Supports inclusion of specific objective enabling community facilities, requests education activities specifically mentioned. • Transport - POL 49.2.5.1, POL 49.2.6.1, POL 49.2.6.3, POL 49.2.6.4 – Support and retain as proposed • Transport - POL 49.2.6.6 – Requiring workplace and school travel plans – supports in part, but wants wording changed from 'demonstrating how' private car trips reduced to 'aim to reduce' private vehicle trips. • Rule 49.4.10 – Support educational facilities as permitted activity in TPLM • Rule 49.4.17 – Support in part provision of, but wants Open Space Precinct included to not preclude opportunity for education 	<p>schools will eventuate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 194 • Pg 201 • Pg 226 <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 19 • Pg 22 • Pg 24 • Pg 26 • Pg 29 • Pg 46 • Pg 48 • Pg 72 • Pg 101 • Pg 109 • Pg 116 • Pg 141 • Pg 159 • Pg 168 • Pg 172 	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>activities within Open Space Precinct noting its size and central location and accessibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 49.5.56 – Standards for Open Space Precinct – Staging development to integrate with transport infrastructure – support in part, but requests eastern roundabout on SH6 included in list of transport infrastructural works.• 49.5.44 – Standards for activities in Commercial Precinct and Glenplanel – support education activities included, retain as proposed.• 49.5.16 – Requests that Stormwater Management Area and Swales are listed as exclusion of gross developable areas as individual site stormwater management required.• 27.7.28 – Support in part, with inclusion of potential land use outcomes as consideration.• 29.5.1.2A Transport rules – Supportive of max parking requirements, but proposed requirement for visitor space per classroom does not align with parking provisions across the motu, requested removed.• 29.10.7 – Minimum requirements for cycle parking, lockers and shower – Support in part, but requirement for end trip facilities (lockers, showers) not appropriate.		
--	--	---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49.7.2 – Assessment matters for site and building design – support and retain as proposed. 		
89	Stuart Victor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent research on work vehicles using LM each day – Unable to use modal shift. Back up plan if modal shift does not occur. Adding apartments for up to 10,000 people reckless – effect all surrounding areas, including commuters. Already traffic jams. Emergency services will be unable to cross Shotover Bridge Traffic solution needs to occur before (if ever) land rezoned Streamlined planning process slap in face. 90% of community against further development. 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development [11.18] - [11.35] - Theme C - consultation issues [11.33] - [11.32] - Theme C - sub theme - majority opposition [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects <p>Look at evidence of Colin Shields and Tony Piccard</p> <p>Consultation Section 11 theme C</p> <p>Vicki Jones - Change in size of supermarket also recommended</p>	<p>Section 42A - too much focus on modal shift and works that need to be done (eg bus lane). It must be proven to work before it gets done.</p> <p>The variation is in the wrong location – the land should stay rural.</p> <p>Extra traffic will cause stress, missed meeting, flights etc and a negative perception of Queenstown, which will negatively impact the economy.</p> <p>Many are tradies can't take public transport.</p> <p>Opposition ignored by QLDC. Reference to Lake Hayes etc in term of where opposition is coming from.</p> <p>How can the addition of 10k people improve things?</p> <p>What about summer maintenance work to the bridge resulting in further congestion?</p> <p>Note the proposed bus lane seems to be one of solutions by QLDC but currently can't get the busses out of Shotover country. Those coming from out of town expect to come into town without traffic issues. Already challenging and getting comments from current visitors that is an issue and a problem getting to activities. This development can't be undone. Modal shift for Shotover/Lake Hayes residents is not realistic. Also need to think about traffic from Wanaka and Cronwell etc.</p> <p>As a manager in the tourism industry for 25 years this won't be attractive. Will be hard to move people around the area only get worse with this development. Companies that come to Queenstown on incentive programmes for short times say traffic terrible and they are often late for events.</p> <p>Need to protect for future generations or no one will want to live here or visit.</p> <p>What is the backup plan if this doesn't work? It can't be undone once it's done and concern that it is risky to rely so much on the modal shift to public transport. If approved infrastructural works are to occur, then these must be proven to work before they happen.</p> <p>Residents will always need to cross Shotover Bridge.</p>

				<p>Need to take into consideration the need for travel from Wanaka, Arrowtown etc.</p> <p>Jeff – Reiterate looking at evidence of Colin Shields and Tony Pickard focused on Traffic issues. Have a read of Section 11 theme D in the S42A report. Also, Waka Kotahi submission and evidence</p>
95	Charlie Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support in full • Support Zone Purpose in Appendix B • Support visitor accommodation as non-complying, reduce rental prices. 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • [11.167] – [11.184] – Theme F – sub theme – Affordable housing • [11.237] - [11.245] - Theme J - Visitor accommodation <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 42 	Did not attend
96	Ross Copland (Ferry Hill Trust)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape • Agree with landscape architect - land has been significantly changed, further development of little consequence – should also apply to Hansen Road as well. 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 161 – 162 – Rezoning submissions • [11.202] - [11.214] - Theme H - Infrastructure staging triggers 	Do not attend

		<p>Zone Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zone Objectives – Good, but provide only very limited additional infrastructure capacity proposed. <p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport studies confirm irrespective of minor network capacity upgrades, strong residual demand for SH6. • Existing infrastructure constraints severe. • Existing infrastructure constraints severe – LM would exacerbate all current issues (trip time, travel speed, transport network resilience – conflict with objectives and values of LM). • Rezoning would need large infrastructure investment – Definitely need dual carriageway along SH6 from LM to BP Roundabout (w bus priority). • Masterplan documents notes it creates significant unfunded infrastructure – now completely disregard inequity of forcing existing QLDC ratepayers (or NZTA) to fund the infrastructure upgrades necessitated by Masterplan. • Would support rezoning if – 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects • [11.99] - [11.149] - Theme E - Alternative locations 	
--	--	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Funding – QLDC commit to applying a development contribution, IFF Act payment or Targeted Rate sufficient to fund all construction and maintenance of infrastructure.• Vesting of land – all land for secondary school to be vested in MoE and zoned for that exclusive purpose. Sufficient land vested to widen SH6 for full dual carriageway to NZTA as condition of Zoning.• Vesting or acquisition by developer of land to construct grade-separated local road for cars travelling between Shotover Country / LHE and new zone to eliminate cross-flowing traffic. <p>PDP amended as follows –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify and zone Mass Rapid Transit Corridor where cablecar is a Controlled activity connecting Queenstown to Frankton bus interchange and LM.• Rezone land adjacent to Hansen Road for HD Residential to increase in supply of housing to infrastructure and services.		
--	--	---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve proposed Middleton Development in Tucker Beach submitted during PDP process & any other proposed development serviced by existing infrastructure to improve housing supply. • Remove requirement to obtain resource consent for each residential unit – inefficient means of controlling design. • Commit to congestion charged when enabled by law. • Apply for Tier 1 Status under NPS-UD. 		
97	Philippa Crick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on Outstanding Natural Landscape of development, pristine environment. • Traffic – Ongoing issues, coming back post-covid, buses won't alleviate. No population base to fully support public transport, alternative routes for traffic movement impossible. Adding 10,000 people insane. Shotover Bridge already reached capacity, 2018 QLDC stated bridge at capacity within 5 years. People rely on Bridge (tradespeople, hospitality, tourists, retired individuals, families) rely on bridge for commuting, travelling and groceries. LMV would further 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects • [11.60] - [11.66] - Theme D - sub-theme - Landscape and rural character 	Not attending nor is she attending the hearing. Rosemary Crick (mother) will cover off her submission – see 123)

		<p>exacerbate stress levels, noise pollution, frustration and safety risks along SH6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure – cost to provide drains and water infrastructure ultimately on QLDC, and ratepayers do not support development. Financial burden. Many ongoing projects, where will workforce come from. • Visual impact – cf village in California, strict design guidelines contributing to appeal of town. Negative impacts from Queenstown and Frankton already, quality and density of high density housing, and these have higher building heights. • Affordable housing unrealistic e.g. Lake Hayes. • ONL – Slope Hill & whole area & arterial route through Queenstown – detrimental impact on entire landscape and wider community. Other development tucked away (oppose LM). Better valleys and nooks e.g. Quail Rise – attractiveness with discretion. Damages entranced to city. • Reduce AirBNBs and short term accommodation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 162 – 167 (pg 164)– Rezoning submissions 	
99	Brett Giddens (Corona Trust)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site not included in variation area but abuts Low Density Residential Precinct • Supports intense development along SH6 • Oppose proposed intensification of the land 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for 	Did not attend

		<p>shown as sub-area H2 in the LDR precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation has adverse effects that have been overlooked. Inappropriate use of this land affects the submitter • Seeks that this land is removed from the variation or that effects on the submitter are addressed through amendments to provisions 	<p>urban development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.185] - [11.201] - Theme G - Density minima • Pg 148 – 152 Rezoning submission • Pg 189 • Pg 198 <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 3 • Pg 8 • Pg 9 • Pg 20 • Pg 21 • Pg 29 • Pg 30 • Pg 32 • Pg 57 • Pg 58 • Pg 65 • Pg 110 • Pg 111 • Pg 124 • Pg 125 • Pg 141 • Pg 142 • Pg 156 • Pg 164 • Pg 165 • Pg 179 	
101	David Finlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner of 21 and 25 McDowell Drive • Zoning, height and structure plans should be merged to 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriatene 	<p>Confirmed location on eastern edge of masterplan adjoining Threeewood farm. Also a member of Threeewood Assn.</p> <p>Overall, he is comfortable with the changes being proposed in the s 42A report in response to his submission but noted the following:</p>

		<p>avoid contradictions between plans e.g. zoning of Open Space area in northern corner of submitters land or the height limit that applies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans unclear whether unformed road that extends to north of McDowell Drive are proposed to be closed / used as road / for active transport purposes. The proposed Structure Plan identifies Sub Areas A to J. With the exception of one proposed subdivision assessment matter; the rules in the proposed Variation do not make any reference to those sub-areas. The Medium Density Residential precinct located on the eastern side of the submitters land (Sub Area G) is particularly narrow, and should be widened to a consistent width for the length of that boundary to ensure the land can be reasonably used and developed. Wording changes to policies to achieve density (e.g. 'promote' instead of 'avoid' not meeting densities in each Precinct) & visual interest built design policy. R 49.5.15 – Change rule requiring implementation of Structure Plan – identification of 'Open Space' in northern corridor on submitters land – 	<p>ss of TPLM for urban development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pg 162 – 167 – Rezoning submissions <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pg 11 Pg 12 Pg 13 Pg 34 Pg 70 Pg 72 Pg 74 Pg 76 Pg 101 Pg 125 Pg 126 	<p>Landscape vegetation buffer supported, and Dave F has started to establish a shelter belt along the collector road.</p> <p>Moving the road to the east makes sense as otherwise it would leave a strip of land that is too wide. Comfortable with buffer but noted it would be nice if round-about could be moved further east also.</p> <p>Kate noted that there are topographical constraints that limit the extent to which the roundabout can be moved east.</p> <p>In relation to the revision to Collector Road B setback and buffer zone, that will require a lot of vegetation within the buffer area. Wonder if it has to be as big as it is, from his own arborist landscaper background. Could be hard to look after.</p> <p>Collector road E taken a lot of land for those. Any consideration around that?</p> <p>Suggested that within revised Collector Road B, there could be space to include parking.</p> <p>Setbacks that have been revised for high to med density; he is assuming the lines are indicative in the revised eastern boundary study.</p> <p>Jeff asked David to email his points and he will forward to the urban design team to investigate and clarify.</p> <p>The paper road at the northern boundary of the property. While nice to have, he questioned whether providing an active link within the paper road is necessary and cost effective given there is already an active transport link through collector road A and another at the front of the property in the plan. He is also aware of Threepwood's concerns relating to how they will manage the farm with that road developed as an active link. He noted that he can view traffic from his property and that during school holidays the traffic congestion drops and increases again when school starts. Happened last three years. Less traffic issues when school holidays on considers the school traffic is a significant driving force.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>requests 'Open space' area be deleted from the Structure Plan, provide for those in later proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• R 49.5.16 – Density rule – opposed to non-complying status of residential development in MDR and HDR precincts that do not achieve min density requirements.• R 49.5.16 – Gross Developable Area should be included in Definitions Chapter rather than part of rule.• R 49.5.17.1 and 1 – Oppose non-complying and restricted discretionary rules on number of floor levels.• R 49.5.17 – Amend structure plan to include reference to building height limits, as opposed to separate plan. Building Height Plan includes references to min. 5 storey overlay and max. 3 storey overlay – notations not references in objectives, policies and rules.• R 49.5.18 – recession plane should not apply to MDR precinct at eastern end of TPLM (Sub Area G)• Stormwater concerns• Active transport concerns – routes, timing of them, provision of routes and design		
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any provision of open space should be fairly identified If submitters land is not included in MDR precinct, land should offset all open space reserve requirement for development of remainder of submitters land 		
103 (as per 80)	Tim Allan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support residential intensification of Ladies Mile but consider plan variation is an inferior outcome compared to earlier speak housing area proposals Failure to provide affordable housing (4 storey apartments uneconomic) Transport congestion (mode shift not realistic in Queenstown environment) Previous proposals for Special Housing Areas better than current variation proposal including because of funding opportunities <p>Seek as relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed modality of lot sizes Rather than limit development progress to performance of third party agencies, provide for preparatory stages of residential development to be planned for and commenced. Any provision that seeks development to be limited or stopped until 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.167] – [11.184] – Theme F – sub theme – Affordable housing [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development Pg 229 <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pg 56 Pg 63 Pg 64 Pg 126 Pg 151 	<p>Covered off this submission in his earlier one submission 80 above</p> <p>He commented that his submission was largely about traffic modal changes but it appears to have been merged the other submission in the section 42A.</p>

		infrastructure is completed is deleted		
106	Ben Farrell (Queenstown Country Club Village Ltd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the variation in its entirety • The proposal to protect existing trees along the Ladies Mile via the district plan, and the proposal to impose a Building Restriction Area on the QCC site, are not necessary, not appropriate, and are not suitably justified. • Retirement village development should not be subject to the same design rules and standards as residential development in the LDRZ or the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Zone. • QCC was approved in the context of the Ladies Mile being a rural environment. Changing the environment to urban (as is proposed by the variation) changes the context in which the QCC is located. It is reasonable and appropriate to enable opportunities for the layout and design of the QCC to be reconsidered in the context of this proposed new urban environment. • Seek that the proposal is rejected or seek to amend provisions to achieve the above including: on QCC retirement village is a permitted activity, delete BRA and structure plan references to trees on the QCC site, exclude QCC site from being subject to provisions relating to residential density and minimum lot sizes, permit 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • Pg 172 – 174 – Rezoning submission <p>Appendix D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 55 • Pg 127 • Pg 128 • Pg 142 • Pg 143 • Pg 145 • Pg 161 • Pg 179 • Pg 180 	Not attending because they are calling experts. Did attend to view other submitters for a brief time

		education and civil defence activities on QCC site		
118	Martin Barrett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queenstown cannot grow at its current rate given its typography, infrastructure and other constraints Council needs to slow down growth and instead immediately establish temporary short term accommodation and embark on long term council rental housing <p>Submitter raises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic problems: need to address traffic issues before land is rezoned (instead of upgrading infrastructure before building starts) Car ownership problems: cars are a necessity and Council cannot control this. Future parking problem is inevitable Density problems: dense town jammed into a small area. Long term issues with density – social behaviour and minimal control Visual: visual impacts of variation on SH6. Visual mitigation planting helpful but multi storey apartments will be visible. Design control and extensive setbacks critical. Ratepayer cost: cost borne on QLDC that should be on developers (infrastructure and project management costs) 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.9] - 11.17] - Theme B - More land not required for urban growth [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development [11.60] - [11.66] - Theme D - sub-theme - Landscape and rural character [11.81] – [11.83] – Theme D – other effects – social behavioural problems [11.81] – [11.83] – Theme D – other effects – litigation risks [11.99] - [11.149] - Theme E - Alternative locations [11.116] – [11.121] Theme E – 	Did not attend

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership: likely that many units bought by investors and out of towners and will lead to high rents and more Air BnBs • Infrastructure: sewage and stormwater will need to be provided and funded by Council • Legal litigation: potential for litigation and associated costs considerable • Control of development: hard to see how masterplan can be achieved given how many parties are involved • Alternative idea: relocate Queenstown Airport to Kingston and redevelop the Airport land for housing 	<p>sub theme – Queenstown Airport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.122] – [11.123] Theme E – sub theme – Queenstown Kingston • [11.152] - [11.153] - Theme F - uncertainty development will occur • Pg 162 – 167 (pg 164 specifically) Rezoning submission 	
121	Rebecca Richwhite and Daniel Foggo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will degrade the region – preserve aesthetic appeal, degrade the beauty, piecemeal approach. • Development should be within the existing urban / town areas and not on rural land – prioritise elevated building heights and higher density in urban / town areas rather than urban sprawl. These already have the infrastructure. Developing laterally instead of upwards. • Sprawl creating traffic issues. 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development • [11.99] - [11.149] - Theme E - Alternative locations • [11.60] - [11.66] - Theme D - sub-theme - Landscape and rural character 	Did not attend

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects 	
123	Rosemary Lee Crick	<p>Traffic and infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic bad already – gridlock Not a safe transport network, dangerous to add 10,000 more people. Shotover Bridge reached capacity – 2018 QLDC stated “Shotover Bridge would be at capacity within 5 years and that any further density development east of the bridge should not be granted” People unable to use public transport – e.g. trades peoples, people requiring vehicles <p>No infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ratepayers do not want this development, all costs to ratepayers, currently already works going on – where are people Needs more supporting data <p>Visual impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frankton could have been more architecturally consistent, lost opportunities. Negative impacts of poor 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.36] - [11.98] - Theme D - Appropriateness of TPLM for urban development Pg 162 – 167 (pg 164 specifically) Rezoning submission [11.39] – [11.59] - Theme D – sub-theme Traffic effects [11.202] - [11.214] - Theme H - Infrastructure staging triggers [11.60] - [11.66] - Theme D - sub-theme - Landscape and rural character [11.249] - [11.259] - Theme L - Sustainability / 	<p>Endorsed Philip Blakely’s submission, which she sat through.</p> <p>Don’t wish to go over some points such as traffic / Shotover Bridge as others have covered this.</p> <p>Lay person submitter owned home for over 30 years.</p> <p>Havsn’t read s42A report – got pages section 11 printed yesterday and has started going through this.</p> <p>Witnessed a great deal of change over 30 years. Apparent lack of appreciation of aesthetics of the area in QLDC. Previous Council workshops and representatives laid down a prescription of the town centre in approximately 1996.</p> <p>cited concerns about the Hamilton building and Sofitel hotel building to a higher height, which has caused a domino effect whereby residents lost their views but Council’s view was that houses could add a storey and then the layer behind would add another storey, and so on.</p> <p>This ‘lack of care’ has continued.</p> <p>Section 11 of the s42A notes that a number of submitters note that growth in the district should be stopped or slowed. The s 42A seems to wipe out the concern of the community that the land/ landscape is being destroyed and there seems to be no acknowledgement of the genuine concerns that many in the community have.</p> <p>Land and landscape and rural character will all be destroyed by this development and it will devalue the Slope Hill ONL.</p> <p>The s 42A Report throughout assumes things like that it will achieve a well-functioning urban environment. Doesn’t tally up and will not achieve this. E.g. there is already a back up of traffic to Amisfield; grid locked much of the time. Report mantra of disagreement of submitters. Submitters are met with a brick wall. What has council done about design / strategy. How does council manage aesthetics of development?</p>

		<p>design and use of inferior building materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.g. Gorge Road development – lack of aesthetics, or provisions for a quality of life <p>Area of ONL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slopehill ONL Main arterial route – ruin entering the District. Not hidden away like Quail Rise and Lake Hayes <p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No consideration for landfill management, and climate change No affordable housing – Lake Hays not affordable Community doesn't want the development – downstream effect and frustration from community if not listened to Not measured plan, highly reactive approach with numerous unfortunate consequences 	<p>climate change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.18] - [11.35] - Theme C - consultation issues 	<p>There are 2 realities – what the report says and what the community says it is.</p> <p>Public transport does make sense – reference to buses and carparks. But who monitors how people get around; what about tradies – things are every which way in Queenstown.</p> <p>Modal shift in behaviour is hard to understand. Takes over an hour for people who live in Fernhill to get to Frankton..</p> <p>Affordable housing - how is that possible? It is not happening now in Queenstown and is not providing for affordable housing.</p> <p>Has no faith in council to provide design guidelines for developers, citing examples of poor design and poor quality of living such as the Holiday Inn, the Ngai Tahu development on Gorge Rd.</p> <p>Guideline and strategy - what is proposed?</p> <p>Jeff noted that there are design guides in the provisions (at – section 13 of the s42A report) – there are numerous references to quality of design e.g. rule 49.4.4 and a suite of assessment matters in 49.7.</p> <p>She will review these provisions ahead of the hearing. She has no faith in council to ensure quality design aesthetics and to address the visual impact (e.g, through colour palettes and character guidelines) based on what has happened..</p> <p>This is Council pushing against the community.</p> <p>Facilitator noted independence of Panel and importance of her presentation to the Panel. Urged her to look at additional design guidelines and assessments.</p>
136	Brendon Liggett (Kainga Ora)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose large part of FENZ submission (36), largely because building consent processes rather than RMA matters. Opposes building setbacks from state highways as are unnecessary and impede development – setbacks aren't provided for further 	<p>S 42A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [11.167] – [11.184] – Theme F – sub theme – Affordable housing [11.177] – [11.178] – Specific 	<p>Did not attend</p>

		<p>south west as you travel down SH6 (support OS46.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes submissions seeking single detached dwellings (Werner Murray). • Opposes Waka Kotahi's reliance on standards 'metric setbacks' to identify the areas of land adjacent to State Highways and railway lines that require acoustic treatment. • For Glenpanel Development submission in so far- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does not support 1-2 dwellings per site as a permitted activity, and opposes reduction in minimum density (40 – 48, to 25-30) ○ Supports more enabling recession planes, yard setbacks, one building height for all of medium density precinct with no 'step-down', supports 3 dwellings on a site as a permitted activity, increase in commercial centre heights. • Opposes Ladies Mile Property Syndicate submission re reduction in minimum density, and 	<p>discussion on submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [11.185] - [11.201] - Theme G - Density minima 	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>weakening of policy wording “avoid subdivision”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opposes Sanderson Group submission with regards to –<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ any weakening of “requiring higher residential densities” to “enabling”;○ opposes any reduction in minimum density;○ opposes provisions suggested for setback from rural living area as that reduces density outcomes.• Opposes setbacks from rural areas as impedes ability to achieve density outcomes.		
--	--	--	--	--