

**Appendix B** - A copy of the Appellant's further submission;

**Submitter Details**

First Name: **Charlie**  
 Last Name: **Grant**  
 Organisation: **Seven Albert Town Property Owners . See Table in Attachments**  
 On behalf of: **Land Solutions Ltd**  
 Street: **PO Box 577**  
 Suburb:  
 City: **Wanaka**  
 Country: **New Zealand**  
 PostCode: **9343**  
 Daytime Phone: **03 4435246**  
 Mobile: **0274314089**  
 eMail: **landgroup@xtra.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes  
 No

Preferred hearing location:

- |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 1 -<br>Introduction                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 2 - Definitions   | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 3 - Strategic<br>Direction                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 4 - Urban<br>Development                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 5 - Tangata                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 6 - Landscape   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 7 - Low<br>Density Residential        | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 8 - Medium Density<br>Residential                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 9 - High<br>Density<br>Residential      | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 10 - Arrowtown<br>Residential Historic<br>Management Zone | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 11 - Large Lot<br>Residential                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 12 - Queenstown<br>Town Centre                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 13 - Wanaka<br>Town Centre              | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 14 - Arrowtown Town<br>Centre                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 15 - Local<br>Shopping Centres                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 16 - Business<br>Mixed Use Zone                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 17 -<br>Queenstown<br>Airport Mixed Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 21 - Rural Zone   | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 22 - Rural<br>Residential and<br>Rural Lifestyle | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 23 - Gibbston<br>Character Zone                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 26 - Historic<br>Heritage               | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 27 - Subdivision and<br>Development                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 28 - Natural<br>Hazards                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 30 - Energy and<br>Utilities                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 32 -<br>Protected Trees                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 33 - Indigenous<br>Vegetation and<br>Biodiversity         | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 34 - Wilding<br>Exotic Trees                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 35 - Temporary<br>Activities and Relocated<br>Buildings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 36 - Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 37 - Designations   | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 41 - Jacks<br>Point Zone                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 42 - Waterfall Park                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 43 -<br>Millbrook Resort<br>Zone        |   |  |   |

Are you a Certain Person:

- Representing Public Interest  
 Having Special Interest  
 Local Authority

Certain Person Comment: Group of residents whose use of their properties would potentially be affected by the changes requested.

## Submission

---

### Consultation Document Submissions

**Original Submitter:** Alan Cutler (48 Alison Avenue, Albert Town, Wanaka, New Zealand, 9305)(  
Submitter No. 110)

**Original Point:** 110.8 7 Low Density Residential

- Support
- Oppose

#### The reasons for my support or opposition are

The original submission is in three parts. Firstly the submitter supports certain clauses which set standards for light spill onto another site. This part of the original submission is not opposed. Secondly he raises concerns about 'the direction of lights and maximum lux'. The submission states that existing rules are not being adhered to, or are not being enforced and requests that if this is because that standards are incorrectly worded then Council reword or redefine the standards in the Proposed Plan. This submission is opposed on the basis that the submitter does not define what relief is being sought. The submission is essentially an open ended statement. Thirdly, the submitter requests a rule be added to the Proposed Plan to ensure motion activated lights and or alarms are only triggered by activities on the subject parcel of private land. This submission is opposed on the basis that any such a rule would be at best unworkable and probably ultra vires. The Resource Management Act is about effects and a sensor itself does not have any effects. Should a sensor trigger some action, then it is that action that should be considered and if appropriate controlled. The actions referred to in the submission are light and in the case of an alarm presumably noise, both already controlled by standards in the Proposed Plan. By way of comment it seems odd that this submission seeks only to change/set new standards in the Low Density Residential Area.

#### I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed

That the submission be disallowed and the provisions in the Proposed District Plan as notified remain unchanged.

---

**Original Submitter:** Alan Cutler (48 Alison Avenue, Albert Town, Wanaka, New Zealand, 9305)(  
Submitter No. 110)

**Original Point:** 110.13 Map 24 - Cardrona, Albert Town

- Support
- Oppose

#### The reasons for my support or opposition are

The submitter has requested that the ONF boundary on the true right bank either side of the State Highway Bridge be extended to include all open space and natural banks and terrace faces. The Cross Submitters all own property at Albert Town that access off Alison Avenue and front onto the unformed public road on the true right bank of the Clutha River upstream of the SH 6 Bridge. The terrace referred to at this locality is not natural having been engineered to some degree or another in response to land instability. These issues are potentially on going and further works may be required in the future. Consideration of the ONF boundary indicates that the boundary location has been carefully considered by Council, not just here but all around the Albert Town area. Proper consideration has been given to the setting and that this is an established Residential Area. In any event the terrace face adjoining the Cross Submitters properties is in Public Ownership ( legal Road) so whatever happens on it in the future is controlled by the community through Council. The Original Submission is opposed, on the basis that the proposed location of the ONF boundary on Planning Map 24 b is entirely appropriate.

#### I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed

The submission be disallowed in its entirety.

---

Attached Documents

File

Cross Submitters Names