

Appendix B: Summary Response to the Brief

Key Points	Project Team Response
The Hearing Panel considered that an additional study of the Wakatipu Basin was required to:	
<p>a Identify the environmental characteristics and amenity values of the area that should be maintained and enhanced, noting that these will vary across the Wakatipu Basin floor.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).</p>
<p>b Identify those areas able to absorb development without adversely affecting the values derived in (a) and without adversely affecting the values associated with the surrounding Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).</p>
<p>c Identify those areas that are unable to absorb such development.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).</p>
<p>d Determine whether, given the residual development already consented, there is any capacity for further development in the Wakatipu Basin floor and, if there is, where it should be located and what form it should take.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).</p>
The council's brief (dated September 2016) requires the study:	
<p>a To critically review the Council's reports and evidence used to date to support the PDP as it relates to the approach to manage development in the Wakatipu Basin, and to consider submissions received on zoning in the Wakatipu Basin and the evidence relevant to the Wakatipu Basin heard in the PDP Hearing Streams 1 & 2.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).</p>
<p>b To identify and consider, given the residual development already consented and approved HASHA developments, the capacity of the Wakatipu Basin to accommodate further development, and the nature and type of any such development.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).</p>

Key Points		Project Team Response
c	To identify, at a high level, any other important planning opportunities and constraints including but not limited to transportation, walking and cycle trails, water, waste water and stormwater management, and any environmental constraints such as natural hazards which should be taken into account when considering the future capacity of the Wakatipu Basin to absorb further development.	<p>To be addressed in the draft and final report. Our preliminary response is that relevant assessment criteria can address such matters.</p> <p>Walkways and cycleways pass through many of the landscape units. It is recommended that any future development gives careful consideration to the integration of new development with the existing routes. In units that do not have existing walkways and cycleways, it is recommended that consideration is given to the incorporation of walkways and cycleways.</p>
d	Based on a-c, to provide an assessment of the capacity of the Wakatipu Basin to absorb further development and to recommend resource management methods to appropriately manage the character and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin to achieve the Strategic Direction of the PDP.	These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).
Hearings Panel memo key points		
a	The Rural Zone outside of the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features was largely used for rural living, not farming.	Agreed.
b	The policy direction of the District Plan incorrectly provided an emphasis on farming when farming is barely practised in the Wakatipu Basin.	Agreed. Farming is concentrated in the Outer Wakatipu Basin area and activity levels have changed little over the past decade.
c	The range of activities present in the Wakatipu Basin severely constrains the viability of farming in the Basin.	The existing lot size pattern is the more significant constraint coupled with competing demand for land from higher value rural lifestyle uses that dominate.
d	More provision needs to be made for tourism activities, including small-scale visitor accommodation.	Agreed. Resident and tourist projections indicate on-going high demand for accommodation in the study area.
e	There remains the potential for carefully located development (rural- residential and other) within the Rural Zone.	Agreed. These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).

Key Points		Project Team Response
f	The appropriate density for the Rural Lifestyle Zone is an average of 1 residential building platform per 1 hectare.	<p>In a landscape outcome driven context, the location and form of buildings is, on our finding, more critical than density per se. While a baseline PA density has merit in terms of setting ‘bottom lines’, it can tend to result in homogenous lot size patterns which conflict with facilitation of development that responds to landscape character and amenity.</p> <p>We consider that an appropriate baseline lot size may be 4,000m² rather than 10,000m². Where an existing parent lot is 4ha or more, then a discretionary Comprehensive Development Plan process can be used to enable greater ‘residential lifestyle’ yield, provided key landscape outcomes and protections are achieved; in essence a bonus lot type regime promulgated through a comprehensive development plan process.</p>
g	In both the Rural and Rural Lifestyle Zones, provision should be made for more than 1 dwelling per residential building platform.	The Residential Flat provision as a permitted activity allows for what is often termed a ‘minor dwelling’. Where lot coverage and building form, scale etc. are managed through application consenting processes (as we suggest) allowing for two dwellings may be appropriate but only where that provision replaces the Residential Flat as a permitted activity (which accordingly will be deleted) and where any second dwelling is ‘integral’ to the other dwelling. If not integral, RDA consent should be required.
h	Identify the environmental characteristics and amenity values of the area that should be maintained and enhanced, noting that these will vary across the Wakatipu Basin floor.	These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).
i	Identify those areas able to absorb development without adversely affecting the values derived in (a) and without adversely affecting the values associated with the surrounding Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features.	These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).
j	Identify those areas that are unable to absorb such development.	These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).
k	Determine whether, given the residual development already consented, there is any capacity for further development in the Wakatipu Basin floor and, if there is, where it should be located and what form it should take.	These matters are addressed in the body of this report (and are not repeated here).

Key Points		Project Team Response
l	In the course of the hearing, based on the evidence from the Council and submitters, we came to the preliminary conclusion that continuation of the fully discretionary development regime of the Rural General Zone of the ODP, as proposed by the PDP, was unlikely to achieve the Strategic Direction of the PDP in the Wakatipu Basin over the life of the PDP.	We agree with that tentative finding as discussed elsewhere in this report.
m	We are concerned that, without careful assessment, further development within the Wakatipu Basin has the potential to cumulatively and irreversibly damage the character and amenity values which attract residents and other activities to the area.	We agree with that tentative finding as discussed elsewhere in this report.
n	In addition, we consider there is some merit in the proposition that the rural character and amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin do not derive predominantly from farming and agricultural activities.	We agree with that tentative finding as discussed elsewhere in this report.