
PLANNING EVIDENCE OF BEN FARRELL FOR CHAPTERS 21, 22, 33

APPENDIX BF7

LIST OF KEY PLANNING ISSUES – RURAL LIVING (WAKATIPU BASIN)

TABLED AT QLDC HEARING 26 May 2016

List of Key Planning Issues for Ben Farrell – Rural Living (Wakatipu Basin)

1. Mr Barr's recommended amendments to Objectives 22.2.1 and 22.2.2; Policies 21.2.8.1; 22.2.1.1; 22.2.1.2; and Rule 22.5.1 are appropriate.
2. The most appropriate way to implement the purpose of the Act and Strategic Direction objectives (as amended in my EiC) is to ensure the socioeconomic benefits of rural living development in the Wakatipu Basin are recognised and provided for by inserting a new objective and policy into Chapter 21, and by amending various other provisions in Chapters 21 and 22. This is primarily because:
 - a. The existing 'rural living' character of the Wakatipu Basin is not disputed in landscape evidence and this should be recognised through planning provisions. There is high demand for rural living subdivision and development in the Wakatipu Basin but the PDP does not provide specific policy guidance relating to the Wakatipu Basin.
 - b. The Wakatipu Basin has the capacity to absorb further subdivision and residential development while maintaining and enhancing amenity values and the quality of the environment in terms of s7, and without adversely affecting s6 values.
 - c. The potential for further subdivision and residential development in the Basin is supported by landscape evidence and there appears to be no evidence before you that justifies (in respect of s32 evaluations) why further appropriate subdivision and residential development in the Basin would be inappropriate.
 - d. Providing for continued recognition of rural living development in appropriate parts of the Basin will achieve an efficient and effective use of resources in accordance with section 7(b).
3. As set out in my evidence chapters 21 and 22 should be amended as follows:
 - a. A new Objective and policy should be introduced into Chapter 21 to recognise the (undisputed) rural living character of the Wakatipu Basin and to enable future subdivision and development that maintains that character (refer p.12 of my evidence).
 - b. Objective and policy suite 22.2.1 should provide a more balanced framework for decision-makers considering development proposals, as generally recommended in the s42A Report (refer p.33 of my evidence).
 - c. Assessment Matters 21.7.2 and 21.7.3 should recognise that a variety of activities occur and are appropriate the Rural Zone, including rural living (refer pp.29-32 of my evidence).
 - d. Policy 22.2.2.2 should be deleted as UGBs are not currently identified in a consistent and justified manner (refer pp.33-34 of my evidence).
 - e. For the reasons stated on p.36 of my evidence Rule 22.5.3 should be amended so that buildings within an approved building platform between 500m²-1000m² should be enabled as a controlled activity.
 - f. For the reasons stated on p.36 of my evidence Rules 22.5.12.1 and 22.5.12.2 should be amended to increase the permitted number of residential units from one to two.
 - g. For the reasons stated on p.37 of my evidence Rule 22.5.12.3 should be amended to reduce the 2ha average standard to 1ha.