

Amy Bowbyes for QLDC: Summary of Evidence, Stream 18 – Settlement Zone Townships Review (Stage 3) and Cardrona (Stage 3B) – Text and variations Lake McKay Partnership Ltd (Submission 3196) - Rezoning request

Text

1. The PDP Settlement Zone (**SETZ**) replaces the Operative Townships Zone and is proposed to apply to the settlements of Makarora, Luggate, Glenorchy, Kinloch, Kingston.
2. Cardrona is currently zoned Operative Rural Visitor Zone and is also proposed to be zoned SETZ in the PDP.
3. Albert Town and Hāwea are currently zoned Operative Townships Zone, and are proposed to be zoned Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone (**LDSRZ**) in the PDP.
4. The SETZ predominantly provides for low-density residential activities, with provision for commercial and visitor accommodation activities in Commercial Precincts and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zones shown on planning maps. Residential development provided for in the SETZ predominantly comprises detached, single-storey dwellings on spacious sites with low building coverage.
5. My key recommended changes to the notified SETZ provisions are briefly summarised as follows:
 - (a) Amending notified Objective 20.2.1 and Policies 20.2.1.1, 20.2.2.1 and 20.2.2.2 to replace the word “intensity” with “density”;
 - (b) Amending notified Policy 20.2.2.6 and adding a new Advice Note in 20.3.3 regarding electricity sub-transmission infrastructure and compliance with the Electrical Code of Practice for Safe Distances (NZECP34:2001);
 - (c) Amending notified Rule 20.5.3 to exclude associated office, storage, staffroom and bathroom activities from the calculation of gross floor area of retail and office activities located in a Commercial Precinct;
 - (d) Amending notified Rule 20.5.10 to provide greater flexibility for heavy vehicles to be parked overnight on sites within Commercial Precincts and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zones; and
 - (e) Amending Rule 30.5.6.6 of Chapter 30 - Energy and Utilities to provide for telecommunications poles up to 15m high in the Commercial Precinct at Cardrona as a Permitted activity, subject to compliance with rules for height recession planes, setbacks,

maximum headframe and antenna dimension, and maximum light reflectance value.

6. In relation to the key outstanding matters of disagreement between myself and submitters who have filed evidence, the following key matters remain in contention:
- (a) Telecommunications pole heights located in the Commercial Precinct at Cardrona, whereby Mr Horne for Spark NZ Ltd and Vodafone (31002) seeks a maximum permitted height of 18m for poles with co-located antennas;
 - (b) The rule framework for education facilities in the SETZ, whereby Mr Frenz for the Ministry of Education (3152) seeks that the National Planning Standards definition of *Education Facility* be included in Chapter 2 – Definitions; and that education facilities are provided for as a Restricted Discretionary activity in areas of the SETZ located outside of a Commercial Precinct, rather than as a Discretionary activity pursuant to notified Rule 20.4.13;
 - (c) The site specific provisions sought by Mr Grace for Kingston Lifestyle Properties Ltd (3297) and Cardrona Village Ltd (31019), which generally seek to add greater flexibility to the SETZ provisions for the submission sites at Kingston and Cardrona;
 - (d) The site specific provisions sought by Mr Williams for Quartz Commercial Group Ltd (3328), which generally seek to add greater flexibility to the LDSRZ provisions for the submission site at Hāwea; and
 - (e) The relief sought by Mr Farrell for Wayfare Ltd (31022) and Cardrona Alpine Resort Ltd (31018) to introduce an enabling framework for worker accommodation in the SETZ.

Lake McKay Partnership rezoning

7. Regarding the Lake McKay Partnership rezoning, as the outstanding matter related to infrastructure has now been resolved through evidence exchange, I recommend at Section 8 of my rebuttal that the rezoning be accepted in part with the amendments outlined at Section 13 of my Evidence in Chief. I note that these amendments are supported by Mr Curley for the submitter (at pages 2 to 4 of Mr Curley's Evidence). I also note that the rezoning is opposed by Queenstown Airport Corporation (FS3436).