

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS17.1		Purdie, Elizabeth	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Rezone the land on the eastern side of Riverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS19.10		Fround, Kain	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports the provision	Accept		Entire report
OS21.40		Walsh, Alison	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports the provision	Accept		Entire report
OS27.2		Troon, Todd, Todd, John, Jane, Graeme	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	supports the zoning prepared east of Lower Shotover Road and in particular the location of boundaries between the Rural Lifestyle and Rural General Zones shown on Planning Map 30. Requests that the Council confirm the zoning shown for the area east of Lower Shotover Road on Planning Map 30 and in particular the location of the boundaries between the Rural Lifestyle and Rural General Zones.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS98.4		Juie Q.T. Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	A) Rezone Lots 1-4 on Deposited Plan 427059 from 'Rural' to 'Rural Lifestyle' (refer attached plan). B) Re-draw (if necessary) the boundary between ONL and RLC to follow the northern boundary of Lots 1,3,4 DP 427059 (refer attached plan).		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS100.2		Leary, Stephen	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Retain the Operative District Plan Rural Lifestyle Zone on the property at 218a Wanaka Mt Aspiring Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS100.3		Leary, Stephen	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Retain the Operative District Plan Rural Lifestyle Zone on the property at 218a Wanaka Mt Aspiring Road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS117.8		Lawton, Maggie	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	If this is about rural residential outside of the urban boundary that should be made clearer. 22.2.2.3 Florences is a good example of a restaurant that blends well with its peri-rural surroundings. I'm glad that Florences wasn't discouraged, maybe consider the wording of that clause further.	Reject		This activity was in the Rural Zone
OS119.1		Solbak, Laura	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	The current Rural Residential Zone in Lake Hawea remain unchanged.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS121.3		Topp, Lindsay - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The proposed district plan maps are amended to include existing and approved residential development on Lots 1 and 2 DP 476278, located west of Alec Robbins Road on planning map 30.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS123.2		Lamont, Edwin - represented by Kerr Ritchie Architects	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Rezone the 25 hectare property located at the southwest corner of McDonnell Road and Hogans Gully Road from Rural to Rural Lifestyle to provide for a total of 6 residential lots with an existing winery.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS152.3		Redai (Plus others), Jackie (Plus others) - represented by Southern Land, PO Box 713, Wanaka 9343	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Rezone from Rural to Rural Residential the land located east of Riverbank Road and north of Orchard Road, comprising Lots 1 - 9 DP 300773, located on Planning Map 23.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS157.4		Wilson, Miles	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	That permitted provisions for Visitor Accommodation that are proposed for residential areas are adopted for the Rural Lifestyle zone, & that existing limitations on days of use be removed.		Out of scope not within Stage 1 of the PDP	The urban zone VA provisions have been withdrawn. The submission is not valid because the provisions compared to are not applicable.
OS188.1		Robertson, Gaye	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	The current rural residential zoning pertaining to lake Hawea and Hawea Flat areas remains unchanged.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS219.1		Juie Q.T. Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Retention of Rule 22.4.2, Rule 22.4.5, Rule 22.4.6, 22.5.4.3, 22.5.11.1. B. Amendment of Rule 27.4.1 to make all subdivision activity controlled within the Rural Residential Zone to be processed without the written consent of other persons and not notified or limited notified (requires amendment to Rule 22.6)	Accept in Part		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS228.1		Hutchinson, Anna - represented by Clark Fortune McDonald Associates Attn: Emma Dixon	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	The 2 Ha average rule to be removed, with the requirements for new lots in the Rural Lifestyle zone being limited to a 1 Ha minimum allotment size: <i>27.5.1 No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area or where specified, average, less than the minimum specified - Rural Lifestyle - One hectare, providing the average lot size is not less than 2 hectares.</i> <i>22.5.12.2 On sites less than 2 hectares there shall only be one residential unit.</i> <i>22.5.12.3 On site equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than one residential unit per two hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than 4 hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be 4 hectares.</i>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS229.3		Felzar Properties Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Endorses 22.4.2, 22.4.5 – 22.5.11	Accept		Entire report
OS231.1		Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Endorses 22.4.3 – 22.5.12	Accept		Entire report

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS232.2		Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Endorses 22.4.3 – 22.5.12 Change the zoning from Rural to Rural Lifestyle located on planning map 26 and 30		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS236.1		Perkins, Claire & Nigel	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports the zone purpose focused on rural living opportunities. Confirm the purpose of the Rural Residential zone as providing for rural living opportunities.	Accept		Entire report
OS238.9		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Don't support pocket development that generates more traffic away from walkable communities and is in conflict with the Rural Land objective to keep rural land productive	Reject		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
OS238.127		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Opposes changes from to Rural General Land to Rural Lifestyle in Mooney Road area, Littles Rd / Fitzpatrick Rd / Mountain Road, southern side of Domain Road & Lower Shotover Road. Change planning maps in Mooney Road area, Littles Rd / Fitzpatrick Rd / Mountain Road, southern side of Domain Road & Lower Shotover Road back to Rural.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS265.10		Bunn, Phillip	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Considers that Rural Lifestyle/Rural Residential Zones are more appropriate zones for much of the Morven Ferry Road area (shown on proposed planning map 30). Believes the Rural General zone is almost redundant because pastoral farming is not viable in the Wakatipu basin.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS272.1		Devine, Robert	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Maintain the proposed District Plan Rural Residential zones as depicted in Map 17 of the proposed District Plan.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS298.1		Clark, Nick	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Change from Rural Lifestyle to Rural Residential. The land at Closeburn is useless for anything but building on. Remove the building restriction area.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS310.5		Waterston, Jon - represented by Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Submitter seeks an extension to the Rural Residential zoning (see attached map - including the eastern portions of lots Proposed Lots 9 and 10 of Proposed Lot 1 DP 366504 and other portions of the subject land, being LOT 20 DP 464459 HAVING 3/11 SH IN LOTS 18-19 DP 430336) beyond the existing Ferry Hills Sub-Zone to resolve minor split zonings across lots and to enable additional rural residential development on an area of land which is difficult to farm productively.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS310.10		Waterston, Jon - represented by Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	In the alternative any such other combination of rules and standards provided that the intent of this submission, as set out in Parts 2 and 3 is enabled.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS314.9		Wakatipu Holdings	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The Submitter seeks the removal of the Hydro Generation zoning over Lot 1 DP 300025 and it is rezoned Rural Lifestyle.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS322.4		Blennerhassett, Murray Stewart	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	That existing smaller Rural lots which have a road frontage to Studholme Rd (east) have an effective Rural Residential Zoning applied as long as they can feasibly provide services. Furthermore I would ask the QLDC to consider a deferred or eventual Rural Lifestyle Zoning for other suitable areas within the surrounding land between Studholme Rd (east) and Cardrona Valley Rd.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS332.2		this is a personal submission	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Ensure the provisions capture the difference between Rural Residential and Large Lot and that anticipated activity is made clear, in particular the differences in location.	Accept		Entire Report
OS339.65		Alty, Evan	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Delete the Rural Lifestyle zone at Rekos Point and rezone as Rural, being the land located between Kane Road and the Clutha River, identified on Planning Map 18 and 18a.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS345.15		McQuilkin, (K)John - represented by Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Seeks the extension of the Rural Lifestyle Zone as shown on the marked up Planning Map 29, attachment A to submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS352.2		Taylor, J & B - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Delete the Rural Lifestyle Zone over Lot 1 DP 300316 and Lot 1 DP 474658, or alternatively, defer the Rural Lifestyle Zone until RM100818 has been given full effect to and a completion certification for the subdivision has been issued. NB - Elsewhere in the submission, it notes that the following parcels are also subject to this submission: Lot 3 DP21860 and Lot 1 DP 300014.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS360.1		Stuart Clark	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	The PDP is confirmed as it relates to providing objectives, policies and rules that provided for residential activity within the Rural Lifestyle Zone as a permitted activity. The PDP is modified to provide for the identification of building platforms and new residential development on a lot within the Rural Lifestyle Zone (compliant with the density control) as permitted or controlled activity. The PDP is modified to delete the requirement for an average density and/or lot size of 2 hectares within the Rural Lifestyle Zone	Accept in Part		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS396.4		James Canning Muspratt	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Submitter opposes the zoning of part of the submitter's land (legally described as Lot 1 and 2 DP 486552) being that part of the land west and north of the Outstanding Natural Landscape line shown in proposed planning Map 31 and submits it is rezoned to Rural Residential. Copied from points 396.2 and 396.3.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS402.1		Leslie Richard Nelson and Judith Anne Nelson	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports the zoning of the submitters land as Rural Lifestyle at Mooneys Road and requests this be confirmed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS415.2		Trustees of the Lake Hayes Investment Trust	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Opposes the proposed zoning of the submitter's land at 198 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road (Lot 1 DP 9916, Lot 1 DP 12282, Lot 1 DP 21917, and Lot 1 DP 27571) as Rural Lifestyle and requests that this land be zoned Rural Residential.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS416.3		Queenstown Lakes Lodge Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Opposes the proposed zoning of the Submitters' land at 190 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road shown on Proposed Planning Map 26 and legally described as Lot 4 Deposited Plan 23626 (the "Submitters' Land"). Requests that the Submitters' Land be rezoned Rural Residential.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS428.1		Barry Francis Ellis and Sandy Joan Ellis	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	support the zoning of the Submitters' Land at 112 Domain Road (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 317834) as Rural Lifestyle. Requests the Council confirm the zoning of the Submitter's Land as Rural Lifestyle.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS430.13		Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	For the the Rural Residential Zone option proposed by the submitter, a new Table 8 is requested to be included in Chapter 22 with rules relating to Density, Building Height, Building Location, Design Standards, Landscaping. The inclusions sought are outlined in section 3.6.1 of submission 430.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS431.5		Barbara Kipke	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Adopt the Rural Lifestyle Zone provisions within proposed Chapter 22.	Accept		Entire report
OS432.1		Pawson, Christine - represented by C Hughes and Associates Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Amend planning map 24 to change the zoning from rural lifestyle to rural residential zone on the land located to the south east of Jack Young Place and to the west of Templeton Street, Albert Town.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS440.1		Sievers, Trevor and Mary-Anne - represented by C Hughes and Associates Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Amend planning map 24 to change the zoning from rural lifestyle to rural residential zone on the land located to the south east of Jack Young Place and to the west of Templeton Street, Albert Town.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS451.1		Martin McDonald and Sonya Anderson	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Supports the rural lifestyle zoning over submitters property located at 51 Walnut Lane (Lot 2 DP 457573). Requests the Rural Lifestyle Zoning be adopted over this property.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS454.1		Martin McDonald & Sonya Anderson	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Supports the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone as identified east of the Urban Growth Boundary on Proposed District Plan Map 30 subject to the imposition of a building restriction area on the steep area down to Hayes Creek, as shown on the plan attached to the submission. States that the use of this land is inappropriate for built form, given the steepness of the land and its relationship to the margin of Hayes Creek. States that it is appropriate to retain this area as Rural Lifestyle, enabling the land to be part of the overall average allotment size calculation, but restricting built form to the upper and flatter terraces.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS460.1		Upper Clutha Women's Support Group Inc	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Lichen Lane and Sam John Place to become residential zoning.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS464.1		Erskine, Mandy	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Reject the new proposed Rural Lifestyle Zones.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS467.4		Mr Scott Conway	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Adopt the Rural Residential Proposed provisions within Chapter 22 as they relate to the area identified in the attached map "Proposed Rural Residential Zone Location Map".		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS473.4		Mr Richard Hanson	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Adopt the Rural Residential Proposed provisions within Chapter 22 as they relate to the area identified in the attached map "Proposed Rural Residential Zone Location Map".		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS476.1		Keith Hindle & Dayle Wright	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Opposes the proposed zoning of the submitters property at Tucker Beach Road, Lower Shotover (Lot 13 DP 351483 and Lot 1 DP 454484) (and those adjoining properties as identified in Attachment 1 of the submission) as Rural and Rural Lifestyle identified on Planning Map 31 – Lower Shotover. Requests that this land be re-zoned to Rural Residential zone with a minimum lot size of 3000m <sup>2</sup> . Adopt the Rural Residential proposed provisions within Chapter 22 and Chapter 27 as they relate to the area identified in Attachment 1: Proposed Rural Residential Zone Location Map		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS481.3		Cabo Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Support the proposed provisions to the Wyuna Rural Lifestyle Zone (inclusive of the building restricted area) as proposed in Planning Map 25. Adopt the Rural Lifestyle provisions within proposed Chapter 22 and Planning Map 25 as it relates to the Wyuna Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS486.1		Temple Peak Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Supports the Proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone as it relates to Temple Peak Station shown on Proposed District Plan Map 9 (legally described as Sec 1-9 SO460577 Sec 32-34 38A 39 Blk 1 Glenorchy SD). Adopt the Rural Lifestyle provisions for the area identified.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS497.14		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Amend the relevant plan provisions to: Enable year round visitor accommodation activities in the Rural Lifestyle zone;	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation
OS497.15		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Amend the relevant plan provisions to:  Remove any restrictions on visitor accommodation activities in the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Accept in Part		Visitor Accommodation

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS500.3		Mr David Broomfield	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Submitter requests the rezoning of land located immediately northwest of the Quail Rise zone on Tucker Beach Road, Lower Shotover, Wakatipu. Adopt the Rural Residential proposed provisions within Chapter 22 as they relate to this area of land, as identified in the map attached to the submission "Proposed Rural Residential Zone Location Map".		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS501.12		Woodlot Properties Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Submission refers specifically to the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) and Rural Zone (RZ) off Littles Road and Moorhill Road, Dalefield. Seeks that the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) as publicly notified on Proposed District Plan Map 29 - Dalefield, Coronet Peak Road is extended to include similar neighbouring land within the area as identified in the hatched green area shown on the map attached to submission 501.  Requests that Proposed District Plan Map 29 - Dalefield, Coronet Peak Road is amended to replace the zone boundary line between the Rural Zone and the Rural Lifestyle Zone with that of the area outlined within the attached map. Requests that the Rural Lifestyle provisions within proposed Chapter 22 are adopted as it relates to this area as identified on the attached map.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS501.19		Woodlot Properties Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Seeks that land identified within the hatched area on the map attached to submission 501 (generally located adjacent to Hansen Road and east of Quail Rise) be zoned as Rural Residential and/or Rural Lifestyle.  Seeks that the Rural Lifestyle and/or Rural Residential proposed provisions within Chapter 22 are adopted as they relate to the area identified on the map attached to the submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS514.4		Duncan Fea	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Retain Chapter 22; except in relation to the relief identified for 22.5.12.3.	Accept in part		Visitor Accommodation
OS546.1		J L M Davies, A J Morcom & Veritas 2013 Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	In respect of the submitter's property described as Lot 1 DP 307454 ("Lot 1") at 59 Fitzpatrick Road and shown on Planning Map 29 the submitter supports its inclusion in the Rural Lifestyle Zone AND requests that the portion of the site that is proposed to be zoned Rural is instead zoned Rural Lifestyle.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS546.2		J L M Davies, A J Morcom & Veritas 2013 Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Submitter supports the objectives and provisions that provide for residential activity within the Rural Lifestyle Zone as a permitted activity.	Accept		Entire report
OS546.3		J L M Davies, A J Morcom & Veritas 2013 Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The submitter requests that the PDP is modified to provide for the identification of building platforms and new residential development on a lot within the Rural Lifestyle Zone (compliant with the density control) as a permitted or controlled activity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS546.4		J L M Davies, A J Morcom & Veritas 2013 Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The PDP is modified to delete the requirement for an average density and/or lot size of 2ha within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS546.5		J L M Davies, A J Morcom & Veritas 2013 Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The PDP is modified so that the status of subdivision is a controlled activity within the Rural Lifestyle Zone with a minimum lot size of 1ha.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS554.2		R H Ffiske	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The PDP as notified is confirmed as it relates to providing objectives, policies and rules that provided for residential activity within the Rural Lifestyle Zone as a permitted activity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS554.3		R H Ffiske	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The PDP is modified to provide for the identification of building platforms and new residential development on a lot within the Rural Lifestyle zone (compliant with the density control) as permitted or controlled activity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS554.4		R H Ffiske	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The PDP is modified to delete the requirement for an average density and/or lot size of 2 hectares within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS554.5		R H Ffiske	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The PDP is modified so that the status of subdivision is a controlled activity within the Rural Lifestyle Zone with a minimum lot size of 1 hectare.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS557.1		Speargrass Trust	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		That Lot 2 is fully contained within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS557.2		Speargrass Trust	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The deletion and/or amendment of the PDP provisions listed in Points 4.4 and 4.12 above.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS557.3		Speargrass Trust	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The PDP is modified to delete the requirement for an average density and/or lot size of 2 hectares within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS565.3		J M Martin	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The PDP is modified to delete the requirement for an average density and/or lot size of 2 hectares within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS585.1		Pennycook, Heather	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The Rural Lifestyle Zone, continued from the operative District Plan, at Makarora be rezoned Rural and made an outstanding natural landscape. That if the area remains as Rural Lifestyle zone, the average Lot size is increased to 45Ha and a requirement added for Resource Consent for all subdivisions to protect those areas of landscape that cannot absorb any development (which is a large part of the Valley and which remains unprotected at present). Alternatively – create a Special Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS594.1		Alexander Kenneth & Robert Barry Robins & Robins Farm Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Support in part. The Proposed District Plan as notified is confirmed as it relates to the zoning of Part Section 28 Block IX Shotover Survey District and the surrounding area Rural Lifestyle and Lot 5 DP 468905 Rural Residential.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS594.2		Alexander Kenneth & Robert Barry Robins & Robins Farm Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Support in part. The Proposed District Plan as notified is confirmed as it relates to providing objectives, policies and rules that provided for residential activity within the Rural Lifestyle Zone as a permitted activity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS594.3		Alexander Kenneth & Robert Barry Robins & Robins Farm Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Oppose in part. The Proposed District Plan is modified to provide for the identification of building platforms and new residential development on a lot within the Rural Lifestyle zone (compliant with the density control) as permitted or controlled activity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS594.4		Alexander Kenneth & Robert Barry Robins & Robins Farm Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Oppose in part. The Proposed District Plan is modified to delete the requirement for an average density and/or lot size of 2ha within the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS594.5		Alexander Kenneth & Robert Barry Robins & Robins Farm Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Oppose in part. The ONL line as it relates to Lot 5 DP 468905 is moved to the southern boundary of the lot such that the lot is not located within the ONL.		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
OS595.1		Matakauri Lodge Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Support in part. The Visitor Accommodation sub-zoning for the MLL site is confirmed,	Accept	In the context of this submission relating to the zoning of a specific site the submission is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
OS595.2		Matakauri Lodge Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Support in part. The Objectives, Policies and Rules of the Rural Lifestyle Zone that provide for visitor accommodation activity and buildings as a controlled activity within the Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone are confirmed.	Accept		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS631.2		Cassidy Trust	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	The Cassidy Trust supports the ability to subdivide properties into smaller lot sizes within the Rural lifestyle zone.	Accept		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS633.3		Flight, Nick	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports the rezoning of land west of Dalefield to Rural Lifestyle zone as proposed. QLDC should continue with plans to rezone this rural land this is a good use of the land our of sight of the road.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS655.5		Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Requests that Lot 3 Deposited Plan 392823, Lot 4 Deposited Plan 447906, Lot 1 Deposited Plan 26719, Lot 1 Deposited Plan 21087 and Lot 3 Deposited Plan 337268 be zoned Medium Density Residential		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS669.3		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Retain Lot 1 DP 425385 within the Rural Lifestyle Zone as per the notified version of the proposed district plan.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS669.5		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Include Lot 1 DP 425385 within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.2		Glentui Heights Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Delete the Bobs Cove Sub Zone as shown on the Planning Maps and show as Rural Residential Zone with no subzone.		Rezoning request. Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.24		Glentui Heights Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Other	Retain all provisions in Section 22 not otherwise submitted upon in this submission as notified unless they duplicate other provisions in which case they should be deleted.	Reject		Entire Report
OS697.1		Streat Developments Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		That the Proposed District Plan including the provisions of the Township Zone - Section 9 (DP), Rural Residential Zone - Section 22 (PDP) and PDP Map 17 be amended to allow for adjustment of the Rural Residential & Lifestyle Zone boundary with the Township Zone at Lake Hawea Township as outline in this submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS706.57		Forest and Bird NZ	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Delete the Rural Lifestyle zone at Rekos Point and rezone as Rural, being the land located between Kane Road and the Clutha River, identified on Planning Map 18 and 18a.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS733.1		Young, John	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Riverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS741.1		Roulston, Marianne	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS742.1		Telford, Gerald	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS743.1		Thomlinson, K and M R	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS745.1		Stewart, Danni and Simon	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS747.1		Hamer, M and E	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS749.1		Jolly and Shaw, Craig and Maree	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS750.1		Watson, Peter J E and Gillian O	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS753.1		Dowdall, Graham P and Mary H	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS756.1		Skeggs, E B	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Rezone the land on the eastern side of Rlverbank Road Wanaka, currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone shown on planning map 18 to Rural Residential Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS771.7		Hawea Community Association	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Support the content and provisions for the Rural Residential Zone of Chapter 22.	Accept		Entire report
OS772.2		Island Capital Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Delete the new area of rural lifestyle zone identified on the escarpment east of Glenorchy Town anywhere it is identified within the PDP.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS811.1		Scaife, Marc	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		The proposed Planning provisions for the Rural living zones have too many activities and rules that have discretionary activity status, and too few that are non-complying or prohibited.	Reject		The framework proposed is considered the most appropriate in terms of being efficient and effective.
OS816.2		Solbak, Jan	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Request that the current Rural Residential Zone in Lake Hawea consisting of Grandview Rd, Sam John Place and Lichen Lane remain unchanged. The 2003 Hawea Community Plan's vision for 2020 states, in part, 'people live here because of the strong community, landscape values ..... development is largely contained within current zoning to ensure efficient service provision, and the retention of the surrounding rural character'. In 2015. This vision is still highly relevant for the next 10 years.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS820.1		Jeremy Bell Investments	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Adopt the Rural Lifestyle proposed provisions within Chapter 22 and Chapter 27 as they relate to the area identified in the attached map "Proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone Location Map" described by the submitter as Mt Criffel Station and accessed from Smith Road via Mt Barker Road, Wanaka.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS820.5		Jeremy Bell Investments	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	That the land identified in the graphic attached to the submission be re-zoned to Rural lifestyle zone with a minimum lot area of one hectare providing the average lot size is not less than 2 hectares and for the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than 4 hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be 4 hectares.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS851.2		Briscoe, Julia & Simon	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle		Opposes the proposed rezoning of land on the southern side of Littles Road and Northern side of the Fitzpatrick Basin to Rural Lifestyle, shown on Proposed Planning Map 29.  Requests that the southern side of Littles Rd which is currently zoned Rural General and the northern side of the Fitzpatrick Basin should remain zoned as Rural General; with any consents to residential development subject to all the scrutiny and notification that all such development within Rural General areas requires.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS852.1		Arrow Irrigation Company Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Lot 1 DP 22733 is re-zoned from Rural Lifestyle to Industrial B.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1012.33	119.1	Willowridge Developments Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	That the submission supporting the retention of the Rural Residential Zone in Lake Hawea is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land between Domain Road, Noema Terrance, Capell Avenue and Cemetery Road and that the Willowridge submission to rezone the land as Low Density Residential is allowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1012.39	188.1	Willowridge Developments Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	That the submission supporting the retention of the Rural Residential Zone in Lake Hawea is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land between Domain Road, Noema Terrance, Capell Avenue and Cemetery Road and that the Willowridge submission to rezone the land as Low Density Residential is allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1013.3	152.3	Orchard Road Holdings Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Oppose in Part - That the submission is disallowed in advance of a decision on PC46. That the submission is disallowed if PC46 is rejected.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1031.1	265.10	Mahon, Stewart	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Support the whole of the submission. See attached plan showing adjoining neighbours wanting the same outcome and supporting each other from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle as per chapter 22.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1034.145	820.1	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1034.149	820.5	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1047.1	501.12	Borrell, John	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	I seek that the whole of the submission is disallowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1050.33	430.13	Jan Andersson	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter seeks that the whole of that submission be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1055.1	238.127	James, Sophie	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Seek that the relief sort in 238.127 be declined		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1064.5	655.5	MacDonald, Martin - represented by Carey Vivian	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed as per the reasons given in my original submissions reference numbers 451 and 454. I consider Medium Density zoning as inappropriate in this area, and that shifting of the outstanding natural landscape line and urban growth boundary line will result in significant adverse effects on the environment (both east and west of Hayes Creek) which is contrary to the principles of sustainable management.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1065.6	546.4	Ohapi Trust	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	The Trust seeks the submissions be allowed to the extent that the 2 hectare average is deleted from the Rural Lifestyle Zone, either generally or specifically in relation to their property.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1067.2	772.2	Vivian, Carey - represented by Cabo Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	We seek that the whole of submission be disallowed and the Rural lifestyle Zoning be adopted as per our original submission (#481).		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1071.6	655.5	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1082.30	430.13	Hadley, J and R	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission. The proposed rezoning will have significant adverse effects on the landscape and rural amenity of the surrounding properties; it will compromise the purpose and rural amenity of the North Lake Hayes Rural Residential Zone and destroy the existing settlement pattern and character of Arrowtown.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1084.14	430.13	Clarke, Wendy	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Seek that Submission #430 be rejected in its entirety and that the wording of Proposed District Plan as notified remains.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1086.16	430.13	Hadley, J	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission. The proposed rezoning will have significant adverse effects on the landscape and rural amenity of the surrounding properties; it will compromise the purpose and rural amenity of the North Lake Hayes Rural Residential Zone and destroy the existing settlement pattern and character of Arrowtown.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1087.14	430.13	Hart, Robyn	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	I seek that the entire submission #430 be disallowed, and I support the current wording of the Proposed District Plan.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1089.32	430.13	McGuiness, Mark	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Opposes the submission and believes that this will compromise the purpose and rural amenity of the North Lake Hayes Rural Residential Zone and destroy the existing settlement pattern and character of Arrowtown. Seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1099.13	430.13	Thomas, Brendon and Katrina	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Residential intensification in this area will adversely affect the rural character and significantly compromise the amenity values. Matters associated with the provision of infrastructure to such a development is also not addressed and would need to be adequately resolved before an assessment of the appropriateness of residential development on the relevant land. We submit that the whole of the submission be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1102.12	501.12	Cranfield, Bob and Justine	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Oppose whole submission. The ONL line was clarified and confirmed in its present position in the Environment Court Judgement (HIL v QLDC) and should not be rezoned as rural residential or rural lifestyle.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1102.19	501.19	Cranfield, Bob and Justine	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Oppose whole submission. The ONL line was clarified and confirmed in its present position in the Environment Court Judgement (HIL v QLDC) and should not be rezoned as rural residential or rural lifestyle.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1107.14	238.9	Man Street Properties Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1107.132	238.127	Man Street Properties Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1112.3	501.19	Middleton Family Trust (Arnold Andrew Middletonm Isabella Gladys Middletonm Webb Farry Nominees Ltd & Steward Parker	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	That the part of the submission that relates to land outlined in yellow on the plan contained in Attachment C to submission 501 be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1117.5	17.1	Remarkables Park Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	For the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission, oppose to the extent that the submission supports the strategic directions chapter as notified.	accept in part		Further submission in general opposition. Does not appear to relate specifically to the matter submitted on.
FS1119.5	238.127	Banco Trustees Limited, McCulloch Trustees 2004 Limited, and others	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Agrees that the land (OT14A/295) is suitable to be rezoned Rural Residential to achieve the sustainable management. Seeks that the part of the submission that opposes the Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan's rezoning of Rural General land to Rural Lifestyle be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1120.4	27.2	Brial, Michael	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	The Council should confirm the zoning shown for the area east of Lower Shotover Road on proposed Planning Map 30 and in particular the location of the boundaries between the Rural Lifestyle and Rural General zones. Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1129.13	430.13	Hill, Graeme - represented by Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined. The land the subject of the submission is not land that should be rezoned as Rural Residential, Resort- Waterfall Park Special zone, or a zone that establishes further residential development as: 1. It is not suitable for such zoning given its location and characteristics. 2. The adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1133.14	430.13	Blair, John - represented by Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Agrees that the land should not be rezoned as Rural Residential, Resort - Waterfall Park Special zone, or a zone that establishes further residential development because it is not suitable for such zoning (given its location and characteristics) and believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seek that all of the relief sought be declined.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1138.1	460.1	Rogers, Darryll	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	I seek that the whole part of the submission be allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1141.4	460.1	Rogers, Melanie	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	I seek that the whole of the submission be allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1142.2	27.2	Peterson and Longney, Kevin and Angela - represented by Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed. The Council should confirm the zoning shown for the area east of Lower Shotover Road on proposed Planning Map 30 and in particular the location of the boundaries between the Rural Lifestyle and Rural General zones.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1146.31	430.13	Nicolson, Lee	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed. Of particular concern is relief sought to rezone land north of Lake Hayes and to extend the Arrowtown Urban Growth Boundary.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1154.4	238.9	Hogans Gully Farm Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Opposes the submission as not all new development should be "urban". Strongly believes that visitors want to appreciate what the rural land can offer, whether it is farmed land or resort zones where activities such as golf can be undertaken within a lower density rural residential environment. For these reasons, rural land is not and cannot be used productively. Seeks that the submission be rejected or accepted in part to the extent that it achieves HGF's original submission.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1157.34	238.9	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1157.42	238.127	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1162.111	706.57	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1163.1	27.2	Troon & Todd, John, Jane & Graeme - represented by GTODD Law	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	We seek that the part of the original submission that refers to "the zoning prepared east of Lower Shotover Road", be amended to read "the zoning proposed east of Lower Shotover Road".		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1165.2	238.127	Nelson, Leslie Richard & Judith Anne - represented by GTODD Law	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Agrees that the land (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 442784) is suitable land to be rezoned Rural Lifestyle to achieve the sustainable management of the land. Seeks that the part of the submission that opposes rezoning of Rural General land to Rural Lifestyle be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	



**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1203.1	236.1	Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Oppose Submission in its entirety	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1206.2	238.127	Williamson, Skipp - represented by Vivian Espie	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Seeks that the entire submission - related to Mooney's Rd - to be disallowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1206.5	360.1	Williamson, Skipp - represented by Vivian Espie	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Seeks that the entire submission to be allowed.	Accept in Part		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1221.5	594.5	Robins Farm Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	That the submission is allowed. The submission is supported and the submitter considers the location of the ONL line in relation to Jean Robins Road should be shifted to include the lower portion of Lot 8 DP 468905 to provide a logical line from Jean Robins Road up to the top boundary of Lot 5 DP 468905.		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
FS1224.48	811.1	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
FS1226.14	238.9	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1226.132	238.127	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1234.14	238.9	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1234.132	238.127	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1239.14	238.9	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1239.132	238.127	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1241.14	238.9	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1241.132	238.127	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1242.37	238.9	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1242.155	238.127	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1248.14	238.9	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1248.132	238.127	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1249.14	238.9	Tweed Development Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1249.132	238.127	Tweed Development Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1255.26	238.127	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Disallow this submission to the extent that it opposes rezoning changes from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1256.67	238.127	Ashford Trust	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks rezoning of land identified as Rural Lifestyle under the Proposed Plan to Rural Zone.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1261.8	451.1	Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Disallow the submission. The Urban Growth Boundary, Outstanding Natural Landscape boundary, and zoning of the land subject to this Submission should be as requested in Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited Primary Submission #655. The zoning of the McDonald property should be consistent with the zoning determined for the Bridesdale Farm property.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1261.14	454.1	Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Disallow the submission. The Urban Growth Boundary, Outstanding Natural Landscape boundary, and zoning of the land subject to this Submission should be as requested in Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited Primary Submission #655. The zoning of the MacDonald property should be consistent with the zoning determined for the Bridesdale Farm property. There is no need for the no build area requested.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1263.3	238.127	Kirstie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Disallow the submission. The submission is opposed as it opposes changes from Rural General Land to Rural Lifestyle in Mooney Road area.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1270.92	501.12	Hansen Family Partnership	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports in part. Leave is reserved to alter this position, and seek changes to the proposed provisions, after review of further information from the submitter. Seeks conditional support for allowing the submission, subject to the review of further information that will be required to advance the submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1270.99	501.19	Hansen Family Partnership	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports in part. Leave is reserved to alter this position, and seek changes to the proposed provisions, after review of further information from the submitter. Seeks conditional support for allowing the submission, subject to the review of further information that will be required to advance the submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1286.60	231.1	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1286.68	232.2	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1286.81	27.2	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Disallow the submission.. Seeking retention of the rural areas in the Slopehill Road area as currently identified in the Operative Plan will not achieve the efficient and effective use of resources.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1289.12	501.12	Oasis In The Basin Association	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The whole of the submission be allowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1289.19	501.19	Oasis In The Basin Association	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	The whole of the submission be allowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1292.2	238.127	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Insofar as the submission seeks to retain zoning over parts of Mooney Road area, Littles Rd / Fitzpatrick Rd / Mountain Road, southern side of Domain Road & Lower Shotover Road, disallow the submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1292.3	428.1	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Insofar as the submission supports rezoning over parts of Domain Road to Rural Lifestyle, the submission be allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1295.1	238.9	Slopehill Joint Venture	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1295.17	27.2	Slopehill Joint Venture	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Refuse the submission		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1298.2	238.127	Wakatipu Equities	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Insofar as the submission seeks to retain zoning over parts of Mooney Road area, Littles Rd / Fitzpatrick Rd / Mountain Road, southern side of Domain Road & Lower Shotover Road, disallow the submission.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1298.16	27.2	Wakatipu Equities	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	Insofar as the submission seeks to retain Rural zoning over areas east of Lower Shotover Road disallow the submission. Seeking retention of the rural areas as currently identified in the Operative Plan will not contribute to efficient and effective use of resources.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1309.9	314.9	The Alpine Group	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	the submission of Wakatipu Holdings Limited is rejected.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1322.117	594.3	Juie Q.T. Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter numbered 5. 3, 5. 4 and 5.5 in original submission 594 be allowed.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.118	594.4	Juie Q.T. Limited	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter numbered 5. 3, 5. 4 and 5.5 in original submission 594 be allowed.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1340.117	501.12	Queenstown Airport Corporation	22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle	Oppose	QAC is concerned rezoning requests that will result in the intensification of ASAN establishing within close proximity to Queenstown Airport. The proposed rezoning is a significant departure from the nature, scale and intensity of ASAN development currently anticipated at this site and may potentially result in adverse effects on QAC over the longer term. The proposed rezoning request should not be accepted.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS13.1		Cassidy Trust	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	That the proposed rezoning from Rural to Rural Lifestyle as shown on map 31 at Lower Shotover be implemented .		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS21.41		Walsh, Alison	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports the provision	Accept		
OS119.3		Solbak, Laura	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The current Rural Residential Zone in Lake Hawea remain unchanged.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS126.1		Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	A commitment to robustly defend the density limits proposed.	Accept		Entire Report
OS188.2		Robertson, Gaye	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	The current rural residential zoning for Lake Hawea and Hawea Flat areas remain as is i.e. unchanged. For clarity I request that the word 'generally' be deleted/removed from Chapter 22 under the heading 'Zone Purpose'.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS238.120		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Support intent behind zone descriptions with following provisos. Oppose description as 'buffer edge' as term implies encouragement of sprawl of urban boundaries. Delete the following; " <del>where applicable, a buffer edge between urban areas</del> "	Accept		22.1 Zone Purpose
OS243.7		Byrch, Christine	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Re-write to make it clear and concise.	Reject		No Comment
OS286.2		Metzger, Urs & Rosalie	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Removal of word 'generally' from sentence in 22.1 Zone purpose.	Reject		Zone Purpose

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS339.58		Alty, Evan	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Amend as follows: <i>Maintain and enhance the district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity <u>and nature conservation</u> values while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from those landscapes.</i>	Reject		Nature Conservation values are not necessarily located in these zones. If so they will be specified. Such as Bobs Cove.
OS383.42		Queenstown Lakes District Council	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Amend - Last sentence, second paragraph to confirm that Makarora has been identified for reasons associated with natural hazards.	Accept		Clarification.
OS383.43		Queenstown Lakes District Council	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add (0.4 hectares) after "every 4000m2".	Reject		Clarification.
OS462.1		van Riel, Joel	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Rezone Sam John Place to allow minimum half acre lots.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS497.1		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add the following to the Zone purpose <u>The provision of housing and land supply for housing in these zones recognises the significant growth and development pressures on accommodation in the District. Efficient and effective use of land in these zones for rural living will be encouraged.</u>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS497.2		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides for rural living opportunities, having a development density of one residential dwelling platform unit per hectare. <del>With an overall density of one residential unit per two hectares across a subdivision.</del>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS513.30		Jenny Barb	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add the following to the Zone purpose: <u>The provision of housing and land supply for housing in these zones recognises the significant growth and development pressures on accommodation in the District. Efficient and effective use of land in these zones for rural living will be encouraged.</u>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS513.31		Jenny Barb	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides for rural living opportunities, having a development density of one residential dwelling platform unit per hectare. <del>With an overall density of one residential unit per two hectares across a subdivision.</del>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS523.1		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add the following to the Zone purpose: <u>The provision of housing and land supply for housing in these zones recognises the significant growth and development pressures on accommodation in the District. Efficient and effective use of land in these zones for rural living will be encouraged.</u>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS523.2		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides for rural living opportunities, having a development density of one residential dwelling platform unit per hectare. <del>With an overall density of one residential unit per two hectares across a subdivision.</del>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS534.20		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add the following to the Zone purpose: <u>The provision of housing and land supply for housing in these zones recognises the significant growth and development pressures on accommodation in the District. Efficient and effective use of land in these zones for rural living will be encouraged.</u>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS534.21		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides for rural living opportunities, having a development density of one residential dwelling platform unit per hectare. <del>With an overall density of one residential unit per two hectares across a subdivision.</del>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS535.20		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add the following to the Zone purpose: <u>The provision of housing and land supply for housing in these zones recognises the significant growth and development pressures on accommodation in the District. Efficient and effective use of land in these zones for rural living will be encouraged.</u>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS535.21		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	The Rural Lifestyle Zone provides for rural living opportunities, having a development density of one residential dwelling platform unit per hectare. <del>With an overall density of one residential unit per two hectares across a subdivision.</del>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS669.10		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Either Delete this entire section or delete those parts after the first two paragraphs.	Reject		22.1 Purpose. In addition no specific alternative is submitted and without any evidence the notified version is appropriate.
OS674.1		Hadley, J & R	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Add an introduction to the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zone to include the purpose of the zone for rural residential living with associated rural character and amenity values, as the proposed plan does not describe or recognise the purpose of the RRZ in the manner that the operative plan does.	Reject		The purpose statement is adequate.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS674.15		Hadley, J & R	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Any consequential amendments to give effect to the submission points	Accept in part		entire report
OS706.50		Forest and Bird NZ	22.1 Zone Purpose		Amend as follows: Maintain and enhance the district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity <u>and nature conservation</u> values while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from those landscapes.	reject		Refer to statement for Submitter Evan Alty.
OS771.8		Hawea Community Association	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports the zone purpose.	Accept		entire report
OS844.1		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.1 Zone Purpose	Other	Oppose and Amend: The Rural Residential zone generally provides for development at a density of up to one residence every 4000m <sup>2</sup> . Some Rural Residential areas are located within visually sensitive landscapes <u>whereas some are located on the fringe of residential areas and have a greater residential feel than rural</u> . Additional provisions apply to development in some areas to enhance landscape values, indigenous vegetation, the quality of living environments within the zone, and to manage the visual effects of the anticipated development from outside the zone. Particularly from surrounding rural areas, lakes and rivers. The potential adverse effects of buildings are controlled by bulk and location, colour and lighting standards and, where required, design and landscaping controls imposed at the time of subdivision. <u>Community facilities are anticipated activities providing their effects are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	Reject		Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1012.35	119.3	Willowridge Developments Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	That the submission supporting the retention of the Rural Residential Zone in Lake Hawea is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land between Domain Road, Noema Terrance, Capell Avenue and Cemetery Road and that the Willowridge submission to rezone the land as Low Density Residential is allowed.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1012.40	188.2	Willowridge Developments Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	That the submission supporting the retention of the Rural Residential Zone in Lake Hawea is disallowed insofar as it relates to Willowridge Developments Limited land between Domain Road, Noema Terrance, Capell Avenue and Cemetery Road and that the Willowridge submission to rezone the land as Low Density Residential is allowed		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1050.2	674.1	Jan Andersson	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Reject		The purpose statement is adequate.
FS1050.16	674.15	Jan Andersson	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Accept in part		entire report
FS1068.20	535.20	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1068.21	535.21	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.33	535.20	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.34	535.21	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1082.1	674.1	Hadley, J and R	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		The purpose statement is adequate.
FS1082.15	674.15	Hadley, J and R	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		entire report
FS1089.2	674.1	McGuiness, Mark	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		The purpose statement is adequate.
FS1089.16	674.15	McGuiness, Mark	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		entire report
FS1107.125	238.120	Man Street Properties Ltd	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose
FS1138.4	462.1	Rogers, Darryll	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	I seek part of the submission be allowed. I agree that rezoning should take place but believe minimum lot sizes could be less than a half an acre		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1141.1	462.1	Rogers, Melanie	22.1 Zone Purpose		I seek that part of the submission be allowed. I agree that the area should be rezoned, but that minimum lot sizes could be less than half an acre		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1146.1	674.1	Nicolson, Lee	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		The purpose statement is adequate.
FS1146.15	674.15	Nicolson, Lee	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept in part		entire report
FS1157.35	238.120	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose
FS1162.104	706.50	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTOOD Law	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in part		Refer to statement for Submitter Evan Alty.
FS1224.7	243.7	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.		General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1226.125	238.120	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1234.125	238.120	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1239.125	238.120	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1241.125	238.120	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1242.148	238.120	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1248.125	238.120	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1249.125	238.120	Tweed Development Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in Part		Entire Report. Rural Living is already established in the Wakatipu Basin. The Density of the Rural Lifestyle zone provisions do not constitute pocket development.
FS1255.1	674.1	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks to restrict or discourage visitor accommodation in these zones. Visitor accommodation using an existing dwelling, such as Air BnB type visitor accommodation which makes use of existing infrastructure and generates effects very little different from residential activities, is appropriate in these zones.	Accept in Part		The purpose statement is adequate.
FS1255.28	238.120	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Support this submission to the extent that it seeks deletion of references to 'buffer edge' in relation to Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zoning.	Accept in part		22.1 Zone Purpose
FS1256.1	523.1	Ashford Trust	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1256.2	523.2	Ashford Trust	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1259.4	535.20	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1259.5	535.21	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1267.4	535.20	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1267.5	535.21	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.60	534.20	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.61	534.21	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.97	535.20	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.98	535.21	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS21.42		Walsh, Alison	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		entire report
OS236.5		Perkins, Claire & Nigel	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Opposes community activities, restaurants, cafes, and larger forms of visitor accommodation in this zone in Albert Town. Make community activities, restaurants, cafes, and larger forms of visitor accommodation a non-complying or prohibited activity in this zone and amend the relevant objectives and policies to reflect these changes.	Reject		The provisions as set out in the report are considered appropriate.
OS248.5		Shotover Trust	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Other	Oppose in part the PDP objectives, policies and rules that inform and support the rule framework requiring a discretionary regime for the establishment of a new building platform within the Rural Lifestyle Zone (Rule 22.4.3.3) and non-complying activity consent to construct a dwelling not located within a building platform (Rule 22.4.1). Oppose in part the PDP objectives, policies and rules that inform and support the rule framework for residential density requiring an average of one dwelling per 2 hectares (Rule 22.5.12.2 & 22.5.12.3).	Accept in Part		Density
OS339.59		Alty, Evan	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Other	Add new policy: <u>Any development including subdivision shall avoid SNA's and avoid undermining the integrity of nature conservation values.</u>	Reject		the provisions for SNAs are in Chpater 33.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS581.3		Lesley and Jerry Burdon	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Other	Add the following objective and policy: Objective – The Dene Rural Lifestyle Zone. To enable rural living development in a way that protects and maintains the outstanding natural landscape and visual amenity values as experienced from Makarora – Lake Hawea Road, the Lake Hawea Township and Lake Hawea. Policies (a) The subdivision design, identification of building platforms and associated mitigation measures shall ensure that built form and associated activities within the zone are inconspicuous when viewed from Makarora – Lake Hawea Road, the Lake Hawea Township and Lake Hawea. Measures to achieve this include: • Prohibiting development over the sensitive areas of the zone via building restriction areas; • Appropriately locating building platforms within the zone so they are minor components within the landscape vistas of the Zone, including restrictions on future building bulk and recessive colour tones; • The identification of residential curtilage areas; • Using native vegetation to assist visual screening of development; (b) To maintain and enhance indigenous vegetation and ecosystems within building restriction area. This shall include appropriate on-going controls to manage and remove pest and weed species.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS636.5		Crown Range Holdings Ltd	22.2 Objectives and Policies		Requests the following amendments to Policies 21.2.2.1 and 21.2.2.2 <i>Allow for the establishment of a range of activities that utilise the soil resource in a sustainable manner <u>or do not detract from the life supporting capacity of significant soils.</u></i> <i>Maintain the productive potential and <u>significant</u> soil resource of Rural Zoned land and encourage land management practices and activities that benefit soil and vegetation cover.</i>	Reject		This is not the intent of the zones.
OS674.2		Hadley, J & R	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Objectives and Policies and seek a review of the Objectives and Policies to uphold the purpose and intent of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zone, noting that: a) The PDP has an obligation to ensure that the important values of rural character and amenity that differentiate the RRZ from other residential zones are upheld and protected by the Objectives and Policies; b) no Objectives and Policies are included that protect the amenity within the rural living zone for residents.	Reject		The objectives and provisions are considered balanced and adequately manage both the impacts of development on the wider Rural Zoned areas and amenity within the zones. Without any specific relief sought I recommend the provisions in Appendix 1 are accepted.
OS706.51		Forest and Bird NZ	22.2 Objectives and Policies		Add new policy: <u>Any development including subdivision shall avoid SNA's and avoid undermining the integrity of nature conservation values.</u>	Reject		The provisions for SNAs are managed in Chapter 33.
OS767.7		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.2 Objectives and Policies		Insert new Objective 22.2.8 Commercial Overlay, as follows: <u>22.2.8 Objective – Commercial Overlay. Recognise and provide for the non-residential character of the commercial overlay, which is distinct from other parts of the Rural Residential Zone.</u>		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS767.8		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.2 Objectives and Policies		Insert new Policies below the new Objective 22.2.8 Commercial Overlay, as follows: <u>22.2.8.1 To enable commercial activities within the commercial overlay, where their effects on the environment can be appropriately managed.</u> <u>22.2.8.2 To encourage building associated with commercial activities within the commercial overlay to achieve a high level of design and external appearance.</u> <u>22.2.8.3 To recognise the scale of building associated with commercial activities within the commercial overlay as being greater than development anticipated within the rural residential zone.</u> <u>22.2.8.4 To recognise that noise and hours of operation of activities located within the commercial overlay difference in character from the surrounding residential and rural residential zones.</u>		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1032.3	581.3	Goodger, Marjorie	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	The Area has already been compromised. The lake has been artificially raised and is now over used by Contact Energy which affects the environment. The life style block has the ability to absorb the change without affecting the environment. It is a natural area for supporting the growth of Lake Hawea		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1033.3	581.3	McCaughan, Sheila & Brian	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Our area suffers from exploitation of our lake which is artificially lowered by Contact Energy to alarming levels. We also have the main highway to contend with. The landscape therefore is already modified and this subdivision will protect and enhance the area		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1037.3	581.3	Pinckney, Dan	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	I would recommend that QLDC should approve this submission		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	



Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1050.3	674.2	Jan Andersson	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Reject		refer to comment on primary submission.
FS1082.2	674.2	Hadley, J and R	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		refer to comment on primary submission.
FS1089.3	674.2	McGuiness, Mark	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		refer to comment on primary submission.
FS1097.166	339.59	Queenstown Park Limited	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Submitter requests restriction of any development within SNA, including subdivision, and suggests use of the term 'avoid' without a qualification. These amendments are opposed; there are cases where subdivision of SNA is appropriate, and these should be considered on their merits as in some cases they may assist in enhancing nature conservation values. Use of the term 'avoid' should be qualified, and the terminology of the Act used.	Reject		the provisions for SNAs are in Chapter 33.
FS1146.2	674.2	Nicolson, Lee	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		refer to comment on primary submission.
FS1150.9	706.51	ORFEL Limited	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	We seek that the part of this submission relating to the proposed new policy within Chapter 22 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the addition of a new policy to chapter 22 seeking that any development including subdivision avoid SNA's and avoid undermining the integrity of nature conservation values. ORFEL considers this approach establishes an unreasonable level of protection and should be incorporated as part of a balance suite of policies including within Chapter 33 Indigenous vegetation and biodiversity.	Accept in Part		The provisions for SNAs are managed in Chapter 33.
FS1162.105	706.51	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTOOD Law	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in Part		The provisions for SNAs are managed in Chapter 33.
FS1177.3	581.3	Cochrane, D M	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	I Support the application as being further progress for lifestyle subdivision, which will enhance the approach into Hawea Township		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1183.3	581.3	Burdon, Richard and Sarah	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	I Support the application to subdivide as proposed in the submission 581		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1203.5	236.5	Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose Submission in its entirety	accept in part		The provisions as set out in the report are considered appropriate.
FS1255.5	674.2	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks policy protection for rural character in these zones. "Rural character" is different from "rural living character". Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones, when developed, have rural living character. It is inappropriate to seek to retain rural character in these zones.	Accept in Part		refer to comment on primary submission.
FS1325.9	706.51	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.2 Objectives and Policies		Support/Oppose - seek that the part of this submission relating to the proposed new policy within Chapter 22 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lake Hayes supports the concept of protecting SNAs, but opposes the addition of a new policy to chapter 22 seeking that any development including subdivision avoid SNA's that are not identified. Lake Hayes considers this approach establishes an uncertain level of protection and should be clarified and incorporated as part of a balance suite of policies including within Chapter 33 Indigenous vegetation and biodiversity.	Accept in Part		The provisions for SNAs are managed in Chapter 33.
OS243.8		Byrch, Christine	22.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	This objective could be re written to be clear and concise.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS380.41		Villa dellago	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS497.3		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values are maintained and enhanced while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from absorb development within those landscapes are enabled	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS513.32		Jenny Barb	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values are maintained and enhanced while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from absorb development within those landscapes are enabled	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS515.26		Wakatipu Equities	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows:  <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from <u>absorb development within those landscapes are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS522.30		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows:  <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from <u>absorb development within those landscapes are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS523.3		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows:  <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from <u>absorb development within those landscapes are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS530.1		Byron Ballan	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows:  <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from <u>absorb development within those landscapes are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS532.20		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> <del>the district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values</del> <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from <u>absorb development within those landscapes are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS534.22		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> <del>the district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values</del> <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from <u>absorb development within those landscapes are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS535.22		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> <del>the district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values</del> <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from <u>absorb development within those landscapes are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS537.28		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows:  <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from <u>absorb development within those landscapes are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS669.11		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Delete <del>Maintain and enhance</del> the district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from those landscapes. And replace with: Rural living opportunities are enabled in identified appropriate areas.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS669.13		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Add new policy: Establish maximum density standards so as to indicate what at a minimum is a reasonable development density in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS761.19		ORFEL Ltd	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Support in Part Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from those landscapes <u>are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS763.1		Lake Hayes Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Support in part Amend Objective 22.2.1 to read as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while <del>enabling</del> rural living opportunities in areas that can <del>avoid detracting from</del> <u>absorb development within</u> those landscapes are enabled.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS764.1		Mount Christina Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Oppose in part. Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while <del>enabling</del> rural living opportunities in areas that can <del>avoid detracting from</del> <u>absorb development within</u> those landscapes <u>are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS767.1		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.1 as follows: <del>Maintain and enhance</del> The district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values <u>are maintained and enhanced</u> while <del>enabling</del> rural living opportunities in areas that can <del>avoid detracting from</del> <u>absorb development within</u> those landscapes <u>are enabled</u> .	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1068.22	535.22	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1071.35	535.22	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1071.78	532.20	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1120.32	537.28	Brial, Michael	22.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1150.8	243.8	ORFEL Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	We seek that the parts of this submission relating to Objective 22.2.1, Policy 22.2.1.1, Policy 22.2.1.3 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the suggested changes to these propositions. The changes to Policy 22.2.1.1 to "avoid visually prominent buildings ..." has a particular legal meaning following the judgement of the supreme court in the King Salmon case, which would result in a level of protection inappropriate for the management of this resource. ORFEL also disagrees that Policy 22.2.1.3 should be changed to make density provisions inflexible. ORFEL considers that this change may prevent achieving high quality design outcomes response to landscape values and topography through rigid adherence to density and it is appropriate to retain some discretion through the policy.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1224.8	243.8	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1256.3	523.3	Ashford Trust	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1256.46	537.28	Ashford Trust	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1259.6	535.22	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1267.6	535.22	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1286.37	537.28	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1292.32	537.28	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1292.79	522.30	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1322.24	532.20	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specifk nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1322.62	534.22	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1322.99	535.22	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1325.5	243.8	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.2.1 Objective 1	Oppose	seek that the parts of this submission relating to Objective 22.2.1, Policy 22.2.1.1, Policy 22.2.1.3 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lake Hayes opposes the suggested changes to these propositions. The changes to Policy 22.2.1.1 to "avoid visually prominent buildings ..." has a particular legal meaning following the judgement of the Supreme Court in the King Salmon case, which would result in a level of protection inappropriate for the management of this resource. Lake Hayes also disagrees that Policy 22.2.1.3 should be changed to make density provisions inflexible. Lake Hayes considers that this change may prevent achieving high quality design outcomes response to landscape values and topography through rigid adherence to density and it is appropriate to retain some discretion through the policy.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS497.4		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2.1.1.	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.1 as follows: Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, <u>remedied, or mitigated</u> , particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS513.33		Jenny Barb	22.2.1.1.	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.1 as follows: Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, <u>remedied, or mitigated</u> , particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS515.27		Wakatipu Equities	22.2.1.1.	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.1 as follows: Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, <u>remedied, or mitigated</u> , particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS522.31		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.2.1.1.	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.1 as follows: Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, <u>remedied, or mitigated</u> , particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS523.4		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.2.1.1.	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.1 as follows: Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, <u>remedied, or mitigated</u> , particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS530.2		Byron Ballan	22.2.1.1.	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.1 as follows: Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, <u>remedied, or mitigated</u> , particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS537.29		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.2.1.1.	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.1 as follows:  Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, <u>remedied, or mitigated</u> , particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1120.33	537.29	Brial, Michael	22.2.1.1.	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1256.4	523.4	Ashford Trust	22.2.1.1.	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1256.47	537.29	Ashford Trust	22.2.1.1.	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1286.38	537.29	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1.1.	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1292.33	537.29	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1.1.	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1292.80	522.31	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1.1.	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS238.121		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22.2.1.2	Oppose	Questions whether "minimum" is a typo and should be maximum. Change minimum to maximum.	Accept		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS368.1		Anna-Marie Chin Architects and Phil Vautier	22.2.1.2	Oppose	Change minimum density requirements to maximum density requirements.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
OS497.5		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2.1.2	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.2 as follows: <del>Set minimum density and building coverage standards in order to achieve and maintain an appropriate density of development and related rural amenity values. so that adverse effects on the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced</del>	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS513.34		Jenny Barb	22.2.1.2	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.2 as follows:  Set minimum density and building coverage standards so <u>that adverse effects on the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced-mitigated</u>	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS515.28		Wakatipu Equities	22.2.1.2	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.2 as follows:  Set minimum density and building coverage standards so <u>that adverse effects on the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced-mitigated</u>	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS522.32		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.2.1.2	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.2 as follows: <del>Set minimum density and building coverage standards in order to achieve and maintain an appropriate density of development and related rural amenity values. so that adverse effects on the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced</del>	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS523.5		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.2.1.2	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.2 as follows: <del>Set minimum density and building coverage standards in order to achieve and maintain an appropriate density of development and related rural amenity values. so that adverse effects on the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced</del>	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS530.3		Byron Ballan	22.2.1.2	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.2 as follows:  Set minimum density and building coverage standards so <u>that adverse effects on the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced-mitigated.</u>	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS537.30		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.2.1.2	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.1.2 as follows:  Set minimum density and building coverage standards so <u>that adverse effects on the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced-mitigated.</u>	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS669.12		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.2.1.2	Oppose	Set <del>minimum</del> <u>maximum</u> density and building coverage standards so <u>as to maintain</u> the open space, natural and rural <u>amenity values</u> qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced.	Reject		C and M Burgess
FS1107.126	238.121	Man Street Properties Ltd	22.2.1.2	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1120.34	537.30	Brial, Michael	22.2.1.2	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1157.36	238.121	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.2.1.2	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1226.126	238.121	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22.2.1.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1234.126	238.121	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22.2.1.2	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1239.126	238.121	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22.2.1.2	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1241.126	238.121	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22.2.1.2	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1242.149	238.121	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22.2.1.2	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1248.126	238.121	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22.2.1.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1249.126	238.121	Tweed Development Limited	22.2.1.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1256.5	523.5	Ashford Trust	22.2.1.2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1256.48	537.30	Ashford Trust	22.2.1.2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1286.39	537.30	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1.2	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1292.34	537.30	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1.2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part	Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1292.81	522.32	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1.2	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS238.122		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22.2.1.3	Other	Support in part. Add: <u>Mandatory Urban Design Panel review for such developments. High quality urban design outcomes essential.</u>	Reject		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
OS368.2		Anna-Marie Chin Architects and Phil Vautier	22.2.1.3	Other	Support in part, require an urban design panel or a dedicated review panel assess these proposals.	Reject		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
OS444.1		Taylor, Mark and Jane	22.2.1.3	Support	Supports the ability to consider density provisions for design led outcomes.	Accept		Density
OS444.9		Taylor, Mark and Jane	22.2.1.3	Other	That Standard 22.5.11 explicitly gives effect to Policy 22.2.1.3 to avoid any ambiguity.	Accept in part		I do not recommend modifying the minimum allotment size. However I accept that an average density has merits. Proposals can apply for a resource consent and these cases can be treated on a case by case basis.
OS669.14		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.2.1.3	Other	Amend as follows: Allow for flexibility of the density provisions, where <del>design led and innovative patterns of subdivision and residential development, roading and planting would enhance the character of the zone and the District's landscapes, effects on</del> landscape and amenity values would be no worse than that of a proposal which complies with the maximum density provisions	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1089.35	444.1	McGuinness, Mark	22.2.1.3	Support	Supports in part. Supports the discussion and relief sought with regard to policy 22.2.2.1, Rule 22.4.12 regarding community activities within the Rural Residential Zone. Seeks clarification of Standard 22.5.11 that requires not more than one residential unit per 4000m2 so that dwellings may be clustered together with the balance of the land retained as open (landscaped) space.	Accept in part		I do not recommend modifying the minimum allotment size. However I accept that an average density has merits. Proposals can apply for a resource consent and these cases can be treated on a case by case basis.
FS1107.127	238.122	Man Street Properties Ltd	22.2.1.3	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1150.2	238.122	ORFEL Limited	22.2.1.3	Oppose	We seek that the submission relating to Policy 22.2.1.3 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the relief requested to amend policy 22.2.1.3 to require mandatory urban design panel review for development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Mandatory assessment by the urban design panel is unnecessary given no urban design assessment through a resource consent process is proposed to apply within the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1150.14	368.2	ORFEL Limited	22.2.1.3	Support	We seek that the part of this submission relating to Policy 22.2.1.3 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the relief sought by this submitter to modify Policy 22.2.1.3 in a manner that would make Urban Design Panel review a mandatory part of any subdivision or development proposal within the rural lifestyle or rural residential zones. Mandatory assessment by the urban design panel is unnecessary given no urban design assessment through a resource consent process is proposed to apply within the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.



Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1157.37	238.122	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.2.1.3	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1226.127	238.122	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22.2.1.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1234.127	238.122	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22.2.1.3	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1239.127	238.122	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22.2.1.3	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1241.127	238.122	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22.2.1.3	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1242.150	238.122	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22.2.1.3	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1248.127	238.122	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22.2.1.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1249.127	238.122	Tweed Development Limited	22.2.1.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1255.30	238.122	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2.1.3	Oppose	Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks the involvement of the Urban Design Panel in Rural and/or Rural Residential/Rural Lifestyle subdivision.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1256.63	238.122	Ashford Trust	22.2.1.3	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks relief for policy 22.2.1.3	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1258.1	238.122	Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited	22.2.1.3	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks relief for policy 22.2.1.3	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1273.1	238.122	Heywood, Robert and Elvena - represented by Warwick Goldsmith, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.1.3	Oppose	Opposes. States that mandatory assessment by the urban design panel is unnecessary given no urban design assessment through a resource consent process is proposed to apply within the Rural Lifestyle zone. Seeks that QLDC to refuse the submission insofar as it seeks relief for policy 22.2.1.3.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1325.14	368.2	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.2.1.3		Support/Oppose - seek that the part of this submission relating to Policy 22.2.1.3 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lake Hayes supports the proposal to enable landscape architects and architects assist with design controls/guidelines on proposals administered by residents, but opposes the relief sought by this submitter to modify Policy 22.2.1.3 in a manner that would make "Urban Design Panel" review a mandatory part of any subdivision or development proposal within the rural lifestyle or rural residential zones.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
FS1325.15	238.122	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.2.1.3		Support/Oppose - seek that the part of this submission relating to Policy 22.2.1.3 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission. - Lake Hayes supports the proposal to enable landscape architects and architects assist with design controls/guidelines on proposals administered by residents, but opposes the relief requested to amend policy 22.2.1.3 to require mandatory urban design panel review for development in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Accept in part		The reference to design led flexibility of provisions is on the Rural Lifestyle Zone density requirement that maintain an average. These zones are not urban development. Assessing the subdivision design does not need an urban design panel.
OS289.17		Brown, A	22.2.1.6	Other	Amend to require all new and replacement lighting in the district to be downward facing using energy efficient light bulbs.	Reject		the submitter has no supplied any justification in temr sof the economic costs and benefits of making this change.
OS761.20		ORFEL Ltd	22.2.1.7	Other	Support in Part Move Policy 22.2.1.7 to sit under Objective 22.2.3.	Reject		Objective 1 is relevant to housing generally and fire risk from vegetation. Retain in this location
OS763.2		Lake Hayes Limited	22.2.1.7	Other	Support in part Move Policy 22.2.1.7 to sit under Objective 22.2.3	Reject		Objective 1 is relevant to housing generally and fire risk from vegetation. Retain in this location
OS764.2		Mount Christina Limited	22.2.1.7		Move Policy 22.2.1.7 to sit under Objective 22.2.3.	Reject		Objective 1 is relevant to housing generally and fire risk from vegetation. Retain in this location
OS767.2		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.2.1.7	Other	Move Policy 22.2.1.7 to sit under Objective 22.2.3.	Reject		Objective 1 is relevant to housing generally and fire risk from vegetation. Retain in this location
OS217.16		Berriman, Jay	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	No decision sought.		No issue identifeid or decision sought.	
OS243.9		Byrch, Christine	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Delete 'and where appropriate, visitor activities' from objective 22.2.2.	Reject		Visitor Accommodation
OS248.2		Shotover Trust	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Oppose in part Objective 22.2.2 and Policy 22.2.2.3 which seek to discourage commercial and non-residential activities, including restaurants, visitor accommodation and industrial activities from occurring within the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Reject		Commercial Activities
OS285.14		MacColl, Debbie	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Provide a framework so that visitor accommodation and rural amenities can co exist with residential development in the rural area.	Reject		Visitor Accommodation
OS294.3		Bunn, Steven	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	The objective should be widened. QLDC should be zoning more Rural Residential land and providing more tourist and diverse activities in the rural area.	Reject		Visitor Accommodation

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS380.42		Villa dellago	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		Entire Report
OS423.3		Bunn, Carol	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Encourage commercial and non-residential activities, especially in locations that are next to or near the Queenstown cycle trail.	Reject		Commercial Activity
OS497.6		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential, visitor and, <u>where appropriate</u> , community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS513.35		Jenny Barb	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows: <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS515.29		Wakatipu Equities	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS522.33		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS523.6		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS524.36		Ministry of Education	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Retain	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS530.4		Byron Ballan	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS532.21		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows: <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS534.23		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows: <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS535.23		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows: <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS537.31		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows <del>Ensure the</del> <u>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</u> , predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS600.95		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	22.2.2 Objective 2		Objective 22.2.2 is adopted as proposed.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS669.15		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Replace/Renumber as a policy	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS674.9		Hadley, J & R	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Strongly disagree with Objective 22.2.2. Visitor and community activities should in almost all cases not be included in the zone. We also note that visitor activities could be commercial activities which are discouraged at Policy 22.2.2.3.	Reject		Community activities

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS761.22		ORFEL Ltd	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Support in Part Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows: <u>Ensure the <b>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</b>, predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.</u>	Accept in part		Community activities
OS763.3		Lake Hayes Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Support in part Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows: <u>Ensure the <b>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</b>, predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.</u>	Accept in part		Community activities
OS764.4		Mount Christina Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Support in part. Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows: <u>Ensure the <b>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</b>, predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.</u>	Accept in part		Community activities
OS767.3		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.2 as follows: <u>Ensure the <b>Within the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones</b>, predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.</u>	Accept in part		Community activities
OS844.2		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Retain	Accept in part		Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS844.6		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.2.2 Objective 2		<u>New Policy 22.2.2.3: Recognise and provide for the positive effects that community activities and facilities can have on the environment while ensuring that such activities and facilities are undertaken to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects on the rural environment.</u>	Reject		Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1034.95	600.95	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1050.10	674.9	Jan Andersson	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Accept in part		Community activities
FS1068.23	535.23	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1071.36	535.23	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1071.79	532.21	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1082.9	674.9	Hadley, J and R	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Community activities
FS1089.10	674.9	McGuiness, Mark	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		Community activities
FS1097.129	285.14	Queenstown Park Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Support for the reasons outlined in QPL's primary submission.	Reject		Visitor Accommodation
FS1120.35	537.31	Brial, Michael	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1125.17	763.3	New Zealand Fire Service	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Allow. The Commission is neutral on whether or not subdivision is changed from a Discretionary to a Controlled Activity. However, should the Commissions submission point 438.39 requesting the inclusion of new standards requiring the provision of fire fighting water supply in accordance with the NZFS Code of Practice (SNZ PAS 4509:2008) not be accepted, and this submission point is accepted, then the Commission supports the inclusion of fire fighting water supply as a matter over which Council will restrict its control. The Commission requests though that the provisions include a specific reference to the the NZFS Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	Accept in Part		Firefighting
FS1146.9	674.9	Nicolson, Lee	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		Community activities
FS1209.95	600.95	Burdon, Richard	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Support entire submission	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1224.9	243.9	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
FS1255.3	674.9	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks to restrict or discourage visitor accommodation in these zones. Visitor accommodation using an existing dwelling, such as Air BnB type visitor accommodation which makes use of existing infrastructure and generates effects very little different from residential activities, is appropriate in these zones.	Accept in part		Community activities
FS1256.6	523.6	Ashford Trust	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1256.49	537.31	Ashford Trust	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1259.7	535.23	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1267.7	535.23	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1286.40	537.31	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1292.35	537.31	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1292.82	522.33	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1322.25	532.21	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specifk nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1322.63	534.23	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		No issue identifeid or decision sought.	
FS1322.100	535.23	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		No issue identifeid or decision sought.	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS444.2		Taylor, Mark and Jane	22.2.2.1	Oppose	Amend to read: 'Provide for residential and farming as permitted activities, and recognise that depending on the location, scale and type, community activities may be compatible with and enhance the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones where these primarily benefit the local community'.	Reject		Community activities and the policy and framework is considered to meet the relief sought.
OS524.37		Ministry of Education	22.2.2.1	Support	Retain	Accept in part		Community activities
OS600.96		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	22.2.2.1	Support	Policy 22.2.2.1 is adopted as proposed.	Accept in part		Community activities
OS844.3		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.2.2.1	Support	Retain.	Accept		Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1034.96	600.96	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22.2.2.1	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		Community activities
FS1089.36	444.2	McGuiness, Mark	22.2.2.1	Support	Supports in part. Supports the discussion and relief sought with regard to policy 22.2.2.1, Rule 22.4.12 regarding community activities within the Rural Residential Zone. Seeks clarification of Standard 22.5.11 that requires not more than one residential unit per 4000m2 so that dwellings may be clustered together with the balance of the land retained as open (landscaped) space.	Accept in part		Density
FS1209.96	600.96	Burdon, Richard	22.2.2.1	Support	Support entire submission	Accept in part		Community activities
OS238.123		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22.2.2.2	Other	Support in part. add ' <u>shall be discouraged</u> ' to avoid undermining.	Reject		Community activities
OS497.7		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2 and replace with the following: <u>Encourage the efficient and effective use of land zoned for rural living purposes.</u>	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS513.36		Jenny Barb	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete <b>Policy 22.2.2.2</b>	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS513.37		Jenny Barb	22.2.2.2	Support	Add new policy: <u>Encourage the efficient and effective use of land zoned for rural living purposes.</u>	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS515.30		Wakatipu Equities	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS522.34		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS523.7		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS523.8		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.2.2.2	Support	<u>Encourage the efficient and effective use of land zoned for rural living purposes.</u>	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS530.5		Byron Ballan	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS532.22		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS534.24		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS534.25		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.2.2.2	Support	Add the following new policy: <u>Encourage the efficient and effective use of land zoned for rural living purposes.</u>	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density



Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS535.24		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS535.25		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.2.2.2	Support	Add the following new policy: <u>Encourage the efficient and effective use of land zoned for rural living purposes.</u>	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS537.32		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.2.2	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS719.107		NZ Transport Agency	22.2.2.2	Support	Retain	Accept		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS844.4		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.2.2.2	Other	Amend to: Any development <u>of the rural lifestyle zone</u> , including subdivision, located on the periphery of residential and township areas, shall avoid undermining the integrity of the urban rural edge and where applicable, the urban growth boundaries.	Reject		Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1068.24	535.24	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1068.25	535.25	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1071.37	535.24	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.2.2.2	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1071.38	535.25	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.2.2.2	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1071.80	532.22	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.2.2.2	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to a submission on rezoning.	
FS1107.128	238.123	Man Street Properties Ltd	22.2.2.2	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Community activities
FS1120.36	537.32	Brial, Michael	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1157.38	238.123	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.2.2.2	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.	Reject		Community activities
FS1226.128	238.123	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22.2.2.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Community activities
FS1234.128	238.123	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22.2.2.2	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Community activities
FS1239.128	238.123	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1241.128	238.123	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22.2.2.2	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose
FS1242.151	238.123	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22.2.2.2	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Reject		Community activities
FS1248.128	238.123	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22.2.2.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose
FS1249.128	238.123	Tweed Development Limited	22.2.2.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose
FS1256.7	523.7	Ashford Trust	22.2.2.2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1256.8	523.8	Ashford Trust	22.2.2.2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1256.50	537.32	Ashford Trust	22.2.2.2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1259.8	535.24	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.2.2	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1259.9	535.25	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.2.2	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1267.8	535.24	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.2.2	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1267.9	535.25	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.2.2	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1286.41	537.32	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.2.2	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1292.36	537.32	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.2.2	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1292.83	522.34	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.2.2.2	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1322.26	532.22	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.2.2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to a submission on rezoning.	
FS1322.64	534.24	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.2.2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		No issue identified or decision sought.	
FS1322.65	534.25	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.2.2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		No issue identified or decision sought.	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1322.101	535.24	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.2.2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
FS1322.102	535.25	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.2.2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to rezoning request. Not specifically on Chapter 22 provisions.	
OS221.3		Cleaver, Susan	22.2.2.3	Oppose	Oppose the policy. Encourage commercial and non-residential activities, especially in locations that are next to or near the Queenstown and NZ Cycle trails.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density and Commercial activity
OS265.3		Bunn, Phillip	22.2.2.3	Oppose	Encourage Commercial and Non Residential activity - Commercial development should be encouraged in areas where there is public activity. eg: Cycle Trail.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density and Commercial Activity
OS577.1		Murray and Narelle Garrick	22.2.2.3	Other	Oppose in part. Policy 22.2.2.3 is deleted and replaced with the following wording (or similar) ‘To ensure the nature and scale and hours of operation of non-residential activities do not compromise the amenity, quality and character of the Rural Residential Zone and Rural Lifestyle zone and the vitality of the District’s commercial zones are not undermined’.	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS674.6		Hadley, J & R	22.2.2.3	Support	Support Policy 22.2.2.3 that discourages commercial and non-residential activities so that the amenity, quality and character of the RRZ is not diminished.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS719.108		NZ Transport Agency	22.2.2.3	Support	Support	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS763.4		Lake Hayes Limited	22.2.2.3	Other	Support in part Amend Policy 22.2.2.3 as follows: Discourage commercial and non-residential activities, including restaurants, visitor accommodation and industrial activities, <del>so that where</del> the amenity, quality and character of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones <del>are not diminished</del> would be <u>adversely affected</u> and the vitality of the District’s commercial zones <del>not</del> undermined	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS764.5		Mount Christina Limited	22.2.2.3		Oppose in part. Amend 22.2.2.3 as follows: Discourage commercial and non-residential activities, including restaurants, visitor accommodation and industrial activities, <del>so that where</del> the amenity, quality and character of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones <del>are not diminished</del> <u>is adversely affected</u> and the vitality of the District’s commercial zones <del>is not</del> undermined.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS767.4		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.2.2.3	Other	Amend Policy 22.2.2.3 as follows: Discourage commercial and non-residential activities <u>in areas outside of the commercial overlay</u> , including restaurants, visitor accommodation and industrial activities, <del>so that where</del> the amenity, quality and character of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones <del>are not diminished</del> <u>would be adversely affected</u> and the vitality of the District’s commercial zones <del>is not</del> undermined	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS844.5		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses	22.2.2.3	Other	Amend 22.2.2.3 to: Discourage commercial and non-residential activities ( <u>excluding community activities</u> ), including restaurants, visitor accommodation and industrial activities, so that the amenity, quality and character of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones are not diminished and the vitality of the District’s commercial zones is not undermined.	Reject		Visitor Accommodation, Community and Commercial Activities
FS1015.132	764.5	Straterra	22.2.2.3	Oppose	I seek that 764.5 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: “Oppose in part. Amend 22.2.2.3 as follows: Discourage commercial and non-residential activities, including restaurants, visitor accommodation and industrial activities, <u>except in the case of location-specific and/or temporary activities</u> , so that the amenity, quality and character of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones are not <del>significantly degraded</del> <u>diminished</u> and the vitality of the District’s commercial zones <del>is maintained</del> <u>not undermined</u> .”	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1015.133	767.4	Straterra	22.2.2.3	Oppose	I seek that 767.4 be allowed, subject to the proposed amendments below: "Amend Policy 22.2.2.3 as follows: Discourage commercial and non-residential activities in areas outside of the commercial overlay, including restaurants, visitor accommodation and industrial activities where the amenity, quality and character of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones would be adversely affected, <u>except in the case of location-specific and/or temporary activities</u> , and the vitality of the District's commercial zones is <u>maintained</u> not undermined."	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1050.7	674.6	Jan Andersson	22.2.2.3	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1082.6	674.6	Hadley, J and R	22.2.2.3	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1089.7	674.6	McGuinness, Mark	22.2.2.3	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1146.6	674.6	Nicolson, Lee	22.2.2.3	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1255.9	674.6	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.2.2.3	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks policy protection for rural character in these zones. "Rural character" is different from "rural living character". Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones, when developed, have rural living character. It is inappropriate to seek to retain rural character in these zones.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS243.25		Byrch, Christine	22.2.2.4	Oppose	Visitor accommodation is too different from the purpose of this zone to have a visitor accommodation sub zone.	Reject		Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1224.25	243.25	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.2.2.4	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS530.6		Byron Ballan	22.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Amend <b>Objective 22.2.3</b> , as follows: <del>Manage</del> <u>new development and adequately manages natural hazards risks</u> .	Accept		Objective 22.2.3
OS669.16		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.2.3 Objective 3	Oppose	Delete: <del>Objective – Manage new development and natural hazards</del>	Reject		Objective 22.2.3
OS761.21		ORFEL Ltd	22.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Support in part. Move Policy 22.2.1.7 to sit under Objective 22.2.3.	Reject		Density
OS761.23		ORFEL Ltd	22.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Support in Part Amend Objective 22.2.3 <del>Manage</del> <u>new development and adequately manages natural hazards risks</u> .	Accept		Objective 22.2.3
OS763.5		Lake Hayes Limited	22.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Support in part. Amend Objective 22.2.3 as follows: <del>Manage</del> <u>new development and adequately manages natural hazards risks</u> .	Accept		Objective 22.2.3
OS764.3		Mount Christina Limited	22.2.3 Objective 3		Move Policy 22.2.1.7 to sit under Objective 22.2.3.	Reject		Objective 22.2.3
OS764.6		Mount Christina Limited	22.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Support in part Amend Objective 22.2.3, as follows: <del>Manage</del> <u>new development and adequately manages natural hazards risks</u> .	Accept		Objective 22.2.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS767.5		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.2.3 Objective 3	Other	Amend Objective 22.2.3, as follows: <del>Manage n</del> New development and <u>adequately manages</u> natural hazards <u>risks</u> .	Accept in part		
OS669.17		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.2.3.1	Oppose	Delete: Policy – Parts of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones have been, and might be identified in the future as susceptible to natural hazards and some areas may not be appropriate for residential activity if the natural hazard risk cannot be adequately managed.	Reject		Objective 22.2.3
OS763.6		Lake Hayes Limited	22.2.3.1	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.3.1	Reject		Objective 22.2.3
OS764.7		Mount Christina Limited	22.2.3.1	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.3.1.	Reject		Objective 22.2.3
OS767.6		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.2.3.1	Oppose	Delete Policy 22.2.3.1.	Reject		Objective 22.2.3
OS217.17		Berriman, Jay	22.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Supports the objective, Rural Lifestyle developments to be encouraged and Rural Residential to be heavily restricted, especially around Lake Hayes and Arrow Junction areas.	Accept		
OS243.24		Byrch, Christine	22.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	Delete 'and where appropriate, visitor activities' from objective 22.2.2	Reject		Entire Report
OS380.43		Villa dellago	22.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		
OS438.33		New Zealand Fire Service	22.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Retain 22.2.4 as notified	Accept		Fire-Fighting
OS719.109		NZ Transport Agency	22.2.4 Objective 4	Support	Retain	Accept		
FS1224.24	243.24	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.2.4 Objective 4	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS719.110		NZ Transport Agency	22.2.4.1.	Support	Retain	Accept		
OS719.111		NZ Transport Agency	22.2.4.2	Support	Retain	Accept		
OS243.10		Byrch, Christine	22.2.5 Objective 5	Other	Revise, it needs to be more clearly written.	Reject		Entire Report
OS600.97		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	22.2.5 Objective 5	Support	Objective 22.2.5 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		
OS719.112		NZ Transport Agency	22.2.5 Objective 5	Support	Retain	Accept		
OS811.4		Scaife, Marc	22.2.5 Objective 5	Support	With reference to the Control of buildings objective 22.2.2.5 refers to the bulk scale and intensity of buildings. The latter is missing in 22.4.10. Also there is control over buildings, but questions control over numbers of people for different activities/land use types.	Reject		The matters of control for VA in the subzone are considered adequate. Intensity is addressed by site standard 22.5.13 that controls density and intensity is included.
FS1034.97	600.97	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22.2.5 Objective 5	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		
FS1209.97	600.97	Burdon, Richard	22.2.5 Objective 5	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		
FS1224.10	243.10	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.2.5 Objective 5	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1224.51	811.4	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.2.5 Objective 5	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS534.26		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.2.5.1	Other	Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m <sup>2</sup> , new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape: <u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:</u> 22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs; 22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist). <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u> Discretion is restricted to all of the following: • Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties. • Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building. • The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.	Reject		Standards for Structures and Buildings 22.5.1
OS535.26		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.2.5.1	Other	Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m <sup>2</sup> , new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape: <u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:</u> 22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs; 22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist). <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u> Discretion is restricted to all of the following: • Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties. • Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building. • The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.	Reject		Standards for Structures and Buildings 22.5.1
OS600.98		Federated Farmers of New Zealand	22.2.5.1	Support	Policy 22.2.5.1 is adopted as proposed.	Accept		
OS719.113		NZ Transport Agency	22.2.5.1	Support	Retain	Accept		
FS1034.98	600.98	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22.2.5.1	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		
FS1068.26	535.26	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.2.5.1	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).		Relates to a rezoning.	
FS1071.39	535.26	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.2.5.1	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to a rezoning.	
FS1157.57	534.26	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.2.5.1	Support	The submission point be accepted to the extent it is not inconsistent with the Trojan Helmet Limited's original submission. The submission in relation to Rule 22.5, which seeks clarification and amendment to the Building Materials and Colours rule, including that the former 36% reflectivity LRV is reinstated, is supported	Reject		Standards for Structures and Buildings 22.5.1
FS1209.98	600.98	Burdon, Richard	22.2.5.1	Support	Support entire submission	Accept		
FS1259.10	535.26	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.5.1	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.		Relates to a rezoning.	
FS1267.10	535.26	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.2.5.1	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.		Relates to a rezoning.	
FS1322.66	534.26	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.5.1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Standards for Structures and Buildings 22.5.1
FS1322.103	535.26	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.2.5.1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to a rezoning.	
OS243.11		Byrch, Christine	22.2.6 Objective 6	Other	Clarify the sentences within the objective and policies.	Reject		Entire Report
OS380.44		Villa dellago	22.2.6 Objective 6	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS694.3		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.2.6 Objective 6	Oppose	Delete the following: Objective – Bob’s Cove Rural Residential subzone – To create comprehensively planned residential development with ample open space and a predominance of indigenous vegetation throughout the zone. Policies: Ensure at least 75% of the zone is retained as undomesticated area and at least 50% of this area is established and maintained in indigenous species such that total indigenous vegetation cover is maintained over that area. Ensure there is open space in front of buildings that remains generally free of vegetation to avoid disrupting the open pastoral character of the area and the lake and mountain views.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS712.6		Bobs Cove Developments Limited	22.2.6 Objective 6	Oppose	Delete this objective		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1224.11	243.11	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.2.6 Objective 6	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS694.4		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.2.6.1	Oppose	Delete the following: Objective – Bob’s Cove Rural Residential subzone – To create comprehensively planned residential development with ample open space and a predominance of indigenous vegetation throughout the zone. Policies: Ensure at least 75% of the zone is retained as undomesticated area and at least 50% of this area is established and maintained in indigenous species such that total indigenous vegetation cover is maintained over that area. Ensure there is open space in front of buildings that remains generally free of vegetation to avoid disrupting the open pastoral character of the area and the lake and mountain views.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS712.7		Bobs Cove Developments Limited	22.2.6.1	Oppose	Delete this policy		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.5		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.2.6.2	Oppose	Delete the following: Objective – Bob’s Cove Rural Residential subzone – To create comprehensively planned residential development with ample open space and a predominance of indigenous vegetation throughout the zone. Policies: Ensure at least 75% of the zone is retained as undomesticated area and at least 50% of this area is established and maintained in indigenous species such that total indigenous vegetation cover is maintained over that area. Ensure there is open space in front of buildings that remains generally free of vegetation to avoid disrupting the open pastoral character of the area and the lake and mountain views.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS712.8		Bobs Cove Developments Limited	22.2.6.2		Delete this policy		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.6		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.2.7 Objective 7	Support	Confirm the following: Objective - Bob’s Cove Rural Residential Zone - To maintain and enhance the ecological and amenity values of the Bob’s Cove Rural Residential zone. Policies: To ensure views of Lake Wakatipu and the surrounding landforms from the Glenorchy- Queenstown Road are retained through appropriate landscaping and the retention of view shafts. To ensure the ecological and amenity values of Bob’s Cove are retained and, where possible, enhanced through: ??appropriate landscaping using native plants; ??restricting the use of exotic plants; ??removing wilding species; ??providing guidance on the design and colour of buildings; ??maintaining view shafts from the Queenstown		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS712.9		Bobs Cove Developments Limited	22.2.7 Objective 7	Support	Confirm the following: Objective - Bob's Cove Rural Residential Zone - To maintain and enhance the ecological and amenity values of the Bob's Cove Rural Residential zone. Policies: To ensure views of Lake Wakatipu and the surrounding landforms from the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road are retained through appropriate landscaping and the retention of view shafts. To ensure the ecological and amenity values of Bob's Cove are retained and, where possible, enhanced through: · appropriate landscaping using native plants; · restricting the use of exotic plants; · removing wilding species; · providing guidance on the design and colour of buildings; · maintaining view shafts from the Queenstown-Glenorchy Road		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.7		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.2.7.1	Support	Confirm the following: Objective - Bob's Cove Rural Residential Zone - To maintain and enhance the ecological and amenity values of the Bob's Cove Rural Residential zone. Policies: To ensure views of Lake Wakatipu and the surrounding landforms from the Glenorchy- Queenstown Road are retained through appropriate landscaping and the retention of view shafts. To ensure the ecological and amenity values of Bob's Cove are retained and, where possible, enhanced through: ??appropriate landscaping using native plants; ??restricting the use of exotic plants; ??removing wilding species; ??providing guidance on the design and colour of buildings; ??maintaining view shafts from the Queenstown		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.8		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.2.7.2	Support	Confirm the following: Objective - Bob's Cove Rural Residential Zone - To maintain and enhance the ecological and amenity values of the Bob's Cove Rural Residential zone. Policies: To ensure views of Lake Wakatipu and the surrounding landforms from the Glenorchy- Queenstown Road are retained through appropriate landscaping and the retention of view shafts. To ensure the ecological and amenity values of Bob's Cove are retained and, where possible, enhanced through: ??appropriate landscaping using native plants; ??restricting the use of exotic plants; ??removing wilding species; ??providing guidance on the design and colour of buildings; ??maintaining view shafts from the Queenstown		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS21.43		Walsh, Alison	22.3 Other Provisions and Rules	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		
OS243.12		Byrch, Christine	22.3.2.7	Other	Is another floor area calculation necessary.	Accept		Entire Report
FS1224.12	243.12	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.3.2.7	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS21.44		Walsh, Alison	22.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		
OS243.13		Byrch, Christine	22.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Revise so that all buildings are given an activity status.	Reject		Entire Report
OS243.14		Byrch, Christine	22.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Remove the Visitor Accommodation sub-zone from the proposed plan.	Reject		Entire Report
OS581.4		Lesley and Jerry Burdon	22.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Add the following rules: 1. The maximum number of residential building platforms permitted within 'The Dene' Rural Lifestyle Zone is five (including one building platform encompassing the existing residential dwelling). Noncompliance with this rule to be a non-complying activity. 2. The maximum height of all buildings within 'The Dene' Rural Lifestyle Zone shall be 5m. Noncompliance with this rule to be a non-complying activity.		Rezoning request. Deferred to the hearing on mapping	



Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS674.3		Hadley, J & R	22.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Rules of the RRZ, which are more permissive than for the same Zone in the Operative Plan and seek that they be reviewed and strengthened in order to uphold the purpose and intention of the Zone, with particular reference to the North Lake Hayes Rural Residential Zone in which we own property. The PDP has an obligation to ensure that the important values of rural character and amenity that differentiate the RRZ from other residential zones are upheld and protected by the Rules and Assessment Matters of the RRZ.	Accept in part		Entire report including changes to the RR Zone at the north of Lake Hayes.
OS764.11		Mount Christina Limited	22.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.4.1 Visitor Accommodation to lower the activity status from Non-Complying to Restricted Discretionary, together with the addition of the following matters of discretion: Visitor Accommodation outside of a visitor accommodation subzone, including the construction or use of buildings for visitor accommodation. <u>Councils discretion is restricted to:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Impacts on the amenity values of neighbouring properties</u></li> <li>• <u>Traffic generation, access and parking</u></li> <li>• <u>Noise</u></li> <li>• <u>Signs and lighting</u></li> <li>• <u>The external appearance, bulk and scale of building</u></li> </ul>	Reject		Visitor Accommodation.
OS767.12		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.4 Rules - Activities		Insert a new rule within Table 1, providing for Commercial Activities within the Commercial Overlay as a controlled activity, as follows: Rule: <del>22.4.X</del> Activities – Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones: <u>Commercial activities located within the commercial overlay.</u> <u>Councils control is limited to:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The bulk, location and external appearance of the building</u></li> <li>• <u>Traffic generation, access and parking</u></li> <li>• <u>Servicing infrastructure</u></li> <li>• <u>Signs</u></li> <li>• <u>Landscaping</u></li> </ul> Activity Status: <u>C</u>		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1050.4	674.3	Jan Andersson	22.4 Rules - Activities	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Accept in part		Entire report including changes to the RR Zone at the north of Lake Hayes.
FS1082.3	674.3	Hadley, J and R	22.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		Entire report including changes to the RR Zone at the north of Lake Hayes.
FS1089.4	674.3	McGuinness, Mark	22.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		Entire report including changes to the RR Zone at the north of Lake Hayes.
FS1146.3	674.3	Nicolson, Lee	22.4 Rules - Activities	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept in part		Entire report including changes to the RR Zone at the north of Lake Hayes.
FS1224.13	243.13	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1224.14	243.14	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1255.6	674.3	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks policy protection for rural character in these zones. "Rural character" is different from "rural living character". Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones, when developed, have rural living character. It is inappropriate to seek to retain rural character in these zones.	Accept in part		Entire report including changes to the RR Zone at the north of Lake Hayes.
OS248.4		Shotover Trust	22.4.1	Oppose	Oppose in part the PDP objectives, policies and rules that inform and support the rule framework requiring non-complying activity consent to construct a dwelling not located within a building platform (Rule 22.4.1).	Reject		Commercial Activities
OS669.18		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.4.1	Oppose	Any other activity not listed in Tables 1-7: <u>NC P</u> And make consequential amendments to list non-complying activities.	Reject		A non-complying status is appropriate for activities not contemplated in the rule framework. The Submitter has not identified any activities that would inadvertently be captured by a non-complying status.
OS694.22		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.4.1	Oppose	Any other activity not listed in Tables 1-7: <u>NC P</u> And make consequential amendments to list non-complying activities	Reject		It is appropriate to make activities that are not contemplated a non-complying activity. The submitter has not identified any activities that would inadvertently require a non-comply resource consent.
OS712.12		Bobs Cove Developments Limited	22.4.1	Oppose	Any other activity not listed in Tables 1-7: <u>NC P</u> And make consequential amendments to list non-complying activities.	Reject		Refer to other comments on this matter.
OS763.7		Lake Hayes Limited	22.4.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.4.1 Visitor Accommodation to lower the activity status from Non-Complying to Restricted Discretionary, together with the addition of the following matters of discretion: <b>Visitor Accommodation</b> outside of a visitor accommodation subzone, including the construction or use of buildings for visitor accommodation. <u>Councils discretion is restricted to:</u> • <u>Impacts on the amenity values of neighbouring properties</u> • <u>Traffic generation, access and parking</u> • <u>Noise</u> • <u>Signs and lighting</u> • <u>The external appearance, bulk and scale of building</u>	Reject		Visitor Accommodation
OS219.2		Juie Q.T. Limited	22.4.2	Support	Retain	Accept		
OS669.19		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.4.2	Support	Retain as notified	Accept		Standards
OS694.23		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.4.2	Support	Retain as notified	Accept		
OS712.13		Bobs Cove Developments Limited	22.4.2	Support	Retain as notified	Accept		
OS763.8		Lake Hayes Limited	22.4.2	Support	Retain Rule 22.4.2 unchanged	Accept		
OS764.8		Mount Christina Limited	22.4.2	Support	Retain Rule 22.4.2 unchanged.	Accept		
OS767.9		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.4.2	Support	Retain Rule 22.4.2 unchanged.	Accept		Standards

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS844.7		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.4.2	Support	Retain rule	Accept		Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS811.2		Scaife, Marc	22.4.3		The change from controlled to permitted activity status for building platforms is sensible, but only if standards are introduced which define the matters previously controlled: location, appearance, earthworks, landscaping. These standards do not exist in the proposed plan as it stands.	Reject		Could not define relief sought.
OS811.3		Scaife, Marc	22.4.3	Support	The proposed plan is not clear as to the activity status of buildings Not on a building platform in the RL zone. Nor does there appear to be standard governing the number of non-residential buildings, or building platforms for non-residential buildings. But these matters do need to have clear rules.	Reject		First point: Rule 22.4.1 Non-complying activity. Second matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.
FS1224.49	811.2	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
FS1224.50	811.3	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
OS384.10		Glen Dene Ltd	22.4.3.1	Support	Support construction of a residential unit and associated accessory buildings on a building platform as a permitted activity.	Accept		
OS761.24		ORFEL Ltd	22.4.3.1	Support	Retain Rule 22.4.3.1 unchanged.	Accept		
OS238.124		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22.4.3.2	Oppose	Opposes the rule. Considers this should be Discretionary – incentivise working within approved building platforms to contain sprawl. Requests change to Discretionary Activity.	Reject		Rule 22.4.3.2
OS339.60		Alty, Evan	22.4.3.2		Add the following as a matter of discretion: <u>Nature Conservation Values</u>	Reject		Nature Conservation values are not necessarily located in these zones. If so they will be specified. Such as Bobs Cove.
OS350.2		Dalefield Trustee Ltd	22.4.3.2	Support	The Submitter SUPPORTS Rule 22.4.3.2 as it enables flexibility in the location of buildings within the building platform on the site.	Accept		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS350.3		Dalefield Trustee Ltd	22.4.3.2	Oppose	The submitter OPPOSES, and seeks the deletion of, "visibility from public places" in the list of matters over which discretionary is restricted.	Reject		This assessment matter is important to control the adverse effects of building that are not located in a building platform and exceed the standard allowing additions up to 30%. The ability to consider the effects from public places is appropriate and accords with the policies under Objectives 22.2.1 and 22.2.2 and even sections 6 and 7 of the RMA.
OS384.12		Glen Dene Ltd	22.4.3.2	Support	Support enabling the construction and exterior alterations to buildings within a building platform as a permitted activity.	Accept		
OS706.52		Forest and Bird NZ	22.4.3.2		Add the following as a matter of discretion: <u>Nature Conservation Values</u>	Reject		Nature Conservation values are not necessarily located in these zones. If so they will be specified. Such as Bobs Cove.
OS761.25		ORFEL Ltd	22.4.3.2	Support	Retain rule 22.4.3.2 unchanged.	Accept		
FS1015.114	706.52	Straterra	22.4.3.2	Oppose	I seek that 706.52 be disallowed: "Any development including subdivision shall avoid SNA's and avoid undermining the integrity of nature conservation values."	Accept		Nature Conservation values are not necessarily located in these zones. If so they will be specified. Such as Bobs Cove.
FS1107.129	238.124	Man Street Properties Ltd	22.4.3.2	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept		Rule 22.4.3.10
FS1150.3	238.124	ORFEL Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	We seek that the submission relating to Rule 22.4.3.2 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the relief requested to change the permitted status of exterior alteration of buildings located outside of building platforms to a discretionary activity. The permitted status provides appropriate flexibility for small scale alterations which would not impact on the important landscape and visual amenity characteristics of the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Accept		Rule 22.4.3.3
FS1157.39	238.124	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.4.3.2	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.	Accept		Rule 22.4.3.6
FS1162.106	706.52	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTOOD Law	22.4.3.2	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept		Nature Conservation values are not necessarily located in these zones. If so they will be specified. Such as Bobs Cove.
FS1226.129	238.124	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1234.129	238.124	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		22.1 Zone Purpose
FS1239.129	238.124	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in part		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
FS1241.129	238.124	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22.4.3.2	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.		Relates to Submission on Visitor Accommodation	
FS1242.152	238.124	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22.4.3.2	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1248.129	238.124	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1249.129	238.124	Tweed Development Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1255.29	238.124	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	Disallow this submission to the extent that it seeks to change the status of exterior alterations to existing buildings.	Accept		Rule 22.4.3.7
FS1256.64	238.124	Ashford Trust	22.4.3.2	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks relief for rule 22.4.3.2	Accept		Rule 22.4.3.8
FS1258.2	238.124	Ayrburn Farm Estate Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	Refuse the submission insofar as it seeks to amend rule 22.4.3.2	Accept		Rule 22.4.3.4
FS1273.2	238.124	Heywood, Robert and Elvena - represented by Warwick Goldsmith, Anderson Lloyd	22.4.3.2	Oppose	Opposes. States that the permitted status provides appropriate flexibility for small scale alterations which would not impact on the important landscape and visual amenity characteristics of the Rural Lifestyle zone.. Seeks that QLDC to refuse the submission insofar as it seeks relief for rule 22.4.3.2	Accept		Rule 22.4.3.5
FS1325.16	238.124	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.4.3.2	Oppose	seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.4.3.2 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lake Hayes opposes the relief requested to change the permitted status of exterior alteration of buildings located outside of building platforms to a discretionary activity. The permitted status provides appropriate flexibility for small scale alterations which would not impact on the important landscape and visual amenity characteristics of the Rural Lifestyle zone.	Accept		Rule 22.4.3.9
OS248.3		Shotover Trust	22.4.3.3	Other	Oppose in part the PDP objectives, policies and rules that inform and support the rule framework requiring a discretionary regime for the establishment of a new building platform within the Rural Lifestyle Zone (Rule 22.4.3.3). and non-complying activity consent to construct a dwelling not located within a building platform (Rule 22.4.1).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS761.26		ORFEL Ltd	22.4.3.3	Support	Retain rule 22.4.3.3 unchanged.	Accept		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS820.7		Jeremy Bell Investments	22.4.3.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.4.3.3 to change the activity status for a building platform for a residential unit from Discretionary to Controlled Activity status.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1034.151	820.7	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22.4.3.3	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS339.61		Alty, Evan	22.4.4	Oppose	Delete the Makarora Rural Lifestyle zone and rezone Rural.  Amend maps to rezone the Makarora Valley as Rural except for the town ship.		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS706.53		Forest and Bird NZ	22.4.4	Oppose	Delete the Makarora Rural Lifestyle zone and rezone Rural.  Amend maps to rezone the Makarora Valley as Rural except for the town ship.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1162.107	706.53	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTODD Law	22.4.4	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Accept in part		
OS219.3		Juie Q.T. Limited	22.4.5		Retain.	Accept		
OS763.9		Lake Hayes Limited	22.4.5	Support	Retain Rule 22.4.5 unchanged	Accept		
OS764.9		Mount Christina Limited	22.4.5	Support	Retain Rule 22.4.5 unchanged.	Accept		
OS767.10		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.4.5	Support	Retain Rule 22.4.5 unchanged.	Accept		Standards
OS219.4		Juie Q.T. Limited	22.4.6	Support	Retain.	Accept		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS350.4		Dalefield Trustee Ltd	22.4.6	Support	The Submitter SUPPORTS the permitted status of 'Residential Flat' in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. This definition assists in providing a pathway to affordability for landowners in the District.	Accept		
OS577.2		Murray and Narelle Garrick	22.4.6	Other	Oppose in part. Rule 22.4.16 is changed from a non-complying activity status to discretionary activity status.	Reject		Commercial Activity
OS761.27		ORFEL Ltd	22.4.6	Support	Retain rule 22.4.6 unchanged.	Accept		
OS764.10		Mount Christina Limited	22.4.6	Support	Retain rule 22.4.6 unchanged.	Accept		
OS767.11		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.4.6	Support	Retain rule 22.4.6 unchanged.	Accept		Standards
OS238.125		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22.4.9	Oppose	Opposes the rule. Considers should be Permitted activity to encourage locally grown and made goods for a more sustainable future. Change to Permitted Activity.	Reject		Controlled activity status is appropriate to manage the impacts on amenity generally and road safety. The status is controlled and Council must grant the consent. It is a checks and balances rule and is not considered onerous.
OS719.114		NZ Transport Agency	22.4.9	Support	Retain	Accept		
FS1107.130	238.125	Man Street Properties Ltd	22.4.9	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.		Not related to this matter	
FS1157.40	238.125	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.4.9	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.		Not related to this matter	
FS1226.130	238.125	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22.4.9	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1234.130	238.125	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22.4.9	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1239.130	238.125	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22.4.9	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1241.130	238.125	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22.4.9	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Reject		Relates to wider submission, not on this point associated with Policy 22.2.1.2.
FS1242.153	238.125	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22.4.9	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.		Relates to a rezoning	
FS1248.130	238.125	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22.4.9	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	accept		22.1 Purpose. In addition no specific alternative is submitted and without any evidence the notified version is appropriate.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1249.130	238.125	Tweed Development Limited	22.4.9	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	accept		22.1 Purpose. In addition no specific alternative is submitted and without any evidence the notified version is appropriate.
OS243.26		Byrch, Christine	22.4.10	Oppose	All visitor accommodation should be non-complying.	Reject		Visitor Accommodation
OS674.10		Hadley, J & R	22.4.10	Oppose	Impose much more stringent standards and assessment matters Visitor accommodation within a Visitor Subzone, including scale and intensity of the activity, effect on character and amenity within the RRZ, noise, traffic and visual effects.	Reject		The matters of control for VA in the subzone are considered adequate. Intensity is addressed by site standard 22.5.13 that controls density and intensity is included.
OS719.115		NZ Transport Agency	22.4.10	Support	Retain	Accept		Entire Report
OS811.15		Scaife, Marc	22.4.10		Opposes the VA subzone over the Matakauri Lodge. The proposed sub zone for Matakauri has no planning rationale. Submits that the creation of special Rural Lifestyle visitor accommodation subzones will not solve potential conflicts between the Rural Lifestyle zone and visitor accommodation , but rather enhance them. The site has been developed to a level of intensity that is now in excess of twenty times the standard for visitor accommodation activity.		Deferrd to the hearing on mapping	
FS1050.11	674.10	Jan Andersson	22.4.10	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Accept in Part		The matters of control for VA in the subzone are considered adequate. Intensity is addressed by site standard 22.5.13 that controls density and intensity is included.
FS1082.10	674.10	Hadley, J and R	22.4.10	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in Part		The matters of control for VA in the subzone are considered adequate. Intensity is addressed by site standard 22.5.13 that controls density and intensity is included.
FS1089.11	674.10	McGuinness, Mark	22.4.10	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in Part		The matters of control for VA in the subzone are considered adequate. Intensity is addressed by site standard 22.5.13 that controls density and intensity is included.
FS1146.10	674.10	Nicolson, Lee	22.4.10	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept in Part		The matters of control for VA in the subzone are considered adequate. Intensity is addressed by site standard 22.5.13 that controls density and intensity is included.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1224.26	243.26	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4.10	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1224.62	811.15	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4.10	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
FS1255.4	674.10	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.4.10	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks to restrict or discourage visitor accommodation in these zones. Visitor accommodation using an existing dwelling, such as Air BnB type visitor accommodation which makes use of existing infrastructure and generates effects very little different from residential activities, is appropriate in these zones.	Accept in Part		The matters of control for VA in the subzone are considered adequate. Intensity is addressed by site standard 22.5.13 that controls density and intensity is included.
OS236.4		Perkins, Claire & Nigel	22.4.11	Oppose	Opposes any potential for visitor accommodation beyond a small B and B type operation to be established in this zone in Albert Town. Make larger forms of visitor accommodation non complying or prohibited and amend the relevant objectives and policies to reflect these changes. Any consequential or additional relief to give effect to this submission.	Reject		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS674.7		Hadley, J & R	22.4.11	Support	Support Rule 22.4.11 that states Visitor Accommodation outside of a Visitor Accommodation sub zone is Non Complying.	Reject		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1050.8	674.7	Jan Andersson	22.4.11	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Reject		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1082.7	674.7	Hadley, J and R	22.4.11	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1089.8	674.7	McGuinness, Mark	22.4.11	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1146.7	674.7	Nicolson, Lee	22.4.11	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1203.4	236.4	Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.4.11	Oppose	Oppose Submission in its entirety	Accept in Part		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities



Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1255.2	674.7	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.4.11	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks to restrict or discourage visitor accommodation in these zones. Visitor accommodation using an existing dwelling, such as Air BnB type visitor accommodation which makes use of existing infrastructure and generates effects very little different from residential activities, is appropriate in these zones.	Accept		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS236.2		Perkins, Claire & Nigel	22.4.12	Oppose	Opposes the establishment of community activities, including restaurants and cafes, in this zone, in Albert Town. Make community activities non complying or prohibited and amend the relevant objectives and policies to reflect these changes.	Accept in Part		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS674.11		Hadley, J & R	22.4.12	Oppose	Oppose Rule 22.4.12 regarding community activities as this should be a Non Complying not Discretionary activity. Community activities require strong assessment standards so that the purpose of the zone for rural living is recognised and the rural character and amenity of the zone is maintained and so that non-residential activities are not allowed.	Accept in Part		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS844.8		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.4.12	Other	Amend to: Community Activity. <b>Control is reserved to all of the following:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Car parking</b></li> <li>• <b>Noise</b></li> <li>• <b>Signs and lighting</b></li> <li>• <b>The bulk and scale of buildings in the context of the scale of residential buildings in the surrounding area</b></li> <li>• <b>Access safety and transportation effects</b></li> <li>• <b>Landscaping</b></li> </ul>	Reject		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1050.12	674.11	Jan Andersson	22.4.12	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Accept in Part		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1082.11	674.11	Hadley, J and R	22.4.12	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in Part		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1089.12	674.11	McGuinness, Mark	22.4.12	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in Part		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1146.11	674.11	Nicolson, Lee	22.4.12	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept in Part		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
FS1203.2	236.2	Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.4.12	Oppose	Oppose Submission in its entirety	Accept in Part		12. Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS126.2		Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	22.4.13	Oppose	Make informal airports a non-complying activity in the Rural Lifestyle and Rural residential zones with the exception of the exemptions in 22.4.14 (farming, fire fighting and emergencies) with the addition of construction activities.	Reject		Informal Airports
OS243.27		Byrch, Christine	22.4.13	Oppose	Informal airports should be prohibited.	Reject		Informal Airports
OS674.12		Hadley, J & R	22.4.13	Oppose	Airports require strong assessment standards so that the purpose of the zone for rural living is recognised and the rural character and amenity of the zone is maintained and so that non-residential activities are not allowed.	Reject		Assessment Matters
OS811.5		Scaife, Marc	22.4.13	Support	Informal airports should have a prohibited activity status.	Reject		Informal Airports and Discretionary status is considered appropriate for proposals to be considered on their merits. Prohibited is too onerous.

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1050.13	674.12	Jan Andersson	22.4.13	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1082.12	674.12	Hadley, J and R	22.4.13	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1089.13	674.12	McGuiness, Mark	22.4.13	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1146.12	674.12	Nicolson, Lee	22.4.13	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1150.5	811.5	ORFEL Limited	22.4.13	Oppose	We seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.4.13 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the relief sought in this submission to list informal airports as a prohibited activity. The submission provides no justification for this change and is unsupported by fact, evidence of effects or sound resource management principles.	Accept		
FS1224.27	243.27	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4.13	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1224.52	811.5	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4.13	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
FS1325.2	811.5	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.4.13	Oppose	seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.4.13 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lake Hayes opposes the relief sought in this submission to list informal airports as a prohibited activity. The submission provides no justification for this change and is unsupported by fact, evidence of effects or sound resource management principles.	Accept		
OS674.14		Hadley, J & R	22.4.14	Oppose	Airports require strong assessment standards so that the purpose of the zone for rural living is recognised and the rural character and amenity of the zone is maintained and so that non-residential activities are not allowed. See uploaded submission paras 4.11 and 4.12	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1050.15	674.14	Jan Andersson	22.4.14	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1082.14	674.14	Hadley, J and R	22.4.14	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1089.15	674.14	McGuiness, Mark	22.4.14	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1146.14	674.14	Nicolson, Lee	22.4.14	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		Assessment Matters
OS243.28		Byrch, Christine	22.4.15	Oppose	Any building within a building restriction area should be prohibited.	Reject		Entire Report
FS1224.28	243.28	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.4.15	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS236.3		Perkins, Claire & Nigel	22.4.16	Oppose	Opposes the establishment of community activities, including restaurants and cafes, in this zone, in Albert Town. Make restaurants, cafes non complying or prohibited and amend relevant objectives and policies to reflect these changes. Any consequential or additional relief to give effect to this submission.	Accept in Part		Commercial Activities
OS674.8		Hadley, J & R	22.4.16	Support	Support Rule 22.4.16 that states any other commercial or industrial activity is Non Complying	Accept		Commercial Activities
OS674.13		Hadley, J & R	22.4.16	Oppose	Commercial and industrial activity require strong assessment standards so that the purpose of the zone for rural living is recognised and the rural character and amenity of the zone is maintained and so that non-residential activities are not allowed.	Accept in part		Commercial Activities
FS1050.9	674.8	Jan Andersson	22.4.16	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Accept		Commercial Activities
FS1050.14	674.13	Jan Andersson	22.4.16	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Accept in part		Commercial Activities

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1082.8	674.8	Hadley, J and R	22.4.16	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept		Commercial Activities
FS1082.13	674.13	Hadley, J and R	22.4.16	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		Commercial Activities
FS1089.9	674.8	McGuinness, Mark	22.4.16	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept		Commercial Activities
FS1089.14	674.13	McGuinness, Mark	22.4.16	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Accept in part		Commercial Activities
FS1146.8	674.8	Nicolson, Lee	22.4.16	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept		Commercial Activities
FS1146.13	674.13	Nicolson, Lee	22.4.16	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Accept in part		Commercial Activities
FS1203.3	236.3	Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.4.16	Oppose	Oppose Submission in its entirety	Accept in part		Commercial Activities
OS127.1		Chisholm, Simon	22.4.17	Oppose	That commercial secondary meat processing at a scale limited by output (maximum 10 metric tonnes/year) be a discretionary activity for rural residential and rural lifestyle zones	Accept		Prohibited commercial activities
OS486.3		Temple Peak Ltd	22.4.17	Oppose	Opposes Rule 22.4.1.7 and submits that "motor vehicle repair" should not be listed as a prohibited activity. iAmend by deleting the words "motor vehicle repair".	Reject		Prohibited commercial activities
OS21.45		Walsh, Alison	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		
OS243.15		Byrch, Christine	22.5 Rules - Standards	Other	No Decision specified.	Reject		Entire Report
OS243.16		Byrch, Christine	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Any non compliance should be prohibited	Reject		Entire Report
OS383.44		Queenstown Lakes District Council	22.5 Rules - Standards	Other	Amend spelling to Wyuna.	Accept		Spelling error.
OS481.5		Cabo Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards		Reference correction in Part 22.5 Rules – Standards. Delete the Wyuna Station Rural Lifestyle Zone Table '4' and insert correct reference Table 7	Accept		Spelling error.
OS532.29		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.5 Rules - Standards		Insert Table 7 into the Rural Lifestyle Chapter (subzone Northern Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway) with the following provision:  Table 7: 22.5.39  Rural Lifestyle (Northern Frankton Ladies Mile Highway sub zone): Building restriction area: Buildings shall be located a distance of 100m from the Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway.  Non-compliance status D_C		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS532.30		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.5 Rules - Standards		Insert Table 7 above into the Rural Lifestyle Chapter (subzone Northern Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway) with the following provision: Table 7 Rural Lifestyle (Northern Frankton Ladies Mile Highway sub zone) Non-compliance status 22.5.39.1 Any application for consent shall be accompanied by a landscaping plan which shows the species, number, and location of all plantings to be established, and shall include details of the proposed timeframes for all such plantings and a maintenance programme.  The landscape plan shall ensure that:  • The border of the 100m setback building restriction areas shall be planted to create a visual screen between SH 6 and any residential unit. • Any existing trees within the 100m building restriction area shall be removed to enhance views from SH6 D_C		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS535.40		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.5 Rules - Standards		Insert Table 7 into the Rural Lifestyle Chapter (Ladies Mile Subzone) as follows Table 7 22.5.39 Rural Lifestyle (Ladies Mile sub zone) Building restriction area: No buildings shall be located within 100m of State Highway 6 Non-compliance status D_NC		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS535.41		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.5 Rules - Standards		<p>Insert Table 7 into the Rural Lifestyle Chapter (Ladies Mile Subzone) as follows Table 7 22.5.39.1: Rural Lifestyle (Ladies Mile sub zone):</p> <p>Any application for consent shall be accompanied by a landscaping plan which shows the species, number, and location of all plantings to be established, and shall include details of the proposed timeframes for all such plantings and a maintenance programme.</p> <p>The landscape plan shall ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The border of the 100m setback building restriction area shall be planted to create a visual screen between SH 6 and any residential unit.</li> <li>• Any existing trees within the 100m building restriction area shall be removed to enhance views from SH6</li> </ul> <p>Non-compliance status <del>D-NC</del></p>		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS712.10		Bobs Cove Developments Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Rules 22.5.21 to 22.5.32 - delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS811.6		Scaife, Marc	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Where buildings are permitted there needs to be as standard or landscaping, location, earthworks (submitters words).	Reject		Any landscaping necessary is intended to be imposed through the subdivision consent. The s32 describes the costs and benefits associated with permitted activity status vs controlled.
FS1068.40	535.40	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1068.41	535.41	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1071.53	535.40	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1071.54	535.41	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1071.87	532.29	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1071.88	532.30	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1224.15	243.15	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1224.16	243.16	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1224.53	811.6	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
FS1259.24	535.40	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1259.25	535.41	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1267.24	535.40	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1322.33	532.29	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1322.34	532.30	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1322.115	535.40	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1322.116	535.41	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5 Rules - Standards	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).		Relates to rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS29.1		Shearer, Jane	22.5.1	Other	Glossy surfaces reflect light in concentrated, whereas matte surfaces reflect light diffusely. Add a policy considering concentrated vs diffuse reflection of light, not just reflectance value of colours/finishes.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS146.1		Bradley, Sue	22.5.1	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS166.6		Aurum Survey Consultants	22.5.1	Oppose	Reject rule because the 500msq limit to does not equate to the anticipated building coverage of 15% which equates to 600msq on a 4000msq site.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.3
OS238.126		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	22.5.1	Other	Support in part. Area should Increase to 10sqm to be consistent with Building Act. Change to 10sqm.	Reject		Rule 22.5.1
OS243.18		Byrch, Christine	22.5.1	Oppose	Distinguish between residential buildings and all other buildings. The maximum building size should be the same for both rural lifestyle and rural residential zones.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS368.4		Anna-Marie Chin Architects and Phil Vautier	22.5.1	Oppose	Change the area requirement to 10m2. Change the wording of the rule to allow for buildings built before the guidelines (or a pre date a certain time) are not required to meet these rules. The reflectance values should be increased back to 36% for walls and roof. There should be an ability for planners to allow for an flexibility of these rules where there the effects are minimal and the overall outcome is good. The surface finishes shall not include concrete, timber when left untreated or stained, unpainted steel, schist stone, (dry stacked, bagged, rendered etc), copper and zinc.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS411.4		NT McDonald Family Trust	22.5.1	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.1 (which restricts structures in excess of 5 square metres) from the Proposed District Plan. (Note: The submission cites Rule 25.5.1 but this does not relate to the subject matter discussed and is therefore presumed to be an error).	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS443.3		Trojan Helmet Limited	22.5.1		supports Table 2, Building materials and Colours, subject to the following modifications (or similar): to give effect to the proposed structure plan for the new zone. <i>Table 2, Building Materials and Colours</i> <i>All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m2, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive with the surrounding landscape:</i> <i>22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces (excluding windows) shall be coloured in a range of black, browns, greens and greys;</i> <i>22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20%</i> <i>22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance values of not greater than 30%.</i> <i>22.5.1.4 Natural materials such as locally sourced schist and unstained cedar may be used.</i>	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS444.4		Taylor, Mark and Jane	22.5.1	Oppose	That either (in order of preference): The Standard be deleted and the former Controlled Activity status be retained for all buildings, irrespective of size; OR The Standard be retained but that: (i) Any building over 500m2 be assessed as a Controlled Activity (C), with the first 3 matters of discretion retained as matters of control; and (ii) That the 4th bullet point 'Building design and reasons for the size' be deleted; If neither of these alternatives is acceptable, at a very minimum the 4th bullet point should be deleted.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS452.3		Trojan Helmet Limited	22.5.1		Supports Table 2, Building Materials and Colours subject to the following modifications requested to give effect to the proposed structure plan for the proposed rezoning. <i>"Table 2, Building Materials and Colours</i> <i>All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m2, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive with the surrounding landscape:</i> <i>22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces (excluding windows) shall be coloured in a range of black, browns, greens and greys;</i> <i>22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20%</i> <i>22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance values of not greater than 30%.</i> <i>22.5.1.4 Natural materials such as locally sourced schist and unstained cedar may be used."</i>	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS497.8		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.5.1	Other	Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m2, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape: <u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:</u> <u>22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;</u> <u>22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs;</u> <u>22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to</u> <u>any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</u>  <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u> <u>These rules do not apply to solar panels or other renewable energy building materials of this nature.</u>  Discretion is restricted to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS515.31		Wakatipu Equities	22.5.1	Other	<p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</p> <p><u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:</u></p> <p>22.5.1.1 <del>All exterior surfaces shall be coloured</del> in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 <del>Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs;</del> 22.5.1.3 <del>Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</del></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to solar panels or other renewable energy building materials of this nature.</u></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS522.35		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.5.1	Other	<p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</p> <p><u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:</u></p> <p>22.5.1.1 <del>All exterior surface shall be coloured</del> in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 <del>Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs;</del> 22.5.1.3 <del>Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</del></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to solar panels or other renewable energy building materials of this nature.</u></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS523.9		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.5.1	Other	<p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</p> <p><u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:</u></p> <p>22.5.1.1 <del>All exterior surfaces shall be coloured</del> in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 <del>Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall</del> have a reflectance value not greater than 20% <u>for roofs</u>; 22.5.1.3 <del>Surface finishes shall</del> have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% <u>for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</u></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to solar panels or other renewable energy building materials of this nature.</u></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS530.7		Byron Ballan	22.5.1	Other	<p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</p> <p><u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:</u></p> <p>22.5.1.1 <del>All exterior surfaces shall be coloured</del> in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 <del>Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall</del> have a reflectance value not greater than 20% <u>for roofs</u>; 22.5.1.3 <del>Surface finishes shall</del> have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% <u>for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</u></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to solar panels or other renewable energy building materials of this nature.</u></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS532.23		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.5.1	Other	<p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</p> <p><u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:</u></p> <p>22.5.1.1 <del>All exterior surfaces shall be coloured</del> in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 <del>Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall</del> have a reflectance value not greater than 20% <u>for roofs</u>; 22.5.1.3 <del>Surface finishes shall</del> have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% <u>for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</u></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1



Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS537.33		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.5.1	Other	<p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours as follows:                      All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:                      The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or with any applied finish) shall be:                      22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;                      22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs;                      22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist).</p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u></p> <p><u>These rules do not apply to solar panels or other renewable energy building materials of this nature.</u></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS761.28		ORFEL Ltd	22.5.1	Other	<p>Support in part                      Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows:                      All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:                      Exterior colours of buildings materials shall be:                      22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;                      22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall <del>For roofs</del> have a reflectance value not greater than 20%;                      22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall <del>For all other external surfaces</del> have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%.  <u>Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist).</u>  <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS763.10		Lake Hayes Limited	22.5.1	Other	<p>Support in part                      Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows:                      All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:                      Exterior colours of building s materials shall be:                      22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;                      22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs;                      22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces.  <u>Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist).</u>  <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul> <p>-</p>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS764.12		Mount Christina Limited	22.5.1	Other	Support in part Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m <sup>2</sup> , new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape: <u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or without any applied finish) shall be:</u> 22.5.1.1 <del>All exterior surfaces shall be coloured</del> in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 <del>Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs;</del> 22.5.1.3 <del>Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist).</del> <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u> Discretion is restricted to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS767.13		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.5.1	Other	Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows: All buildings, <u>except within the commercial overlay and subject to [insert new Rule 22.4.x],</u> including any structure larger than 5m <sup>2</sup> , new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS844.9		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.5.1	Other	Amend: Alter activity status from restricted Discretionary to Controlled and retain those matters as discretion as matters of control. As an alternative, have the controlled activity status for just the rural residential zone.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1071.81	532.23	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.1	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place		Relates to a rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1107.131	238.126	Man Street Properties Ltd	22.5.1	Oppose	The Submitter opposes this submission. Submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. The matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act, and are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1120.37	537.33	Brial, Michael	22.5.1	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.		Relates to a rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1157.41	238.126	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.5.1	Oppose	That the submission is rejected. It is not appropriate that all new development be located in urban areas. In some cases visitors may want to appreciate what the rural land can offer in terms of other uses, such as golf for example. It is appropriate that these other activities, which require a rural environment, but do not use the land in a traditional "productive" sense, be provided for. It is also appropriate that areas for lower density living be provided for in rural areas, as not all landowners seek or need to live in urban areas.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1157.52	146.1	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.5.1	Support	That the submission point be accepted. Support the submission in relation to Rule 22.5.1.1 that the colours are too restrictive.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1157.56	444.4	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.5.1	Support	That the submission point be accepted. The submission in relation to Rule 22.5, Table 2, which seeks the standard for building size is deleted and the former controlled activity status is retained, is supported.	Reject		Standards for buildings
FS1157.60	29.1	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.5.1	Support	That the submission point be accepted. Support submission seeking amendments to policy and/or other provisions which explain differences in glossy and matte surfaces in reflecting light and consider more analysis is made of the rules.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1157.62	368.4	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.5.1	Support	That the submission point be accepted. The submission seeking that reflective values of building surfaces for walls and roofs be increased back to 36% is supported	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1224.18	243.18	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1226.131	238.126	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	22.5.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in part	General opposition to NZIA submissions	
FS1234.131	238.126	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	22.5.1	Oppose	States that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. Agrees that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in part	General opposition to NZIA submissions	
FS1239.131	238.126	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	22.5.1	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in part	General opposition to NZIA submissions	
FS1241.131	238.126	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	22.5.1	Oppose	Agrees that submission 238 will not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives.	Accept in part	General opposition to NZIA submissions	
FS1242.154	238.126	Stokes, Antony & Ruth	22.5.1	Oppose	The submitter seeks submission be disallowed as it relates to the expansion of the Business Mixed Use Zone (submission point 238.93) with the High Density Residential Zone on the northern side of Henry Street being retained.	Reject	relates to a rezoning.	Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1248.131	238.126	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	22.5.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in part	General opposition to NZIA submissions	
FS1249.131	238.126	Tweed Development Limited	22.5.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission . Alerts that the submission and matters sought in it will therefore not promote or give effect to Part 2 of the Act. States that matters raised in the submission do not meet section 32 of the Act. are not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the Proposed District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits.	Accept in part	General opposition to NZIA submissions	
FS1256.9	523.9	Ashford Trust	22.5.1	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1256.51	537.33	Ashford Trust	22.5.1	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1286.42	537.33	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.1	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.		Relates to a rezoning. Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1292.37	537.33	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.1	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1292.84	522.35	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.1	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1322.4	444.4	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.1	Support	Supports in part. Requests that Rule 22. 5. 3 be deleted and the former controlled activity rule be reinstated. In the event that Rule 22.5.3 is retained, I request that the Rule adopt a two-tier approach, with buildings under 500m2 having a permitted activity status, and buildings over 500m2 having a controlled activity status.	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
FS1322.27	532.23	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specifk nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Accept in Part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS761.32		ORFEL Ltd	22.5.1.1	Other	<p>Support in part</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows:</p> <p>All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</p> <p>Exterior colours of buildings <del>materials shall be:</del></p> <p>22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;</p> <p>22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall <del>For roofs</del> have a reflectance value not greater than 20%;</p> <p>22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall <del>For all other external surfaces</del> have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p> <p><b>Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</b></p> <p><b>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</b></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS764.13		Mount Christina Limited	22.5.1.1	Other	<p>Support in part</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows:</p> <p>All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</p> <p><del>The</del> Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or without any applied finish) shall be:</p> <p>22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;</p> <p>22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs;</p> <p>22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. <del>Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</del></p> <p><b>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</b></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS761.33		ORFEL Ltd	22.5.1.2	Other	<p>Support in part</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows:</p> <p>All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m<sup>2</sup>, new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape:</p> <p>Exterior colours of buildings <del>materials shall be:</del></p> <p>22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys;</p> <p>22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall <del>For roofs</del> have a reflectance value not greater than 20%;</p> <p>22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall <del>For all other external surfaces</del> have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%.</p> <p><b>Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist)</b></p> <p><b>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</b></p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS764.14		Mount Christina Limited	22.5.1.2	Other	Support in part Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m <sup>2</sup> , new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape: <u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or without any applied finish) shall be:</u> 22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs; 22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist). <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u> Discretion is restricted to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS761.34		ORFEL Ltd	22.5.1.3	Other	Support in part Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m <sup>2</sup> , new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape: <u>Exterior colours of buildings materials shall be:</u> 22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall <del>For roofs</del> have a reflectance value not greater than 20%; 22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall <del>For all other external surfaces</del> have a reflectance value of not greater than 30%. <u>Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist).</u> <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u> Discretion is restricted to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Accept in part		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS764.15		Mount Christina Limited	22.5.1.3	Other	Support in part Amend Rule 22.5.1 Building Materials and Colours, as follows: All buildings, including any structure larger than 5m <sup>2</sup> , new, relocated, altered, reclad or repainted, are subject to the following in order to ensure they are visually recessive within the surrounding landscape: <u>The Exterior colours of all buildings materials (treated, untreated, natural or manufactured, with or without any applied finish) shall be:</u> 22.5.1.1 All exterior surfaces shall be coloured in the range of black, browns, greens or greys; 22.5.1.2 Pre-painted steel, and all roofs shall have a reflectance value not greater than 20% for roofs; 22.5.1.3 Surface finishes shall have a reflectance value of not greater than 30% for all other external surfaces. Except that this rule shall not apply to any locally sourced stone (e.g. schist). <u>These rules do not apply to any material or surface colours used inside any building.</u> Discretion is restricted to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Whether the proposed colour is appropriate given the existence of established screening or in the case of alterations, if the proposed colour is already present on a long established building.</li> <li>• The size and height of the building where the subject colours would be applied.</li> </ul>	Reject		Standards for structures and buildings Rule 22.5.1
OS243.30		Byrch, Christine	22.5.2	Oppose	Delete the maximum site coverage for rural residential - this zone should also have a building platform. 22.5.2. This standard as it is written allows many buildings covering 15% of the net site area. Do you mean maximum of all buildings should be 15%? I think that is too much.	Reject		Entire Report
OS764.16		Mount Christina Limited	22.5.2	Support	Retain Rule 22.5.2 Building Coverage unchanged	Accept		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS767.14		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.5.2	Other	Amend Rule 22.5.2 Building Coverage, as follows: The maximum ground floor area of any building shall be 15% of the net site area, <u>except within the commercial overlay where the maximum ground floor area of any building shall be limited to 25% of the net site area.</u> Discretion is restricted to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effect on open space, character and amenity.</li> <li>• Effects on views and outlook from neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Ability of stormwater and effluent to be disposed of on-site</li> </ul>		Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS811.7		Scaife, Marc	22.5.2	Support	15% BC may be too much for larger Rural lifestyle lot sections. Numerous RR lots exist that are well in excess of the minimum 4000 sqm . A uniform site coverage of 15 % could result in massive sprawl of buildings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Non compliance status (NCS) for breaches of site coverage should not be discretionary. It should be NC or PR.</li> </ul>	Reject		15% is long established in the RR Zone. The RL zone is coverage is set by by the Building Platform, usually 1000 square meters so this is up to 10% equivalent. The submitter would need to submit more information to prove 15% is not appropriate in the RR zone. it does not apply in the RL zone.
FS1150.6	811.7	ORFEL Limited	22.5.2	Oppose	We seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.2 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes a change to the status of any breach of the building coverage rule becoming a non-complying or prohibited activity. The submitter has incorrectly understood the rule as applying to the Rural Lifestyle Zone and a uniform coverage does not apply to the rural lifestyle zone. The requested change does not represent sound resource management advice.	Accept		Refer to comment made relating to primary submission
FS1224.30	243.30	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1224.54	811.7	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
FS1325.3	811.7	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.5.2	Oppose	seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.2 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lakes Hayes opposes a change to the status of any breach of the building coverage rule becoming a non-complying or prohibited activity. The submitter has incorrectly understood the rule as applying to the Rural Lifestyle Zone and a uniform coverage does not apply to the rural lifestyle zone. The requested change does not represent sound resource management advice.	Accept		Refer to comment made relating to primary submission
OS243.31		Byrch, Christine	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete the matters of discretion: 'Building design and reasons for the size'.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS367.3		Borrell, John	22.5.3	Oppose	Change rule 22.5.3:- The maximum size of any building shall be 400m2	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS368.3		Anna-Marie Chin Architects and Phil Vautier	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete this rule. The platform size has already defined an area within which to build and the assessment has been on this envelope.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS443.4		Trojan Helmet Limited	22.5.3	Oppose	Opposes Rule 22.5.3 which limits the maximum size of any building in the Rural Lifestyle zone to 500m2 and considers it it should be deleted.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS444.8		Taylor, Mark and Jane	22.5.3	Oppose	That either (in order of preference): The Standard be deleted and the former Controlled Activity status be retained for all buildings, irrespective of size; OR The Standard be retained but that: (i) Any building over 500m2 be assessed as a Controlled Activity (C), with the first 3 matters of discretion retained as matters of control; and (ii)That the 4th bullet point 'Building design and reasons for the size' be deleted; If neither of these alternatives is acceptable, at a very minimum the 4th bullet point should be deleted.	Accept in part		Standards for buildings

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS452.4		Trojan Helmet Limited	22.5.3	Oppose	Requests modifications to give effect to the proposed structure plan for the proposed rezoning. Opposes Rule 22.5.3 which limits the maximum size of any building in the Rural Lifestyle zone to 500m2 and considers it should be deleted.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS497.9		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3;	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS513.38		Jenny Barb	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS515.32		Wakatipu Equities	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS522.36		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3;	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS523.10		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS530.8		Byron Ballan	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3;	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS532.24		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS534.27		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS535.27		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS537.34		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS764.17		Mount Christina Limited	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3 Building Size	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS767.15		Lake Hayes Cellar Limited	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3 Building Size	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS811.8		Scaife, Marc	22.5.3	Support	Questions whether max size = defined GFA or Ground floor area.	Reject		Measured from outside exterior building footprint at ground floor.
OS820.8		Jeremy Bell Investments	22.5.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.3	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS820.12		Jeremy Bell Investments	22.5.3		Delete Rule 22.5.3 (maximum building size 500m2).	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1034.152	820.8	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22.5.3	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1034.156	820.12	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)	22.5.3	Oppose	The Society OPPOSES the entire submission and seeks that the entire submission is DISALLOWED.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1068.27	535.27	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.5.3	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	
FS1071.40	535.27	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.3	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	
FS1071.82	532.24	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.3	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1120.38	537.34	Brial, Michael	22.5.3	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	
FS1157.58	534.27	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.5.3	Support	That the submission point be accepted. The submission that Rule 22.5.3 be deleted is supported. There is no need for a maximum building footprint rule when there is already a building coverage rule.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1157.61	368.3	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.5.3	Support	That the submission point be accepted. The submission seeking Rule 22.5.3 be deleted is supported. The deletion of the rule is appropriate as the platform size has already the defined the area to build on.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1224.31	243.31	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1224.55	811.8	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
FS1256.10	523.10	Ashford Trust	22.5.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1256.52	537.34	Ashford Trust	22.5.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	
FS1259.11	535.27	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.3	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	
FS1267.11	535.27	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.3	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	
FS1286.43	537.34	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.3	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	
FS1292.38	537.34	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	
FS1292.85	522.36	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.3	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1322.28	532.24	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1322.67	534.27	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
FS1322.104	535.27	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Standards - Rule 22.5.3
OS811.9		Scaife, Marc	22.5.4	Support	Setbacks: NCS should be non-complying, possibly PR. Scrap the exception for R Visitor zone in 22.5.6.	Reject		Buildings are controlled in the VA sub zone so the exemption is appropriate. It is where buildings are permitted a standard is necessary.
FS1150.7	811.9	ORFEL Limited	22.5.4	Oppose	We seek that the parts of this submission relating to Rules 22.5.4, 22.5.4.5 and 22.5.4.6 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes changes to the status of any breach of the building setback rules becoming a non-complying or prohibited activity. The requested change does not represent sound resource management advice and would potential constrain the efficient use of land.	Accept in part		Buildings are controlled in the VA sub zone so the exemption is appropriate. It is where buildings are permitted a standard is necessary.
FS1224.56	811.9	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.4	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation



Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1325.4	811.9	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.5.4	Oppose	seek that the parts of this submission relating to Rules 22.5.4, 22.5.4.5 and 22.5.4.6 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lakes Hayes opposes changes to the status of any breach of the building setback rules becoming a non-complying or prohibited activity. The requested change does not represent sound resource management advice and would potential constrain the efficient use of land.	Accept in Part		Buildings are controlled in the VA sub zone so the exemption is appropriate. It is where buildings are permitted a standard is necessary.
OS219.5		Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.4.3	Support	Retain.	Accept		
OS350.5		Dalefield Trustee Ltd	22.5.5	Oppose	Oppose the setback of 10m from roads in the Rural Lifestyle Zone and seeks that the setback be extended to 15 m.	Accept in part		Rule 22.5
OS367.2		Borrell, John	22.5.5	Oppose	Rule 22.5.5 should state :- The minimum setbacks from roads in the rural lifestyle zone shall be 30 metres.	Accept in part		Rule 22.5
OS443.5		Trojan Helmet Limited	22.5.5		seeks that Rule 22.5.5 be modified to include appropriate setbacks for buildings from roads in the proposed Rural Lifestyle zone sought by this submission. The particular modifications sought are as follows (or similar): <b>22.5.5 Setback from Roads</b> <i>The minimum setback of any building from a road boundary shall be 10m, except:</i> <i>- in the Rural Residential zone at the north end of Lake Hayes, the minimum setback from Speargrass Flat road shall be 15m.</i> <i>- In the Rural Lifestyle zone on Mc Donnell Road the minimum setback shall be 75m.</i>		Relates to a rezoning - requested Rural Lifestyle Zone. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS452.5		Trojan Helmet Limited	22.5.5		Requests modifications to give effect to the proposed structure plan for the proposed rezoning. Seeks that Rule 22.5.5 be modified to include appropriate setbacks for buildings from roads in the proposed Rural Lifestyle zone sought by this submission. <i>The particular modifications sought are as follows (or similar):</i> <b>22.5.5 Setback from Roads</b> <i>The minimum setback of any building from a road boundary shall be 10m, except:</i> <i>- in the Rural Residential zone at the north end of Lake Hayes, the minimum setback from Speargrass Flat road shall be 15m.</i> <i>- In the Rural Lifestyle zone on Hogans Gully Road the minimum setback shall be 75m.</i>		Relates to a rezoning - requested Rural Lifestyle Zone. Deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS719.116		NZ Transport Agency	22.5.5		Amend Rule 22.5.5 to read as follows: The minimum setback of any building from a road boundary shall be 10m, <u>except for State highways where the minimum setback shall be 20m.</u> and except in the Rural Residential Zone at the north of Lake Hayes, the minimum setback from Speargrass Flaot Road shall be 1 Sm.	Accept in part		Rule 22.5
FS1150.10	350.5	ORFEL Limited	22.5.5	Oppose	We seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.5 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the suggested change to this rule to increase the minimum road boundary setback from 10m to 15m. This change is considered to result in a pattern of development inconsistent with existing building within this zone and an inefficient use of the available land resource.	Reject		Rule 22.5
FS1150.11	367.2	ORFEL Limited	22.5.5	Oppose	We seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.5 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the suggested change to this rule to increase the minimum road boundary setback from 10m to 30m. This change is considered to result in a pattern of development inconsistent with existing building within this zone and an inefficient use of the available land resource.	Accept in part		Rule 22.5
FS1325.1	719.116	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.5.5	Oppose	seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.5 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission. - Lake Hayes opposes the relief sought in this submission to increase the road boundary setback within the rural lifestyle and rural residential zones along the State Highway to 20m. This change is arbitrary and unjustified. In the case of the land Owned by Lake Hayes Cellar Ltd the increase setback would significantly impact on the efficient use of the available land use.	Accept in part		Rule 22.5
FS1325.10	350.5	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.5.5	Oppose	seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.5 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lakes Hayes opposes the suggested change to this rule to increase the minimum road boundary setback from 10m to 15m. This change is considered to result in a pattern of development inconsistent with existing building within this zone and an inefficient use of the available land resource.	Reject		Rule 22.5
FS1325.11	367.2	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.5.5	Oppose	seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.5 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lakes Hayes opposes the suggested change to this rule to increase the minimum road boundary setback from 10m to 30m. This change is considered to result in a pattern of development inconsistent with existing building within this zone and an inefficient use of the available land resource.	Accept in part		Rule 22.5

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS243.17		Byrch, Christine	22.5.6	Oppose	Delete the sentence 'Except this rule does not apply to the visitor accommodation sub zones' from Rule 22.5.6.	Reject		Buildings are controlled in the VA sub zone so the exemption is appropriate. It is where buildings are permitted a standard is necessary.
OS243.32		Byrch, Christine	22.5.6	Oppose	Setbacks from water bodies should apply to visitor accommodation subzones.	Reject		Buildings are controlled in the VA sub zone so the exemption is appropriate. It is where buildings are permitted a standard is necessary.
OS339.64		Alty, Evan	22.5.6	Support	Supports the rule.	Accept		
OS350.6		Dalefield Trustee Ltd	22.5.6	Oppose	Oppose the proposed rule exempting visitor accommodation sub zones from the 20m setback from water bodies, as it is necessary.	Reject		Buildings are controlled in the VA sub zone so the exemption is appropriate. It is where buildings are permitted a standard is necessary.
OS706.56		Forest and Bird NZ	22.5.6	Support	Supports the rule.	accept		
FS1162.110	706.56	Cooper, James Wilson - represented by GTOOD Law	22.5.6	Oppose	Believes that the relief sought in the submission does not result in sound resource management planning. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		
FS1224.17	243.17	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.6	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1224.32	243.32	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.6	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS127.2		Chisholm, Simon	22.5.7.3	Oppose	That the maximum net floor areas for home occupation in Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle be increased to 80m <sup>2</sup> and 180m <sup>2</sup> respectively	Reject		Home Occupation
OS367.4		Borrell, John	22.5.8	Oppose	That rule 22.5.8 be changed to :- The maximum height for any building shall be 7 metres.	Reject		The building height of 8m is appropriate and is the long standing height. More evidence is required to justify the reduction to 7m.
FS1150.12	367.4	ORFEL Limited	22.5.8	Oppose	We seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.8 be disallowed. ORFEL opposes the suggested change to this rule reducing the maximum permitted building height from 8m to 7m. 8m is considered an appropriate height that is consistent with established building character, acknowledging that the visual impact of buildings within this zone are mitigated by larger distances between boundaries, a greater proportion of open space and associated landscape planting.	Accept		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1325.12	367.4	Lake Hayes Cellars Limited, Lake Hayes Limited and Mount Christina Limited	22.5.8	Oppose	seek that the part of this submission relating to Rule 22.5.8 be disallowed for the reasons expressed in this further submission - Lake Hayes opposes the suggested change to this rule reducing the maximum permitted building height from 8m to 7m. 8m is considered an appropriate height that is consistent with established building character, acknowledging that the visual impact of buildings within this zone are mitigated by larger distances between boundaries, a greater proportion of open space and associated landscape planting.	Accept		
OS126.3		Hunter Leece / Anne Kobienia	22.5.10	Oppose	Revise the allowable storage of heavy vehicles in rural residential/lifestyle zones to exclude commercial vehicles but include privately owned for personal use or in association with the use of the land, and to be parked in close proximity to the buildings (house/garages) on the property.	Reject		The rule as notified is considered to meet the relief sought however the issues raised are more to do with compliance.
OS669.20		Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	22.5.10	Other	Amend as follows: Residential Density: Rural Residential Zone Not more than one residential unit per 4000m <sup>2</sup> net site area. Residential Density: Rural Lifestyle Zone <u>Not more than one residential unit per 1 Ha net site area.</u> <u>One residential unit located within each building platform.</u> <u>On sites less than 2ha there shall be only one residential unit.</u> - <u>On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than one residential unit per two hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than 4 hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be 4 hectares.</u> And make the status for breaching these rules Restricted Discretionary with discretion limited to: • <u>Effects on landscape, rural amenity and character values, privacy, infrastructure capacity and road safety and efficiency</u>	Reject		Purpose Statement, Objectives and Policies relating to Residential Density
OS444.5		Taylor, Mark and Jane	22.5.11	Other	That Standard 22.5.11 explicitly gives effect to Policy 22.2.1.3 to avoid any ambiguity.	Accept in part		I do not recommend modifying the minimum allotment size. However I accept that an average density has merits. Proposals can apply for a resource consent and these cases can be treated on a case by case basis.
OS811.10		Scaife, Marc	22.5.11	Support	Residential density. Non complying status should be Prohibited.	Reject		This is too onerous and does not accord with section 5 RMA.
FS1082.17	444.5	Hadley, J and R	22.5.11	Support	Allow this submission point. Community activities in the Rural Residential Zone will in almost all cases have significant adverse effects to the local residents of the zone particularly with regard to rural amenity, noise, traffic, visual and landscape character. Strong assessment criteria for community activities are required to safeguard the purpose of the zone for rural residential living with the associated rural character and amenity values. Community activities must be for the demonstrable benefit of the existing local farming and rural residential community Support Objective 22.2.1.3 but consider that each lot containing one residential house must still have a minimum area of 4000m <sup>2</sup> , although this may include a part of the balance land to be retained as open (landscaped) space. The balance of the land could contain trees or farmed crops, it need not be entirely open or "landscaped" but it should not include any residential curtilage.	Accept in Part		Community activities
FS1089.37	444.5	McGuinness, Mark	22.5.11	Support	Supports in part. Supports the discussion and relief sought with regard to policy 22.2.2.1, Rule 22.4.12 regarding community activities within the Rural Residential Zone. Seeks clarification of Standard 22.5.11 that requires not more than one residential unit per 4000m <sup>2</sup> so that dwellings may be clustered together with the balance of the land retained as open (landscaped) space.	Accept in part		Community activities

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1224.57	811.10	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.11	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
OS26.2		Clarke, David	22.5.11.1	Other	The Rural Residential Zone north of Lake Hayes had an averaging rule but this has been removed. Supports the retention of the North Lake Hayes Rural Residential Rules.	Accept		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS219.6		Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.11.1	Support	Retain.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS157.2		Wilson, Miles	22.5.12	Support	Confirm the existing Rural Lifestyle Density rules that require a minimum allotment size of 1 hectare, with an average of 2 hectares.	Accept		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS216.1		Wadworth, Elizabeth	22.5.12	Oppose	That land in the rural life style zone be allowed to be subdivided down to 1ha lots.	reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS351.2		Strain, Sam - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	22.5.12	Oppose	Remove the lot averages standard 22.5.12.3.	reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS367.7		Borrell, John	22.5.12	Oppose	Change the rule requiring an average of 2ha so that the minimum Lot size for subdivision in the rural lifestyle zone be 1 hectare.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS402.2		Leslie Richard Nelson and Judith Anne Nelson	22.5.12	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.2.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS428.3		Barry Francis Ellis and Sandy Joan Ellis	22.5.12	Oppose	Opposes Rule 22.5.12.2 and Rule 22.5.12.3	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS763.11		Lake Hayes Limited	22.5.12	Oppose	Amend <b>Rule 22.5.12.1</b> as follows: <del>One</del> Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS811.11		Scaife, Marc	22.5.12	Support	Residential density. Non complying status should be Prohibited.	Reject		This is too onerous and does not accord with section 5 RMA.
FS1071.56	351.2	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject	relates to a rezoning request	Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1224.58	811.11	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.12	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
OS331.4		The Station at Waitiri	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.1 from the Proposed District Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS348.7		Greenslade, Mrs M K - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Delete rule 22.5.12.1.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS411.2		NT McDonald Family Trust	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.1 from the Proposed District Plan	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS414.7		Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.1 (that restricts buildings in approved platforms to one residential unit).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS497.10		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.5.12.1	Other	Amend Rule 22.5.12.1 as follows: <del>One</del> Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS513.39		Jenny Barb	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.12 as follows: <del>One</del> Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS515.40		Wakatipu Equities	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.1 as follows: <del>One</del> Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS530.9		Byron Ballan	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.1 as follows:  One Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS532.25		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.1 as follows:  One Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS534.28		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.1 as follows:  One Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS535.28		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.1 as follows:  One Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS763.17		Lake Hayes Limited	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Amend <b>Rule 22.5.12.1</b> as follows:  One Two residential Units located within each building platform	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1068.28	535.28	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.5.12.1	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.41	535.28	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.1	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.83	532.25	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.1	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.110	414.7	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.1	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1255.16	414.7	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.5.12.1	Support	Allow the submission.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1259.12	535.28	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.12.1	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1267.12	535.28	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.12.1	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.9	348.7	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.1	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.29	532.25	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specifk nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.68	534.28	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.105	535.28	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.1	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS231.3		Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Delete the rule.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS232.6		Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Delete rule.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS233.3		Gallagher, Dean - represented by Clark Fortune McDonald Attn: Emma Dixon	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Delete rule.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS235.3		Sim, Graeme - represented by Clark Fortune McDonald Attn: Emma Dixon	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Delete rule.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS248.6		Shotover Trust	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Oppose in part the PDP objectives, policies and rules that inform and support the rule framework for residential density requiring an average of one dwelling per 2 hectares (Rule 22.5.12.2 & 22.5.12.3).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS497.11		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.2 as follows: <u>On sites less than 2ha there shall be only one residential building platform.</u>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS513.40		Jenny Barb	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.2 as follows:  <u>On sites less than 2ha there shall be only one residential building platform.</u>	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS515.33		Wakatipu Equities	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.2 as follows:  On sites less than 2ha <u>there may be up to two</u> residential units	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS530.10		Byron Ballan	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.2 as follows:  On sites less than 2ha there <u>may be up to two</u> residential units	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS532.26		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.2 as follows:  On sites less than 2ha there <u>may be up to two</u> residential units <u>within one building platform</u> .	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS534.29		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.2 as follows:  On sites less than 2ha there <u>shall be only one residential building platform</u> .	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS535.29		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.2 as follows:  On sites less than 2ha there <u>shall be only one residential building platform</u> .	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS763.12		Lake Hayes Limited	22.5.12.2	Other	Oppose in part. Amend <b>Rule 22.5.12.2</b> as follows: On sites less than 2ha there <u>may be up to two</u> residential units	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS830.3		Robertson, Duncan Edward	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.2	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1068.29	535.29	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.5.12.2	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.42	535.29	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.2	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.84	532.26	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.2	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1259.13	535.29	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.12.2	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1267.13	535.29	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.12.2	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.62	231.3	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.2	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.72	232.6	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.2	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.76	830.3	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.2	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.30	532.26	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specifk nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.69	534.29	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.106	535.29	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.2	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS166.20		Aurum Survey Consultants	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Reject 4ha cap to calculate the average.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS231.4		Antony Strain, Sarah Strain and Samuel Strain	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete the rule	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS232.7		Don Andrew, Kathleen Andrew and Roger Macassey	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete rule.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS233.4		Gallagher, Dean - represented by Clark Fortune McDonald Attn: Emma Dixon	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete rule.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS235.4		Sim, Graeme - represented by Clark Fortune McDonald Attn: Emma Dixon	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete rule.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS248.7		Shotover Trust	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Oppose in part the PDP objectives, policies and rules that inform and support the rule framework for residential density requiring an average of one dwelling per 2 hectares (Rule 22.5.12.2 & 22.5.12.3).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS314.4		Wakatipu Holdings	22.5.12.3	Oppose	The Rural Lifestyle zone be amended to remove the 2ha lot averages	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS328.3		Gutzewitz, Noel - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Remove the requirement for a 2ha average.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS331.7		The Station at Waitiri	22.5.12.3		Amend Standard 22.5.12.3 in order to remove the Rural Lifestyle Zone lot averages	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS348.4		Greenslade, Mrs M K - represented by Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend to remove the lot averages standard 22.5.12.3.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS367.1		Borrell, John	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Change rule 22.5.12.3 to read - On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than two residential units.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS402.5		Leslie Richard Nelson and Judith Anne Nelson	22.5.12.3		Delete Rule 22.5.12.3.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS414.5		Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates Ltd	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Remove the lot average standard 22.5.12.3.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS497.12		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS497.13		Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows: On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <u>one residential building platform per hectare</u> on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS513.41		Jenny Barb	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3; or  Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <u>one residential building platform per hectare</u> on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS514.5		Duncan Fea	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows: On sites equal to or greater than <u>1 hectare</u> there shall be no more than one residential unit per <del>two</del> hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS515.34		Wakatipu Equities	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS515.35		Wakatipu Equities	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <del>one</del> <u>two</u> residential units per <del>two</del> hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS522.37		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS522.38		Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows: On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than one residential unit per <del>two</del> hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS523.11		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS523.12		Robert and Elvena Heywood	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than one residential unit per <del>two</del> hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS530.11		Byron Ballan	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS530.12		Byron Ballan	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <del>one two</del> residential <u>units</u> per <del>two</del> hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS532.27		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3;	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS532.28		Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <del>one two</del> residential <u>units</u> per <del>two</del> hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS534.30		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3;	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS534.31		Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <u>one residential building platform per hectare</u> on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS535.30		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3;	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS535.31		G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <u>one residential building platform per hectare</u> on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS537.35		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS537.36		Slopehill Joint Venture	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <del>one two</del> residential <u>units</u> per <del>two</del> hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS631.4		Cassidy Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	The Cassidy Trust supports Rule 22.5.12.3 but seeks an amendment to delete the second sentence of this rule.	Accept		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS763.13		Lake Hayes Limited	22.5.12.3	Oppose	<b>1. Delete Rule 22.5.12.3; or</b> <b>2. Amend Rule 22.5.12.3 as follows:</b>  On sites equal to or greater than 2 hectares there shall be no more than <del>one two</del> residential <u>units</u> per <del>two</del> hectares on average. For the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than <u>2</u> hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be <u>2</u> hectares.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS830.4		Robertson, Duncan Edward	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.5.12.3	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1068.30	535.30	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone



**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1068.31	535.31	Lemaire-Sicre, Keri & Roland	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed. The over domestication on this area (Ladies Mile between Lower Shotover Road and Lake Hayes southern end) which is the intent of this submission will have adverse effects by introducing domestic activities which will disturb our boarding pets and compromise the operation of the Pet Lodge; creating huge reverse sensitivity issues. This site was chosen for its rural location (over 40 years ago).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.43	535.30	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.3	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.44	535.31	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.3	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.85	532.27	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.3	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.86	532.28	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.3	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1071.108	414.5	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association	22.5.12.3	Oppose	That the entire submission is disallowed and hte existing zoning remains in place	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1120.39	537.35	Brial, Michael	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1120.40	537.36	Brial, Michael	22.5.12.3	Oppose	Does not agree that the land of the submission should be rezoned Rural Lifestyle due to its location and characteristics. Believes that the adverse cumulative effect development allowed by such zoning would have on the environment of itself and in association with other land for which such zoning has been sought in the immediate vicinity. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1157.55	166.20	Trojan Helmet Ltd	22.5.12.3	Support	That the submission point be accepted. Reject the 4ha cap to calculate the average.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1255.14	414.5	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.5.12.3	Support	Allow the submission.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1256.11	523.11	Ashford Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1256.12	523.12	Ashford Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1256.53	537.35	Ashford Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1256.54	537.36	Ashford Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1259.14	535.30	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1259.15	535.31	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	That the submission be allowed insofar as it seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1267.14	535.30	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1267.15	535.31	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	22.5.12.3	Support	Supports. Seeks amendments to chapters 21, 22, 27 and Planning Map 30 of the Proposed Plan.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.6	348.4	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.44	537.35	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.45	537.36	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.63	231.4	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.73	232.7	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1286.77	830.4	Henry, Mr M and Mrs J - represented by Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	The submission be allowed. The Submission is supported in its entirety. The rezoning is considered to achieve the most efficient and effective use of resources as that land is no longer capable of rural productivity.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1292.39	537.35	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone

**Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle**

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
FS1292.40	537.36	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	Insofar as the submission seeks changes to the provisions of chapters 3, 6, 21, 22, and 27, the submission is supported.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1292.86	522.37	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1292.87	522.38	Wilkinson, Roger and Carol - represented by Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	22.5.12.3	Support	That the submission be allowed in its entirety.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1309.4	314.4	The Alpine Group	22.5.12.3	Oppose	the submission of Wakatipu Holdings Limited is rejected.	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.31	532.27	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.32	532.28	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 532 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.70	534.30	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.71	534.31	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 534 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.107	535.30	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
FS1322.108	535.31	Juie Q.T. Limited	22.5.12.3	Support	Supports. Requests that the decisions requested by the original submitter in original submission 535 be allowed (save for those of a site specific nature in respect of which I do not express a view).	Reject		Residential Density – Rural Lifestyle Zone
OS243.33		Byrch, Christine	22.5.13	Oppose	Delete this sub-zone, but if it is retained, maximum building coverage should be 2000m <sup>2</sup> , and any more than this should be prohibited. add another point for discretion: Whether the building would be visually prominent, especially in the context of the wider landscape, rural environment and as viewed from neighbouring properties.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS811.12		Scaife, Marc	22.5.13	Support	NCS should be non-complying, possibly Prohibited. Questions how can the scale and intensity of the activity be compatible with surrounding activities if the VA subzone is surrounded by Rural Lifestyle? Rural Lifestyle has 1 residential unit, max 1000 sqm site coverage whereas VA has 2.5 times that?	Reject		This is too onerous and does not accord with section 5 RMA.
FS1224.33	243.33	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.13	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
FS1224.59	811.12	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.13	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
OS811.13		Scaife, Marc	22.5.20	Support	Building restriction NCS should be Prohibited.	Reject		This is too onerous and does not accord with section 5 RMA.
FS1224.60	811.13	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.20	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in part	General opposition to submission 811 associated with the Matakauri Lodge VA subzone. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Visitor Accommodation
OS694.9		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.21	Oppose	Delete Table 5 (Rules 22.5.21 to 22.5.32)		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.10		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.22	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.11		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.23	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS166.5		Aurum Survey Consultants	22.5.24	Oppose	Reject rule 22.5.2.4 where it relates to averaging in the Bobs Cove Rural Residential Sub zone.	Reject		These rules are well established and the removal of them could have adverse effects on landscape values and rural living amenity.
OS694.12		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.24	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS243.23		Byrch, Christine	22.5.25	Other	Informal Airports Located on Public Conservation and Crown Pastoral Land Helicopter landings at informal airports that do not comply with this standard should be prohibited or even non complying.	Reject		Informal Airports Chapter 21.2.25
OS694.13		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.25	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
FS1224.23	243.23	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.5.25	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	Informal Airports Chapter 21.2.25
FS1330.15	243.23	Treble Cone Investments Limited	22.5.25		Support.Oppose - seek that the part of the submission relating to Rule 21.5.26 (informal airports) be allowed, to the extent it is consistent with the original submission from TC and for the reasons expressed within this further submission.	Reject		Informal Airports Chapter 21.2.25
OS146.2		Bradley, Sue	22.5.25.1	Oppose	Reject, the rule is too inflexible.	Reject		The rule is considered to be certain in so far that it is practical to show a plan with these planting densities.
OS694.14		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.26	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.15		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.27	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.16		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.28	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.17		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.29	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.18		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.30	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.19		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.31	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS694.20		Glentui Heights Ltd	22.5.32	Oppose	Delete Table 5		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
OS21.46		Walsh, Alison	22.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		
OS197.22		Hylton, Jeffrey	22.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		
OS444.6		Taylor, Mark and Jane	22.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Other	A further Rule should be inserted to require non-notification of any applications that breach Standard 22.5.3 if Controlled Activity status is reinstated in accordance with our submission on this point above (which would then require an appropriate supporting Rule to be inserted in Table 1).	Reject		Standadrds for buildings
OS844.10		Queenstown Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	22.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Other	Amend to include provision for community facilities and buildings in the rural residential zone: <u>22.6.3 Controlled Activity community facilities</u> <u>22.6.3 Controlled Activity buildings in rural residential zone</u>	Reject		Visitor Accommodation, Community Activities and Commercial Activities
OS719.117		NZ Transport Agency	22.6.1.	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.6.1 to read as follows: Controlled activity Home occupation (Rule 22.4.9), <u>except where access is onto a State highway.</u>	Accept		Non-notification
OS243.19		Byrch, Christine	22.6.2.	Oppose	This VA sub-zone should be deleted. If not, applications for resource consent should all be notified.		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Submission Point Number	Original Submission Ref	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Deferred	Issue Reference
OS719.118		NZ Transport Agency	22.6.2.	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.6.2 to read as follows: Controlled activity Visitor Accommodation within a Visitor Accommodation subzone (Rule 22.4.10), <u>except where the access is onto a State highway.</u>	Reject		Non-notification
FS1224.19	243.19	Matakauri Lodge Limited	22.6.2.	Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Subzone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Accept in Part	General opposition to submission 243.33 requesting the visitor accommodation subzone is deleted. The deletion of the sub zone is a rezoning matter is deferred to the hearing on mapping.	
OS21.47		Walsh, Alison	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	Supports the provisions.	Accept		
OS444.3		Taylor, Mark and Jane	22.7Assessment Matters	Other	Support the Rules in Table 1, and in particular Rule 22.4.12 which provides that community activities are to be assessed as Discretionary Activities. Add assessment criteria to ensure that any Community Activity must be for the principal benefit of the local community and that the benefits be clearly identified and demonstrated.	Accept in part		Policy Framework provides adequate guidance.
OS674.4		Hadley, J & R	22.7Assessment Matters	Oppose	Reinstate and review the operative assessment matters to ensure amenity and rural character is maintained. Consideration should also be given to ecological systems and the water quality of Mill Stream and Lake Hayes should be protected and enhanced.	Reject		Assessment Matters
OS674.5		Hadley, J & R	22.7Assessment Matters	Oppose	Include strong assessment matters with clear standards to be met with regard to effects including noise, traffic, visibility and others so that the rural character and amenity values of the RRZ are maintained	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1050.5	674.4	Jan Andersson	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1050.6	674.5	Jan Andersson	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	The submitter seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1082.4	674.4	Hadley, J and R	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1082.5	674.5	Hadley, J and R	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	Allow the whole submission. Submission 674 seeks to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1082.16	444.3	Hadley, J and R	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	Allow this submission point. Community activities in the Rural Residential Zone will in almost all cases have significant adverse effects to the local residents of the zone particularly with regard to rural amenity, noise, traffic, visual and landscape character. Strong assessment criteria for community activities are required to safeguard the purpose of the zone for rural residential living with the associated rural character and amenity values. Community activities must be for the demonstrable benefit of the existing local farming and rural residential community Support Objective 22.2.1.3 but consider that each lot containing one residential house must still have a minimum area of 4000m2, although this may include a part of the balance land to be retained as open (landscaped) space. The balance of the land could contain trees or farmed crops, it need not be entirely open or "landscaped" but it should not include any residential curtilage.	Accept in part		Policy Framework provides adequate guidance.
FS1089.5	674.4	McGuiness, Mark	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1089.6	674.5	McGuiness, Mark	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	Supports and seeks that the whole submission be allowed to strengthen the Rural Residential Zone so that the purpose of the zone is clear and protects the rural amenity, visual amenity and landscape character for the residents.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1146.4	674.4	Nicolson, Lee	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1146.5	674.5	Nicolson, Lee	22.7Assessment Matters	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Reject		Assessment Matters
FS1255.7	674.4	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.7Assessment Matters	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks policy protection for rural character in these zones. "Rural character" is different from "rural living character". Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones, when developed, have rural living character. It is inappropriate to seek to retain rural character in these zones.	Accept in part		Assessment Matters
FS1255.8	674.5	Arcadian Triangle Limited	22.7Assessment Matters	Oppose	Oppose in part. Disallow the submission to the extent that it seeks policy protection for rural character in these zones. "Rural character" is different from "rural living character". Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones, when developed, have rural living character. It is inappropriate to seek to retain rural character in these zones.	Accept in Part		Assessment Matters