

Queenstown Lakes District Proposed District Plan – Stage 1

**Section 42A Hearing Report
For Hearing commencing: 28 November 2016**

Report dated: 2 November 2016

Report on submissions and further submissions
Chapter 17 – Airport Zone

File Reference: Chp.17S42A

Contents:

1. Executive summary
2. Introduction
3. Code of conduct
4. Scope
5. Background – Statutory and Non-Statutory Documents
6. Background – Overview of the issues
7. Queenstown Airport Zone - Analysis of issues raised in submissions
8. Minor Amendments and Comments
9. Definitions – Analysis of Submissions
10. Wanaka Airport Zone
11. Conclusion

- Appendix 1. Recommended revised chapter
Appendix 2. List of Submission points with recommended decision
Appendix 3. Section 32 Report Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone
Appendix 4. Section 32 Report Landscape Rural Zone Gibbston Character Zone
Appendix 5. S32AA evaluation for Queenstown Airport Zone provisions
Appendix 6. S32AA evaluation for Wanaka Airport Zone provisions

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 The framework, structure and majority of the provisions in the notified Chapter 17 Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone (**Notified Chapter**) of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**), should be retained in relation to Queenstown Airport as outlined and supported in the section 32 (**s 32**) assessment included at **Appendix 3**. In relation to the Wanaka Airport, the framework and structure of the Notified Chapter should be applied rather than the notified Rural zoning, as outlined and supported in the s 32AA assessment attached as **Appendix 6** of this report.

1.2 I consider that the recommended provisions are more effective and efficient than the notified provisions, the changes requested by submitters (except where recommended to be accepted), are more appropriate than the Operative District Plan (**ODP**) and better meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**). Key reasons include:

- a. The proposed chapter will provide for the activities currently undertaken or anticipated to occur at Queenstown and Wanaka Airports.
- b. The proposed provisions recognise Queenstown Airport as a nationally significant infrastructure asset that is a generator of significant economic, social and cultural benefits.
- c. Creating a separate Airport Zone at Wanaka Airport is more efficient than the current situation where all people building, operating and leasing aircraft facilities and buildings in the area would have to seek consents under an incompatible Rural Zone.
- d. The provisions identify and give direction as to how the specific issues that pertain to the Airport Mixed Use Zone are to be addressed.

1.3 Several changes to the Notified Chapter are considered appropriate based on submissions received, and direction given from the Panel¹ in the Rural hearing stream.² These are shown in the recommended Revised Chapter attached as **Appendix 1 (Revised Chapter)** to this evidence.

1.4 A number are minor changes, or wording changes that provide better expression. Some of the changes are to the policies. In terms of the rules, the key change

¹ Minute Concerning Provisions Applying to Wanaka Airport, 16.6.16

² Paragraph 15.6 – 15.10 (pages 66-67), Section 42A Hearing Report For Hearing Commencing: 2 May 2016 (Chp. 21 S42A), dated 7 April 2016, prepared by Mr Craig Bar.

recommended relates to removal of references to parts of the ODP that do not form part of Stage 1 of the District Plan review.

- 1.5 Where a change is considered to be of substance, a section 32AA evaluation is included within **Appendix 5**. Otherwise, an explanation and reasons for the changes are set out within the body of this report.
- 1.6 Submissions that have been made on definitions that are used in the Notified Chapter have been addressed in this section 42A report. Some of the definitions addressed were considered in the hearings on the Noise (Chapter 36) and Rural Chapter (Chapter 21), but are addressed again here. The definitions and any recommended changes are recorded in **Appendix 1** for clarity. To avoid any doubt the purpose of including the definitions in **Appendix 1** is not to recommend that they become part of the chapter.
- 1.7 A full set of provisions (objectives, policies and rules) has been provided with my evidence to incorporate a Wanaka Airport Zone into the Notified Chapter as outlined in the Revised Chapter attached as **Appendix 1** of this report. Given these are substantive changes to provisions, I have assessed the changes in terms of s 32AA of the RMA at **Appendix 6** of this report. The extent of the Airport Zone at Wanaka Airport correlates with the boundary of Designation #64.
- 1.8 By way of summary the recommendations contained within the Revised Chapter include:
 - a. Identifying Queenstown Airport as nationally significant infrastructure;
 - b. Including provisions for the promotion of walking, cycling and public transport services to support the functioning of Queenstown Airport;
 - c. Distinguishing between Airport and Airport related activities at Queenstown and Wanaka Airports;
 - d. Managing exterior lighting on buildings associated with Airport Related Activities;
 - e. Removing an unnecessary rule that refers to the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (**HSNO**) and Civil Aviation Authority (**CAA**) requirements;
 - f. Updating references to other parts of the PDP; and
 - g. Removing reference to Transportation standards contained within the ODP.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 My full name is Rebecca Dawn Holden. I have been employed by the QLDC since October 2014. During this time I have worked as both a Planner and Senior Planner within the Resource Consents Team, and currently hold the position of Senior Planner within the Policy Team.

2.2 I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Arts (Hons) in Geography and Anthropology from the University of Canterbury. Since 2005, I have been an Associate Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute primarily working in a Local Government context in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand where I have held a number of planning roles associated with monitoring and research, policy development and resource consent processing.

2.3 I was not the principal author of the Notified Chapter.

3.0 CODE OF CONDUCT

3.1 Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

3.2 I am authorised to give this evidence on the Council's behalf.

4.0 SCOPE

4.1 My evidence addresses the submissions and further submissions received on the Notified Chapter. I discuss issues raised under broad topics, and where I recommend substantive changes to provisions I assess those changes in terms of s32AA of the RMA (see **Appendix 5**) Otherwise, an explanation and reasons for the changes are set out within the body of this report. The table in **Appendix 2** outlines my recommendations to the Panel on whether, in my opinion, individual submissions should be accepted, accepted in part, rejected, considered to be out of scope, or transferred to another hearing stream.

- 4.2** My evidence will also address the relevant submission points on Chapter 21 - Rural Zone as they relate to Wanaka Airport. I note that no other submissions on the Rural Chapter are of relevance to Chapter 17. A summary of the submission points transferred from the Rural Hearing Stream is attached at **Appendix 2**.
- 4.3** I note that the submissions on Chapter 27 (Subdivision) of the PDP that relate to minimum allotment sizes (Notified Rule 27.5.1) were transferred to the respective zone chapter. The Notified Chapter does not have a minimum allotment size for the notified Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. I note that one submission from QAC (433) was received in support on Notified Rule 27.5.1 in relation to the Queenstown AMUZ whereby QAC requested that the minimum lot size for subdivision within the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone be retained as notified within the PDP. This submission was opposed by Queenstown Park Limited (**QPL**) (FS1097) and Remarkables Park Limited (**RPL**) (FS1117) who opposed all amendments that undermined or circumvented Plan Change 35 (**PC35**). The provisions relating to subdivision are however in my view consistent with the ODP and PC35.
- 4.4** A number of submissions were received on the Rural Zone (Chapter 21) associated with the minimum allotment size. However I have reviewed these and am of the view that these do not relate to the Wanaka Airport and therefore are not relevant to this hearing stream.
- 4.5** In summary, I do not consider that there is any need to assess any submissions associated with Notified Rule 27.5.1 in this hearing stream, as far as they relate to the Airport Zone.
- 4.6** Although this evidence is intended to be a stand-alone document and also meet the requirements of s 42A of the RMA, a more in-depth understanding can be obtained from reading the s 32 report on the Notified Chapter provided as **Appendix 3** to this report. Additionally, I advise the Panel that **Appendix 4** to the s 32 report for notified Queenstown Airport Mixed Use contained an acoustic review of the provisions within the Notified Chapter,³ while **Appendix 5** to this report contained a traffic and transportation assessment of the proposed provisions.⁴ I have relied on these reports in forming my recommendations to the

³ 'Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone, Acoustical review of proposed District Plan provisions, Rp 100 R01 2014513A' dated 19 November 2014 and prepared by Mr Steve Peakall of Marshall Day Acoustics.

⁴ 'Review of Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone', dated 26 November 2014 and prepared by Mr Andy Carr of Carriageway Consulting

Panel on submissions and further submissions in relation to noise and transportation provisions within the Notified Chapter, and have specifically included them within Appendices 4 and 5 rather than relying on the electronic links within the notified s 32 reports.

5.0 BACKGROUND – STATUTORY AND NON-STATUTORY DOCUMENTS

5.1 Of relevance to the context of the Notified Chapter are two previous plan changes to the ODP; Plan Change 26 (**PC26**) for Wanaka Airport, and PC35 for Queenstown Airport. The plan changes relate to noise boundaries and planning provisions for activities surrounding the airport. I am generally familiar with both of these plan changes. The provisions confirmed through both plan changes in relation to noise were included within the Notified Chapter.

5.2 To assist the Panel, I briefly summarise PC26 and PC35:

- a. PC26 amended the aircraft noise boundaries shown on the District Planning Maps for Wanaka Airport. PC26 also amended existing provisions and introduced new provisions relating to aircraft noise for Wanaka Airport. A new Notice of Requirement (**NoR**) to alter the existing Wanaka Airport Aerodrome Designation (Designation #64) was concurrently lodged with this plan change which introduced obligations on Council as requiring authority of Wanaka Airport in relation to aircraft noise monitoring and engine testing; and
- b. The purpose of PC35 was to establish an appropriate land use management regime around Queenstown Airport while providing for the predicted ongoing growth of aircraft operations at the airport until 2037. The vast majority of PC35 is no longer at issue following the three interim Environment Court decisions. However, one outstanding matter remains in relation to the location of noise boundaries in the vicinity of Lot 6.

5.3 Also of relevance is Chapter 37 (Designations) of the PDP. Both Queenstown and Wanaka Airports are designated for the purpose of 'Aerodrome' in the ODP and notices of requirement have been given in respect of the PDP (discussed further below).

5.4 The s 32 (**Appendix 3**) provides a detailed overview of the higher order planning documents applicable to the Notified Chapter. I summarise the provisions that I consider particularly relevant as follows:

- a. **The RMA** – in particular the purpose and principles in Part 2, which emphasise the requirement to sustainably manage the use, development and protection of the natural and physical resources for current and future generations, taking into account the 'four well beings' (social, economic, cultural and environmental).
- b. **The Local Government Act 2002** - in particular section 14, Principles relating to local authorities. Sub-sections 14(c), (g) and (h) emphasise a strong intergenerational approach, considering not only current environments, communities and residents but also those of the future. They demand a future focussed policy approach, balanced with considering current needs and interests. Like the RMA, the provisions also emphasise the need to take into account social, economic and cultural matters in addition to environmental ones.
- c. **Iwi Management Plans** - when preparing or changing a District Plan, Section 74(2A)(a) of the RMA states that Council's must "take into account" any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the Queenstown Lakes District (**District**). Two iwi management plans are relevant:
 - i *The Cry of the People, Te Tangi a Taurira*: Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008 (MNRMP 2008); and
 - ii *Kāi Tahu ki Otago* Natural Resource Management Plan 2005 (KTKO NRMP 2005).
- d. **Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 (Operative RPS)** - Section 75(3) of the RMA requires that a District Plan prepared by a territorial authority must "give effect to" any regional policy statement. The Operative RPS contains a number of objectives and policies of relevance to the Airport Mixed Use Zone Chapter and the infrastructure and established aviation

activities at Wanaka Airport. These include objectives and policies relating to managing the productive capacity of land, and those relating to the built environment in terms of the relationship with the well-being, safety and health of people and communities. Specifically, the following, Objectives 5.4.1 to 5.4.2 and 9.4.1 to 9.4.3 (inclusive), as well as the associated Policies 5.5.3 to 5.5.5 and 9.5.2 and 9.5.3, are relevant:

- 5.4.1 *To promote the sustainable management of Otago's land resources in order:*
 - (a) *To maintain and enhance the primary productive capacity and life-supporting capacity of land resources; and*
 - (b) *To meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's people and communities.*

- 5.4.2 *To avoid, remedy or mitigate degradation of Otago's natural and physical resources resulting from activities utilising the land resource.*

- 9.4.1 *To promote the sustainable management of Otago's built environment in order to:*
 - (a) *Meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's people and communities; and*
 - (b) *Provide for amenity values, and*
 - (c) *Conserve and enhance environmental and landscape quality; and*
 - (d) *Recognise and protect heritage values.*

- 9.4.2 *To promote the sustainable management of Otago's infrastructure to meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's communities.*

- 9.4.3 *To avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of Otago's built environment on Otago's natural and physical resources.*

e. Section 74 of the RMA requires that a District Plan must "have regard to" any proposed regional policy statement.

f. **The Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2016 (PRPS)** was notified for public submissions on 23 May 2015. Council decisions on submissions were released on 1 October 2016. At the time of preparing this report the appeal period has not closed⁵ and it is not known whether the provisions that are relevant to this chapter will be subject to further change. Notwithstanding the above, the following objectives and policies of the PRPS

⁵ Appeals close 30 working days after notification of Council's decision on 1 October 2016 (14 November 2016).

Decision Version 2016 (**PRPS 2016**) are relevant to the Airport Mixed Use Chapter:

- i. Objective 4.1 is that risk that natural hazards pose to Otago's communities are minimised. Policy 4.1.12 recognises lifeline utilities and facilities for essential or emergency services. Objective 4.3 is that infrastructure is managed and developed in a sustainable way with associated policies relating to managing and protecting nationally and regionally significant infrastructure. These objectives are relevant to the Airport Mixed Use Zone Chapter as Notified Objective 17.2.1 and associated policies recognise that Queenstown Airport is a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits. Additionally, Queenstown Airport has been identified as a lifeline utility and a nationally significant infrastructure asset. Notified Objective 17.2.2 recognises that Airport and Airport Related Activities at Wanaka Airport support the essential functioning and viability of aviation activities.

- ii. Objective 4.5 of the PRPS is that urban growth and development is well designed, reflects local character and integrates effectively with adjoining urban and rural environments. Policy 4.5.1 is managing for urban growth and development in a strategic and co-ordinated way by, amongst other things, restricting the location of activities that may result in reverse sensitivity effects on existing activities. This objective and this policy is relevant to the Airport Mixed Use Zone Chapter as *Notified Objective 17.2.2 [Redrafted 17.2.3]* is that the provision for the requirements of the airports is balanced with achieving an acceptable level of amenity for those using the airports and surrounding land.

5.5 I became aware on 1 November, when finalising this s42A report, that the final National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity has been approved. I have not had an opportunity to consider the approved version in this s42A, but will do so prior to the Business hearing.⁶

⁶ http://www.mfe.govt.nz/sites/default/files/media/Towns%20and%20cities/National_Policy_Statement_on_Urban_Development_Capacity_2016-final.pdf.

6.0 BACKGROUND – OVERVIEW OF THE ISSUES

- 6.1** The purpose of the Notified Chapter is to enable the sustainable management and growth of Queenstown Airport by providing for a range of airport and airport related activities, which recognise the unique role of the airport in providing for the social and economic well-being of the community. This is proposed to be revised to also recognise Wanaka Airport as Regionally Significant infrastructure within the District, having importance as a commercial and recreational aviation hub for the Upper Clutha.
- 6.2** Both the ODP and PDP seek to recognise Queenstown Airport as an asset which facilitates the transportation of people and freight, and recognising that it is a key asset to the District in terms of supporting the tourism industry and needs of local and business travellers.
- 6.3** The rules in the Notified Chapter are drafted to enable any airport activity or airport related activity which complies with all the relevant standards to be permitted, whereas incompatible activities such as residential activities and other Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (**ASAN**) are restricted. Standards relate to ensuring amenity within surrounding zones is retained with requirements such as maximum building coverage, minimum setbacks, maximum building height and noise limits.
- 6.4** Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited (**QAC**) (433) (which operates Wanaka Airport on behalf of the QLDC as landowner and requiring authority for the designations) submitted that, although designations (Designation #64 Aerodrome and Designation #65 Airport Approach and Land Use Controls) exist for Wanaka Airport, only the requiring authority (QLDC) can rely on the designation. The result is that all other people building, operating and leasing aircraft facilities and buildings in the area would have to seek consents under an incompatible Rural Zone. QAC (433) requested specific provision to be made for airport and airport related activity to be carried out at Wanaka Airport.
- 6.5** The incompatibility of the underlying rural zone was recognised by the Council in its reply on the Rural chapters.

7.0 QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT ZONE – ANALYSIS OF ISSUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS

- 7.1** Twenty-two submissions or further submissions with 70 points of submission were received on the Notified Chapter in relation to the notified Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone.
- 7.2** The RMA, as amended in December 2013, no longer requires a report prepared under s42A or the Council decision to address each submission point but, instead, requires a summary of the issues raised in the submissions.
- 7.3** Some submissions contain more than one issue, and will be addressed where they are most relevant within this evidence.
- 7.4** Because of the relatively low number of submissions on the Notified Chapter, the analysis of the submissions is set out according to the specific part of the Notified Chapter submitted on. Where efficient and appropriate, a particular submission is singled out.

Submissions on 17.1 – Zone Purpose

- 7.5** The Zone Purpose is outlined at section 17.1 of the Notified Chapter. It states that Queenstown Airport provides "*facilities for the transportation of people and freight and is a key asset to the District in terms of supporting the tourism industry and the needs of local and business travellers.*" It also recognises that the main function of Queenstown Airport is for domestic and international scheduled passenger movements as well as freight, and that the airport is a nationally significant asset as a result of its significant contribution to the tourism industry.
- 7.6** The provisions of the Notified Chapter are intended to apply to all land used for airport and airport-related activities at Queenstown Airport, applying standards to manage the effects on amenity values as a result of activities carried out at the airport.
- 7.7** Submitter QAC (#433) supports the Zone Purpose within the Notified Chapter and seeks that it be retained as notified. This is opposed by further submissions from QPL (1097) and RPL (1117) who oppose all amendments that are inconsistent with PC35 or that impose additional restrictions on existing urban zones. Additionally, these further submissions oppose all changes within the Notified

Chapter that enable urban activities on land zoned Airport Mixed Use Zone where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport.

- 7.8** I do not consider that the text within the Zone Purpose is inconsistent with PC35 as confirmed by the Environment Court in its interim decision, nor does this text impose additional restrictions on existing urban zones outside of the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. I recommend to the Panel that these further submissions be rejected in the context of the Zone Purpose. However, I advise the Panel that I will address these submissions in further detail below where they have greater relevance.
- 7.9** Submitter 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) requests that the Zone Purpose is retained without further modification given the purpose recognises that the Queenstown Airport is both nationally significant and is a lifeline utility. This submitter notes that this is in line with the PRPS. I recommend to the Panel that this submission be accepted.
- 7.10** Although RPL (807) supports the identification of the airport's importance to tourism, this submitter considers that the Zone Purpose could be improved by removing repetition, providing amended wording for the Panel to consider. Specifically, RPL (807) request that the following text be included in the Zone Purpose:

Queenstown Airport is the gateway to Queenstown and is a key asset that provides facilities for the transportation of people and freight. The Airport is a key contributor to the tourism industry and generates significant economic growth at a district, regional and national level.

The airport also provides local facilities, including helicopter, flightseeing and general aviation operations. It is also a critical provider of emergency services and is a lifeline under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

The Airport Mixed Use Zone provides for the future growth and development of the airport in a manner that recognises the importance of maintaining amenity values of the airport and its surrounds.

- 7.11** I recommend to the Panel that this submitter's relief be rejected, in that the revised wording proposed by RPL does not acknowledge a number of important factors that are mentioned in the Zone Purpose of the Notified Chapter, including:

- a. The Queenstown Airport is the gateway to the District, not just Queenstown as suggested by submitter RPL.
- b. As well as tourism, the needs of local and business travellers are also provided for by the Queenstown Airport which RPL excludes from the suggested wording.
- c. Queenstown Airport is recognised as a nationally significant asset in terms of its contribution to the tourism industry. Queenstown's national significance is not mentioned within the suggested wording by RPL.
- d. In addition to the District's reliance on air transport for tourism, the role the airport plays in terms of international tourism which is New Zealand's largest foreign exchange earner is not included in the suggested wording provided by RPL.
- e. Queenstown Airport is a significant source of employment for the District which RPL's suggested wording does not recognise.

7.12 In my opinion, the proposed changes requested by RPL (807) substantially change the intended outcome of the Zone Purpose and detract from the importance of Queenstown Airport to the region.

7.13 Additionally, I note that the relief sought by RPL is opposed by further submissions received from the Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (**BARNZ**) (1077) which supports the Zone Purpose as notified.

7.14 Submitter J Berriman (217) opposes the Zone Purpose contained within the Notified Chapter on the grounds of not wanting to see further growth in Queenstown. I recommend to the Panel that this submission be rejected. Submitter Berriman has not provided any evidence as to why further growth in Queenstown should be discouraged. The Zone Purpose sets the scene for why the zone has been identified, recognising the Airport's status in terms of being a nationally significant asset in relation to the tourism industry and being a critical provider of emergency services. As outlined above in Part 5 of my report, the provisions within the Notified Chapter give effect to the relevant higher order statutory documents as required by the RMA.

7.15 For the reasons outlined above, I recommend to the Panel that submissions 217 (J Berriman) and 807 (RPL) be rejected, and that submissions 433 (QAC) and 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) as well as Further

Submission 1077 (BARNZ) be accepted, as indicated in **Appendix 2** to this report.

Submissions on 17.2 Objectives and Policies

7.16 Section 17.2 of the Notified Chapter contains the objectives and policies to ensure that the effects of land uses carried out at Queenstown Airport are appropriately managed or provided for.

7.17 Submitter QAC (433) supports the provisions within section 17.2 of the Notified Chapter and requests that these be retained as notified. I recommend to the Panel that this submission be accepted in part, taking into consideration the relief sought by submitters discussed in the following paragraphs.

Objective 17.2.1

7.18 I recommend that minor amendments to Objective 17.2.1 be made to address the Fourth Procedural Minute issued by the Panel on 8 April 2016 regarding the drafting of objectives. I am of the opinion that the recommended objective contained within the Revised Chapter attached as **Appendix 1** (Revised Chapter), now reads as an outcome or goal rather than a policy.

7.19 This objective seeks to recognise Queenstown Airport as a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits. Submitter 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) supports this objective in principle, but requests amendments to reflect that the airport itself is nationally significant infrastructure. Suggested rewording of the objective is provided within the submission as follows (inserted text underlined):

Queenstown Airport is recognised as being nationally significant infrastructure and a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits.

7.20 I note that Objective 4.3 of the PRPS 2016 is for infrastructure of national and regional significance to be managed in a sustainable way, with supporting Policies 4.3.2 and 4.3.4 seeking the recognition and protection of infrastructure that is nationally and regionally significant. I am of the opinion that the wording proposed by submitter 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) has better regard to the PRPS than the Notified Chapter. The suggested wording

clarifies that as well Queenstown Airport being a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits; it is also a nationally significant piece of infrastructure in its own right. As such, I recommend to the Panel that submission 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) be accepted. Included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

7.21 Submission 798 (Otago Regional Council) (**ORC**) requests that "*provisions for roading, access and parking should recognise the needs of active transport modes, public transport services and infrastructure.*" I agree with submitter ORC in so far as the provision of public transport services and infrastructure in the future should be recognised. Objective 17.2.1 does not specifically recognise these transports needs. However, I note that associated with this objective is Policy 17.2.1.2, which seeks to provide for a range of airport related activities that support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport. Further, the definition of "Airport Related Activity" includes the provision of "land transport activities" as well as servicing and infrastructure.

7.22 I consider that greater emphasis should be placed on the promotion of these alternate modes of travel particularly given airport activities generate a number of vehicle movements associated with dropping off or picking up passengers. As such, my recommendation to the Panel is that the ORC's submission be accepted in part by including an additional policy to encourage walking and cycling (being active transport modes) and public transport. The insertion of an additional policy that encourages active transport modes, public transport services and infrastructure is supported by Further Submission 1340 (QAC). Additionally, I note that Policy 4.4.6 of the PRPS 2016 seeks to enable energy efficient and sustainable transport for Otago's communities by placing a high priority on walking, cycling and public transport.

7.23 To assist the Panel, I have suggested wording for an additional policy contained within the Revised Chapter (**Appendix 1**) as follows:

17.2.1.4 *Promote the use of walking, cycling and public transport services and infrastructure to support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.*

7.24 I have also included within **Appendix 5** of this report a s32AA evaluation of this change.

Policy 17.2.1.1

7.25 Policy 17.2.1.1 seeks to "*provide for those aviation activities necessary to enable Queenstown Airport to operate in a safe and efficient manner.*" Although the intent of this policy is supported by submission 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd), the submitter notes that there is no definition of 'aviation activities' within the PDP and therefore the policy should be amended to refer to 'airport activity' which is a defined term. I agree with this submitter in terms of potential ambiguity resulting from the inconsistent use of terminology.

7.26 As such, I recommend to the Panel that submission 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) be accepted in part in that Policy 17.2.1.1 be amended to refer to 'airport activity' in relation to Queenstown Airport, as requested.

7.27 I also recommend to the Panel that minor amendments are made to this policy to improve drafting, as outlined in the Revised Chapter attached as **Appendix 1**. In my opinion, the amended wording does not change the intended outcome of the policy, rather improves its drafting for greater clarity and therefore the recommended rewording can be made in accordance with Clause 16(2) of the First Schedule of the RMA.

7.28 I have also included within **Appendix 5** of this report a s32AA evaluation of my recommended changes to this policy.

Policy 17.2.1.3

7.29 Policy 17.2.1.3 seeks to ensure that sufficient land is zoned to meet the foreseeable future requirements of activities that support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.

7.30 To give effect to this policy the Notified Chapter and associated Planning Maps 31, 31a and 33 identify that all the land covered by Designation #2 (Aerodrome Purposes) in both the ODP and PDP as being included in the Queenstown AMUZ. As outlined in the s 32 evaluation of the proposed provisions (**Appendix**

3), this land is zoned Rural General in the ODP but has been incorporated into the AMUZ within the PDP to give effect to this policy.

- 7.31** Further, the s 32 evaluation notes that Notified Policy 17.2.1.3 and the proposed rezoning of land at Queenstown Airport address an identified need to provide additional capability for airport related activities at Queenstown Airport on account of the importance of Queenstown Airport's role in the District's tourism industry. I agree with this assessment within the s 32 report (**Appendix 3**).
- 7.32** Submitter RPL (807) requests that Notified Policy 17.2.1.3 be deleted.
- 7.33** Submitter RPL (807) considers that the reason for the area of land which is designated for aerodrome purposes not being contained within the AMUZ within the ODP is that it is inconsistent with the use of that land for aerodrome purposes. The land covered by Designation #2 for the purposes of Aerodrome within the PDP the same as the proposed AMUZ. I disagree with the rationale presented by RPL in their submission (807), and recommend its submission is rejected.
- 7.34** Additionally I note that the Further Submissions received from QAC (1340) and BARNZ (1077) oppose this submission from RPL (807).

Notified Policy 17.2.2.3 [Redrafted Policy 17.2.3.3]

- 7.35** Notified Policy 17.2.2.3 [redrafted 17.2.3.3] is to '*avoid the establishment of activities that are incompatible with the ongoing operation and functioning of Queenstown Airport*'. As outlined in the s 32 analysis (**Appendix 3**), this policy sets out the framework to retain the prohibited activity status for incompatible activities which are currently prohibited within the ODP.
- 7.36** Although not directly stated in the s 32 evaluation, it is my view that this policy also provides a foundation for the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects.
- 7.37** Submitter 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) supports this policy in part in that when combined with Notified Objective 17.2.2 [Redrafted 17.2.3] and Notified Policy 17.2.2.2 [Redrafted 17.2.3.2], this submitter is of the opinion that the interface between the airport and surrounding land uses is appropriately controlled. However, this submitter requests that Notified Policy 17.2.2.3 [Redrafted 17.2.3.3] be amended to recognise that the intensification of

existing incompatible activities also has the potential to adversely impact on the functioning of Queenstown Airport, and therefore requests that the word "intensification" is inserted into the policy. I recommend that this submission point is accepted because I consider that reverse sensitivity effects could be exacerbated if intensification of existing land uses sensitive to aircraft noise were to occur. This recommended change has been included in the Revised Chapter attached as **Appendix 1** and been evaluated in accordance with s32AA of the RMA within **Appendix 5** of this report.

- 7.38** While the submission received from RPL (807) does not specifically address Notified Policy 17.2.2.3 [Redrafted 17.2.3.3.], I note that the general comments made within its submission (paragraph 10.3 and 10.4) outline its position seeking that the ODP provisions be retained. I am of the view that this aspect of its submission should also be considered in the context of Notified Policy 17.2.2.3 [Redrafted 17.2.3.3] given the s32 analysis identified this provision as being required to support the prohibited activity status of some activities within the zone.
- 7.39** Submitter RPL (807) has noted that ASANs are restricted within land adjoining the Queenstown Airport Zone (specifically within the Remarkable Park Zone (**RPZ**)) but not on land within the Queenstown Airport Zone. The relief sought by RPL (807) seeks that as ASANs are enabled within the Queenstown Airport Zone, they should similarly be enabled within the RPZ.
- 7.40** I consider that this submission point is out of scope given the RPZ does not form part of Stage 1 of the District Plan review and a resolution has been passed by the Council to exclude the RPZ from the District Plan Review.⁷ I therefore recommend to the Panel that RPL's submission be rejected in respect of enabling the range of activities including ASANS to occur within RPZ.
- 7.41** However, alternative relief sought by RPL (807) includes a request that the same noise restrictions be imposed within the Queenstown Airport Zone as were imposed on the RPZ through PC35.
- 7.42** PC35 provisions (objectives, policies and rules) were appealed to the Environment Court. I understand that, with the exception of the Lot 6 noise boundaries, the PC35 provisions are to be treated as operative pursuant to section 86F of the RMA.

⁷ Council meeting held on 29 September 2016 – Item 4.

- 7.43** Within the Notified Chapter, visitor accommodation associated with the needs of Airport passengers, visitors and employees at Queenstown Airport is permitted if buildings have been designed to achieve an Indoor Design Sound Level of 40 dB L_{dn} within any Critical Listening Environment, based on the 2037 Noise Contours contained in the PDP planning maps (Rule 17.4.1 and Notified Standard 17.5.8 [Redrafted 17.5.7]).
- 7.44** The noise restrictions within the RPZ that resulted from PC35 proceedings related to any new building or any alteration or addition to an existing building to be used for residential activities or visitor accommodation to be acoustically insulated from aircraft noise so as to achieve an "*Indoor Design Sound Level of 40dB L_{dn} based on the 2037 Noise Contours, except for non-critical listening environments where no special sound insulation is required.*"⁸ This is consistent with the proposed provisions applicable to Visitor Accommodation activities within the Queenstown Airport Zone described above. Within the RPZ, alternative methodologies for addressing effects from aircraft noise are provided for buildings located between the 58 and 60 dB 2037 Noise Contours. As such, I recommend to the Panel that RPL's (807) submission is also rejected on this matter.
- 7.45** RPL's submission (807) requesting that the ODP provisions be retained is also relevant to the provision for visitor accommodation in the Queenstown Airport Zone. Within the ODP visitor accommodation is listed as a prohibited activity (Rule 6.2.3.5ii). However within the PDP visitor accommodation is included within the definition of 'Airport Related Activity' which is permitted under Notified Rule 17.4.1 [Redrafted 17.5.7] if it complies with the relevant standard relating to acoustic insulation (Notified Rule 17.5.8).
- 7.46** I note that Appendix 4 of the s 32 evaluation for the Notified Chapter (**Appendix 3**) is relevant. This report was prepared by Mr Steve Peakall of Marshall Day Acoustics, dated 19 November 2014 and discusses the provision for visitor accommodation within the Queenstown AMUZ at section 3.0 of this report. Mr Peakall, who is an acoustic engineer, considered it appropriate to define visitor accommodation as an activity that can be established within the Queenstown AMUZ given the intent of the zone is to provide for airport related activities, which includes visitor accommodation. Establishing visitor accommodation within close

⁸ Zone Standard 12.11.5.2iv(a).

proximity to an airport has become an acceptable and subsidiary activity to airport operations throughout the country.

7.47 However, Mr Peakall considered that if visitor accommodation is to be permitted within the Queenstown Airport Zone, then reverse sensitivity and adverse noise effects need to be appropriately considered and mitigated through minimum standards. Mr Peakall considered that visitor accommodation should be limited in the following ways:

- a. *Used by people for short term stays, unlikely to exceed a day or two in duration.*
- b. *There would be minimal expectation for outside space to be provided; the main use of visitor accommodation would be for people in transit, at the beginning or end of a vacation and therefore not explicitly on holiday in the MUAZ [mixed use airport zone].*
- c. *Typically people using such accommodation would also be using the airport services so may generally expect and be sympathetic to a degree of impact by the airport.*

7.48 Notwithstanding these points, Mr Peakall noted that visitor accommodation is an ASAN and could still be adversely affected by airport noise. Therefore Mr Peakall recommended that any visitor accommodation developments would need to be fitted with sound insulation to ensure a satisfactory internal noise environment (40 dB L_{dn}) was achieved. Taking Mr Peakall's report into consideration, I agree with the assessment contained within the s 32 analysis, in that Notified Standard 17.5.8.1 [Redrafted 17.5.6.1] is considered to be an effective means of mitigating reverse sensitivity effects associated with visitor accommodation within the zone and the most appropriate way of achieving Notified Objective 17.2.2 [Redrafted 17.2.3]

17.3.2 – District Wide (Other Provisions and Rules)

7.49 Submission 383 (QLDC - Corporate) requests that standard wording related to permitted activities be inserted within notified section 17.3.2. I accept this submission and accordingly, have recommended that redrafted advice note 17.3.2.1 be included in the chapter at **Appendix 1**. I have also included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

- 7.50** I note that the submission received from QAC (433) requests that this section be retained as notified. However, I recommend to the Panel that this submission be rejected as a number of modifications are either sought by submitters (e.g. 383 (QLDC)), or are required to be made to accommodate the Airport Zone at Wanaka Airport (discussed below and which is a result of the relief sought by Submission 433 (QAC)).
- 7.51** In addition, I note that within the Right of Reply for Chapter 30 – Energy and Utilities, a clarification note was included to state that the provisions within Chapter 17 prevail over the provisions contained within Chapter 30. This was to address submitter 433 (QAC) who seek an adjustment to ensure that provisions relating to Airport Activities within the Queenstown Airport Zone prevail over rules within the Energy and Utilities Chapter. As such, I have included the same clarification note within the Revised Chapter attached (**Appendix 1**).

Rule –17.5

- 7.52** Rule 17.5 of the Notified Chapter contains the following standards (as notified) for activities located within the AMUZ:

- 17.5.1 *Maximum Building Coverage*
- 17.5.2 *Maximum Buildings Setback*
- 17.5.3 *Maximum Building Height*
- 17.5.4 *Landscaping*
- 17.5.5 *Building Design and Glare*
- 17.5.6 *Maximum Noise – Land Based Activities*
- 17.5.7 *Hazardous Substances*
- 17.5.8 *Visitor Accommodation – Queenstown Airport*
- 17.5.9 *Transportation*
- 17.5.10 *Signs*

Rule 17.5.1 – Maximum Building Coverage

- 7.53** Submitter RPL (807) seeks that the maximum building coverage be retained as in the ODP. I note that the maximum building coverage is 75% in both the ODP and PDP and has not changed. I therefore recommend that the submission received from RPL (807) be accepted in this regard.

Rule 17.5.2 - Minimum Building Setback

- 7.54** Submitter RPL (807) seek that the ODP minimum building setback rules are reinstated over the PDP rules. I am unsure of the rationale behind this request.
- 7.55** Within the ODP, the minimum setback for buildings within the Queenstown AMUZ is 10m from any zone boundary and 6m from any road. Within the Notified Chapter, these setbacks have been reduced to 5m where any site adjoins a Residential Zone, 3m from all other zones, and 5m from any public road. The s32 evaluation of the notified provisions (**Appendix 3**) concluded that greater development opportunities would result from the amended setback distances particularly given the limited land resource within the Queenstown AMUZ. Costs identified were that the reduced setback distance would result in buildings being located closer to property boundaries. However, the s 32 assessment concludes that, coupled with other building and urban design controls, the effects on amenity values can be appropriately managed. Overall, the s 32 assessment concluded that the minor costs of reducing the minimum setback from boundaries were outweighed by the benefits.
- 7.56** Additionally, I note that the proposed setback standards within the Notified Chapter are no more lenient with that of adjoining zones, including the operative RPZ which has a minimum 1.5m building setback, and the adjoining Activity Area D within the operative Frankton Flats B Zone which has no side or rear boundary setbacks, and a minimum setback distance along a boundary which adjoins the Rural General Zone or a road boundary of 5m.
- 7.57** For the above reasons, I recommend to the Panel that the submission received from RPL (807) be rejected in regards to retaining the existing Queenstown Airport Zone rules in relation to setbacks.
- 7.58** QAC (433) seeks a minor amendment to Standard 17.5.2.1 to remove reference to Queenstown Airport and to clarify that the wording within this standard to refers to all buildings. I consider that this amendment will not change the substance or intent of what the provision was trying to achieve, but will improve clarity. Therefore I recommend that this submission is accepted.

Rule 17.5.3 - Maximum Building Height

- 7.59** RPL (807) submits that the ODP rules in relation to height be retained, stating that the increased building height is not necessary for aerodrome uses.
- 7.60** The maximum building height limit within the operative Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone is 9m. This has been increased to 15m within the Notified Chapter. I note that Designation #4 (Airport Approach and Land Use Controls) further limits the maximum building height within the Queenstown Airport Zone insofar as setting height and obstacle clearance restrictions to safeguard the efficient functioning of the Airport and to protect people's safety.
- 7.61** As mentioned above, AA8 within the operative RPZ directly adjoins the notified Queenstown Airport Zone . The maximum building height in AA8 is 18m [Zone Standard 12.11.5.2ii]. Frankton Flats (B) Zone also directly adjoins the notified Queenstown Airport Zone . The maximum building height in the Frankton Flats (B) Zone ranges from 6.5m to 18.5m [Zone Standard 12.20.6.2ii] (depending on the distance from the State Highway). Immediately adjoining the Queenstown Airport Zone within the Frankton Flats (B) Zone is Activity Area D which provides for a long term location for yard based activities and where the maximum building height is 10m [Zone Standard 12.20.6.2xvii].
- 7.62** Overall, I consider that the increased maximum building height within the Notified Chapter to be consistent with adjoining zones and appropriate to ensure a degree of amenity is retained within surrounding zones, particularly given the additional restrictions imposed by Designation #4. I therefore recommend that the submission of RPL (807) is rejected.

Rule 17.5.4 - Landscaping

- 7.63** RPL (807) seeks to retain the existing provisions relating to landscaping within the Queenstown Airport Zone.
- 7.64** Landscaping requirements for sites within the operative Queenstown Airport Zone require at least 10% of every site to be landscaped (Site Standard 6.2.5.1iii). Sites fronting Lucas Place and Hawthorne Drive are required to provide and maintain a landscape strip extending the full length of the road boundary with the

strip being not less than 1m deep with an average depth of 4m over its entire length [ODP Site Standard 6.2.5.1iii].

- 7.65** Within the Notified Chapter, landscaping along sites fronting Lucas Place and Hawthorn Drive has been reduced from 4m to an average depth of 3m over its entire length. A minimum depth of 1m has been retained. However the minimum 10% requirement for every site to be landscaped has been removed.
- 7.66** The reasons provided within the s 32 assessment related to landscaping, other than well maintained grass, as being inappropriate at airports for operational and safety reasons. The removal of the 10% landscaping requirement was in recognition of this. Further, it was noted that the urban design guidelines prepared and implemented by QAC will identify areas where high quality landscaping is appropriate. I agree with this assessment.
- 7.67** I also note that removing the 10% landscaping requirement will enable greater development opportunities, given the limited land resource at Queenstown Airport.
- 7.68** Overall, I consider that the amendments contained within the Notified Chapter will still ensure an appropriate level of amenity is retained along the interface between the Queenstown AMUZ and adjoining roads (Lucas Place and Hawthorne Drive), while at the same time enabling greater development opportunities, given the limited land resource at Queenstown Airport. As such, I recommend that the submission received by RPL (807) be rejected.
- 7.69** Submission 238 (NZIA) strongly support Council advocacy to promote good urban design. Taking this submission into consideration, I have included redrafted wording within the Revised Chapter to provide better certainty and clarification regarding the matters to which discretion is restricted within Notified Rule 17.5.4. I consider these changes to be minor amendments to improve clarity and have therefore not provided a s 32AA evaluation of these changes.

Rule 17.5.5 – Building Design and Glare

- 7.70** Submitter 383 (QLDC) seeks the insertion of an additional clause to Notified Rule 17.5.5 so as to limit airport lighting when it is not operationally required in order to mitigate impacts through the landscape and on the night sky. The suggested wording of this additional rule states:

Lighting shall be in use only when necessary in an operational sense, so as to minimise adverse impacts on the night sky.

- 7.71** This is opposed by FS1340 (QAC) who consider this rule to be "vague, unenforceable and should not be included".

- 7.72** I agree with QAC (FS1340) to the extent that the suggested condition from QLDC - Corporate (383) would be difficult to administer from a consenting perspective. However, I note that within the adjoining RPZ and Frankton Flats B Zone there are rules to ensure that lighting and glare is directed away from adjacent sites and roads and does not exceed 3.0 lux spill. The relief sought by submitter 383 (QLDC) could be met by a similar standard, which I consider would be more measurable, such as:

Light and Glare

All fixed exterior lighting on buildings associated with Airport Related Activities shall be directed away from adjacent sites and roads.

- 7.73** This recommended condition is included in **Appendix 1** and **Appendix 2** to this report. Included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

Notified Rule 17.5.6 – Maximum Noise – Land Based Activities

- 7.74** The Maximum Noise for land based activities standard within the Notified Chapter states:

17.5.6.1 Sound from land based activities measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802: 2008 shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within any Residential Zone, the notional boundary in the Rural Zone, or at any point within Activity Areas 1, 3, 4, 6 and 8 of the Remarkables Park

Zone. On any site within the zone, land based activities shall be conducted such that the following noise levels are not exceeded at any adjacent Zone boundary

- a. *Daytime (0700 to 2200 hrs) 55 dB LAeq (15 min)*
- b. *Night-time (2200 to 0700 hrs) 45 dB LAeq (15 min) 70 dB LAFmax*

17.5.6.2 The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to any aircraft noise activities subject to the Queenstown Airport noise provisions managed through Designation 2.

17.5.6.3 The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to construction noise which shall be assessed in accordance with NZS6803:1999 "Acoustics – Construction Noise".

**Discretion is limited to the extent of effects of noise generated on adjoining zones.*

7.75 Notified Rule 36.5.2 [Redrafted 36.5.15] seeks to control the level of sound received from the Queenstown AMUZ within the adjoining Residential and Rural Zones. QAC requested that Notified Rule 36.5.2 be replaced with Notified Rule 17.5.6 to ensure that all noise provisions are located within one section of the PDP (Chapter 36 Noise). Additionally, QAC (433) submitted that Notified Rule 36.5.2 did not specify acceptable levels for land based noise.

7.76 This submission point was addressed in the District Wide Hearing Stream 05 in relation to Chapter 36 Noise. It was the reporting officer, Ms Ruth Evans' recommendation⁹ that the submission requesting the deletion of Notified Rule 36.5.2 be rejected. Ms Evan's view is that Notified Rue 36.5.2 [Redrafted 36.5.15] better reflects the structure of the PDP compared with Notified Rule 17.5.6, as Notified Rue 36.5.2 [Redrafted 36.5.15] stipulates noise limits for the receiving environment rather than the point of noise generation.

7.77 Ms Evans recommended that noise from aircraft operations be excluded from Notified Rule 36.5.2 [Redrafted 36.5.15] and that reference to the RPZ be included, as requested by QAC (433).

⁹ Ms Ruth Evans – Section 42A Report Noise Chapter 26 dated 17 August 2016 (Page 15, paragraph 8.26): <http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Planning/District-Plan/Hearings-Page/Hearing-Stream-5/Section-42A-Reports-and-Council-Expert-Evidence/QLDC-05-Chapter-36-Noise-Section-42A-report-Full-File.pdf>.

7.78 Notified Rule 36.5.2 [Redrafted 36.5.15] as recommended by Ms Evans in the QLDC's Right of Reply is as follows (recommend changes to notified chapter are shown in red underlined text for additions and ~~red strike through~~ text for deletions recommended insertion underlined):

<i>Activity or sound source</i>	<i>Assessment location</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Noise Limit</i>	<i>Non-compliance status</i>
"Sound from the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone received in the Residential Zones, <u>Remarkables Park Zone</u> and the Rural Zone, <u>excluding sound from aircraft operations.</u> "	At any point within the Residential Zone and at any point within the notional boundary in the Rural Zone	0700h to 2200h 2200h to 0700h	55 dB LAeq (15min) 45 dB LAeq (15min) 75 dB LAFmax	RD Discretion is restricted to the extent of effects of noise generated on adjoining zones

7.79 I have reviewed Ms Evan's recommendations and agree that the removal of Rule 17.5.6 from the Notified Chapter would be consistent with the approach taken in drafting the PDP in terms of all the rules relating to noise limits being grouped within one district-wide chapter. The removal of Notified Rule 17.5.6 will also avoid repetition within the PDP. I also consider that Redrafted Rule 36.5.15 appropriately controls noise generated from the Queenstown AMUZ. As such, I recommend that Notified Rule 17.5.6 be deleted and Redrafted Rule 36.5.15 be retained. Included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

Notified Rule 17.5.7 [Redrafted 17.5.6] – Hazardous Substances

7.80 Notified Standard 17.5.7 [Redrafted 17.5.6] requires hazardous substances to be used, stored and transported in accordance with HSNO, and any CAA requirements. There is also a note for clarification that Chapter 16 of the ODP (Hazardous Substances) does not apply.

7.81 Submitter Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (768) supports the reliance on HSNO rather than the provision within the ODP, considering this to be appropriate. However, the submitter questions whether the storage and use of

hazardous substances can lawfully occur if there is a non-compliance with HSNO. Submitter 768 suggests that Notified Standard 17.5.7 [Redrafted 17.5.6] be deleted.

- 7.82** I agree with submitter 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) in that the reference to the HSNO and CAA requirements are not necessary as they apply regardless of any provision in the PDP. It is my recommendation to the Panel that submission 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) be accepted and that Notified Rule 17.5.7 be removed, excluding the reference to Chapter 16 of the ODP which I recommend be retained. Included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

Notified Rule 17.5.8 [Redrafted 17.5.7] – Visitor Accommodation – Queenstown Airport

- 7.83** Notified Rule 17.5.8 [Redrafted 17.5.7] requires new buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings that contain visitor accommodation activities, and that are located within the Air Noise Boundary (**ANB**) or between the ANB and Outer Control Boundary (**OCB**), be designed to achieve an appropriate indoor design sound level within any 'Critical Listening Environment'.
- 7.84** The corporate submission received from QLDC (383) seeks amendments to the wording of Notified Rule 17.5.8, as does QAC (433). Both of these submitters note that the Notified Chapter cross-references ODP provisions that form part of Stage 1 of the District Plan Review. Specifically, these submitters request that reference to 'Appendix 13' of the Noise Chapter within the ODP is updated to reference the appropriate provisions within the Chapter 36 (Noise) of the PDP. I recommend to the Panel that these minor amendments be made, as marked in the Revised Chapter attached at **Appendix 1**, and that submissions from QLDC (383) and QAC (433) are accepted.
- 7.85** I note that further submissions 1097 (QPL) and 1117 (RPL) oppose submission 433 (QAC) insofar as QAC requests all amendments that place additional restrictions on existing urban zones including the RPZ be rejected. They also oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent PC35 proceedings currently before the Environment Court, as well as opposing all amendments that enable urban activities on airport land when such activities are restricted within adjoining zones. The Council has resolved to exclude the RPZ from the PDP. (However, further steps will need to be taken by the Council to achieve this).

Therefore, it is my understanding that the ODP provisions, that deal with activities within the Air Noise Boundary that are located on RPZ land, will continue to be dealt with under the ODP, and therefore there is no need for identical provisions in the PDP.

7.86 Despite this, as discussed above in relation to Notified Policy 17.2.2.3 [Redrafted Policy 17.2.3.3], the noise restrictions within the RPZ that resulted from PC35 proceedings related to any new building or any alteration or addition to an existing building, to be used for residential activities or visitor accommodation, to be acoustically insulated from aircraft noise so as to achieve an “*Indoor Design Sound Level of 40dB Ldn based on the 2037 Noise Contours, except for non-critical listening environments where no special sound insulation is required*”¹⁰. This is consistent with the proposed provisions applicable to Visitor Accommodation activities within the Queenstown Airport Zone .

7.87 Overall, I recommend to the Panel that QAC's (433) submission is accepted and that further submissions 1097 (QPL) and 1117 (RPL) are rejected.

Notified Rule 17.5.9 – Transportation [Redrafted 17.5.8]

7.88 The Notified Chapter includes:

- a. Notified Rule 17.5.9.1 which provides that loading and access shall comply with the requirements specified in Section 14 Transport of the ODP; and
- b. Notified Rule 17.5.9.2 which states that car parking shall comply with the requirements specified in Section 14 Transport of the ODP except for activities undertaken within or in association with the airport terminal facility.

7.89 Submitter QLDC - Corporate (383) requests that the provisions relating to parking, loading and access, which refer to the ODP, be removed.

7.90 Section 17.3.1 of the Notified Chapter draws attention to the relevant District Wide chapters. Transport (14 ODP) is listed. In my view, the references to the

¹⁰ Council decision on Private Plan Change 35 dated 1 November 2010 and confirmed by Environment Court Interim Decision issued 10 September 2012.

ODP in Notified Rule 17.5.9 read more like advice notes. Further, they duplicate Notified Section 17.3.1. Accordingly, I recommend that they be removed and that the submission by QLDC (383) be accepted. I have noted these changes in the Revised Chapter attached (**Appendix 1**) at Redrafted Rule 17.5.8. I have also included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

- 7.91** In its further submission, QAC (1340) submitted that part of Notified Rule 17.5.9 be retained as it relates to the minimum car parking exemption for activities undertaken within or in association with the terminal building. However, Submitter H McPhail (834) considers that the car parking provided at the airport is presently inadequate, and considers future expansion of the airport as being incompatible with Notified Policy 17.2.2.1 (maintaining Queenstown Airport as a memorable and attractive gateway to the District), unless parking buildings and underground parking are developed. Submitter H McPhail (834) considers that more car parking must be provided as inadequate provision is resulting in flow on effects to the wider Frankton Area. I note that M Harris (116) raises concerns in relation to improving parking at the airport to alleviate the effects on the wider environment associated with traffic congestion and parking.
- 7.92** I agree with submitter H McPhail (834) in terms of land being a finite resource at the airport which must be carefully managed.
- 7.93** The s 32 evaluation at **Appendix 3** includes a traffic report carried out by Carriageway Consulting (at Attachment 5). The report reviews the traffic implications of the notified Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone provisions. The report concludes that the change to the status quo will not result in more than negligible traffic effects. However, the review did not address whether the current provision for car parking for activities within or in association with the terminal facility was adequate or sufficient to meet parking demand at the Airport.
- 7.94** In terms of the requests from submitters 834 (H McPhail) and 116 (M Harris) to provide more parking at the airport, I observe that the airport generates many vehicle movements associated with passengers departing or arriving. Users of the airport have the option of paying to park within the long term car park provided by QAC, or parking within the surrounding streets. Council intends to undertake a comprehensive review of minimum car parking requirements through Stage 2 of the District Plan review forming part of the Transport Chapter. Additionally, I do not consider there to be adequate information about the parking

demand at the airport to recommend that the exception be removed at this stage. On this basis, I recommend to the Panel that the submissions of M Harris (116) and H McPhail (834) are rejected.

- 7.95** I further note that parking within adjoining zones in the legal road reserve in the vicinity of Queenstown Airport is not controlled by the District Plan. I also note that the most prominent adjacent road is administered by the NZ Transport Agency (**NZTA**) and is outside the jurisdiction of the QLDC. Therefore, I have no basis to offer a recommendation on this part of Messrs McPhail and Harris's submissions.

Section 17.6.1 – Non-Notification of Applications

- 7.96** QLDC's corporate submission (383) requests that amendments are made to the wording of this provision to make it consistent with that contained within other chapters of the PDP. I can confirm that the amendments sought are consistent with wording contained within other chapters of the PDP.
- 7.97** I note that further submission 1097 (QPL) opposes submission 383 (QLDC) in relation to the non-notification of airport activities. Given the purpose of the Queenstown Airport Zone is to facilitate the functioning of the Queenstown and Wanaka Airports; I recommend to the Panel that this further submission is rejected.
- 7.98** Notified Provision 17.6.1 states that applications for discretionary activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited notified. There are no activities or non-compliance with standards that have a discretionary activity status in respect of the Queenstown AMUZ. Therefore, the removal of the reference to discretionary activity will have no substantive impact in respect of the Queenstown AMUZ. I recommend that reference to 'discretionary activities' is deleted in accordance with the submission of QLDC (383).
- 7.99** I note that a range of activities in the recommended Wanaka Airport Zone are proposed to be discretionary. I consider it appropriate to ask for written approval from affected persons in the case of these activities, given the QLDC is provided a full range of discretion in terms of assessing the adverse effects that may

potentially result. Therefore, I consider that it would be appropriate for these activities to be subject to the RMA provisions on notification.

Section 17.7 – Non – Regulatory Methods

7.100 Submitter NZIA and Architecture + Woman Southern (**NZIA**) (238) supports non-regulatory methods at Notified Section 17.7 of the Notified Chapter. QAC (433) similarly supports the non-regulatory method provisions and requests that they be retained as notified.

7.101 I recommend to the Panel that the submissions of NZIA (238) and QAC (433) be accepted.

7.102 I note that further submissions were received from QPL (1097) and RPL (1117) opposing QAC's submission which supported the non-regulatory provisions as notified. The reasons given relate to inconsistency with PC35 and any additional restrictions on existing urban zones. I recommend to the Panel that these further submissions are rejected as they are not related to the statements contained within Notified Clause 17.7 in terms of non-regulatory methods.

8.0 MINOR AMENDMENTS AND COMMENTS

8.1 I have recommended some general amendments to the Notified Chapter for the purposes of efficiency, and in accordance with previous directions of the Panel regarding the appropriate drafting of objectives and policies. These include the following:

- a. In previous hearings the Panel has queried the status of provisions under the heading "*Other Provisions and Rules,*" specifically within the sub-heading "*Clarification*". Accordingly, I have relabelled the statements contained within section 17.3.2 under two additional sub-headings: "*General Rules*" and "*Advice Notes*".
- b. I recommend that the chapter is renamed "Airport Zone" in order to accommodate the provisions as they relate to Wanaka Airport.
- c. I have added some clarification text to differentiate between the rules and standards applicable to Queenstown and Wanaka Airports at Section 17.3.2.

- d. I have included an advice note relating to the obligations for approval of the requiring authority to works undertaken within the 'Aerodrome Purposes' designations at Queenstown and Wanaka Airports.
- e. I have recommended that minor changes be made to the wording of Rule 17.4.2 in relation to activities not listed in Rules 17.4.3 to 17.4.9 being assessed as Restricted Discretionary activities.
- f. I have provided redrafted wording for matters whereby discretion is restricted to be consistent with the drafting of provisions contained within other Chapters of the PDP.
- g. I have recommended that the word 'Note' be changed to 'Except' within Standard 17.5.2 given the subsequent text relates to an exemption.
- h. At Standard 17.5.5 I have recommended that clarification is made that the colour of buildings relates to its exterior.
- i. I have recommended correction of a typo for the definition of 'Landside' to remove 'that' after the word 'means'.

8.2 I do not consider these changes to be substantive and therefore consider that they can be made in accordance with clause 16(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA.

Notified Rule 17.4 – Activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone

8.3 Within the Notified Chapter, Rule 17.4.1 provides for any airport or airport related activity or farming activity which complies with all the relevant rules in Section 17.5 as a permitted activity.

8.4 I note that some of the land zoned Rural in the ODP which is now included within the AMUZ is used for the grazing of livestock. However, the grazing of livestock does not meet the definition of 'farming activity' as it does not involve the primary purpose of the production of vegetative matters and/or commercial livestock given that stock would primarily be for land management purposes to keep the grass down which differs from the primary purpose being for commercial livestock. The definition of 'farming activity' within the PDP is as follows:

"Means the use of land and buildings for the primary purpose of the production of vegetative matters and/or commercial livestock. Excludes residential activity, home occupations, factory farming and forestry activity. Means the use of lakes and rivers for access for farming activities."

8.5 The ODP lists 'Farming' as a prohibited activity (Rule 6.2.3.5vi) in the Airport Mixed Use Zone. However the area north of the runway at Queenstown Airport is zoned Rural General in the ODP. As such, farming or the grazing of animals is permitted within this area under the ODP provisions. With the expansion of the AMUZ to encompass this area presently zoned Rural General within the ODP, the intent of listing 'farming' as a permitted activity was to capture this existing permitted activity carried out under a different zoning.

8.6 No submission has been made to provide scope for this change. Therefore, I have not recommended it in **Appendix 1**. However, in my view it would be appropriate for 'farming activity' to be removed from the list of permitted activities and for the definition of 'Airport Related Activity – Queenstown Airport' be amended to include 'grazing and the keeping of livestock for land management purposes'.

Notified Standard 17.5.10 [Redraft 17.5.9] Signs

8.7 When drafting this s42A report, I noted that Notified Standard 17.5.10 [Redraft 17.5.9] relating to signs reads as an activity rather than a standard. I also note that this rule is poorly drafted and not easily followed. There have been no submissions on this provision. Therefore, I am of the understanding that there is no scope to recommend changes. However, I wish to record that my view is that Notified Standard 17.5.10 [Redraft 7.5.8] should be redrafted to be consistent with other standards within this table or moved in its entirety. In any case, it is likely that the QLDC can rectify this through Stage 2 of the PDP by moving these provisions to the Signs Chapter.

9.0 DEFINITIONS – ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS

9.1 A number of submissions were received in relation to definitions which affect the Airport Zone provisions. I have grouped these by definition as follows:

9.2 Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN):

- 9.2.1** Submitter Christine Byrch (243) requests that the definition of ASAN be amended to include outdoor spaces associated with residential, visitor accommodation, community and day care activities, given people of Queenstown enjoy the outdoor areas of their properties in addition to inside spaces.
- 9.2.2** As outlined in the acoustic assessment contained within **Appendix 4** to the s32 analysis, given visitor accommodation within the Airport Zone would be used by people for short term stays, there would be minimal expectation for outside space to be provided. Typically people using such accommodation would also be using the airport services resulting in a degree of sympathy towards airport noise. I agree with this assessment. Accordingly, I do not consider that it is necessary to include a reference to outdoor spaces in the definition of ASAN in the context of the Airport Zone Chapter. However, I note that the definition of ASAN is used in other chapters in the PDP. The submission of Christine Byrch may, therefore, need to be reassessed in the relevant hearing stream for those chapters and again in the definitions hearing.
- 9.2.3** QAC requests that the definition of ASAN be retained as notified. This submission is opposed by Further Submissions 1117 (RPL) and 1097 (QPL). These submitters request that all definitions within the PDP be consistent with PC35. I am of the understanding that the definition of ASAN promulgated by PC35¹¹ was included in the PDP when notified.
- 9.2.4** Accordingly, I recommend to the Panel that Further Submissions 1117 (RPL) and 1097 (QPL) be rejected and that submission 433 (QAC) is accepted by the Panel.
- 9.2.5** Further, submitter 584 (Air New Zealand Limited) requests that the definition of ASAN be amended to be consistent with QLDC's decision with respect to PC19, which relates to the Frankton Flats B Special Zone. Given the time that has lapsed since QLDC's decision was made on PC19 and the intervening proceedings associated with PC35, I

¹¹ Council decision on Private Plan Change 35 dated 1 November 2010 and confirmed by Environment Court Interim Decision issued 10 September 2012.

recommend rejection of the request by submitter 584 on the basis that the definition reflects the latest definition confirmed by the Environment Court. This version better reflects the existing environment surrounding Queenstown Airport that that confirmed through QLDC's decision on PC19.

9.3 Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) Wanaka

9.3.1 QAC note that this definition is a near duplication of the definition of ASAN (noted above) and as such, would support its removal as the definition of ASAN applies to both Queenstown and Wanaka Airports. I note that the only difference between these two definitions is that the definition of 'Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) Wanaka' includes the following statement: "including all outdoor spaces associated with any educational facility." It could be argued that aviation schools are classified for "educational facilities." However given such schools would be directly associated with aviation and airport operations, a degree of acceptance would be afforded toward airport noise. As such, I agree with submitter 433 (QAC) and recommend to the Panel that this submission be accepted. As recommended in **Appendix 1**.

9.3.2 I note that submitter 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) supports the removal of this definition noting its similarity to the definition of 'ASAN'. I agree with this submission.

9.3.3 Included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

9.4 Aerodrome

9.4.1 The definition for 'Aerodrome' was inserted into the Notified Chapter and states as follows:

Means a defined area of land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft including any buildings, installations and equipment on or adjacent to any such area used in connection with the aerodrome or its administration.

9.4.2 Submitter 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) is of the opinion that it is unclear why there is a definition of 'Aerodrome' in the PDP when other provisions refer to 'Airport'. This submitter seeks that this definition is deleted.

9.4.3 I am of the opinion that this definition was included to clarify wording within the definition of 'Informal Airport', which specifically excludes 'Aerodromes'. The terms 'Aerodrome' and 'Informal Airport' are not used in the Airport Mixed Use Chapter. Accordingly, I do not consider that this submission point is relevant to this hearing stream.

9.4.4 The definition of 'Informal Airport' was addressed in the Rural Hearing, however, the definition of 'Aerodrome' was not. Therefore, the term 'Aerodrome' will need to be addressed in the hearing for Chapter 2 – Definitions.

9.5 Aircraft:

9.5.1 Submission 296 (Royal New Zealand Aero Club Inc/Flying NZ) requests that the definition of 'Aircraft' be amended to reference 'motorised aircraft' so that the rules are targeted to the primary issue of noise.

9.5.2 I consider this submission is also relevant to informal airports. However, I note that this submission was not considered during the Rural Hearing 2 and, therefore, will need to be considered at the definitions hearing.

9.5.3 I do not support the relief sought by Submitter Royal New Zealand Aero Club Inc/Flying NZ (296) because aircraft and the related informal airports rules also intentionally include non-motorised use of land for informal airports such as hot air balloons and parasailing. I consider that these activities should be included as aircraft.

9.5.4 Submission 383 (QLDC - Corporate) requests that the definition of aircraft is amended to exclude remotely piloted aircraft that are of a small scale and unlikely to have noise effects comparable to helicopters and fixed wing aircraft. QLDC also consider that retaining the potential for small scale remotely piloted aircraft to be subject to the PDP provisions could result in a large number of resource consents. Further, Civil Aviation Authority rules are tailored to specify remotely piloted aircraft. The District Plan should not duplicate these functions.

9.5.5 In its submission (383), QLDC seek that the definition of Aircraft is amended as follows (requested insertion underlined):

Means any machine that can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air otherwise than by reactions of the air against the surface of the earth. Excludes remotely piloted aircraft that weigh less than 15 kilograms.

9.5.6 Additionally, QLDC – Corporate (submission 383) also seeks that a new definition for Remotely Piloted Aircraft is added as follows:

Remotely Piloted Aircraft:

Means an unmanned aircraft that is piloted from a remote station.

9.5.7 Submission 383 (QLDC) is supported in part by Further Submission 1340 (QAC) who consider it appropriate to exclude remotely piloted aircraft from the definition of aircraft. However, QAC submits that that all definitions should be consistent with Civil Aviation Authority definitions. The CAA definition of ‘Aircraft’ is consistent with that notified.

9.5.8 My understanding of the Council’s corporate submission on Remotely Piloted Aircraft is that it was prepared to align with the information available from the Civil Aviation Authority at that time in October 2015. Irrespective of the current definition provided by the CAA, I consider that the relief sought by QLDC is effective in so far that it would exclude a range of activities such as the use of drones, even kite flying, that could otherwise be unintentionally captured by the informal airports rules and the reliance on the definition of Aircraft as notified.

9.5.9 I recommend the changes proposed by QLDC (383) be included in the Revised Chapter (**Appendix 1**). I have also included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of these changes.

9.6 Aircraft operations:

9.6.1 The definition of 'Aircraft Operations' in the PDP as notified stated:

Includes the operation of aircraft during landing, take-off and taxiing but excludes:

- *aircraft operating in an emergency;*
- *aircraft using the Airport as an alternative to landing at a scheduled airport;*
- *military aircraft movements; and*
- *engine testing.*

9.6.2 This definition was inserted into the PDP when notified. The ODP does not include this definition.

9.6.3 Submitter 243 (Christine Byrch) asks why "aircraft using the Airport as an alternative to landing at a scheduled airport" is excluded from the definition of 'Aircraft Operations'. According to this submitter, this omission appears to be a mistake.

9.6.4 By way of background I note that as part of the proceedings for PC35, the definition of 'Aircraft Operations' was confirmed and was included in the PDP when notified. Although not identified in the s 32 analysis for the Definitions Chapter of the PDP (Chapter 2) or the s 32 analysis for PC35, new and revised definitions were included in the PDP to reflect PC35 decisions. I note that reference is made to 'Aircraft Operations' within the definition for Airport Activity and within Chapter 37 – Designations of the PDP.

9.6.5 In addition, I note that I have also included the term 'Aircraft Operations' within the definition of 'Airport Activity' at Wanaka Airport. Currently, Wanaka Airport does not involve the landing or take-off of scheduled flights. Although I do not have any information available to inform the background to the phrase's inclusion, unless evidence is provided to the

contrary, I recommend that this part of the definition be retained and submission 243 (Christine Byrch) be rejected.

9.7 Air Noise Boundary

9.7.1 The definition of 'Air Noise Boundary' (**ANB**) in the PDP as notified states:

Means a boundary, the location of which is based on predicted day/night sound levels of Ldn 65 dBA from future airport operations. The location of the boundary is shown on the District Plan Maps.

9.7.2 Submitter 433 (QAC) requests that that this definition be removed. According to this submitter this definition relates to the ANB at Wanaka Airport which was removed through the proceedings associated with PC26. As such, submitter 433 (QAC) is of the view that this definition is redundant and can be removed.

9.7.3 I have consulted the Planning Maps notified as part of the PDP and can confirm that within Map 18a relating to Wanaka Airport, there is no Air Noise Boundary identified. Furthermore, there are no rules contained within Chapter 21 (Rural) which refer to an ANB restricting activities within such an area in Wanaka.

9.7.4 I note that there is a definition for an 'Air Noise Boundary Queenstown (ANB)' which applies to activities located at Queenstown Airport and which states:

Means a boundary as shown on the District Plan Maps, the location of which is based on the predicted day/night sound level of 65 dB Ldn from airport operations in 2037.

9.7.5 As such, I agree with Submitter 433 (QAC) in that the definition of 'Air Noise Boundary' included in the PDP appears to be redundant, and therefore should be removed. Submitter 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) also requests that this definition be removed as it is redundant. Accordingly, I recommend to the Panel that submissions 433 and 836 be

accepted as Recommended in **Appendix 1**. Included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

9.8 Air Noise Boundary Queenstown (ANB)

9.8.1 Submission 433 (QAC) requests that the definition of 'Air Noise Boundary Queenstown (ANB)' be retained as notified.

9.8.2 I am of the understanding that this definition was confirmed by the Environment Court through the PC35 proceedings. As outlined above, further submissions have been received from the RPL (1117) and QPL (1097) who oppose submission 433 (QAC) in terms of any amendments to definitions which are inconsistent with PC35. I consider this definition to be consistent with that confirmed by the Environment Court, and therefore recommend to the Panel that these Further Submissions be rejected and that Submission 433 (QAC) be accepted.

9.9 Airport Activity

9.9.1 The definition of 'Airport Activity' in the PDP as notified states:

Means land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft, including but not limited to:

(a) aircraft operations, private aircraft traffic, domestic and international aircraft traffic, rotary wing operations, aircraft servicing, general aviation, airport or aircraft training facilities and associated offices.

(b) Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement areas.

(c) Terminal buildings, hangars, control towers, rescue facilities, navigation and safety aids, lighting, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, freight facilities, quarantine and incineration facilities, border control and immigration facilities, medical facilities, fuel storage and fuelling facilities, facilities for the handling and storage of hazardous substances, and associated offices.

- 9.9.2** This definition was inserted into the PDP when notified. Through its submission (433), QAC has confirmed that this definition is largely consistent with the range of activities provided for by Designation #2 (Aerodrome Purposes) which QAC has responsibility for as the requiring authority.
- 9.9.3** However, submitter 433 (QAC) seek to retain the definition as notified but seek that a minor amendment is included to differentiate that this definition applies to airport activities at Queenstown Airport only. Given the direction provided by the Panel to include land uses at Wanaka Airport within the AMU Chapter (which could differ from the nature and scale of those at Queenstown Airport), I agree with this submission and recommend that this definition heading is amended to Airport Activity – Queenstown Airport.
- 9.9.4** I also note that submission 566 and further submission 1123 (Airways Corporation of NZ Limited) seek amendments be made to the definition of 'Airport Activities' at Queenstown to also include air traffic control facilities, flight information services, and navigational and safety aids. In its opinion, these amendments would more accurately reflect and provide for the activities at Queenstown Airport.
- 9.9.5** I agree with these submissions. Overall, I recommend that submission 433 (QAC) be accepted in part with the relief sought by Airways Corporation of NZ Limited through its submission and further submission (566 and 1123) as recommended in **Appendix 1**. Included within **Appendix 5** of this report is a s32AA evaluation of this change.

9.10 Airport Related Activity

- 9.10.1** As discussed in relation to the definition of 'Airport Activity', Submitter 433 (QAC) seeks that the heading for this definition be amended to stipulate that this definition applies to Queenstown. I recommend to the Panel that this submission is accepted.

9.11 Airport Operator

9.11.1 For completeness, I advise the Panel that a submission was received from QAC (433) which supports this definition as notified and seeks for it to be retained without modification. This is opposed by further submissions 1117 (RPL) and 1097 (QPL). As outlined above, the inclusion of this definition in the PDP does not deviate from those promulgated by PC35. Accordingly, I recommend to the Panel that Submission 433 (QAC) be accepted and that further submissions 1117 (RPL) and 1097 (QPL) be rejected.

9.12 Boundary

9.12.1 Submitter 433 (QAC) seeks that amendments are made to the definition of 'Boundary' as notified in the PDP to note that this definition excludes the Air Noise or Outer Control Boundary at Queenstown or Wanaka Airport.

9.12.2 The definition of 'Boundary' contained within Chapter 2 of the PDP states:
Means any boundary of the net area of a site and includes any road boundary or internal boundary.

9.12.3 I am of the opinion that the requested change to this definition is not necessary. It is clear that this definition pertains to the boundary of a 'site' rather than the air noise boundaries around Queenstown or Wanaka Airports. I recommend to the Panel that this submission and the related further submission be rejected.

9.13 Critical Listening Environment

9.13.1 Submitter 433 (QAC) has noted a typographical error (underlined below) in the notified definition for 'Critical Listening Environment' which states:

Means any space that is regularly used for high quality listening or communication for example principle living areas, bedrooms and classrooms but excludes non-critical living environments.

9.13.2 I have referred to the provisions confirmed by the Environment Court and can confirm that the correct word is 'listening' not 'living' as noted by submission 433 (QAC). As such, I recommend that Submission 433 (QAC) be accepted in this regard.

9.14 Outer Control Boundary (OCB) Queenstown & Outer Control Boundary (OCB) Wanaka

9.14.1 Submitter 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) requests that the definition for the OCB at Wanaka and Queenstown be merged to form one definition. The only difference between the two definitions is the basis for the boundary shown on Planning Maps, being the predicted day/night sound level of 55 dB L_{dn} from airport operations in 2037 for Queenstown, and 55 dBA L_{dn} in 2036 for Wanaka.

9.14.2 In addition to the slight difference in the acoustic standard used, the these OCB are based on predicted noise levels for the stated year. Without being able to look at the raw data, the extent to which these boundaries move between 2036 and 2037 may be substantial at either Wanaka or Queenstown. Unless I have information to support the removal of either of these definitions, I recommend that submission 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) be rejected.

9.15 Projected Annual Aircraft Noise Contour (AANC)

9.15.1 A minor amendment is sought by Submitter 433 (QAC) to refer to the correct condition number associated with Designation #2 (Condition 13 rather than Condition 14 as notified). I recommend to the Panel that this submission be accepted and that the associated further submissions be rejected.

9.16 General

9.16.1 Submitter 433 (QAC) request that the definitions contained within Chapter 2 (Definitions) of the PDP are consistent with the recent Environment Court decisions on PC19 (Frankton Flats B Zone); PC26 (Wanaka Airport); and PC35 (Queenstown Airport). Further Submissions 1030 (Jeremy Bell Investments Limited) and 1077 (BARNZ) support

Submission 433 (QAC). It is my understanding that the definitions promulgated by the Environment Court through the proceedings associated with these plan changes were included in the PDP when notified.

9.16.2 A number of changes to definitions, are sought to be retained by Submitter 433 (QAC). I do not consider it necessary to comment on each of these given there were no other submitters and no change was sought. I note that there were two Further Submissions received from QPL (1097) and RPL (1117) opposing the submission from QAC. However, these further submissions do not specifically relate to these definitions. The definitions that QAC seek to retain are as follows:

- a. Day Care Facility;
- b. Design Sound Level;
- c. Educational Facility;
- d. Visitor Accommodation;
- e. Hangar (with the exception of a minor amendment to include the word 'means' which I consider to provide clarity);
- f. Indoor sound level;
- g. Landside;
- h. Non Critical Listening Environment;
- i. 2037 Noise Contours; and
- j. 2037 60 dB Noise Contours.

10.0 WANAKA AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE

10.1 Provisions relating to Wanaka Airport were notified in Chapter 21 Rural. The submission of Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited (QAC) (433) (which operates Wanaka Airport on behalf of the QLDC as landowner and requiring authority for the designations) on the PDP sought amendments to the Rural Zone to provide specifically for airport related activities at Wanaka Airport.

10.2 QAC (433) submitted that, although designations (Designation #64 Aerodrome and Designation #65 Airport Approach and Land Use Controls) exist for Wanaka Airport, only the requiring authority (QLDC) can rely on the designation

provisions. The result is that all other people building, operating and leasing aircraft facilities and buildings in the area would have to seek consents under an incompatible Rural Zone.

- 10.3** As part of the Rural Hearing 02 of the PDP, QAC and the QLDC agreed that an underlying zoning similar to the Queenstown AMUZ would be more appropriate.
- 10.4** In its Minute, dated 16 June 2016, the Panel directed that the QLDC transfer the submission received from QAC (#433) from Hearing Stream 2 Rural Zones to Hearing Stream 8 Business Zones and that draft provisions be provided to the Panel for its consideration.
- 10.5** QAC proposed a working draft of the revised chapter, and I have taken that draft chapter and further refined it.
- 10.6** Provisions have been included in the Revised Chapter (**Appendix 1**) to accommodate airport and airport related activities as permitted activities, so long as they comply with all the relevant standards designed to ensure an appropriate level of amenity is retained within surrounding zones. These provisions have also been drafted to ensure that any airport related activity is genuinely essential to support the functioning and viability of airport activities.
- 10.7** A full set of provisions (objectives, policies and rules) has been provided with my evidence as outlined in the Revised Chapter attached as **Appendix 1** of this report. Given these are substantive changes to provisions; I have assessed the changes in terms of s 32AA of the RMA at **Appendix 6** of this report.
- 10.8** While changes to the Notified Chapter are proposed to include a Wanaka AMUZ, relevant submissions were made on Rural Zone Chapter 21. This report assesses both the proposed provisions and the relevant submissions on Rural Zone Chapter 21 in relation to Wanaka Airport.

Activities undertaken at Wanaka Airport

- 10.9** The core aviation activities carried out at Wanaka Airport include the movement of aircraft, helicopters and general aviation. Night time flights are also provided for under Designation #64 until 10pm provided the existing noise contours are updated. Airport related activities at Wanaka Airport include aviation schools,

facilities and activities associated with veteran, vintage and classic aircraft operations, aviation museums, aero recreation, terminal buildings, cafeteria, hangars, fuel storage and offices associated with the ancillary activities.

Recommended Objectives and Provisions

10.10 I recommend a number of objectives and provisions to provide a framework for the AMUZ at Wanaka Airport in the recommended revised Chapter at **Appendix 1**. These proposed provisions manage the adverse effects of activities and ensure that airport related activities have a legitimate ancillary and support function to Wanaka Airport. A thorough evaluation in accordance with section 32AA of the RMA has been undertaken and is contained in **Appendix 6** to this report. These provisions focus on ensuring the ability of Airport Activities to operate efficiently and effectively by seeking to protect Wanaka Airport from incompatible land-use activities (particularly retail) which could constrain Airport Activities from operating or which would be more appropriately located within other nearby zones, such as Three Parks or Wanaka Town Centre.

Signage

10.11 I note that Part 18 – Signs of the ODP has rules associated with signs applicable to the Queenstown AMUZ but not Wanaka Airport. Accordingly, I recommend that a new rule be included in the PDP associated with directional signage within the AMUZ at Wanaka. It is my preference that all rules for signs be located in a district wide chapter. As Part 18 – Signs of the ODP is not included in Stage 1 of the PDP, I have included this new rule as Redrafted Rule 17.5.7 in the Notified Chapter (**Appendix 1**). However, I recommend that this rule be relocated to the district wide Signs Chapter as part of Stage 2 of the review.

Minor amendments

10.12 I note that minor amendments to the provisions relating to the Queenstown AMUZ are necessary to incorporate Wanaka Airport into the Notified Chapter. These include:

- a references to Wanaka as well as Queenstown or differentiating between the two locations as well as consequential renumbering as a result of inserting new provisions; and

- b minor amendments to the activities listed within Table 1: Activities located within the Notified Rule 17.4. This includes the rephrasing of Notified Rule 17.4.1 to align with the drafting style of other chapters and to differentiate between definitions for activities at Queenstown and Wanaka Airports.

10.13 These changes are also evaluated in accordance with s 32AA of the RMA attached at **Appendix 6**.

Definitions

Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport

10.14 Submitter 433 (QAC) made a submission on Chapter 21 Rural requesting that an additional definition for 'Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport' at Wanaka Airport be included as follows:

Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport Means land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft, including but not limited to:

- (a) aircraft operations, rotary wing aircraft operations, helicopter aprons, and associated touch down and lift off areas, aircraft servicing, general aviation, navigational and safety aids, lighting, aviation schools, space research and associated activities, facilities and activities associated with veteran, vintage and classic aircraft operations, aviation museums and aero recreation;*
- (b) Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement or safety areas.*
- (c) Terminal buildings, hangars, rescue facilities, navigation and safety aids, lighting, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, freight facilities, quarantine and incineration facilities, medical facilities, fuel storage and fuelling facilities, and associated offices*

10.15 Submission 1088 (Ross and Judith Young Family Trust) supports the definition provided in the submission from QAC (433) seeking that this part of their submission is accepted given it accurately reflects the extent of Airport Activities around Wanaka Airport.

10.16 I agree with Submission 433 (QAC) in terms of the appropriateness of including an additional definition pertaining to the Airport Activities at Wanaka Airport. I consider a definition such as this will help differentiate airport activities at Wanaka Airport from those at Queenstown Airport, where the nature and scale of such activities is significantly greater.

10.17 However, I note that QAC also proposes a definition for 'Airport Related Activities' at Wanaka Airport. I consider that the following activities included in the proposed definition of 'Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport' above would more appropriately be included in the definition of a 'Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport':

- a. *facilities and activities associated with veteran, vintage and classic aircraft operations;*
- b. *aviation museums; and*
- c. *aero recreation.*

10.18 Further Submissions were also received from RPL (1117) and QPL (1097). I do not consider these further submissions to be relevant to the definition of 'Airport Activity - Wanaka Airport' given their primary concerns relate to QAC's submission at Queenstown Airport.

10.19 Accordingly, I recommend to the Panel that Submission 433 (QAC) and Further Submission 1088 (Ross and Judith Young Family Trust) be accepted in part as detailed in **Appendix 1**, incorporating the activities identified in paragraph 10.17 above within the definition of 'Airport Related Activity- Wanaka Airport'.

10.20 A new definition is proposed by Submitter 433 (QAC) for 'Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport' as follows:

Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport Means any retail activity, restaurants and other food and beverage facilities, industrial and commercial activities, provided they are connected with and ancillary to the use of the Airport. Also includes Temporary Activities associated with Air Shows, Conferences and Meetings, and rental vehicles, valet activities and public transport facilities. Includes Military Training Operations.

- 10.21** This submission is supported by Further Submissions 1030 (Jeremy Bell Investments Limited), 1088 (Ross and Judith Young Family Trust) and 1211 (New Zealand Defence Force)
- 10.22** Overall, I consider the requested definition of 'Airport Related Activity - Wanaka Airport' to be appropriate and I accept that a wide range of activities can be contemplated to support and complement Wanaka Airport's core airport activities. However, I consider that activities such as retail and commercial activities need a degree of control. In this regard I recommend that the definition be slightly amended and that rules are included in the Notified Chapter to ensure that retail activities do not have adverse effects on the airport land resource or adverse effects on the viability of the Wanaka town retail and commercial viability. I have recommended that a 100m² limit be placed on the total gross floor area of any separate Airport Related Activity, as well as limits on the cumulative total gross floor area for any Airport Related Activities of 1000m² over the zone.
- 10.23** I consider that the activities I have recommended to the Panel be removed from the definition proposed for 'Airport Activity - Wanaka Airport' (10.17 above) are better placed within the definition of 'Airport Related Activity - Wanaka Airport.'
- 10.24** In summary, I recommend to the Panel that Submission 433 (QAC) be accepted in part to include the recommended changes to the definition of 'Airport Related Activity - Wanaka Airport' as outlined in the Revised Chapter attached as **Appendix 1** to this report.

Outer Control Boundary (OCB) Wanaka

- 10.25** Submission 433 (QAC) seeks that this definition be amended to refer to the appropriate map within PDP (Map 18a). QAC submits that this amendment will improve clarity and ensure full consistency with PC26.
- 10.26** I consider that this change will provide clarity, and therefore recommend to the Panel that this submission point in relation to the definition of 'Outer Control Boundary (**OCB**) Wanaka be accepted.
- 10.27** Submission 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) notes that there are two separate definitions for OCB, one pertaining to Wanaka and one to Queenstown. However according to this submitter, it is unclear why two identical definitions are included

with slightly different meanings. Submitter 836 seeks for one of the two definitions to be deleted.

10.28 I am of the understanding that these two definitions (one for Wanaka and one for Queenstown) originated from their respective plan changes relating to airport noise (PC26 and PC35) and are calculated slightly differently with slightly different limits set. As such, I recommend that submission 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) be rejected in this regard.

11.0 CONCLUSION

11.1 On the basis of my analysis within this evidence, I recommend that the changes within the Revised Chapter in **Appendix 1** are accepted.

11.2 The changes will improve the clarity and administration of the Plan; contribute towards achieving the objectives of the Plan and Strategic Direction goals in an effective and efficient manner; and give effect to the purpose and principles of the RMA.

11.3 As outlined in the s 32AA assessments provided in **Appendix 5** and **Appendix 6** to this report, I am of the opinion that these recommended provisions will promote the purpose of the RMA as they have been drafted to recognise the importance of Airport Zone land to the economic wellbeing of the District. Additionally, the identification of land strategically important for Airport and Airport Related activities coupled with using Airport zoning and rules to protect these activities from incompatible or competing land uses in these areas will enable third party operators to carry out activities in accordance with the existing land use established on the site.



Rebecca Holden
Senior Planner
2 November 2016

Appendix 1. Recommended Revised Chapter

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

Key:

Recommend changes to notified chapter are shown in underlined text for additions and ~~strike through text~~ for deletions. Appendix 1 to s42A report, dated 2 November 2016.

17 Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone

Comment [RH1]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

17.1 Zone Purpose

The purpose the Airport Zone is to provide for a range of airport and airport related activities at Queenstown and Wanaka Airports and to recognise the unique role of the airports in providing for the social and economic wellbeing of the community.

Comment [RH2]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Queenstown Airport provides facilities for the transportation of people and freight and is a key asset to the District in terms of supporting the tourism industry and the needs of local and business travellers. ~~Queenstown The~~ Airport acts as an important gateway into the District and facilitates access and economic activity in the local and broader regional economies.

Comment [SG3]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

~~Queenstown The~~ Airport's main function is for domestic and international scheduled passenger movements as well as freight. The Queenstown Airport is recognised as a nationally significant asset in the light of its significant contribution to the tourism industry. Queenstown Airport also provides facilities and infrastructure for helicopter, flightseeing and general aviation operations. It is also a critical provider of emergency services and is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

Comment [SG4]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [SG5]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

International tourism is New Zealand's largest foreign exchange earner and the Queenstown Lakes District tourism industry is heavily reliant on air transport. Queenstown Airport The airport is a significant source of employment for the District.

Comment [SG6]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Wanaka Airport is Regionally Significant Infrastructure to the District and is an important commercial and recreational aviation hub for the Upper Clutha. Wanaka Airport has capacity for commercial passenger flights and flights through until 10pm at night and, as such, the Airport may one day accommodate scheduled and chartered air transport services.

Comment [RH7]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

The Airport ~~Mixed Use~~ zZone applies to all land used for airport and airport-related activities at Queenstown and Wanaka Airports. The Zone rules apply a range of performance standards to manage the effects of land uses carried out at the Airports on amenity values.

Comment [RH8]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

The objective and provisions for Queenstown Airport promote a wide range of activities and reflect the location of Queenstown Airport within the Queenstown Urban Growth Boundary. The objectives and provisions for Wanaka Airport reflect the more remote location of Wanaka Airport outside of the Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary and seek to avoid adverse effects from inappropriate commercial activities locating at the Airport. The strategic importance to the District of both airports and the finite nature of the land resource for both airports is also recognised in the Airport Zone provisions.

Comment [CB9]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

17.3 Objectives and Policies

17.3.1 Objective – Queenstown Airport is ~~recognised as~~ nationally significant infrastructure and a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits.

Comment [RH10]: Fourth Procedural Minute

Comment [RH11]: 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) 2.11.16

Policies

17.3.1.1 ~~Airport activities are enabled, provided~~ ~~Provide for these aviation activities necessary to enable~~ Queenstown Airport ~~can to~~ operate in a safe and efficient manner.

Comment [RH12]: 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) 2.11.16

17.3.1.2 Provide for a range of airport related service, business, industrial and commercial activity to support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.

Comment [RH13]: Clarification 2.11.16

17.2.1.3 Zone sufficient land to meet the foreseeable future requirements of activities that support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.

Comment [RH14]: Fourth Procedural Minute

Comment [SG15]: Fourth Procedural Minute

17.2.1.4 Promote the use of walking, cycling and public transport services and infrastructure to support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.

Comment [RH16]: 798 (ORC) 2.11.16

17.2.2 Objective – At Wanaka Airport, Airport Activities and Airport Related Activities support the essential functioning of aviation activities.

Comment [RH17]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Policies

17.2.2.1 Airport Activities which are core to the safe and efficient operation of Wanaka Airport are enabled and provided for.

Comment [RH18]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

17.2.2.2 Ensure land uses including Airport Related Activities have a legitimate relationship with Airport Activities and are only allowed where they are of a size (either individually or cumulatively) that:

a. is ancillary to and support part of the operation of an Airport Activity; and

b. do not adversely affect the key local service and employment function of Wanaka Town Centre or other commercially zoned areas within the District.

Comment [RH19]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

17.2.2.3 Only allow retail and food and beverage facilities which are designed and operated and of a nature, scale and intensity to service visitors, passengers or workers engaged in or associated with Airport Activities or Airport Related Activities within the Wanaka Airport zone, and are unlikely to attract significant patronage outside of this purpose.

Comment [RH20]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

17.2.2.4 Ensure buildings and activities are adequately serviced with a water supply for fire-fighting purposes as well as provision of potable water, sewage treatment and disposal.

Comment [RH21]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

17.2.23 Objective – Provision for the requirements of Queenstown and Wanaka Airports is balanced with achieving an acceptable level of amenity for those using the airports and for those residing on neighbouring land.

Comment [RH22]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Policies

~~17.2.2.1~~**17.2.3.1** Maintain Queenstown Airport as a memorable and attractive gateway to the District.

~~17.2.2.2~~**17.2.3.2** Manage adverse effects on amenity values arising from the on-going development, use and maintenance of Queenstown and Wanaka Airports.

Comment [SG23]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

17.2.23.3 Avoid the establishment or intensification of activities that are incompatible with the ongoing operation and functioning of Queenstown Airport.

Comment [RH24]: 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) 2.11.16

17.4 Other Provisions and Rules

17.4.1 District Wide

Attention is drawn to the following District Wide chapters. All provisions referred to are within Stage 1 of the Proposed District Plan, unless marked as Operative District Plan (ODP).

Comment [RH25]: Changes to this section made for consistency with other chapters. Plan guidance only, no change in substance.

1 Introduction	2 Definitions	3 Strategic Direction
4 Urban Development	5 Tangata Whenua	24 Signs (18 Operative DP)
25 Earthworks (22 Operative-ODP)	27 Subdivision 26 Historic Heritage	28 Natural Hazards 27 Subdivision
29 Transport (ODP) 28 Natural Hazards	30 Utilities and Renewable Energy 29 Transport (14 Operative)	31 Hazardous Substances (ODP) 30 Energy and Utilities
35 Temporary Activities and Relocated Buildings 31 Hazardous Substances (16 Operative)	36 Noise 32 Protected Trees	37 Designations 35 Temporary Activities and Relocated Buildings
Planning Maps 36 Noise	37 Designations	Planning Maps

17.4.2 District Wide Clarification

Advice Notes:

Comment [SG26]: Clarification 2.11.16

17.3.2.1 A permitted activity must comply with all the rules listed in the activity and standards tables.

Comment [SG27]: 383 (QLDC) 2.11.16

17.3.2.2 Where an activity does not comply with a Standard listed in the Standards table, the activity status identified by the 'Non-Compliance Status' column shall apply. Where an activity breaches more than one Standard, the most restrictive status shall apply to the Activity.

17.3.2.3 Rules 17.4.1 to 17.4.9 and the standards contained in Table 2 apply to Queenstown Airport. Rules 17.4.10 to 17.4.23 and the standards contained in Table 3 apply to Wanaka Airport.

Comment [RH28]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

17.3.2.4 In addition to these rules, any person wishing to undertake an activity within the Aerodrome Purposes designation at Queenstown or Wanaka Airport must obtain the written approval of the requiring authority, in accordance with section 176 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Comment [RH29]: Clarification 2.11.16

17.3.2.5 The following abbreviations are used within this Chapter.

P	Permitted	C	Controlled
RD	Restricted Discretionary	D	Discretionary
NC	Non Complying	PR	Prohibited

28556586_1.docx

Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan 2015, s42A report, Appendix 1

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

General Rules:

17.3.2.6 For Airport Activities at Queenstown Airport, including the Queenstown Airport Corporation as Network Utility Operator, the Airport Zone (Chapter 17) shall prevail over the Energy and Utilities Chapter (Chapter 30).

17.5 Rules - Activities

Table 1 - Activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone		Activity Status
Queenstown Airport		
17.4.1	Any airport activity or airport related activity Airport Activity – Queenstown Airport, Airport Related Activity – Queenstown Airport or farming activity that which complies with all the relevant standards in Table 2 rules in section 17.5 shall be a Permitted Activity.	P
17.4.2	<p>Any non-airport related activity which is Activities not listed in Rules 17.4.3 to 17.4.9 as Prohibited, with Council's discretion restricted to:</p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design, external appearance and siting of buildings and structures; • Traffic generation, vehicle parking, site access and servicing, including provision for an integrated transport assessment; • Landscaping and screening of any outdoor storage; • The extent to which the activity benefits from an Airport location. 	RD
17.4.3	Forestry	PR
17.4.4	Factory Farming	PR
17.4.5	Mining	PR
17.4.6	Any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956	PR
17.4.7	Residential Activities	PR
17.4.8	Community Activities (excluding police stations, fire stations, medical facilities and education facilities provided they serve an aviation related purpose)	PR
17.4.9	Day Care Facilities	PR

Comment [RH30]: 433 (QAC)
Consequential change in accordance with Council's Reply Recommended Chapter 30 Energy and Utilities (Recommended General Rule 30.3.3.4)
2.11.16

Comment [RH31]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH32]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [SG33]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH34]: Clarification 2.11.16

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

Table 1 - Activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone		Activity Status
Wanaka Airport		
17.4.10	Any activity not listed in Rules 17.4.11 to 17.4.23	NC
17.4.11	Any Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport that complies with the relevant standards in Table 3.	P
17.4.12	Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport that complies with the relevant standards in Table 3.	P
17.4.13	Buildings for Airport or Airport Related Activities Except security fencing greater than 2m high which shall not be subject to this rule and is permitted. Control is reserved to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and appearance; • The effects on visual amenity when viewed from the zone boundary; • The purpose of the building and the operational requirements of the activity it contains. • Provision for firefighting; • Wastewater; • Stormwater; • Water Supply. 	C
17.4.14	Instructional or directional signage Control is reserved to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dimensions of signage • Location of signage 	C
17.4.15	Community Activities limited to police stations, fire stations, medical facilities and aviation schools (provided they serve an aviation related purpose).	D
17.4.16	Wholesaling or Commercial Storage Activity	NC
17.4.17	Forestry	PR
17.4.18	Factory Farming	PR
17.4.19	Mining	PR

Comment [RH31]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH35]: The changes noted below (Rule 17.4.10 – 17.4.23) relate to the minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH36]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH37]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

Table 1 - Activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone		Activity Status
17.4.20	Any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956	PR
17.4.21	Residential Activity	PR
17.4.22	Community Activities (excluding those identified in Rule 17.4.15)	PR
17.4.23	Day Care Facilities	PR

Comment [RH31]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

17.6 Rules - Standards

Table 2 Standards for activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone		Non-compliance status:
17.6.1	<p>Maximum Building Coverage</p> <p>75% of the site area</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following: *Discretion is limited to consideration of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effects on urban design outcomes, and The positive economic, social and/or cultural effects that may be generated from the proposed activity. 	RD
17.6.2	<p>Minimum Buildings Setback</p> <p>17.6.2.1 For all buildings at Queenstown Airport:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where the site adjoins the Residential Zone the setback shall be 5m. The setback for from all other zones shall be 3m. The setback from any public road shall be 5m. <p>17.5.2.4 Except: Security fencing around the perimeter of Queenstown Airport and jet blast fences are not subject to the building setback standards in (a) above.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following: *Discretion is limited to consideration of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effects on urban design outcomes, and The positive economic, social and/or cultural effects that may be generated from 	RD

Comment [RH38]: Clarification 2.11.16

Comment [RH39]: 433 (QAC) 2.11.16

Comment [RH40]: Clarification 2.11.16

Comment [RH41]: Clarification 2.11.16

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

Table 2 Standards for activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed-Use Zone		Non-compliance status:
	the proposed activity.	
17.6.3	<p>Maximum Building Height</p> <p>The maximum building height of all buildings within the Queenstown Airport Zone within the Zone is 15m. The limit specified above shall not apply to control towers, lighting towers, hangars or meteorological, navigation or communication masts and aerials which shall not be subject to a height limit.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following: *Discretion is limited to consideration of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effects on urban design outcomes, and Visual effects, The positive economic, social and/or cultural effects that may be generated from the proposed activity. 	RD
17.6.4	<p>Landscaping</p> <p>At Queenstown Airport, those properties fronting Lucas Place and Hawthorn Drive to the west of Copper Beech Ave shall provide and maintain a landscape strip extending the full length of the road boundary, except across vehicle and pedestrian entranceways. The strip shall be not less than 1m deep and shall have an average depth of 3m over its entire length.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following: *Discretion is limited to consideration of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effects on urban design outcomes and the visual landscape effects of reduction in landscaping, and The functional and operational requirements of the site. 	RD
17.6.5	<p>Building Design and Glare</p> <p>17.6.5.1 The exterior of buildings situated within the landside area at Queenstown Airport shall be designed so that roof and wall colours are limited to a maximum reflectivity of 36%, except where:</p> <p>a. Trims, highlights and signage totalling up to 10% of the façade area may exceed this level and be of contrasting colour.</p>	RD

Comment [RH42]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH43]: Clarification 2.11.16

Comment [RH44]: Clarification 2.11.16

Comment [RH45]: 238 (NZIA)

Comment [RH46]: Clarification 2.11.16

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

Table 2 Standards for activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed-Use Zone	Non-compliance status:
<p>17.6.5.2 Any landside activity which requires the lighting of outdoor areas shall ensure that direct or indirect illumination does not exceed 10 lux at the windows of residential buildings in any adjacent Residential Zone</p> <p>17.5.5.3 All fixed exterior lighting on buildings associated with Airport Related Activities shall be directed away from adjacent sites and roads.</p> <p>*Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited to [the extent of adverse effects from lighting on Residential Activities, And • The extent to which the lighting is required for operational purposes. 	<p>Comment [RH47]: 383 (QLDC)</p> <p>Comment [RH48]: Clarification 2.11.16</p>
<p>17.5.6</p> <p>Maximum Noise – Land Based Activities</p> <p>17.5.6.1 Sound from land based activities measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802: 2008 shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within any Residential Zone, the notional boundary in the Rural Zone, or at any point within Activity Areas 1, 3, 4, 6 and 8 of the Remarkables Park Zone. On any site within the zone, land based activities shall be conducted such that the following noise levels are not exceeded at any adjacent Zone boundary:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Daytime (0700 to 2200 hrs) 55 dB <i>L_{Aeq(15 min)}</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. Night time (2200 to 0700 hrs) 45 dB <i>L_{Aeq(15 min)} 70 dB L_{AEmax}</i></p> <p>17.5.6.2 The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to any aircraft noise activities subject to the Queenstown Airport noise provisions managed through Designation 2.</p> <p>17.5.6.3 The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to construction noise which shall be assessed in accordance with NZS6803:1999 “Acoustics – Construction Noise”.</p> <p>*Discretion is limited to the extent of effects of</p>	<p>RD</p>

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

Table 2 Standards for activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone		Non-compliance status:
	noise generated on adjoining zones.	
17.5.717.5.6	<p>Hazardous Substances</p> <p>Hazardous substances must be used, stored and transported in accordance with the HSNQ regulations and any CAA requirements (NB Chapter 16 Hazardous Substances of the Operative District Plan does not apply to the Airport Mixed Use Zone).</p>	NC
17.5.87	<p>Visitor Accommodation– Queenstown Airport</p> <p>17.5.87.1 Within the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) – New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings containing Visitor Accommodation shall be designed to achieve an Indoor Design Sound Level of 40 dB Ldn within any Critical Listening Environment, based on the 2037 Noise Contours. Compliance shall be demonstrated by either adhering to the sound insulation requirements in Table 4 of Appendix 13 <u>Table 4 of Chapter 36 of the Operative this</u> District Plan and installation of mechanical ventilation to achieve the requirements in Table 2 of Appendix 13 <u>Table 5 of Chapter 36</u>, or by submitting a certificate to Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction can achieve the Indoor Design Sound Level with the windows open.</p> <p>17.5.87.2 Between the Outer Control Boundary (OCB) and the ANB - New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings containing Visitor Accommodation shall be designed to achieve an Indoor Design Sound Level of 40 dB Ldn within any Critical Listening Environment, based on the 2037 Noise Contours. Compliance shall be demonstrated by either installation of mechanical ventilation to achieve the requirements in Table 2 of Appendix 13 <u>Table 5 of Chapter 36 of the Operative this</u> District Plan or by submitting a certificate to Council from a person suitably qualified in acoustics stating that the proposed construction can achieve the Indoor Design Sound Level with</p>	NC

Comment [RH49]: 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) 2.11.16

Comment [RH50]: 383 (QLDC) 2.11.16

Comment [RH51]: 383 (QLDC) 2.11.16

Comment [RH52]: 383 (QLDC) 2.11.16

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

Table 2 Standards for activities located in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone		Non-compliance status:
	the windows open.	
17.5.98	<p>Transportation</p> <p>17.5.9.1 Loading and Access</p> <p>Loading and Access shall comply with the requirements specified in Section 14 Transport of the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>17.5.9.2 Minimum Car Parking</p> <p>Activities undertaken within or in association with the airport terminal facility are exempt from complying with any minimum parking requirement. Except for those activities undertaken within or in association with the airport terminal facility, on site car parking shall comply with the car parking requirements specified in Section 14 of the Operative District Plan.</p>	
17.5.940	<p>Signs</p> <p>17.5.409.1 For a Any advertising or promotional signage shall not be located within 20m of the zone boundary, whether it is affixed to a building or freestanding the rules in Section 18 – Signs of the Operative District Plan apply.</p> <p>17.5.409.2 For signage to be viewed by persons within the zone at not directed at persons outside the site, no limits apply.</p> <p>17.5.409.3 There are no restrictions on the dimensions or location of instructional and directional signage.</p> <p>No signage shall be permitted on building roofs.</p>	

Comment [RH53]: 383 (QLDC) 2.11.16

Table 3 Standards for activities located in the Wanaka Airport Zone		Non-compliance status:
17.5.10	<p>Minimum Building Setback</p> <p>a. <u>The setback from all zone boundaries shall be 5m.</u></p> <p>b. <u>The setback from the eastern side of the centreline of the main runway (as at</u></p>	RD

28556586_1.docx

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

	<p><u>2013) shall be 217 metres.</u></p> <p>c. <u>The setback from the western side of the centre line of the main runway (as at 2013) shall be 124 metres.</u></p> <p>d. <u>The setback from any public road shall be 5m.</u></p> <p><u>Except no setbacks shall apply to security fencing greater than 2m in height.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to the following (where relevant):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>For non-compliances with (a) or (d) only, the visual effects of the bulk and location when viewed from the boundary of the zone or adjacent public roads.</u> • <u>For non-compliances with (b) or (c) only, the effects on the current and future operation of the Airport.</u> • <u>For all non-compliances, the purpose of the building and the operational requirements of the activity it contains.</u> 	
17.5.11	<p>Maximum Building Height</p> <p><u>The maximum height of all buildings shall be 10m.</u></p> <p><u>Except this limit shall not apply to control towers, lighting towers or navigation and communication masts and aerials which are not subject to a height limit.</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Visual effects of the bulk and location non-compliance when viewed from the boundary of the zone.</u> • <u>The purpose of the building and the operational requirements of the activity it contains.</u> 	RD
17.5.12	<p>Glare</p> <p><u>All lighting shall:</u></p> <p>a. <u>ensure that direct or indirect illumination does not exceed 3 lux spill of light at any adjacent site.</u></p> <p>b. <u>be directed away from adjoining sites and roads;</u></p> <p>c. <u>not be directed upwards.</u></p>	NC

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

17.5.13	<p>Identified Airport Related Activities - Maximum Gross Floor Area</p> <p>The following activities shall not exceed 100m² in Gross Floor Area as part of any single activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. cafes and other food and beverage facilities; b. retail activities; c. offices. 	D
17.5.14	<p>Identified Airport Related Activities - Maximum Total Gross Floor Area</p> <p>The maximum Gross Floor Area of the following activities shall not exceed 1000m² over the zone, irrespective of any site, tenancy or lease arrangement within the zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. cafes and other food and beverage facilities; b. retail activities; c. offices. 	NC
17.5.15	<p>Hours of Operation for Airport Related Activities</p> <p>The hours of operation for the following Airport Related Activities shall be undertaken between 6.00 am and 10.00 pm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. cafes and other food and beverage facilities; b. retail activities; 	NC

17.7 Non-Notification of Applications

17.7.1 ~~Except as provided for by the Act, all applications for controlled or restricted discretionary activities or discretionary activities will be considered without shall not require public notification or the need to obtain the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited notified. approval of or serve notice on affected persons.~~

Comment [RH54]: 383 (QLDC)

Except the following:

Rule 17.5.10 Minimum Building Setback – Wanaka Airport

Rule 17.5.11 Maximum Building Height – Wanaka Airport

Comment [RH55]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

17.8 Non Regulatory Methods

- 17.8.1 Council will use advocacy to promote good urban design and form ~~at in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone.~~
- 17.8.2 As the major requiring authority in the ~~Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Airport Zones at Queenstown~~, the Queenstown Airport Corporation will adopt best practice urban design and urban design led principles ~~at Queenstown Airport.~~
- 17.8.3 The Queenstown Airport Corporation shall prepare an urban design guideline for the Queenstown Airport ~~Mixed Use Zone~~. The urban design guideline shall promote a built form and character which maintains the Airport and its surrounds as an attractive gateway to the district.

Comment [SG56]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH57]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH58]: Non substantive, consequential change to clarify that these do not relate to Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone.

Comment [SG59]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH60]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Note: Recommended amendments to definitions relevant to the activities within Chapter 17.

Aircraft	Means any machine that can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air otherwise than by reactions of the air against the surface of the earth. Excludes remotely piloted aircraft that weigh less than 15 kilograms.
Aircraft Operations	Includes the operation of aircraft during landing, take-off and taxiing but excludes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft operating in an emergency - Aircraft using the Airport as an alternative to landing at a scheduled airport; - Military aircraft movements; and - Engine testing
Activity Sensitive To Aircraft Noise (ASAN)	Means any residential activity, visitor accommodation activity, community activity and day care facility activity as defined in this District Plan including all outdoor spaces associated with any educational facility, but excludes activity in police stations, fire stations, courthouses, probation and detention centres, government and local government offices.
Activity Sensitive To Aircraft Noise (ASAN) Wanaka	Means any residential activity, visitor accommodation activity, community activity and day care facility activity, but excludes activity in police stations, fire stations, courthouses, probation and detention centres, government and local government offices.
Air Noise Boundary	Means a boundary, the location of which is based on predicted day/night sound levels of Ldn 65 dBA from future airport operations. The location of the boundary is shown on the District Plan Maps.

Comment [RH61]: 383 (QLDC)

Comment [RH62]: 433 (QAC) and 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited)

Comment [RH63]: 433 (QAC) and 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited)

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

<p>Airport Activity = <u>Queenstown Airport</u></p>	<p>Means land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) aircraft operations, private aircraft traffic, domestic and international aircraft traffic, rotary wing operations, aircraft servicing, general aviation, airport or aircraft training facilities and associated offices. (b) Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement areas. (c) Terminal buildings, hangars, <u>control towers, air traffic control facilities, flight information services, navigation and safety aids, rescue facilities, navigation and safety aids, lighting, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, freight facilities, quarantine and incineration facilities, border control and immigration facilities, medical facilities, fuel storage and fuelling facilities, facilities for the handling and storage of hazardous substances, and associated offices.</u>
<p>Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport</p>	<p>Means land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>aircraft operations, rotary wing aircraft operations, helicopter aprons, and associated touch down and lift off areas, aircraft servicing, general aviation, navigational and safety aids, lighting.</u> (b) <u>Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement or safety areas.</u> (c) <u>Terminal buildings, hangars, air traffic control facilities, flight information services, navigation and safety aids, rescue facilities, lighting, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, quarantine and incineration facilities, medical facilities, fuel storage and fuelling facilities, and associated offices.</u>
<p>Airport Related Activity = <u>Queenstown Airport</u></p>	<p>Means an ancillary activity or service that provides support to the airport. This includes, but is not limited to, land transport activities, buildings and structures, servicing and infrastructure, police stations, fire stations, medical facilities and education facilities provided they serve an aviation related purpose, retail and commercial services, industry and visitor accommodation associated with the needs of Airport passengers, visitors and employees and/or aircraft</p>

Comment [RH64]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH65]: 1123 (Airways Corporation of NZ Limited)

Comment [RH66]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH67]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE 17

	movements and Airport businesses.
<u>Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport</u>	Means any retail activity, cafes and other food and beverage facilities, administrative offices, industrial and commercial activities, provided they are ancillary to the use of the Airport. Also includes aviation schools, space research and associated activities, facilities and activities associated with veteran, vintage and classic aircraft operations, aviation museums and aero recreation. Also includes Temporary Activities associated with Air Shows, Conferences and Meetings, and rental vehicles, valet activities, and public transport facilities. Includes Military Training Operations. Also includes grazing and the keeping of livestock for land management purposes.
Hangar	Means a structure used to store aircraft, including for the maintenance, servicing and/or repair purposes.
Landside	Means that an area of an airport and buildings to which the public has unrestricted access.
Outer Control Boundary (OCB) Wanaka	Means a boundary, as shown on the District Plan Maps <u>18A</u> , the location of which is based on the predicted day/night sound levels of 55 dBA Ldn from airport operations in 2036.
Projected Annual Aircraft Noise Contour (AANC)	Means the Projected Annual Aircraft Noise Contours calculated as specified by the Aerodrome Purposes Designation 2, Condition <u>44 13</u> .
<u>Remotely Piloted Aircraft</u>	Means an unmanned aircraft that is piloted from a remote station.
<u>Wholesaling (Three Parks, and Industrial B and Airport Mixed Use Zones)</u>	Means a business engaged in the storage and distribution of goods to businesses (including retail activities) and institutional customers.

Comment [RH68]: Minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH69]: 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH70]: Clarification 2.11.16

Comment [RH71]: 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH72]: 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH73]: 433 (QAC)

Comment [RH74]: 383 (QLDC)

Comment [RH75]: Consequential change resulting from minute dated 16.6.16. Scope provided by QAC (433)

Appendix 2. List of Submitters and Recommended Decisions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
19.9		Kain Fround		Support	Supports the chapter provisions generally	Accept		
116.1		mike harris		Other	Requests response to the following question: Does the Council have any long range plans to improve parking at the airport by using the airport's profits to create a parking terrace/structure to alleviate the neighbourhood traffic congestion in and around Frankton?	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
238.7		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern		Support	Best practice urban design is essential to creating high quality environments and especially important with the proposed and likely intensification of the urban areas within Urban Growth boundaries due to forecast population growth demand	Accept		
238.7	FS1107.12	Man Street Properties Ltd		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		
238.7	FS1226.12	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited		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		
238.7	FS1234.12	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited		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		
238.7	FS1239.12	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited		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		
238.7	FS1241.12	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents		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		
238.7	FS1242.35	Antony & Ruth Stokes		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	Transferred to Hearing Stream Business	
238.7	FS1248.12	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited		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		
238.7	FS1249.12	Tweed Development Limited		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		
271.15		Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)		Support	Support.	Accept		
271.15	FS1117.35	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	The Queenstown Airport is adequately protected from reverse sensitivity effects under the operative District Plan and Plan Change 50. Queenstown Airport should strive to minimise the adverse effects generated by it. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
271.15	FS1097.118	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	The Queenstown Airport is adequately protected from reverse sensitivity effects under the operative District Plan and Plan Change 50. Queenstown Airport should strive to minimise the adverse effects generated by it. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
807.92		Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	If the existing Airport Mixed Use Zone is to be amended to enable a range of activities including ASANs, then Activity Area of the RPZ be amended to also enable the same range of activities; OR The noise restrictions imposed on the RPZ under PC35 be imposed on the QAC (noting the comments above regarding the status of PC35 and the Lot 6 Notice of Requirement).	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Policy 17.2.2.3
217.15		Jay Berriman	740-17.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Does not want to see further growth..we have enough, the town is in danger of being ruined by to much to fast	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Zone Purpose
433.68		Queenstown Airport Corporation	740-17.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		
433.68	FS1097.354	Queenstown Park Limited	740-17.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.68	FS1117.117	Remarkables Park Limited	740-17.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
768.18		Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	740-17.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Retain the description of the zone purpose without further modification.	Accept		
807.91		Remarkables Park Limited	740-17.1 Zone Purpose	Support	Amend the zone purpose to remove repetition, for instance the introduction could be amended to read: <u>Queenstown Airport is the gateway to Queenstown and is a key asset that provides facilities for the transportation of people and freight. The Airport is a key contributor to the tourism industry and generates significant economic growth at a district, regional and national level.</u> <u>The airport also provides local facilities, including helicopter, flightseeing and general aviation operations. It is also a critical provider of emergency services and is a lifeline under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.</u> <u>The Airport Mixed Use Zone provides for the future growth and development of the airport in a manner that recognises the importance of maintaining amenity values of the airport and its surrounds.</u>	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Zone Purpose
807.91	FS1077.70	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)	740-17.1 Zone Purpose	Oppose	BARNZ supports the current purpose of the Queenstown Airport Zone, with the amendments sought by QAC in submission 433.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Zone Purpose
433.69		Queenstown Airport Corporation	741-17.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
433.69	FS1097.355	Queenstown Park Limited	741-17.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
433.69	FS1117.118	Remarkables Park Limited	741-17.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
768.19		Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	742-17.2.1 Objective 1.	Oppose	Amend as follows or to achieve the same intent, being to recognise Queenstown Airport as nationally significant infrastructure in its own right: Queenstown Airport is recognised as <u>being nationally significant infrastructure and</u> a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
798.34		Otago Regional Council	742-17.2.1 Objective 1.	Oppose	ORC requests that provisions for roading, access and parking should recognise the needs of active transport modes, public transport services and infrastructure. Provisions are requested for Residential developments, particularly those large in scale, to provide for public transport services and infrastructure in the future. Main road corridors in these areas should be retained to accommodate public transport services and infrastructure, both now and in the future.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
798.34	FS1340.32	Queenstown Airport Corporation	742-17.2.1 Objective 1.	Not Stated	Support in part/Oppose in part - QAC supports the inclusion of a new provision that encourages active transport modes, public transport services and infrastructures. QAC opposes the inclusion of provisions relating to residential development and associated transportation requirements however, as such activities are not provided for in the Airport Mixed Use Zone.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
768.20		Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	743-17.2.1.1	Oppose	Amend Policy 17.2.1.1 as follows or to achieve the same intent, being to provide for airport activities as defined: Provide for those aviation activities <u>airport activity that is necessary</u> to enable Queenstown Airport to operate in a safe and efficient manner.	Accept in Part		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
383.35		Queenstown Lakes District Council	744-17.2.1.2	Other	Amend to remove reference to Appendix 13 and instead reference Table 4 and 5 of the Noise Chapter.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
383.36		Queenstown Lakes District Council	744-17.2.1.2	Other	Amend ‘District Wide’ to correct heading title to state “clarification”	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on District Wide heading
383.37		Queenstown Lakes District Council	744-17.2.1.2	Other	Amend to add point under 17.3.2 (Clarification) which states: “A permitted activity must comply with all the rules listed in the activity and standards tables, and any relevant district wide rules.”	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Minor Amendments and Comments
807.94		Remarkables Park Limited	745-17.2.1.3	Oppose	Delete Policy 17.2.1.3.	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
807.94	FS1077.71	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)	745-17.2.1.3	Oppose	Retain policy 17.2.1.3	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
807.94	FS1340.33	Queenstown Airport Corporation	745-17.2.1.3	Oppose	QAC submits that it is appropriate to retain the proposed Airport Mixed Use Zone at Queenstown Airport. The current Rural General zoning is inconsistent with the current use that occurs on site and is enabled by QAC's designation.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
768.21		Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	746-17.2.2 Objective 2	Support	Retain without further modification.			
834.3		Helen McPhail	747-17.2.2.1	Not Stated	Agree (support) 17.2.2.1			
768.22		Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	748-17.2.2.2	Support	Retain without further modification.			
834.4		Helen McPhail	748-17.2.2.2	Not Stated	17.2.2.2, 17.5.9.2 and 17.5 Car parking at present in inadequate and future expansion incompatible with 17.2.2.1 unless parking buildings and underground parking undertaken. Land is a finite resource which needs careful utilisation.	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
768.23		Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	749-17.2.2.3	Oppose	Amend Policy 17.2.2.3 as follows or to achieve the same intent, being to avoid the intensification as well as establishment of incompatible activities: Avoid the establishment <u>or intensification</u> of activities that are incompatible with the ongoing operation and functioning of Queenstown Airport.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Objectives and Policies
433.70		Queenstown Airport Corporation	752-17.3.2 District Wide	Support	Retain as notified.	Reject		
433.70	FS1097.356	Queenstown Park Limited	752-17.3.2 District Wide	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.70	FS1117.119	Remarkables Park Limited	752-17.3.2 District Wide	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
383.38		Queenstown Lakes District Council	757-17.4.1	Other	Add a new Rule 17.5.5.3: Lighting shall be in use only when necessary in an operational sense, so as to minimise adverse impacts on the night sky.	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
383.38	FS1340.30	Queenstown Airport Corporation	757-17.4.1	Oppose	QAC submits that this rule is vague, unenforceable and should not be included.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
383.39		Queenstown Lakes District Council	757-17.4.1	Other	Delete provisions relating to parking, loading and access which refer to the Operative District Plan.	Accept in Part		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
383.39	FS1340.31	Queenstown Airport Corporation	757-17.4.1	Oppose	Oppose in Part - QAC opposes this submission as the rule provides an exemption that car parking in association with the airport terminal facility does not have to meet the minimum car parking requirements of the Operative Plan. QAC submits that the rule should therefore be retained insofar as it relates to car parking at the terminal building.	Accept in Part		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
383.40		Queenstown Lakes District Council	757-17.4.1	Other	Amend to remove reference to Appendix 13 and instead reference Table 4 and 5 of the Noise Chapter.	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
433.71		Queenstown Airport Corporation	766-17.5 Rules - Standards	Other	Amend the Standards as follows: <i>Rule 17.5.2.1</i> For all buildings at Queenstown Airport: Rule 17.5.2.1 Compliance shall be demonstrated by either adhering to the sound insulation requirements in Table 1 of Appendix 13 of the Operative District Plan, Table 4 of Chapter 26, and installation of mechanical ventilation to achieve the requirements in Table 2 of Appendix 13, Table 5 of Chapter 26, or by submitting..... Rule 17.5.2.2 Compliance shall be demonstrated by either installation of mechanical ventilation to achieve the requirements in Table 2 of Appendix 13, Table 5 of Chapter 26, or by submitting.....	Accept		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.71	FS1097.357	Queenstown Park Limited	766-17.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
433.71	FS1117.120	Remarkables Park Limited	766-17.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
807.95		Remarkables Park Limited	766-17.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Retain the existing Airport Mixed Use Zone rules in relation to height, setbacks, building coverage, landscaping.	Accept in Part		Section 7 of 42a report: Submissions on Rules – Standards 17.5
383.41		Queenstown Lakes District Council	768-17.5.2	Other	Amend to reflect standard wording. "Except as provided for by the Act, All applications for controlled, restricted discretionary or discretionary activities will be considered without shall not require public notification or the need to obtain the written approval of or serve notice on affected persons the written the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified".	Accept in Part		Section 9 of 42a report: Minor Amendments and Comments
383.41	FS1097.257	Queenstown Park Limited	768-17.5.2	Oppose	Oppose the submission to the extent it seeks non-notification provision for airport activities.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Minor Amendments and Comments
768.24		Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	780-17.5.7	Support	Retain without further modification.	Accept in Part		
383.41		Queenstown Airport Corporation	791-17.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Support	Retain as notified.	Reject		
383.41	FS1097.358	Queenstown Park Limited	791-17.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
383.41	FS1117.121	Remarkables Park Limited	791-17.6 Non-Notification of Applications	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
238.108		NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	Support	Strongly support Council advocacy to promote good urban design. Best Practice Urban Design is essential to providing high quality urban environments within all areas of the District and therefore should be added to the Strategy Chapter and all town centre and residential chapters within defined Urban Growth Boundaries.	Accept		
238.108	FS1107.113	Man Street Properties Ltd	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	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		
238.108	FS1226.113	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	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		
238.108	FS1234.113	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	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		
238.108	FS1239.113	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	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		
238.108	FS1241.113	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	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		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
238.108	FS1242.136	Antony & Ruth Stokes	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	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		
238.108	FS1248.113	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	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		
238.108	FS1249.113	Tweed Development Limited	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	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		
433.73		Queenstown Airport Corporation	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept		
433.73	FS1097.359	Queenstown Park Limited	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.73	FS1117.122	Remarkables Park Limited	793-17.7 Non Regulatory Methods	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
Submissions relating to Chapter 2 - Definitions								
243.34		Christine Byrch		Other	Rewrite the definitions based on the following comments: Aircraft Operations – why is “aircraft using the Airport as an alternative to landing at a scheduled airport” excluded?	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
243.34	FS1224.34	Matakauri Lodge Limited		Oppose	The submitter opposes this submission and considers that the Proposed District Plan and Visitor Accommodation Sub-zone is an appropriate method to recognise and enable visitor accommodation on Lot 2 DP 27037. Seeks it to be disallowed.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
383.3		Queenstown Lakes District Council		Other	1. Amend the definition of Aircraft as follows: 'Means any machine that can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air otherwise than by reactions of the air against the surface of the earth. Excludes remotely piloted aircraft that weigh less than 15 kilograms.' 2. Add a new definition of Remotely Piloted Aircraft as follows: ' <u>Remotely Piloted Aircraft: Means an unmanned aircraft that is piloted from a remote station.</u> '	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
383.3	FS1340.3	Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	QAC submits that it is appropriate to exclude remotely piloted aircraft from the definition of aircraft, however considers that all definitions should be consistent with Civil Aviation Authority definitions.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.1		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	The definitions contained in the Proposed Plan should be consistent with and give effect to recent Environment Court decisions on: 1. Plan Change 19 (Frankton Flats B Zone); 2. Plan Change 26 Wanaka Airport; and 3. Plan Change 35 Queenstown Airport. The definitions that were in place at the time the above plan changes were promulgated should also be included in the Proposed Plan to ensure the accurate interpretation and application of the provisions introduced by these plan changes.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.1	FS1030.1	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited		Support	JBIL seeks that this part of the submission be allowed.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.1	FS1077.18	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)		Support	To the extent any changes to definitions are required to make them consistent with recent Environment Court decisions on plan changes affecting airports in the Queenstown Lakes District, then such changes should occur.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.1	FS1117.57	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.1	FS1097.287	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.2		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Activity Sensitive To Aircraft Noise (ASAN) : Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.2	FS1117.58	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.2	FS1097.288	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.3		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	Activity Sensitive To Aircraft Noise (ASAN) Wanaka : Support in part. Delete the definition and replace it with definition of 'Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN)'; or Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.3	FS1117.59	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.3	FS1097.289	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.5		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Aircraft : Retain the definition as notified.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.5	FS1117.61	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.5	FS1097.291	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.6		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Aircraft Operations : Retain the definition as notified.	Reject		
433.6	FS1117.62	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.6	FS1097.292	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.7		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Oppose	Air Noise Boundary : Delete the definition.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.7	FS1117.63	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.7	FS1097.293	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.8		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Air Noise Boundary Queenstown (ANB): Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		
433.8	FS1117.64	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.8	FS1097.294	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.9		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	Airport Activity: Support in part. Retain the definition as notified, however include a minor amendment as follows: Airport Activity – Queenstown Airport	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.9	FS1117.65	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.9	FS1097.295	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.10		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	New Definition: <u>Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport</u> . Submitter requests that the following new definition be included in the Proposed Plan: <u>Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport</u> <u>Means land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft, including but not limited to:</u> <u>(a) aircraft operations, rotary wing aircraft operations, helicopter aprons, and associated touch down and lift off areas, aircraft servicing, general aviation, navigational and safety aids, lighting, aviation schools, space research and associated activities, facilities and activities associated with veteran, vintage and classic aircraft operations, aviation museums and aero recreation;</u> <u>(b) Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement or safety areas.</u> <u>(c) Terminal buildings, hangars, rescue facilities, navigation and safety aids, lighting, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, freight facilities, quarantine and incineration facilities, medical facilities, fuel storage and fuelling facilities, and associated offices.</u>	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.10	FS1088.2	Ross and Judith Young Family Trust		Support	The Trust considers that these definitions accurately outline the extent of Airport Activity and Airport Related Activity and around Wanaka Airport. The Trust seeks that this part of the submission be allowed.	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.10	FS1123.1	Airways New Zealand Ltd		Support	Support in part. Seeks the following amendments to the suggested definition: Airport Activities: Means land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft, including but not limited to: (a) aircraft operations, private aircraft traffic, domestic and international aircraft traffic, rotary wing operations, aircraft servicing, general aviation, airport or aircraft training facilities and associated offices. (b) Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement areas. (c) Terminal buildings, hangars, control towers, air traffic control facilities, flight information services, navigation and safety aids rescue facilities, navigation and safety aids, lighting, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, freight facilities, Airways seek that the definition suggested for Airport Activity- Wanaka subject to Airways modification be allowed.	Accept		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.10	FS1117.66	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.10	FS1097.296	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.11		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Airport Aerodrome: Delete the definition as proposed.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.11	FS1117.67	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.11	FS1097.297	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.12		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Airport Operator: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		
433.12	FS1117.68	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.12	FS1097.298	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.13		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	Airport Related Activity: Support in part. Retain the definition as notified, subject to a minor amendment as follows: <u>Airport Related Activity – Queenstown Airport</u>	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.13	FS1117.69	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.13	FS1097.299	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.14		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	<u>New Definition: Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport</u> Include the following new definition in the Proposed Plan: <u>Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport</u> <u>Means any retail activity, restaurants and other food and beverage facilities, industrial and commercial activities, provided they are connected with and ancillary to the use of the Airport. Also includes Temporary Activities associated with Air Shows, Conferences and Meetings, and rental vehicles, valet activities and public transport facilities. Includes Military Training Operations.</u>	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.14	FS1030.2	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited		Support	JBIL seeks that this part of the submission be allowed.	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.14	FS1088.3	Ross and Judith Young Family Trust		Support	The Trust considers that these definitions accurately outline the extent of Airport Activity and Airport Related Activity and around Wanaka Airport. The Trust seeks that this part of the submission be allowed.	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.14	FS1117.70	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.14	FS1211.13	New Zealand Defence Force		Support	Agrees that the inclusion of “Military Training Operations” provides clarification that TMTA can be carried out within this zone, which is appropriate, as TMTA can include activities involving the use of aircraft.	Accept		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.14	FS1097.300	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissions on Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone Definitions
433.15		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	Boundary: Oppose in part. Amend the definition as follows: <u>Boundary:</u> <u>Means any boundary of the net area of a site and includes any road boundary or internal boundary.</u> <u>This definition does not apply the Air Noise or Outer Control Boundary at Queenstown or Wanaka Airport.</u>	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.15	FS1117.71	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.15	FS1097.301	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.16		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Commercial Activity: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept	Transferred to Hearing Stream Business	
433.16	FS1097.302	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject	Transferred to Hearing Stream Business	
433.17		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Community Activity: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		
433.17	FS1117.73	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.17	FS1097.303	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.18		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	Critical Listening Environment: Support in part. Amend the definition as follows: "Critical Listening Environment" <i>Means any space that is regularly used for high quality listening or communication, for example principal living areas, bedrooms and classrooms, but excludes "Non-Critical Living Listening Environments".</i>	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.18	FS1117.74	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.18	FS1097.304	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.19		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Day Care Facility: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.19	FS1117.75	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.19	FS1097.305	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.20		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Design Sound Level: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		
433.20	FS1117.76	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.20	FS1097.306	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.21		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Educational Facility: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.21	FS1117.77	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.21	FS1097.307	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35 Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.23		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Indoor Design Sound Level: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.23	FS1117.79	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.23	FS1097.309	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.25		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Landside: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.25	FS1117.81	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.25	FS1097.311	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.26		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Non Critical Listening Environment: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		
433.26	FS1117.82	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.26	FS1097.312	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.27		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Outer Control Boundary (OCB) Queenstown: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.27	FS1117.83	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.27	FS1097.313	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.28		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	Outer Control Boundary (OCB) Wanaka: Support in part. Amend the definition as follows: <u>Outer Control Boundary (OCB) - Wanaka</u> <u>Means a boundary, as shown on the District Plan Map s-18A, the location of which is based on the predicted day/night sound levels of 55 dBA Ldn from airport operations in 2036.</u>	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.28	FS1117.84	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.28	FS1097.314	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.29		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Other	<u>Projected Annual Aircraft Noise Contour (AANC): Support in part.</u> Amend the definition as follows: <u>Projected Annual Aircraft Noise Contour (AANC)</u> <u>Means the Projected Annual Aircraft Noise Contours calculated as specified by the Aerodrome Purposes Designation 2, Condition 13.</u>	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.29	FS1117.85	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.29	FS1097.315	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.34		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	Visitor Accommodation: Retain the definition as notified.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.34	FS1117.90	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.35		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	2037 Noise Contours: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.35	FS1117.91	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.35	FS1097.321	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.36		Queenstown Airport Corporation		Support	2037 60 dB Noise Contours: Retain the definition as notified.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
433.36	FS1117.92	Remarkables Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
433.36	FS1097.322	Queenstown Park Limited		Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
271.2	FS1117.22	Remarkables Park Limited	2.2 Definitions	Oppose	The Queenstown Airport is adequately protected from reverse sensitivity effects under the operative District Plan and Plan Change 50. Queenstown Airport should strive to minimise the adverse effects generated by it. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
271.2	FS1097.105	Queenstown Park Limited	2.2 Definitions	Oppose	The Queenstown Airport is adequately protected from reverse sensitivity effects under the operative District Plan and Plan Change 50. Queenstown Airport should strive to minimise the adverse effects generated by it. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		
296.1		Royal New Zealand Aero Club Inc/Flying NZ	2.2 Definitions	Other	Define 'aircraft' as 'motorised aircraft' so that any rules are targeted to the primary issue of noise.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
566.1		Airways Corporation of New Zealand	2.2 Definitions	Other	Amend the definition of 'Airport Activities' to specifically provide for air traffic control facilities, flight information services, navigation and safety aids.	Accept in Part		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
566.1	FS1340.4	Queenstown Airport Corporation	2.2 Definitions	Support	QAC supports the inclusion of 'flight information services' in this definition, however notes that "control towers" and "navigation and safety aids" are already provided for in the definition of Airport Activity.	Accept in Part		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
566.2		Airways Corporation of New Zealand	2.2 Definitions	Other	Add the following new definitions: 'Radio Communication Facility: Means any transmitting/receiving devices such as aerials, dishes, antennas, cables, lines, wires and associated equipment/apparatus, as well as support structures such as towers, masts and poles, and ancillary buildings, and as defined in the Radio Communications Act 1989 and its amendments.' 'Navigational Facility: Means any permanent or temporary device or structure constructed and operated for the purpose of facilitating navigation by aircraft or shipping.'	Reject	Transferred to Hearing Stream Definitions	
566.2	FS1106.9	Chorus New Zealand Limited	2.2 Definitions	Support	As this term is used in the Proposed Plan, it is appropriate to have a suitable definition.	Reject		
566.2	FS1208.9	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	2.2 Definitions	Support	Agrees that as this term is used in the Proposed Plan, it is appropriate to have a suitable definition.	Reject		
566.2	FS1253.9	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	2.2 Definitions	Support	Agrees that as this term is used in the Proposed Plan, it is appropriate to have a suitable definition.	Reject		

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
566.2	FS1340.5	Queenstown Airport Corporation	2.2 Definitions	Support	It is appropriate to include definitions for radio communication facilities and navigational facilities in the Proposed Plan. The proposed definition of "navigation facility" should be amended to reflect the terminology and definition set out in the Civil Aviation Act 1990. The term "navigational facility" should also be included in the definition of "Airport Activity" for consistency.	Reject		
584.3		Air new Zealand Limited (ANZL)	2.2 Definitions	Other	the definition of ASAN's be amended consistent with the Council's decision with respect to PC19	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
584.3	FS1077.55	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)	2.2 Definitions	Support	To the extent any changes to definitions are required to make them consistent with recent Environment Court decisions on plan changes affecting airports in the Queenstown Lakes District, then such changes should occur.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
584.3	FS1117.227	Remarkables Park Limited	2.2 Definitions	Support	For the reasons outlined in RP L's primary submission.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
807.90		Remarkables Park Limited	2.2 Definitions	Support	The definitions section of the PDP includes underlined definitions that have arisen out of Plan Change 35 (PC35). These are supported provided they are consistent with PC35.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
836.1		Arcadian Triangle Limited	2.2 Definitions	Not Stated	Definitions - Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) Issue (a) The definition of ASAN should be amended by deleting the words "... as defined in this District Plan... ". Defined terms are used in many definitions, and this formula does not appear to be repeated elsewhere and is unnecessary. (b) It is difficult to see any justification for the one minor difference between the definition of "ASAN" and the definition of "ASAN (Wanaka)". The definition of "ASAN (Wanaka)" can probably be deleted without any consequential adverse effect. Relief Requested: (c) Amend the District Plan to address the issues raised above, plus make any consequential amendments to other relevant plan provisions.	Accept in Part		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
836.2		Arcadian Triangle Limited	2.2 Definitions	Not Stated	Definitions - Aerodrome/Airport Issue: (a) It is unclear why there is a definition of "Aerodrome" in the District Plan, when the other definitions which are relevant to an airport, such as "Airport Activity" and "Airport Operator", all refer to "Airport" rather than "Aerodrome". Relief Requested: (b) Delete the definition "Aerodrome", replace it with an equivalent definition for "Airport", and delete any other reference to "Aerodrome" in the District Plan.	Reject	Transferred to Definitions Hearing Stream.	
836.3		Arcadian Triangle Limited	2.2 Definitions	Not Stated	Definitions - Air Noise Boundary Issue: (a) It is unclear why there needs to be two separate definitions of "Air Noise Boundary", with one applying to all air noise boundaries and the second applying just to the Queenstown ANB. It is also unclear why these two identical definitions should be slightly differently worded. It is difficult to see how deleting one of them could have any meaningful consequence. Relief Requested: (b) Delete one of the two ANB definitions and make any consequential changes to other relevant plan provisions.	Accept		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions
836.11		Arcadian Triangle Limited	2.2 Definitions	Not Stated	Definitions - OCB Issue: (a) The following points are noted: (i) There are two separate definitions, one of which appears to relate to Queenstown Airport and the other to Wanaka Airport, but there is no reference to either Queenstown Airport or Wanaka Airport in the relevant definition; (ii) The wording in the two definitions is inconsistent, particularly noting one reference to "55 dB Ldn" and another to "55 dBA Ldn"; (iii) Are the two year references meant to be different? Relief Requested: (b) Amend these two definitions to address the issues detailed above.	Reject		Section 9 of 42a report: Submissions of Definitions

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
Wanaka Airport submissions from Chapter 21 - Rural Zone								
433.83		Queenstown Airport Corporation	21.2 Objectives and Policies	Other	Insert new provisions as follows: Objective 21.2.X Recognise and provide for Wanaka Airport as strategic infrastructure and a key asset that supports the social and economic wellbeing of the District. Policy 21.2.X.1 Ensure that an appropriate noise boundary is established and maintained around Wanaka Airport to enable operations at the Airport to continue and to expand over time. Policy 21.2.X.2 Provide for a range of airport related service, business, industrial and commercial activity at Wanaka Airport to support or complement the functioning of the Airport, where those activities are located on land within the Airport's Aerodrome Purpose Designation.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.83	FS1030.3	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	21.2 Objectives and Policies	Support	JBIL seeks that this part of the submission be allowed.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.83	FS1030.8	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	21.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	JBIL seeks the part of the submission that relates to new Policy 21.2.x.2 be disallowed.	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.83	FS1097.369	Queenstown Park Limited	21.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.83	FS1117.132	Remarkables Park Limited	21.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.84		Queenstown Airport Corporation	21.2 Objectives and Policies	Other	Insert new provisions as follows to provide for new runway end protection areas at Wanaka Airport. Policy 21.2.X.3 Retain a buffer around Wanaka Airport to provide for the runway end protection areas at the Airport to maintain and enhance the safety of the public and those using aircraft at Wanaka Airport. Policy 21.2.X.1 Avoid activities which may generate effects that compromise the safety of the operation of aircraft arriving at or departing from Wanaka Airport	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.84	FS1097.370	Queenstown Park Limited	21.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.84	FS1117.133	Remarkables Park Limited	21.2 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Accept in Part		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.87		Queenstown Airport Corporation	21.4 Rules - Activities	Other	Insert a new Activities Rule Category specifically relating to activities at Wanaka Airport and insert the following new rules: Rule 21.4.X Activities – Rural Zone Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport Airport Related Activities – Wanaka Airport Activity Status C * Control is reserved to the following: Design, external appearance and siting of buildings and structures; Traffic generation, vehicle parking, site access and servicing; Landscaping and screening of any outdoor areas; The extent to which the activity benefits from an Airport location.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.87	FS1030.4	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	21.4 Rules - Activities	Support	JBIL seeks that this part of the submission be allowed.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.87	FS1088.4	Ross and Judith Young Family Trust	21.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	The Trust considers that these activities should be given permitted activity status. The matters of control promoted could be redrafted as permitted performance standards. This would have the same effect as the matters of control but would remove the requirement for resource consent. The Trust seeks this part of the submission be disallowed.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.87	FS1097.373	Queenstown Park Limited	21.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.87	FS1117.136	Remarkables Park Limited	21.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.88		Queenstown Airport Corporation	21.4 Rules - Activities	Other	New Rule 21.4.X Activities – Rural Zone Activities within the Runway End Protection Areas – Wanaka Airport Within the Runway End Protection Areas, as indicated on the District Plan Maps, Buildings except those required for aviation purposes; Activities which generate or have the potential to generate any of the following effects: mass assembly of people release of any substance which would impair visibility or otherwise interfere with the operation of aircraft including the creation of smoke, dust and steam storage of hazardous substances production of direct light beams or reflective glare which could interfere with the vision of a pilot production of radio or electrical interference which could affect aircraft communications or navigational equipment attraction of birds Activity Status PR The Runway End Protection Area should be shown on the District Plan Maps in accordance with Annexure C.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.88	FS1097.374	Queenstown Park Limited	21.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.88	FS1117.137	Remarkables Park Limited	21.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
649.18		Southern District Health Board	21.4 Rules - Activities	Not Stated	Support 'NC' status for activities within the various Control Boundaries described for Queenstown and Wanaka Airports. For the following reasons. New activities sensitive to aircraft noise should not be established within Outer Control boundary for Wanaka or the Air Noise and Outer Boundaries for Queenstown airport without the prescribed noise immission control measures	Accept		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
649.18	FS1030.18	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	21.4 Rules - Activities	Oppose	The retention of this policy is opposed.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
649.19		Southern District Health Board	21.4 Rules - Activities	Not Stated	Support 'PR' status for activities within the Outer Control Boundaries of Queenstown and Wanaka Airports. For the following reasons. New activities sensitive to aircraft noise should not be established within Outer Control boundaries around airports.	Accept		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.92		Queenstown Airport Corporation	21.5 Rules - Standards	Other	Insert a new Table 11 and associated standards for Wanaka Airport as follows: Table 11 Activities and Standards for Wanaka Airport 21.5.53 Building Height The maximum height of any building shall not exceed 10 metres, except that: this restriction does not apply to control towers, lighting towers or navigation and communication masts and aerials associated with airport operations. No permanent buildings other than the control tower shall infringe the restrictions of the Approach and Land Use Controls Designation. Activity Status RD * Discretion is restricted to all of the following: Rural amenity and landscape character. Privacy, outlook and amenity from adjoining properties. Visual prominence from both public places and private locations. The effects of breaching the surfaces on aircraft safety. 21.5.54 Building Setback The minimum setback for all buildings from all boundaries shall be 5m. The minimum setback for buildings from the eastern side of the centreline of the main runway (as at 2013) shall be 217 metres. Minimum setback for buildings from the western side of the centre line of the main runway (as at 2013) shall be 124 metres. Activity Status RD * Discretion is restricted to all of the following: Privacy, outlook and amenity from adjoining properties. The effects operational and functional effects for aircraft using Wanaka Airport.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.92	FS1030.11	Jeremy Bell Investments Limited	21.5 Rules - Standards	Support	JBIL seeks this part of the submission be disallowed.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone

Appendix 2 to the Section 42A report for Chapter 17

Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary	Planner Recommendation	Transferred	Issue Reference
433.92	FS1097.378	Queenstown Park Limited	21.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
433.92	FS1117.141	Remarkables Park Limited	21.5 Rules - Standards	Oppose	Oppose all amendments to definitions that are inconsistent with Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments to any provisions that seek to impose controls in addition to those proposed under Plan Change 35. Oppose all amendments that seek to place additional restrictions on existing urban zones such as the Remarkables Park Zone. Oppose all amendments that seek to undermine or circumvent the Plan Change 35 and Lot 6 NoR proceedings that are currently before the Environment Court. Oppose all amendments that seek to enable urban activities on airport land where such activities are constrained on land adjoining or near the airport (Frankton and Remarkables Park). Oppose all amendments that seek to reduce open space or buffer areas between the airport and adjoining urban zones. Oppose all amendments that seek to constrain any existing development opportunity within the Remarkables Park Zone. Any amendments or provisions supported/opposed by QAC that seek to achieve any of the outcomes set out above be rejected.	Reject		Section 10 of 42a report: Submissionson Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone
Designations								
5.1		Twenty24 Ltd	E1Aerodrome Purposes	Oppose	Oppose "freight facilities" being a permitted activity on the airport, unless they are related to aerodrome purposes to clarify that only freight facilities associated with aircraft businesses be permitted on the airfield.	Accept		6.3 of s42a (3)
5.1	FS1210.1	Wanaka Hangar Services Limited	E1Aerodrome Purposes	Oppose	Believes that the activity of "freight facilities" should be a permitted activity under designation 37 at Wanaka Airport. Seeks that all of the relief sought be declined.	Reject		6.3 of s42a (3)

Appendix 3. Section 32 Report Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone



Section 32 Evaluation Report

Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone

Contents

Section 32 Evaluation Report: Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone.....	2
1. Strategic Context	2
2. National Planning Documents	2
3. Regional Planning Documents	3
4. Iwi Management Plans	3
5. Section 32 Evaluation	4
6. Resource Management Issues.....	4
7. Purpose and Options	5
8. Evaluation of proposed Objectives - Section 32 (1) (a).....	6
9. Evaluation of broad options for achieving Objectives Section 32 (1) (b)(i)	8
10. Scale and Significance Evaluation – Section 32(1)(c).....	14
11. Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32 (1)(b)(ii).....	14
12. Efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions	30
13. The risk of not acting.....	30
14. References.....	30

Section 32 Evaluation Report: Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone

1. Strategic Context

Council is preparing a new District Plan under Section 74 of the Resource Management Act 1991(RMA or the Act). Section 74(1) of the RMA sets out matters which are to be considered by territorial authorities when preparing or changing district plans. That section states that any change to district plans must be in accordance with the functions for territorial authorities set out in section 31, the provisions of Part 2, the duties under section 32, and any regulations.

Section 74(2) of the Act requires that when preparing or changing a district plan, a territorial shall have regard to:

- (a) *any –*
 - (i) *Proposed regional policy statement; or*
 - (ii) *Proposed regional plan of its region in regard to any matter of regional significance or for which the regional council has primary responsibility under Part 4; and*

- (b) *any-*
 - (i) *Management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts; and*
 - (ii) *Repealed*
 - (ia) *Relevant entry [on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rarangi Korero required by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014]; and*
 - (iii) *Regulations relating to ensuring sustainability, or the conservation, management, or sustainability of fisheries resources (including regulations or bylaws relating to taiapure, mahinga mataitai, or other non-commercial Maori customary fishing),— to the extent that their content has a bearing on resource management issues of the district; and*

- (c) *The extent to which the district plan needs to be consistent with the plans or proposed plans of adjacent territorial authorities.*

Section 74(2A) requires that when preparing or changing a district plan a territorial authority must take into account:

Any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district.

Section 75 of the Act details the requirements for the content of district plans. Section 75 of the Act states that:

- (3) *A district plan must give effect to –*
 - (a) *any national policy statement; and*
 - (b) *any New Zealand coastal policy statement; and*
 - (c) *any regional policy statement.*

- (4) *A district plan must not be inconsistent with -*
 - (a) *a water conservation order; or*
 - (b) *a regional plan for any matter specified in section 30(1).*

Consideration has been given to the matters detailed in sections 74 and 75 of the Act, as outlined in Sections 2 to 5 below.

2. National Planning Documents

National Policy Statements

There are currently four operative national policy statements which the District Plan must give effect to. These include:

- The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010
- The National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011
- The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011
- The National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008

It has been determined that none of these policy statements are relevant to the proposed Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone chapter.

National Environmental Standards

National environmental standards are regulations made under section 43 of the RMA. They can prescribe technical standards, methods or other requirements for environmental matters. In some circumstances, local authorities can impose stricter standards. There is one national environmental standard which is relevant to the proposed chapter, the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2012 (NES).

The proposed chapter does not impose a greater prohibition or restriction on an activity to which this NES already imposes. Therefore, no further evaluation of this NES is required for this evaluation (section 32(4)).

3. Regional Planning Documents

Regional Policy Statement

Otago's Regional Policy Statement ("RPS") promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources by giving an overview of the resource management issues facing Otago, and by setting policies and methods to manage Otago's natural and physical resources. The RPS is currently under Review itself, and may be further advanced in that process by the time the District Plan Review is notified. Amendments to this evaluation may be required to accommodate that change. The District Plan must *give effect* to the Operative RPS and must *have regard* to the Proposed RPS.

The Operative RPS contains a number of objectives and policies that are relevant to this review, namely Objectives 5.4.1 to 5.4.2 and associated Policies 5.5.3 to 5.5.5, and Objectives 9.4.1 to 9.4.3 (inclusive) and associated policies 9.5.2 and 9.5.3. As outlined in detail in **Attachment 1**, the proposed chapter is consistent with, and gives effect to, the relevant operative RPS provisions.

Regional Plans

There are four operative regional plans within the Otago Region relating to air, water, coast and waste. The purpose of the Otago Regional Plan: Air is to promote the sustainable management of the air resource in the Otago region. The Otago Regional Plan: Water is for the use, development and protection of Otago's rivers, lakes, aquifers and wetlands. The Otago Regional Plan: Coast is relevant to the coastal marine area. The Otago Regional Plan: Waste applies to solid waste management, including waste minimisation, contaminated sites, hazardous substances and hazardous wastes and landfills. This chapter does not seek to address any matters that are managed under the Otago Regional Plans for Air, Water and the Coast. The management of Hazardous Substances is addressed in proposed provisions, therefore the Regional Plan: Waste is relevant to this chapter. The provisions recognise that the management of hazardous substances is governed by the Regional Plan: Waste and the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996.

4. Iwi Management Plans

Kai Tahu Ki Otago Resource Management Plan

The Kai Tahu Ki Otago Resource Management Plan (2005) (NRMP) is the principal planning document for Kai Tahu Ki Otago (KTKO) ((KTKO is used to describe the four Papatipu Runanga and associated whanau and ropu of the Otago Region). Chapter 5 of the NRMP identifies issues, objectives and policies for the Otago Region as a whole, and includes the following objectives:

- i. *The rakātirataka and kaitiakitaka of Kāi Tahu ki Otago is recognised and supported.*
- ii. *Ki Uta Ki Tai management of natural resources is adopted within the Otago region.*
- iii. *The mana of Kāi Tahu ki Otago is upheld through the management of natural, physical and historic resources in the Otago Region.*

- iv. *Kāi Tahu ki Otago have effective participation in all resource management activities within the Otago Region.*
- v. *The respective roles and responsibilities of Manawhenua within the Otago Region are recognised and provided for through the other objectives and policies of the Plan.*

Chapter 10 sets out objectives and policies as they are relevant to the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment, in which Queenstown Airport is contained. Given the proposed chapter affects and is within the confines of Frankton's existing built environment, and access to existing servicing is available in this area, the provisions are not directly relevant to the proposed chapter.

Ngai Tahu Ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan (2008)

The Ngai Tahu Ki Murihiku Natural Resources and Environmental Iwi Management Plan (Murihiku Plan) was issued in 2008 and consolidates Ngai Tahuki Murihiku values, knowledge and perspectives on natural resources and environmental management issues. The Murihiku Plan identifies kaitiakitanga, environmental and social, economic, health and wellbeing outcomes that need to be recognised when considering the proposed chapter. The proposed chapter will not offend any of the relevant objectives and policies.

5. Section 32 Evaluation

All District Plan changes must be evaluated as directed by section 32 of the RMA. Section 32(1) and (2) specifies what the evaluation must examine.

- (1) *An evaluation report required under this Act must—*
 - (a) *examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and*
 - (b) *examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by—*
 - (i) *identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and*
 - (ii) *assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and*
 - (iii) *summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and*
 - (c) *contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.*
- (2) *An assessment under subsection (1)(b)(ii) must—*
 - (a) *identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for—*
 - (i) *economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and*
 - (ii) *employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and*
 - (b) *if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to in paragraph (a); and*
 - (c) *assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.*

Section 32(3) relates to "amending proposals". As Council is issuing a new proposed District Plan, this section is not considered relevant.

6. Resource Management Issues

Queenstown Airport provides facilities for the transportation of people and freight and is a key asset to the District in terms of supporting the tourism industry and the needs of local and business travellers. The Airport acts as an essential gateway to the District and facilitates access and economic activity in the local and broader regional economies. It is also a provider of emergency services and is a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. It is therefore essential that the current and future operations of the Airport are safeguarded through the District Plan Review.

Queenstown Airport has experienced a sustained period of passenger growth. To the year ending June 2014, the Airport accommodated approximately 1.25m passengers. This represented a 4.2% increase in

passengers from the previous year. Passenger growth projections undertaken by Market Economics (refer to **Attachment 2**) anticipate this figure to increase to 1.78m passenger per year by 2025 and 2.57m per year by 2037.

In order to accommodate this growth, the Queenstown Airport Corporation (QAC), needs the flexibility to respond to changes and growth in the tourism market. Increasingly, modern airports are also demanding a greater diversity and range of activities to provide for their passengers, and to assist in the efficient operation and functioning of the Airport. In the context of Queenstown Airport, which is surrounded by a range of land use activities, meeting the changing and evolving needs of the Airport will need to be carefully balanced with achieving appropriate environmental outcomes for the immediately surrounding zones.

The resource management issues set out in this section have been identified from the following sources:

- Review of the operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan (the operative District Plan), including the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone and the Queenstown Airport Corporation Designations (Designations D1- Aerodrome Purposes, D.2 – Air Noise Boundary Controls, and D.3 – Airport Approach and Land Use Controls);
- Consultation with the Queenstown Airport Corporation (QAC);
- Councillor workshops;
- Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited Statement of Intent 2015-2017 (**Attachment 2**);
- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Economic Assessment, Market Economics, November 2014 (**Attachment 3**);
- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Acoustical review of proposed District Plan Provisions, Marshall Day Acoustics, November 2014 (**Attachment 4**).

The key resource management issues include:

- The operative Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone does not reflect the extent of the overlying Aerodrome Purposes designation (Designation D.1). The majority of the Aerodrome Purposes designation has an underlying Rural General zone which does not anticipate airport related activities. The operative District Plan therefore does not adequately recognise the entirety of Queenstown Airport land as a strategic transportation hub and centre of economic activity.
- Only the requiring authority having the financial responsibility for a project or work (in this case, Queenstown Airport) can rely on the Aerodrome Purposes designation to establish activities which support, complement or enhance the efficient operation of the Airport.
- Queenstown Airport and its immediate surrounds provide an important gateway to the District and wider region. The operational imperatives of Queenstown Airport therefore need to be maintained whilst balancing the amenity and preservation of the gateway to the District.
- The Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone has not been reviewed since the District Plan became operative in 11 October 2003. Subsequent changes to the surrounding zones have resulted in inconsistencies in the built form anticipated in the adjacent Frankton Flats and Remarkables Park Zone. The Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone therefore requires amendments to create consistency with these planning frameworks.

7. Purpose and Options

The overarching purpose of the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone is to enable the sustainable management and growth of Queenstown Airport.

Under the operative District Plan, approximately 25 ha of Queenstown Airport is currently zoned Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. The remaining 99 ha is zoned Rural General. Currently airport related activities are also provided for by the Airport's designations. The designations enable the safe and efficient operation of the Airport by providing for the activities undertaken by QAC as the requiring authority for Queenstown Airport under section 166(g) of the RMA.

The proposed chapter will provide for the activities currently, and that are anticipated to occur at Queenstown Airport over the next planning period. The following sections of this report (Sections 8 to 13) have been provided in order to fulfil the statutory requirements of section 32 of the RMA.

8. Evaluation of proposed Objectives - Section 32 (1) (a)

Section 32(1)(a) of the RMA requires the evaluation to examine the extent that a new objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. Two new objectives are proposed as part of this proposed chapter. This section of the report considers the new objectives in the context of the purpose of the Act.

The purpose of the Act demands an integrated planning approach and direction:

Section 5 Purpose

- (1) *The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.*
- (2) *In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—*
 - (a) *sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
 - (b) *safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*
 - (c) *avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

The remaining provisions in Part 2 of the Act, particularly section 7, provide a framework within which objectives are required to achieve the purpose of the Act and provisions are required to achieve the relevant objectives. Section 7 (abbreviated below) is particularly relevant to this proposed chapter:

Section 7 Other Matters

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and power under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protecting of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to –

- (b) *the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:*
- (c) *the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:*
- (f) *maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:*

The following objectives serve to address the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone issues identified in Section 6.

Proposed Objective	Appropriateness
<p>Objective 17.2.1</p> <p>Queenstown Airport is recognised as a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits.</p>	<p>This objective acknowledges the national and regional strategic importance of Queenstown Airport and its contribution to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>Queenstown Airport is an important, existing strategic asset to the Queenstown Lakes District and Otago Region. It provides a national and international transport link for the local, regional and international community and has a major influence on the Region's economy.</p> <p>Queenstown Airport serves as an important link to the economies of Queenstown and facilitates tourism spending (VA) of between \$592m and \$638m (refer to Attachment 3) sustaining between 14,855 and 15,948 jobs. Tourism is a crucially important industry</p>

	<p>to the New Zealand economy as a whole. It is evident that the on-going ability of Queenstown Airport to function and grow is essential to the tourism industry, both regionally and nationally.</p> <p>This objective recognises and provides for the airport as a physical resource now and for future generations. The land subject to the proposed rezoning is not highly valued in terms of its rural productivity or landscape value. Therefore there will be no adverse effects on the life supporting capacity of soils, land or water resource.</p> <p>The surrounding Frankton Flats area contains several industrial/commercial developments, and the ongoing use and development of the Airport is considered to be consistent with this and is appropriate in the receiving environment.</p> <p>Heritage features currently identified in the operative District Plan will remain and be protected by provisions relating specifically to their management. This is consistent with the key initiatives of the requiring authority, which seeks to protect QAC owned heritage buildings as set out in its Statement of Intent (Attachment 2).</p> <p>This objective is therefore considered to be consistent with section 5 of the Act. Any section 6 matters will also not be adversely affected by the proposed objective.</p> <p>The proposed objective enables the Airport to grow in the most efficient way and addresses the resource management issues described in section 6 of this report. It is therefore consistent with relevant section 7 matters. The objective is also consistent with Objective 3.2.1.5 of Goal 3.2.1 of the Strategic Directions chapter, and enables the Airport to provide for future passenger and tourism growth.</p> <p>The objective also gives effect to RPS objectives 5.4.1 and 9.4.1 to 9.4.2 and RPS policies 9.5.4 and 9.5.2 to 9.5.3 (refer to Attachment 1 for an assessment of the proposed chapter against these provisions).</p>
<p>Objective - 17.2.2</p> <p>Provision for the requirements of Queenstown Airport is balanced with achieving an acceptable level of amenity for those using the airport and for those residing on neighbouring land.</p>	<p>This objective sets a broad expectation that the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone will maintain high quality outcomes when providing for new development. Urban design plays an important role in managing the amenity of Queenstown Airport as a gateway to the District, whilst meeting the strict operational requirements of a functioning international airport.</p> <p>This objective also acknowledges that appropriate limits must be placed on the effects generated by the airport or airport related activities to enable a mix of uses to occur without any one use being inappropriately compromised by the effects of another. This objective, along the associated provisions which will seek to avoid, remedy or</p>

	<p>mitigate any adverse effects on the environment is consistent with section 5 of the Act.</p> <p>The proposed objective applies to land that is already designated for aerodrome purposes. The majority of the land although zoned rural, is not considered to be an outstanding natural feature or landscape.</p> <p>A portion of the airport zone will extend into the Shotover River delta, which has been deemed to be outstanding in the operative District Plan. While the active river bed displays natural character and landscape value, its margins have been substantially modified by existing airport activities (RESA), industrial activities and river flood protection works.</p> <p>In terms of heritage values it is noted that there are a number of protected heritage features in the operative District Plan within the land designated for Aerodrome Purposes. These features will remain as part of the proposed rezoning and the provisions relating to heritage will apply and therefore sufficiently protect any significant heritage values.</p> <p>Any relevant section 6 matters are therefore recognised and provided for and will not be adversely affected by the proposed objective.</p> <p>Achieving the proposed objective will result in a more efficient use of resources than the current zoning provides for and will result in the development of the Airport in a way that will result in the maintenance of amenity values and environmental quality.</p> <p>There are no known Treaty principles that will be affected by this objective. The proposed objective is not contrary to the Kai Tahu ki Otago resource management plan or the Ngai Tahu Ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan.</p> <p>This objective is consistent with Goal 3.2.3 of the Strategic Directions chapter.</p> <p>This objective also gives effect to RPS objectives 5.4.2, 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and RPS policies 5.5.3 and 9.5.4 (refer to Attachment 1 for an assessment of the proposed chapter against these provisions).</p>
--	---

The above objectives have been considered against Part 2 of the Act, the RPS, and the draft Strategic Directions chapter of the proposed plan. When compared against the objectives of the operative District Plan, the proposed objectives are considered the most appropriate method of achieving the purpose of the Act, as they identify and give direction as to the how the specific issues that pertain to the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone are to be addressed.

9. Evaluation of broad options for achieving Objectives Section 32 (1) (b)(i)

As required by section 32(1)(b)(i) RMA, the following section considers various broad options considered to address the issues identified in Section 6 of this report and are therefore considered the most appropriate way of achieving the new objectives. Recommendations are made as to the most appropriate course of action in each case. For the purposes of this assessment, the issues have been broadly grouped into two categories:

Issue 1: Providing for long term sustainable management of Queenstown Airport;

In addressing Issue 1, Option 1 generally seeks to retain the operative District Plan provisions as they stand. Option 2 seeks to amend and improve the operative District Plan provisions, whilst retaining the operative District Plan Zoning (including the retention of the operative Queenstown Airport Mixed Use and Rural General Zoning). Option 3 would not significantly depart from the operative District Plan provisions, however additional activities to meet the demands and needs of the Airport would be included. The entirety of the land that is subject to the Aerodrome Designation would also be included in the revised zone.

Issue 2: Balancing the operational requirements of the Queenstown Airport with residential amenity and outlook, including the Airport as a key strategic gateway to the District.

In addressing Issue 2, Option 1 again seeks to retain the operative District Plan provisions as they stand. Option 2 seeks to amend and improve the operative District Plan provisions, by creating consistency with the development standards of neighbouring zones (where appropriate), while considering the adoption of non-statutory guidelines. Option 3 comprises a complete review of the existing standards, including the mandatory implementation of urban design guidelines.

Broad options considered to for achieving the objectives (Section 32(1)(b)(i))

Issue 1: Long term growth and sustainable management of the Airport (Objective 17.2.1)

Option 1: Retain the provisions and zoning of the operative District Plan.

Option 2: Amend and improve the operative District Plan provisions, whilst retaining operative District Plan zoning.

Option 3: Amend and improve the operative District Plan provisions, and explore options to enable further development opportunities which complement the efficient operation of Queenstown Airport. Consider amendments to the operative District Plan zone boundaries to establish consistency with the Aerodrome Purposes Designation (Designation D.1).

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Amend operative provisions whilst retaining existing zoning	Option 3: Comprehensive review that enables activities that complement the Airport (including zone boundaries)
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency in the nature, scale and intensity of activities anticipated by the Aerodrome Purposes designation and the underlying zones. • The Airport will not be able to adequately provide for its anticipated growth and development, having a corollary effect on the growth of the local and regional economy. • The existing Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone provides for a limited area of Airport related activity. This restricts growth of the Airport and will have a detrimental effect on the economic wellbeing of the community. • Uncertainty and delays for third parties requiring consent for activities which are anticipated within the designation, but not within the zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation). • Inconsistency in the nature, scale and intensity of activities anticipated by the Aerodrome Purposes designation and the underlying zones. • Limited opportunities for other parties to operate complementary or ancillary activities within the Airport surrounds. • Resource consents would be required for future development of airport related activities within the Rural General zone. Airport related activities are not anticipated in this zone, resulting in consenting uncertainty, delays and costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of some rural land (however this is owned by QAC and typical farming activities are not anticipated within operational airport areas). • Activities that are incompatible with airport operations and do not relate to the efficient operation of the airport would be prohibited, potentially creating loss of economic opportunities. • Financial costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation).

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains the established approach which parties are familiar with. Low cost for Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within appropriately zoned areas it will provide for the types of activities demanded of modern airports and provides certainty around their establishment. Retains but improves the approach parties are familiar with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions and zoning which meet the long term demand for the airport will provide significant economic benefits to the region. New industries and business opportunities corollary to the primary airport functioning will be better enabled. Ensures Queenstown Airport is recognised as a strategic and significant physical asset. Creates consistency between activities anticipated by the Aerodrome Purposes designation and the underlying zones. Potential streamlining opportunities, with QAC managing the overall zone management and development.
Ranking	3	2	1

Option 1 would generally allow the familiarity of users of the zone provisions to remain but would not address the resource management issues identified in Section 6.

Option 2 recognises that some of the existing provisions of the operative District Plan are effective, however there are amendments which could further improve their effectiveness. Option 2 does not adequately protect or provide for the Airport (in its entirety) as a significant physical resource.

Option 3 would not significantly depart from the operative District Plan provisions or those that would be amended via Option 2, however the changes to the zoning would enable activities ancillary and necessary to the functioning of an effective and efficient airport to establish within the wider Airport environs. Option 3 would also streamline the provisions of the zone with the overlying Aerodrome Purposes designation (Designation D.1). Option 3 is therefore the most reasonably practicable option for achieving the objectives and addressing the resource management issues identified in Section 6.

Option 3 is considered the most reasonably practicable option for achieving the objectives of the proposed chapter.

Issue 2: Balancing the operational requirements of Queenstown Airport with maintaining residential and visual amenity and “gateway” to the District (Objective 17.2.2)

Option 1: Retain the provisions of the Operative District Plan.

Option 2: Review the operative bulk and location standards (in light of the nature and scale of activities anticipated by Queenstown Airport’s Aerodrome Designation (Designation D1) and consider combination of statutory and non-statutory methods.

Option 3: Comprehensive review and development of operative bulk and location performance and urban design standards.

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Statutory and non-statutory methods	Option 3: Comprehensive bulk and location development standards and urban design requirements
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The operative policies do not adequately recognise the balance between providing for airport growth and achieving acceptable levels of amenity. • The operative standards do not reflect the bulk and location anticipated at the airport, or in neighbouring zones resulting in loss of comparable development opportunities. • QAC undertakes extensive master and urban planning exercises. There is no reference to, or encouragement of, adherence to these documents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation). • Would result in a change from the status quo – Plan users would need to become familiar with new provisions. • No ability for the Council to enforce non-statutory methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation). • Opens up some parts of the plan which are currently settled. • Providing statutory weight to urban design guidelines would result in a requirement for a plan change each time the guidelines are updated. • Would result in a change from the status quo – Plan users would need to become familiar with new provisions. • Implementing stringent urban design requirements may result in a ‘one size fits all’ approach, and may lead to a lack of diversity in buildings.

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains the established approach which parties are familiar with. • Low cost for Council. • Some provisions of the operative District Plan are working well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-statutory methods encourage creative, site-specific responses. • Opportunity to review and update the methods without entering into a plan change process. • Some provisions of the operative District Plan are working well, but could be improved with further minor amendments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance standards provide certainty and the ability to avoid the resource consent process. • Ability to avoid the resource consent process means potential for reduced financial and time costs, and avoids risk of notification or appeal. • Resource consent process would still apply for developments exceeding performance standards.
Ranking	3	1	2

Option 1 would generally allow the familiarity of users of the zone provisions to remain but would not address the resource management issues identified in Section 6.

Option 2 is recognises that some of the existing provisions are effective, however further amendments and implementation of non-statutory methods could further enhance the zone.

Option 3 would require the implementation of extensive urban design standards which may result in overregulation and would result in a plan change each time the urban design guidelines were amended. QAC undertakes extensive urban design and master planning exercises to identify the best development options for the airport over the longer term. Given their overarching management of the zone due to their role as the primary landowner and requiring authority, Option 3 would result in unnecessary regulation.

Option 2 is considered the most reasonably practicable option for achieving the objectives of the proposed chapter.

10. Scale and Significance Evaluation – Section 32(1)(c)

The level of detailed analysis undertaken for the evaluation of the proposed objectives and provisions has been determined by an assessment of the scale and significance of the implementation of the proposed provisions in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone chapter. In making this assessment, regard has been had to the following, namely whether the objectives and provisions:

- Result in a significant variance from the existing baseline (Section 32(3)).
- Have effects on matters of national importance.
- Adversely affect those with specific interests, e.g., Tangata Whenua.
- Involve effects that have been considered implicitly or explicitly by higher order documents.
- Impose increased costs or restrictions on individuals, communities or businesses.

11. Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32 (1)(b)(ii)

Under section 32 (2)(a) an assessment under section 32(2)(1)(b)(ii) must identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for —

- (i) *economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and*
- (ii) *employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced (section 32(2)(a)).*

With respect to this proposed chapter the following assessments have been commissioned:

- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Economic Assessment (refer **Attachment 3**);
- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Acoustical review of proposed District Plan provisions (**Attachment 4**).
- Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Transportation Assessment (**Attachment 5**)

The necessary assessment of the proposed policies, rules and other methods under sections 32(1)(b)(ii) and (2)(a), is provided below. The policies, rules and other methods that are specific to the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use zone have been assessed for their appropriateness in achieving the proposed objectives for the zone and the overarching Strategic Directions chapter of the proposed plan.

The proposed new policies outlined in this section seek to replace and improve on the operative policies of the District Plan. Many of the methods of the proposed chapter do not significantly depart from those of the operative District Plan.

(See also Table detailing broad options considered in Section 6, above)

Issue 1: Enabling provisions for long term growth and sustainable management of the Airport

Proposed Objective 17.2.1: Queenstown Airport is recognised as a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits

(Strategic Directions Chapter)

Proposed Objective 3.2.1.1 Recognise, develop and sustain the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas as the hubs of New Zealand's premier alpine resorts and the District's economy.

Proposed Objective 3.2.1.2: Recognise, develop and sustain the key local service and employment functions served by commercial centres and industrial areas outside of the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas in the District.

Proposed Objective 3.2.1.5: To maintain and promote the efficient operation of the District's infrastructure, including designated Airports, key roading and communication technology networks.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Enabling opportunities for third party operators to undertake aviation related activities which are anticipated within the Aerodrome Purposes designation.
- Enabling opportunities for activities to establish which are corollary to the primary operational imperatives of the Airport.
- Providing sufficient land to meet the foreseeable future requirements of the Airport, and recognition of the Airport and its associated infrastructure within the District Plan provisions.

Issue 2: Balancing the operational requirements of Queenstown Airport with maintaining residential and visual amenity and "gateway" to the District.

Proposed Objective 17.2.2: Provision for the requirements of Queenstown Airport is balanced with achieving an acceptable level of amenity for those using the airport and for those residing on neighbouring land.

(Strategic Directions Chapter)

Proposed Objective 3.2.3.1: To achieve a built environment that ensures our urban areas are desirable and safe places to live, work and play.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised development standards which reflect the nature, scale and intensity of development with the Aerodrome Designation (Designation D.2) and to the surrounding zone requirements. Promotion of urban design principles. 			
Proposed provisions	Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural Costs	Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural Benefits	Effectiveness, Efficiency & Appropriateness
<p>Policy</p> <p>17.2.1.1</p> <p><i>Provide for those aviation activities necessary to enable Queenstown Airport to operate in a safe and efficient manner.</i></p>	<p>Providing for an increase in land based aviation related activities by third party operators (i.e. not the requiring authority) may result in a perceived acoustic amenity cost for surrounding zones. Marshall Day Acoustics have reviewed the land based noise requirements of the zone to ensure their appropriateness and currency relative to the surrounding zones (Attachment 4). The recommendations of Marshall Day Acoustics have been adopted to mitigate potential noise effects. Aircraft noise would continue to be managed via the Air Noise Boundary designation.</p> <p>Aviation related activities within the zone will continue to be secondary to the operational imperatives of Queenstown Airport. Civil Aviation Authority regulations will also prevail within the zone.</p>	<p>This policy ensures that existing and future aviation activities and infrastructure are recognised and provided for within the District Plan.</p> <p>The assessment prepared by Market Economics (refer Attachment 3) has quantified the contribution the airport makes to the wider economy. Queenstown Airport facilitates tourism spending with a total effect to of between \$592 and \$638m (value added effect) within the Queenstown Lakes District, sustaining in the order of 14,885 to 15,948 jobs. Specific provision for aviation activities within the zone therefore reinforces the significance of Queenstown Airport as a significant contributor to the local and regional economy, which, inherently provides for the social wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>The clarity provided by the specific provision of aviation activities also reduces the opportunity costs of uncertainty in the regulatory environment. The policy provides certainty for aviation activities to be undertaken by parties who cannot currently rely upon the requiring authority's Aerodrome Purposes designation (Designation D.1) or the operative District Plan provisions to operate (with respect to the current Rural</p>	<p>The policy is effective in achieving the objective as it recognises that the Airport is a key physical resource that requires flexibility to develop and grow to meet passenger growth demands in a safe and efficient manner.</p> <p>The policy is an efficient means of implementing the objectives, providing for an organised and holistic approach for utilising the Airport as a physical resource, without undue regulation.</p> <p>The policy is appropriate for achieving proposed Objectives 6.3.1 and 3.2.15.</p>

		General Zoning – refer to Policy 6.3.1.3 below).	
<p>Policy</p> <p>17.2.1.2</p> <p><i>Provide for a range of airport related service, business, industrial and commercial activity to support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.</i></p>	<p>Economic costs could result from an oversupply of commercial and/or industrial opportunities within the wider Frankton Flats area. Given the aviation focus of the zone, and the limited supply of land available for aviation related activities, only those activities that are ancillary to and require or significantly benefit from an airport location are anticipated within the zone, with oversight of the QAC as the primary landowner as to their appropriateness in meeting the demands of the Airport.</p> <p>The inclusion of permitted airport related activities (including industry, commercial activities, , office accommodation and land transport facilities) which previously had some level of control within the operative District Plan have the potential to give rise to acoustic and reverse sensitivity effects both within and beyond the zone. Marshall Day Acoustics have reviewed the land based noise requirements of the zone to ensure their appropriateness and currency relative to the surrounding zones (Attachment 4). The recommendations of Marshall Day Acoustics have been adopted to mitigate potential noise effects. Aircraft noise would continue to be managed via the Air Noise Boundary designation.</p> <p>In terms of effects on the transportation network, Carriageway Consulting have undertaken a transportation assessment for the proposed chapter (Attachment 5).</p>	<p>This policy enables those activities which complement the efficient operation of Queenstown Airport.</p> <p>Modern airports demand a diverse range of activities to provide for their efficient operation. This policy establishes the framework for methods to meet this demand by providing for new support and complementary activities previously not provided for within the zone, including farming, visitor accommodation, commercial activities and industry. Such activities would be corollary to the primary functioning of the Airport.</p> <p>Permitting activities which support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport creates economic efficiencies through the removal of unnecessary consenting requirements. This also provides certainty for ancillary activities which support or complement the efficient operation of Queenstown Airport whom cannot rely upon the requiring authority’s Aerodrome Purposes designation to operate. The report prepared by Market Economics (Attachment 3) sets out opportunity cost associated with uncertainty. This analysis revealed that economic value (value added) of a year’s delay is \$53.4m and 780 jobs-years.</p> <p>Market Economics have set out a notional development scenario of land use activities within the revised zone extent, based on the</p>	<p>This policy will be effective in achieving the objective as it provides for those activities that contribute to the successful functioning of the airport, and benefit from an airport location.</p> <p>The policy is efficient as it will enable a range of airport related activities to establish as permitted activities within the Queenstown Airport zone. This will assist the growth and development of the airport as a whole which will further realise the benefits associated with the Airport.</p> <p>The policy is the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.</p>

	<p>Carriageway Consulting considers that the requirement for activities to be aviation related, or to complement the functioning of the airport, means that the extent of any additional traffic generation will be limited. This is compared to the existing baseline established by the operative District Plan provisions.</p>	<p>types and ratios of activities occurring at airports throughout New Zealand. The economic contribution (impacts and flow on effects) of enabling the activities outlined was estimated at \$53.4m (VA), supporting approximately 780 jobs (refer to Attachment 3). Provision for ancillary and complementary activities will therefore contribute to economic and social wellbeing of the community, creating both direct and indirect employment opportunities.</p>	
<p>Policy</p> <p>17.2.1.3</p> <p><i>Zone sufficient land to meet the foreseeable future requirements of activities that support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.</i></p> <p>District Planning Maps – Proposed amendments to Planning Maps 31 and 33 to rezone the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Land within the Aerodrome Designation currently zoned Rural General will be rezoned Queenstown Airport Mixed Use. There will not be any loss of agricultural opportunities, as farming will continue to be provided for as an activity which is ancillary to the efficient functioning of Queenstown Airport (i.e. maintenance and use of vacant land resource).</p> <p>The provision of additional land for development of aviation related or complementary activities may have effects on the provision of services, both utilities and roading. Both the NZ Transport Agency (as the road controlling authority for State Highway 6), and the Queenstown Lakes District Council (as the provider of local roads and three waters infrastructure) are currently investigating the capacity of these networks, with the intent for future upgrades.</p> <p>While the effects of the proposed chapter on these services is difficult to quantify at this stage, it is anticipated that development contributions and rates obtained from</p>	<p>The areas proposed to be rezoned (Attachment 6) represent the logical expansion of the zone, being entirely consistent with the extent of the Aerodrome Purposes designation which provides for Aerodrome activities, including both operational and landside facilities.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning will provide recognition of Queenstown Airport and its associated infrastructure on Frankton Flats, and protect its future development and use as a strategic transportation and economic hub.</p> <p>The assessment prepared by Market Economics (refer Attachment 3) has determined that the potential economic contribution from the proposed rezoning is in the order of approximately \$53.4m (value added), supporting approximately 780 jobs. These economic and employment opportunities cannot be realised without appropriate zoning of this land. Such economic benefits will also have inherent social benefits in terms of household incomes.</p>	<p>The policy and associated changes to the District Plan maps address an identified need to provide additional capability for airport related activities to establish within the wider Airport environs. This will be effective in sustaining and enhancing growth at Queenstown Airport, which is vital to the District's tourism industry.</p> <p>The changes will also result in economic efficiencies, whereby the regulatory framework will anticipate such aviation and aviation related activities within the zone (as opposed to the Rural General Zone). Additional efficiencies will accrue from the consistency in the Aerodrome Designation and zone extent.</p> <p>The new policy is the most appropriate for achieving the objective.</p>

	<p>activities occurring within the zone would provide for new and ongoing maintenance and repair of such assets. It is noted that operational imperatives will mean less than 20% of the proposed zone could be used for landside activities, with obstacle limitation surfaces further reducing the ability of this land to be developed. Further, the proposed chapter does not deviate significantly from the existing level of development that is anticipated via the Aerodrome Purposes designation. This is confirmed in the assessment prepared by Carriageway Consulting (refer Attachment 5).</p> <p>Enabling larger areas of land to be developed for land use activities may result in an increase in noise effects from land based activities. The acoustic effects with respect to the proposed zone are discussed with respect to Policy 6.3.1.1 and 6.3.1.2, please refer above and Attachment 4.</p>	<p>Market Economic have also identified that additional economic benefits will accrue from the investment certainty created by the proposed rezoning (Attachment 3). Significant investment certainty arising from the clarity of the proposed provisions is valued at between \$41.8m and \$172m across six different development delay scenarios.</p> <p>As set out by Market Economics (refer to Attachment 3), Queenstown Airport is experiencing rapid passenger growth, with passenger numbers projected to rise from 1.25m the year ending June 2014 to 1.78m by 2025 and 2.57m by 2037. Based on Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment tourism forecasts and passenger growth rates, total tourism spending in projected to increase by between 3.4 and 3.9 percent per annum. This is expected to take the total tourism spending facilitated by Queenstown Airport to between \$1.1bn and \$1.4bn.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning will therefore provide for the long term needs of Queenstown Airport in responding to such passenger and tourism spending growth, providing for the economic wellbeing of the community.</p>	
<p>Policy 17.2.2.1 <i>Maintain Queenstown Airport as a memorable and attractive gateway to</i></p>	<p>There may be additional construction costs arising from the implementation of this policy, via the requirement for quality urban design principles to be adopted throughout the entire zone.</p>	<p>Queenstown Airport accommodated 1.25m passenger movements to year ending June 2014. With these numbers forecast to grow significantly by 2025 (1.78m), this policy recognises the significant role of the Airport in providing a memorable gateway to the District.</p>	<p>The proposed policy is effective in providing clear guidance to plan users and decision makers that the zone is to be developed to a high standard in order to provide an iconic and memorable first and lasting impression of the District.</p> <p>This proposed policy is considered to be</p>

<p><i>the District.</i></p>		<p>The Airport is a key gateway into the District and a high level of external amenity and visual coherence in terms of development must be maintained. In this regard, development standards with respect to building design, coverage, and height are proposed to control the visual amenity effects from beyond the zone boundary. Additional standards around signage and landscaping are also proposed along the public interface with the zone.</p> <p>This policy will also beneficial environmental and social outcomes, through the management of adverse amenity effects.</p>	<p>efficient in terms of District Plan administration through providing clear guidance of the expected environmental outcomes for the zone.</p> <p>The proposed policy has been assessed the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Policy</p> <p>17.2.2.2</p> <p><i>Manage adverse effects on amenity values arising from the on-going development, use and maintenance of Queenstown Airport.</i></p>	<p>There costs of including this new policy are similar to those discussed under the costs of Policy 6.3.2.1, please refer above.</p> <p>This policy may also give rise to amenity effects both within and beyond the zone. As discussed in relation to Policy 6.3.2.1, development standards have been adopted to manage these effects. This is also set out in the vision statement of the QAC, which seeks to “<i>Seize the challenge to make Queenstown easy to get to, with an airport experience that leaves a wonderful first and last impression</i>” (Attachment 2).</p>	<p>This policy is proposed to facilitate development in the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone that accords with best practice urban design principles, maintains the amenity of the zone.</p> <p>This policy recognises that in some instances however, there are functional and operational imperatives of the airport that necessitate a certain approach to the built form and function. These may be somewhat utilitarian in appearance, however with good urban design, the effects can be minimised and contained within the zone. In this regard QAC undertakes extensive urban design and master planning exercises which set out the development framework to balance the operational requirements of the Airport with the amenity of the key gateway to the District. As the primary landowner within the zone, it has been determined that QAC can exercise a degree of control, ensuring the built form is consistent with its long term vision and</p>	<p>The proposed policy gives effect to the objective through clear recognition that amenity values within the zone will need to be balanced with the functional requirements of the airport.</p> <p>This policy is effectively complemented by Policy 17.2.2.1 which seeks to maintain Queenstown Airport as a memorable gateway to the District. External amenity values will therefore be protected as far as possible via Policy 17.2.2.1, while this policy seeks to recognise that internal amenity values may be somewhat constrained by functional or technical requirements of airport, or aviation related operations.</p> <p>The policy will assist the efficient development, use and maintenance of Queenstown Airport.</p> <p>The efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed policy will assist in achieving the</p>

		operational requirements. Non statutory methods will further encourage an appropriate balance between managing amenity effects and the built form of the Airport.	proposed objective. The proposed policy has been assessed the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.
<p>Policy</p> <p>17.2.2.3</p> <p><i>Avoid the establishment of activities that are incompatible with the ongoing operation and functioning of Queenstown Airport.</i></p>	<p>This policy sets out the framework to retain the prohibited activity status for incompatible activities which are currently prohibited within the operative District Plan. No significant costs have therefore been identified.</p>	<p>Incompatible land use activities which have the potential to adversely affect the long term sustainable use and development of the airport will be prevented from establishing with the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. This is consistent with the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>In preventing the establishment of sensitive activities within the zone (such as residential activities), this policy will also protect the health and safety and wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>Associated methods seek to retain the prohibited activity status for many activities which are currently prohibited in the operative District Plan. Minor drafting amendments have consolidated the list to reflect how the activities are defined.</p>	<p>These provisions will be effective in limiting the development of activities that are incompatible or conflict with airport operations. This will assist to protect the ongoing operation of the airport and sustainably manage its future growth.</p> <p>The proposed policy has been assessed the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Activity 17.4.1</p> <p><i>Any airport activity or airport related activity or farming activity which complies with all the relevant rules in section 6.5 shall be Permitted Activity.</i></p>	<p>The costs and effects of retaining (and slightly amending) this operative District Plan rule are similar to those discussed under the costs of Policy 17.2.2.2, please refer above.</p>	<p>The benefits of retaining (and slightly amending) this operative District Plan rule are similar to those discussed under the benefits of Policy 6.3.1.2, please refer above.</p> <p>In addition to the benefits outlined with respect to Policies 6.3.1.1 and 6.3.1.2, these methods complement QAC's mission statement as set out in the Statement of Intent 2015-2017 which seeks "to provide airport and related facilities in the district and</p>	<p>The retention of the operative rule is considered to be an efficient and effective means to give effect to the objectives.</p> <p>The inclusion of additional activities previously not permitted in the zone is effective at implementing the objective, but is also generally more consistent with enabling the range of activities currently occurring and provided for within the Aerodrome Designation. This structure creates</p>

		<p><i>meet the growing needs for airport services to the Lakes District, to the highest quality in an economically sustainable manner and in the best interests of the community” (Attachment 2).</i></p>	<p>consistency and efficiency between the designation and the zone provisions.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Activity</p> <p>17.4.2</p> <p><i>Any non-airport related activity which is not listed as Prohibited, with Council’s discretion restricted to:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>Design, external appearance and siting of buildings and structures;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Traffic generation, vehicle parking, site access and servicing, including provision for an integrated transport assessment;</i></p> <p>(c) <i>Landscaping and screening of any outdoor storage;</i></p> <p>(d) <i>The extent to which the activity benefits from an Airport location.</i></p>	<p>This rule creates potential opportunity cost of uncertainty for activities that want to establish within the zone, but are not directly airport related.</p>	<p>This rule enables Council to retain some discretion around the necessity or otherwise of activities establishing in an Airport locale that are not entirely dependent or reliant on an Airport location.</p> <p>The matters of discretion provide an ability for the Council to consider the potential environmental and economic effects of the activity.</p>	<p>The rule is effective in recognising that there may be activities that are not dependent upon an Airport location, however contribute positively to the economic hub of the Airport.</p> <p>The rule is efficient as it retains a level of control which will enable more detailed consideration of the wider impacts of non-airport related activities establishing within the zone.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>

<p>Rules</p> <p>17.4.3 to 17.4.9 (inclusive)</p> <p><i>Forestry, Factory Farming, Mining Activities, Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act, Residential Activities, Community Activities, Day Care Facilities</i></p>	<p>This rule seeks to retain the prohibited activity status for many activities which are currently prohibited within the operative District Plan. There costs of retaining these rules are similar to those discussed under the costs of Policy 6.3.2.3, please refer above.</p>	<p>This rules seeks to retain the prohibited activity status for many activities which are currently prohibited in the operative District Plan. Minor drafting amendments have consolidated the list.</p> <p>The benefits of including this new policy are similar to those discussed under the costs of Policy 6.3.2.3, please refer above.</p>	<p>This rule is an effective and efficient and is continues to prohibit the establishment of incompatible land use activities within the zone.</p> <p>This approach will continue to secure the operational and functional requirements of the airport by avoiding the establishment of incompatible land use activities within close proximity to the Airport, and is therefore considered the most appropriate means of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Rule</p> <p>17.5.1</p> <p>Site coverage</p>	<p>No significant costs have been identified.</p>	<p>The currently operative maximum building coverage requirements have been retained.</p> <p>The benefits of including this rule are similar to those discussed under the benefits of amending Policies 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2, please refer above.</p>	<p>Operational requirements result in a large areas of the zone being free from development. This site coverage provides for the efficient use of land where operational constraints allow.</p> <p>The retention of the site coverage standard provides an appropriate balance between retaining amenity and providing sufficient land for airport and airport related activities within the zone.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Rule</p> <p>17.5.2</p> <p>Minimum Building Setback</p>	<p>Amending the operative setback of buildings from adjacent residential zones from 10m to 5m, other adjacent zones from 10m to 3m) and from adjacent roads from 6m to 5m will result in buildings being located closer to property boundaries. These effects will be limited however, by</p>	<p>Amending the operative setback requirements will enable greater development opportunities and use of a limited land resource.</p> <p>Additional benefits of retaining this standard are also similar to those discussed under the</p>	<p>This standard is clear and easily interpreted and is an efficient method for managing the effects of buildings and in particular the effects on streetscape and adjoining activities.</p> <p>This rule will be effective in providing</p>

	<p>building height controls, which will further be restricted by the obstacle limitation surface.</p> <p>The rule creates a restriction on the use of sites at the interface with adjacent zones. Where a development does not achieve the setbacks, resource consent will be required for a discretionary activity. It is considered that the costs associated with this rule are minor, and are outweighed by the benefits.</p>	<p>benefits of amending Policies 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2, please refer above.</p> <p>The proposed setback standard will also result in built outcomes that are consistent with adjoining zones, noting that Remarkables Park Zone has a 1.5m building setback, and the adjacent Frankton Flats (B) Activity Area D has no side or rear boundary setbacks, with setbacks within this area only applying where a boundary adjoins the Rural General zone or a road boundary. Note, the establishment of buildings within these zones however is subject to a controlled activity consent.</p>	<p>management of the siting of buildings along the boundary of the zone.</p> <p>The setback requirement coupled with other building and urban design controls will ensure that the effects on amenity values are appropriately managed.</p> <p>The proposed will assist in achieving the objectives and is considered appropriate for managing the effects of built development along the interface of the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone with adjacent zones.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Rule</p> <p>17.5.3</p> <p>Maximum Building Height</p>	<p>Increasing the maximum permitted building height may result in shading effects in some areas. The height may also impinge of vistas towards the Remarkables.</p> <p>The actual building height throughout much of the zone will be significantly less than the 12m proposed due to the presence of the obstacle limitation surface. These surfaces limit the construction of any structure or facility which may inhibit the safe and efficient operation of Queenstown Airport. This includes plant and machinery that may be required during construction.</p>	<p>These proposed provisions establish a revised maximum building height from 9m to 12m. These height limits increase the permitted height from the status quo. This will result in benefits in terms of the efficient use of the site, where the obstacle limitation surface enables.</p> <p>The building height has also been evaluated in context of surrounding land uses. The height limits are consistent with those permitted within Activity Area 5 of the adjacent Remarkables Park Zone. Permitted buildings to a height of 12m is consistent with the current and future level of development in the Frankton area.</p>	<p>Height limits are an effective tool for managing the effects of built development while providing for the efficient use of land.</p> <p>The proposed provisions are effective in maximising the efficient use of the land while managing the effects of this use.</p> <p>Taking into account efficiency and effectiveness of this provision, the rule is considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Rule</p> <p>17.5.4</p>	<p>The requirement to provide minimum site landscaping of 10% has been removed. The minimum landscaping strip depth of 4m has also been reduced to 3m. This could</p>	<p>These rules are largely consistent with the requirements of the Operative District Plan, with minor amendments proposed.</p> <p>Landscaping, other than well maintained</p>	<p>Providing minimum landscaping requirements is an effective tool for managing the effects of built development.</p>

Landscaping	potentially result in the establishment of larger areas of impermeable space, with an overall reduction in landscaped area and amenity.	<p>grass, is often inappropriate at airports for operational and safety reasons. The removal of the 10% landscaping requirement provides recognition of this. The urban design guidelines prepared and implemented by the QAC will identify areas where high quality landscaping is appropriate.</p> <p>It is important to provide well landscaped areas along the roading interface of the Airport and Lucas Place and Hawthorne Drive. The proposed 1m reduction in the average landscaping strip width will enable greater development opportunities near these boundaries, whilst maintaining the amenity along these road frontages.</p>	<p>The proposed provisions are effective in maximising the efficient use of the land while maintaining a level of amenity within the zone.</p> <p>The revised landscaping standards provide an appropriate balance between the operational requirements of the Airport and the visual amenity of the zone. The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
Rule 17.5.5 Building Design and Glare	No significant costs have been identified.	<p>Amendments to the rule are proposed to create clarity and certainty for plan users. Some elements of the operative rule have also been deleted for clarity.</p> <p>The benefits of including this new standard is similar to those discussed under the benefits of Policy 6.3.2.1, please refer above. The reflectivity standards proposed are also in line with Environment Court recommendations with regards to building reflectivity in the vicinity of Queenstown Airport.</p>	<p>Minimum standards are an effective tool at managing adverse glare and lighting effects.</p> <p>The rules create efficiencies in the District Plan by focusing of the key areas of glare and lighting that require management in the context of an airport setting. Avoiding over prescriptive lighting requirements will ensure the Airport can response to any changes in operational and/or health and safety requirements without the need for plan change.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
Rule 17.5.6 Maximum Noise –	Enabling longer operational hours for land based activities within the zone may impact on amenity of nearby residential properties. Marshall Day Acoustics have provided recommended land based noise limits for	The adoption of these noise standards is intended to ensure that an appropriate level of acoustic amenity is maintained for those using land and residing on land within the adjacent zone, including for the owners and	<p>This rule is effective in managing adverse noise effects that may arise from new activities establishing within the zone.</p> <p>This standard will enable the efficient use of</p>

Land Activities	Based the zone (Attachment 4) to mitigate these effects. These recommendations have been adopted.	occupiers of adjacent land. Marshall Day Acoustics (Attachment 4) have reviewed the land based noise limits for consistency and currency with surrounding zones and the operational hours of Queenstown Airport. The revised rules provide for airport related activities which service the airport.	the zone through the specific management of land based noise effects. It is considered appropriate to facilitate land use activities within the zone, by appropriately managing noise effects. The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.
Rule HSNO	No significant costs have been identified.	Hazardous substances are regulated under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. In addition to this Act, the Civil Aviation Authority sets out regulations around the storage and use of such substances within Airport Environs. The Regional Plan: Waste also sets out rules and regulations around the management and use of hazardous substances. The proposed rule creates economic efficiencies by avoiding unnecessary duplication of controls provided for under other statutes and regulations.	The rule is both effective and efficient at providing for aviation related activities, whilst avoiding undue regulation which is provided for by other means. The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.
Rule 17.5.8 Visitor Accommodation	Marshall Day Acoustics have identified that reverse sensitivity and adverse noise effects would need to be adequately managed within the zone in order to accommodate visitor accommodation (Attachment 4). Acoustic insulation building design and operational parameters are proposed to manage these effects. The acoustic insulation standards are proposed to address these matters. With respect to operational parameters, the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone	Provision for short term visitor accommodation within the zone will create efficiencies and conveniences for airport passengers. Typically such people would expect and be sympathetic to a degree of noise from the airport. Acoustic insulation requirements are still considered necessary however, to meet a satisfactory internal noise environment.	The standard is considered to be an effective means of mitigating reverse sensitivity effects associated with visitor accommodation within the zone. The rule is efficient as it sets out the minimum requirements for Visitor Accommodation. Additional operational restrictions on such activities can also be implemented by QAC (as the primary landowner within the zone), who will maintain a degree of control over such uses via either direct ownership or lease

	<p>primarily includes land owned by or designated for QAC, therefore QAC can exercise a degree of control around the construction, management and location of such facilities. Notwithstanding this, it is anticipated that visitor accommodation within this zone would only provide for short term stays, primarily for people in transit.</p> <p>There are financial costs associated with adhering to this provision (noise insulation) which will be borne by the developer. This is considered appropriate.</p>		<p>arrangements. It is not efficient to duplicate those management requirements here.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
Minimum Car Parking	No significant costs have been identified.	<p>Car parking requirements in and around airports involves a set of unique considerations, in that many of the visitors to the airport utilise public transport, taxis or shuttles to reach the airport. Applying district wide rules to activities associated with the airport terminal building facilities would therefore likely result in an oversupply of parking and an inefficient use of the land resource.</p> <p>With the exception of activities undertaken with the airport terminal building, car parking is proposed to be in accordance with the District Wide Transportation rules. The assessment completed by Carriageway Consulting (Attachment 5) has confirmed that this approach is appropriate.</p>	<p>This rule is effective as it recognises the unique parking requirements of Airport. It also provides for the efficient use of Airport land.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
Signs	<p>This rule potentially enables a proliferation of signage throughout the zone, impacting on the amenity of the District's Gateway.</p> <p>As outlined in relation to Policies 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2, QAC and QLDC are aware that</p>	The Queenstown Airport has functional and operational imperatives that necessitate a certain degree of signage. This rule recognises these requirements and provides for signage as a permitted activity where the effects of are internalised within the zone.	The rule is effective at achieving the objective as it recognises the unique signage requirements of the Airport, whilst maintaining amenity beyond the zone boundary.

	<p>the Airport is a key gateway into the District. This is managed via the retention of District Wide signage provisions within 20m of the boundary.</p>	<p>This creates economic efficiencies through the removal of consent requirements for signage within the zone where the effects are internalised and managed by QAC.</p> <p>The amenity effects associated with signage at Airports are unique in that visitors are often unfamiliar with the surroundings, therefore require an additional level of instructional and directional signage. This rule also provides for these circumstances, yet maintains amenity beyond the zone by applying the District Wide signage rules where a sign is located within 20m of the zone boundary.</p>	<p>The rule is efficient as it removes undue consent requirements, particularly where the effects of the activity are internal to the site.</p> <p>The rule is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Non Regulatory Methods</p> <p>17.7.1</p> <p>17.7.2</p> <p>17.7.3</p>	<p>Costs associated with complying with the urban design requirements.</p>	<p>These provisions further enable Queenstown Airport to be a vibrant gateway to the District.</p> <p>The use of non-regulatory urban design methods will influence the amenity of the zone. QAC undertakes extensive urban design and master planning exercises which will be used to create a built form and character which maintains the Airport and its surrounds as an attractive gateway to the District. This approach encourages diversity in form and function, without undue regulatory constraints.</p> <p>The urban design guidelines prepared by QAC will be applicable for the entire zone.</p>	<p>These provisions are effective and efficient as they give effect to the various objectives by placing appropriate controls on Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone activities, whilst continuing to enable the establishment of a diverse range of activities.</p> <p>The non-statutory methods enable high quality urban design to be implemented within the zone, without creating an overly prescriptive “one size fits all” approach to land use development. This is considered to be an effective and efficient method to achieving positive amenity and visual outlook outcomes, with QAC regulating its implementation.</p> <p>The method is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>

<p>Non-notification of applications</p> <p>17.6</p>	<p>Costs associated with the affected parties not being involved in the consent process.</p>	<p>This rule provides for the non-notification of resource consent applications within the zone.</p> <p>This creates economic efficiencies through the avoidance of consent delays. All activities which cannot achieve the permitted activity requirements default to a fully discretionary activity, therefore decision makers have the ability to decline consent should the effects be considered too great.</p>	<p>This provision is considered effective as it provides certainty around notification, however does not preclude the decision makers consideration of effects on other parties.</p> <p>The rule is efficient in that it removes potential delays in the consenting process.</p> <p>The method is considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Proposed Definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airport Activity • Airport related activity • Critical Listening Environment • Hangar • Indoor Design Sound Level • Landside • Outer Control Boundary 	<p>No significant costs have been identified.</p>	<p>The new definitions are considered necessary to ensure consistent interpretation of the objectives, policies and rules of the draft chapter.</p> <p>With the exemption of airport activity and related activity, the definitions include those that have been through a recent and rigorous Environment Court process, and are considered to be the most appropriate means to describe nature of the activities occurring in and around Queenstown Airport.</p> <p>With respect to airport and airport related activities, the definition provides clear direction as to the types and range of activities that are permissible within the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. The activities are generally consistent with those provided by the Aerodrome designation.</p>	<p>The proposed definitions will assist with the efficient administration of the District Plan by clearly defining the activities to which they relate. It will be effective in determining the activity status of an activity.</p> <p>The definitions have been largely set out by the Environment Court, and are therefore considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>The provision is therefore considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the objective.</p>

12. Efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions

The above provisions are drafted to specifically address the resource management issues identified with the current provisions, and to enhance those provisions that already function well. A number of areas of the existing chapter have been removed to aid the readability of the Plan by keeping the provisions at a minimum, whilst still retaining adequate protection for the resource. The overlying Aerodrome Designation sets out a second and more onerous level control for land use activities within this zone, ensuring the airport meets Civil Aviation regulations.

By simplifying the objectives, policies and rules (the provisions), the subject matter becomes easier to understand for users of the Plan both as applicant and processing planner. Removal of technical or confusing wording, also encourages correct use. With easier understanding, the provisions create a more efficient consent process by reducing the number of consents required and by expediting the processing of those consents. Activities within this zone will continue to require QAC approval in accordance with Section 176(1)(b) of the RMA.

13. The risk of not acting

Section 32(2)(c) of the Act requires, in the evaluation of the proposed policies and methods, the consideration of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter. of the policies, rules or other methods.

The risk of not acting in this case is the stifling of growth at Queenstown Airport as a result of the existing Plan provisions and zoning extent not protecting the Airport as a key physical resource or providing for its future growth. This would result in significant opportunity costs and delays for future business and employment opportunities for the community.

As noted above, the report prepared by Market Economics Limited has identified the significant role of Queenstown Airport in facilitating the future growth and prosperity of the Queenstown Lakes District and the local and regional economy. While the revised District Plan provisions do not differ significantly from the currently operative District Plan, they provide greater certainty in the types of activities anticipated by the QLDC in this area. The value added to the economy cannot be realised within the partial rezoning of land within this area

It is noted that under the status quo option, or by “not acting”, resource consents would be required for a number of activities at Queenstown Airport which could hinder or delay possible development opportunities. Resource consents within the currently rural general zoned land could be difficult to obtain under the objective and policy framework of the Rural General Zone. It is concluded that the revised chapter is necessary, as the risk of not acting would not address the need for Queenstown Airport’s landholdings to be zoned for airport related purposes.

Overall, the risk of not acting would be of far greater consequence than the risk of acting.

14. References

Attachment 1 - Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 Assessment - [Link](#)

Attachment 2 - Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited Statement of Intent 2015-2017 - [Link](#)

Attachment 3 - Queenstown Airport: Mixed Used Zone Economic Assessment, November 2014 - [Link](#)

Attachment 4 - QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE Acoustical review of proposed District Plan provisions - [Link](#)

Attachment 5 - Review of Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone, Carriageway Consulting - [Link](#)

Attachment 6 - Proposed Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone Extension - [Link](#)

ATTACHMENT 4

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE
Acoustical review of proposed District Plan provisions
Rp 001 R01 2014513A

19 November 2014



Project: **QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED USE ZONE**

Report No.: **Rp 001 2014513A**

Disclaimer

Reports produced by Marshall Day Acoustics Limited are prepared based on the Client's objective and are based on a specific scope, conditions and limitations, as agreed between Marshall Day Acoustics and the Client. Information and/or report(s) prepared by Marshall Day Acoustics may not be suitable for uses other than the original intended objective. No parties other than the Client should use any information and/or report(s) without first conferring with Marshall Day Acoustics.

Copyright

The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Marshall Day Acoustics Limited. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Marshall Day Acoustics constitutes an infringement of copyright. Information shall not be assigned to a third party without prior consent.

Document control

Status:	Rev:	Comments	Date:	Author:	Reviewer:
Client Draft			28 October 2014	Steve Peakall	
Issued	R01		19 November 2014	Steve Peakall	Christopher Day

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 4

2.0 CURRENT NOISE PROVISIONS 4

2.1 Activity Status 4

2.2 General Noise Limits 4

2.3 Construction Noise 5

2.4 Exclusions 5

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS 5

3.1 Visitor Accommodation 5

3.2 General Noise Limits 6

4.0 CONCLUSION 7

APPENDIX A GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY

APPENDIX B EXISTING QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED-USE ZONE RULES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Marshall Day Acoustics (MDA) has been engaged to provide advice on the appropriateness of the noise rules in the Operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan Queenstown Airport Mixed-Use Zone (MUAZ).

The rules are to be reviewed as part of the overall Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) District Plan Review. MDA has been asked to evaluate whether the existing rules need to be updated. In addition to this MDA has been asked to provide comment on whether visitor accommodation is an appropriate land use in this zone.

This report details the potential issues that may arise should the rules remain unchanged and proposes revised noise rules where appropriate. The review of the airport designation and provisions relating to the airport noise boundaries is outside the scope of this report.

A glossary of technical terminology is provided in Appendix A, and the existing MUAZ rules are shown in Appendix B.

2.0 CURRENT NOISE PROVISIONS

In summary there are two noise related issues that relate to the MUAZ rules as they currently apply in the Operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan. Each of these is discussed below.

2.1 Activity Status

The current rules state that most types of activities sensitive to aircraft noise (ASANs) are prohibited in the MUAZ. This is considered generally appropriate. One of the reasons for this is defined in the zone purpose of the MUAZ (paragraph 6.2.1) which states that the zone is “*characterised by airport related activities necessary for the transport interface role of Queenstown Airport, but which do not strictly achieve the purpose of the Aerodrome Designation*”.

This definition therefore inherently suggests that most noise sensitive activities, particularly residential, are not intended for the zone and do not achieve the desired zone outcomes as they are not ‘airport related’.

However, as the definition also states, airport related activities should be allowed to establish and these are often activities that produce some noise emissions themselves. Examples of these kinds of activities would be retail outlets, cafes, restaurants, car hire companies and associated vehicle maintenance facilities. These activities complement the efficient operation of the airport. Another example of an activity that may be considered airport related is visitor accommodation.

The intent of the rules as they are written should generally still apply, in that most types of ASANs should remain prohibited activities. The one exception to this would be visitor accommodation. This is discussed further in section 3.1.

2.2 General Noise Limits

Rule 6.2.5.2 (iv) (a) provides the zone noise rules that apply. It is important to note that these relate to general activities that occur in the zone, and not to aircraft operations. We note however that based on the provisions of Plan Change 35 (PC35), these would also

currently apply to any planned engine testing activity that occurs in the zone. Unplanned engine testing would be exempt from noise limits. Generally speaking the noise rules are similar to those that apply elsewhere in the District, and are consistent with the general noise rules that apply at other airport zones throughout New Zealand.

Overall, the noise limits apply to noise emissions from *non-residential* activities occurring in the zone, as they affect adjacent *residential* activities in other zones. There are currently no noise rules relating to noise emissions affecting activities *within* the zone.

The rules contain daytime and night-time noise limits for noise emissions, with a maximum noise level control also applying at night, to control potential sleep disturbance effects.

The noise rules are similar to the QLDC residential zone noise rules, except that the numerical noise limits applicable to MUAZ noise emissions are 5 dB less stringent. However the numerical noise limits are consistent with those permitted in the adjacent Remarkables Park Zone.

In general the noise limits are appropriate. However, a number of minor modifications are recommended to ensure consistency with other chapters of the District Plan, and to ensure that activities allowed to establish in the zone can operate efficiently, and at the same time, not have undue adverse noise effects on the surrounding community. These are discussed in section 3.2 below.

2.3 Construction Noise

Rule 6.2.5.2 (iv) (b) refers to construction noise and its control. In our opinion this rule is appropriate and can be retained.

2.4 Exclusions

Rule 6.2.5.2 (iv) (c) sets out the activities that are not included in the MUAZ noise rule controls. In summary these are the airport itself, windfarms and helicopter landing areas associated with the airport. This rule is also still appropriate and can be retained.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Visitor Accommodation

As discussed above, it is considered appropriate in this case to define visitor accommodation as an activity that can establish in the zone.

One reason for this is that the intent of the zone is to provide airport related activities. Visitor accommodation is one activity that can be considered airport related.

That is, the provision of visitor accommodation can be considered an airport related activity because people may wish to stay near the airport if they have an early morning flight, or want to take the opportunity to stay after initially arriving in Queenstown. The provision of such an activity may better suit some people's travel itineraries than having to stay off site.

It is noted that there is a recent trend for airport based visitor accommodation to establish in New Zealand for this reason, one example being Auckland.

Should visitor accommodation be allowed to establish in the MUAZ, then reverse sensitivity issues and adverse noise effects would need to be properly addressed through updates to the zone rules.

In terms of reverse sensitivity, it is the opinion of MDA that this can be adequately managed by ensuring that no long term accommodation is provided for, such as residential accommodation. The reasons for this are that generally speaking visitor accommodation in the MUAZ would be:

- Used by people for short term stays, unlikely to exceed a day or two in duration
- There would be minimal expectation for outside space to be provided; the main use of visitor accommodation would be for people in transit, at the beginning or end of a vacation and therefore not explicitly on holiday in the MUAZ
- Typically people using such accommodation would also be using the airport services so may generally expect and be sympathetic to a degree of impact by the airport.

Nevertheless, because the MUAZ is still adversely affected by airport noise, and visitor accommodation is a type of ASAN, then any developments would need to be fitted with sound insulation to endure a satisfactory internal noise environment is achieved.

It is recommended therefore that the MUAZ rules include reference to an appropriate internal design sound level.

It is the opinion of MDA that an appropriate design sound level for visitor accommodation would be an internal sound level of 40 dB L_{dn} , applicable to any rooms where people stay. This would not be required for any rooms used for commercial activity associated with the management of visitor accommodation.

The text of such a sound insulation rule should be consistent with drafting confirmed by the Environment Court in its third interim decision on Plan Change 35, specifically Rule 7.5.5.3(vi) of the Residential Zone. Reference to Appendix 13 (as confirmed by the Environment Court in its third interim decision) which specifies the sound insulation requirements for ASANS inside the airport noise control boundaries should also be made.

In terms of residential accommodation, it is noted that sound insulation does not deal with the outdoor noise environment. New Zealanders in general, enjoy an 'outdoor' type of lifestyle that includes activities such as barbecues, gardening and entertaining friends and family. As a result an unsatisfactory external noise environment is a potential source of residential complaint with demands to reduce noise, potentially affecting airport operations.

In our opinion, minimising the number of people affected by airport noise by restricting residential development is an appropriate form of land use planning inside the MUAZ. These external noise environment issues would not occur with visitor accommodation inside the MUAZ.

When consideration is given to the above, visitor accommodation could be allowed in the MUAZ. However because residential activity is a different type of ASAN, this should remain prohibited.

3.2 General Noise Limits

As discussed in section 2.2 above, it is considered appropriate that the general noise controls be retained, but with some minor amendments.

The proposed text revisions for the rule are provided below:

“Sound from activities measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within any Residential Zone, the notional boundary in the Rural Zone, or at any point within Activity Areas 1, 3, 4, 6 and 8 of the Remarkables Park Zone:

<i>daytime</i>	<i>(0700 to 2200 hrs)</i>	<i>55 dB L_{Aeq}(15 min)</i>
<i>night-time</i>	<i>(2200 to 0700 hrs)</i>	<i>45 dB L_{Aeq}(15 min)</i>
<i>night-time</i>	<i>(2200 to 0700 hrs)</i>	<i>70 dB L_{AFmax}”</i>

If residential activity is allowed to establish in the Frankton Flats zone, then the rule above should be adjusted to ensure these areas are also protected.

In our opinion the noise controls should retain a separate daytime and night-time noise limit and in this case, MDA recommend the same numerical limit as currently exists is also retained. The night-time maximum noise limit should also be retained.

However, it is recommended that the time periods to which the noise controls apply be amended. Currently the daytime period is defined as 8 am – 8 pm. We recommend this be adjusted to 7 am – 10 pm. There are a number of reasons for this, including:

- To account for airport related activity in the zone occurring at the same times that the airport itself is operational (daytime period defined in NZS 6805 as 7am – 10 pm).
- To provide consistency with the time periods that apply to similar activity that can occur in both the Remarkables Park Zone and the Frankton Flats zone, both of which adjoin the MUAZ.

We note that the rule as worded above would mean that there is no noise control between activities in the zone that are not noise sensitive. In our opinion this is acceptable, because noise related issues for such activity is unlikely to occur. It is also noted that the MUAZ only includes land owned by the airport or contained within its designation, and as such, it can exercise a degree of control over who it leases this to, and therefore to what extent a leasee can make noise. In addition, there would still remain a duty on any occupier to ensure noise does not exceed a reasonable level.

If the general noise rules were to remain unchanged, there is a risk that the ancillary activities which service the airport may not comply with the noise rules and this may also detrimentally impact the ability of the airport to effectively operate.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Marshall Day Acoustics has reviewed the Operative Queenstown Airport Mixed Use (MUAZ) rules as they relate to noise. The noise rules for the zone are generally appropriate but can be updated to better reflect the requirements of an international airport, without unduly impacting on the surrounding community.

The revisions that should be made relate to; ensuring the general noise rules are consistent with the surrounding zones, allowing airport related activity to occur during airport operational hours, allowing visitor accommodation to establish inside the zone provided it is fitted with appropriate sound insulation, and ensuring residential activity continues to be prohibited.

APPENDIX A GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY

Noise	A sound that is unwanted by, or distracting to, the receiver.
dBA	The unit of sound level which has its frequency characteristics modified by a filter (A-weighted) so as to more closely approximate the frequency bias of the human ear.
A-weighting	The process by which noise levels are corrected to account for the non-linear frequency response of the human ear.
$L_{Aeq}(t)$	<p>The equivalent continuous (time-averaged) A-weighted sound level. This is commonly referred to as the average noise level.</p> <p>The suffix "t" represents the time period to which the noise level relates, e.g. (8 h) would represent a period of 8 hours, (15 min) would represent a period of 15 minutes and (2200-0700) would represent a measurement time between 10 pm and 7 am.</p>
L_{dn}	The day night noise level which is calculated from the 24 hour L_{Aeq} with a 10 dB penalty applied to the night-time (2200-0700 hours) L_{Aeq} .
Sound Insulation	When sound hits a surface, some of the sound energy travels through the material. 'Sound insulation' refers to the ability of a material to stop sound travelling through it.
NZS 6801:2008	New Zealand Standard NZS 6801:2008 <i>"Acoustics – Measurement of environmental sound"</i>
NZS 6802:2008	New Zealand Standard NZS 6802:2008 <i>"Acoustics – Environmental Noise"</i>
NZS 6805:1992	New Zealand Standard NZS 6805:1992 <i>"Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning"</i>

APPENDIX B: EXISTING QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED-USE ZONE RULES

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED-USE ZONE - RULES

6

6.2 Queenstown Airport Mixed-Use Zone Rules

6.2.1 Zone Purpose

The Mixed Use Zone comprises part of the underlying zone for Queenstown Airport in the vicinity of Lucas Place and Robertson Street at Frankton. It is characterised by airport related activities necessary for the transport interface role of Queenstown Airport, but which do not strictly achieve the purpose of the Aerodrome Designation - the safe and efficient operation of Queenstown Airport. The purpose of the zone is to provide for the continued viability of these activities and to maximise the efficient use of airport land. Future activities within the zone will be provided for without undue regulation, as long as amenity and building appearance standards are met.

6.2.2 District Rules

Attention is drawn to the following District Wide Rules which may apply in addition to any relevant Zone Rules. If the provisions of the District Wide Rules are not met then consent will be required in respect of that matter:

- i Transport - Refer Part 14
- ii Subdivision, Development and Financial Contributions - Refer Part 15
- iii Hazardous Substances - Refer Part 16
- iv Utilities - Refer Part 17
- v Signs - Refer Part 18
- vi Relocation Buildings and Temporary Activities - Refer Part 19

6.2.3 Activities

6.2.3.1 Permitted Activities

Any activity which complies with all the relevant **Site** and **Zone** Standards and is not listed as a **Controlled, Discretionary, Non-complying** or **Prohibited** Activity.

6.2.3.2 Controlled Activities

- i The addition, alteration, and construction of all buildings in respect of location and external appearance.

6.2.3.3 Discretionary Activities

- i Any activity not listed as a **Non-Complying** or **Prohibited Activity** and complies with all the **Zone** Standards but does not comply with one or more of the **Site** Standards shall be a **Discretionary Activity** with the exercise of the Council's discretion being confined to:
 - (a) the matter(s) specified in the standard(s) not complied with; and
 - (b) the extent to which the activity is dependent on an airport location.

- ii Industrial Activities, except the processing of natural materials.

6.2.3.4 Non-Complying Activities

The following shall be **Non-Complying Activities** provided they are not listed as a **Prohibited Activity**:

- i Conference facilities.
- ii Commercial activities, other than retailing.

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED-USE ZONE - RULES

6

- iii Any activity not listed as a Prohibited Activity and does not comply with one or more of the relevant Zone Standards, shall be a **Non-Complying Activity**.

6.2.3.5 Prohibited Activities

The following shall be **prohibited**:

- i Forestry Activities
- ii Visitor Accommodation
- iii Residential Activities
- iv Commercial Recreational Activity
- v Community Activities
- vi Farming
- vii Factory Farming
- viii Mining Activities
- ix Any activity requiring an Offensive Trade Licence under the Health Act 1956
- x Residential Flat

6.2.4 Non-Notification of Applications

An application for a resource consent for the following matters may be considered without the need to obtain a written approval of affected persons and need not be notified in accordance with Section 93 of the Resource Management Act 1991, unless the Council considers special circumstances exist in relation to any such application.

- (i) Applications for the exercise of the Council's discretion in respect of the following **Site Standards**:

- **Visual Amenity**
- **Landscaping**

6.2.5 Standards

6.2.5.1 Site Standards

- i **Building Coverage**
Maximum site coverage - 75%
- ii **Building Setback**
 - (a) Setback from the Zone boundary shall be 10 m.
 - (b) Setback from any road shall be 6 m.
- iii **Landscaping**
 - (a) At least 10% of each site shall be landscaped.
 - (b) Those properties fronting Lucas Place and Hawthorne Drive shall provide and maintain a landscape strip extending the full length of the road boundary, except across entranceways. The strip shall be not less than 1 metre deep and shall have an average depth of 4 m over its entire length.
- iv **Office Accommodation**
Office accommodation shall only be provided as part of an activity undertaken within the Zone.
- v **Land Transport Facilities**
Land transport facilities shall be limited to the following:
 - garaging, including servicing of tour buses and facilities for tour buses

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED-USE ZONE - RULES

6

- courier sorting and distribution centre
- car valet services
- rental car facilities.

6.2.5.2 Zone Standards

i Building Height

Maximum building height - 9 m

ii Glare

- All exterior lighting installed on sites or buildings within the zone shall be directed away from adjacent sites, roads and public places.
- All roofs of buildings shall be finished or treated so they do not give rise to glare when viewed from any public place.
- No activity shall result in a greater than 10 lux spill (horizontal or vertical) of light onto any adjoining property within the zone, measured 2 m inside the boundary of any adjoining property.
- No activity shall result in a greater than 3 lux spill (horizontal or vertical) of light onto any adjoining property which is zoned for residential purposes.

iii Retail Sales

- Retail sales and displays are restricted to areas within the airport terminal and to such goods that serve the needs of the travelling public.
- Any goods displayed for sale and/or retailing shall be limited to the sale of those goods within the airport terminal.

iv Noise

- Sound from activities measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with

NZS 6802:2008 shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within any Residential Zone or at any point within Activity Areas 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 of the Remarkables Park Zone:

- daytime (0800 to 2000 hrs) 55 dB $L_{Aeq(15\ min)}$
- night-time (2000 to 0800 hrs) 45 dB $L_{Aeq(15\ min)}$
- night-time (2000 to 0800 hrs) 70 dB L_{AFmax}

(b) The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to construction sound which shall be assessed in accordance and comply with NZS 6803:1999.

(c) The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to sound associated with airports or windfarms. Sound from these sources shall be assessed in accordance and comply with the relevant New Zealand Standard, either NZS 6805:1992, or NZS 6808:1998. For the avoidance of doubt the reference to airports in this clause does not include helipads other than helipads located within any land designated for Aerodrome Purposes in this Plan.

v Industrial Activities

- There shall be no processing of natural materials.

6.2.6 Resource Consents - Assessment Matters – Airport Mixed Use Zone

6.2.6.1 General

i The following Assessment Matters are other methods or matters included in the District Plan, in order to enable the Council to implement the Plan's policies and fulfil its functions and duties under the Act.

ii In considering resource consents for land use activities, in addition to the applicable provisions of the Act, the Council shall apply the relevant **Assessment Matters** set out in Clause 6.2.6.2 below.

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED-USE ZONE - RULES

6

- iii In the case of **Controlled and Discretionary Activities**, where the exercise of the Council's discretion is restricted to the matter(s) specified in a particular standard(s) only, the assessment matters taken into account shall only be those relevant to that/these standard(s).
- iv In the case of **Controlled Activities**, the assessment matters shall only apply in respect to **conditions** that may be imposed on a consent.
- v Where an activity is a **Discretionary Activity** because it does not comply with one or more relevant Site Standards, but is also specified as a **Controlled Activity** in respect of other matter(s), the Council shall also apply the relevant assessment matters for the Controlled Activity when considering the imposition of conditions on any consent to the discretionary activity.

6.2.6.2 Assessment Matters

In considering whether or not to grant consent or impose conditions, the Council shall have regard to, but not be limited by, the following assessment matters:

i Non Complying Activity – Conference Facilities

- (a) The extent to which the activity is dependent on an airport location.

ii Building Coverage

- (a) The extent to which the proposed buildings will be compatible with the character of the local environment, including the scale of other buildings in the surrounding area.

iii Setback from Zone Boundaries

- (a) The extent to which a limited building setback from the zone boundary is necessary in order to allow more efficient or practical use of the remainder of the site.

- (b) The extent to which alternative practical locations are available for the building or structure.
- (c) The degree to which the proposed building will detract from the pleasantness, coherence, openness and attractiveness of the site as viewed from adjoining zones.
- (d) The degree to which the proposed building will detract from the outlook and privacy of people on adjoining zones.
- (e) The degree to which proposed landscaping, including plantings, will mitigate the effects of limited building setback from a neighbour's in adjoining zones.
- (f) The extent to which the proposed building, will be compatible with the appearance, layout and scale of other buildings and sites in the surrounding zones.
- (g) The extent to which the proposed building will have a size, form, and external appearance which are sympathetic to, and in visual harmony with, the surrounding environment.
- (h) The extent to which the use of the proposed building will detract from the pleasantness or amenity of adjoining zones, in terms of such matters as noise, smell, dust, glare or vibration.

iv Landscaped Areas

- (a) The effect of any reduced landscaping in terms of the visual impacts of the buildings in the Zone and the scale of these buildings.
- (b) The effect of any reduction in landscaping and screening on the visual impacts of outdoor storage areas.
- (c) The extent to which the site is visible from adjoining sites, particularly those in residential zones, and the likely consequences of any reduction in landscaping standards or screening.

QUEENSTOWN AIRPORT MIXED-USE ZONE - RULES

6

- (d) Any aspects of the proposal, which may compensate for reduced landscaping or screening, including the nature of planting or materials used, the location of parking manoeuvring or storage areas and office accommodation.
 - (e) The relative importance of landscaping on the particular site concerned, taking account of the visual quality of the surrounding environment, particularly where a low standard of visual quality exists and improvement is necessary.
 - (f) The nature of the business activity itself, and any particular adverse visual impacts it may have.
 - (g) The effect of any reduction in tree planting provision, particularly in respect to the visual character of car parking areas and building scale.
- v Office Accommodation, Land Transport Facilities, Industrial Activities and Retailing**
- (a) The extent to which the activity is dependent on an airport location.
- vi Building Height**
- (a) With regard to proposals that breach one or more zone standard(s), whether and the extent to which the proposal will facilitate the provision of a range of Residential Activity that contributes to housing affordability in the District.

ATTACHMENT 5

CCL Ref: 14027-Attachment 5-TA

26 November 2014



Queenstown Lakes District Council / Queenstown Airport Corporation

By e-mail only

A. PO Box 29623, Christchurch, 8540
P. 03 377 7010
E. office@carriageway.co.nz

Dear Sirs

Review of Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone

We are pleased to provide our response to the traffic and transportation matters associated with the review of the current land use zoning of the airport.

Background

Queenstown Airport provides facilities for the transportation of people and freight, and is a key asset to Queenstown Lakes District in terms of supporting the tourism industry and the needs of local and business travellers. It is recognised as a nationally significant asset in the light of its significant contribution to the tourism industry, is a significant source of employment for the District and is also a lifeline asset.

As part of the Queenstown Lakes District Plan Review, the Queenstown Lakes District Council is reviewing the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. The revised zone is proposed to better facilitate the expansion of Queenstown Airport to accommodate supporting and complementary activities, and to provide for its long term sustainable growth and development. The zoning would apply to all land used or designated for airport and airport-related activities.

Proposed Provisions

The revised Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone provisions seek to apply a range of performance standards on amenity values to manage the effects of land uses carried out at the airport. We understand that the Queenstown Airport Corporation is currently reviewing the airport precinct masterplan.

In respect of transportation matters, the provisions set out that airport and airport related activities will be permitted (subject to compliance with the rules). The revised provisions also set out that it is expected that any such land developments will comply with the district-wide provisions of the District Plan, including in regard to transportation matters other than the parking required for activities that are undertaken within the airport terminal complex.

No changes are proposed to the roading network external to the airport, meaning that Sir Henry Wigley Drive and Lucas Place will continue to have an important role in providing access, as they do at present.

Current Land Zoning

We understand that the majority of land uses that are enabled by the proposed provisions are already envisaged under the existing Airport Mixed Use Zone. However under the current District Plan provisions they are mostly Controlled or Discretionary (Restricted) Activities, whereas under the current proposals, they would become Permitted Activities.



We are aware that if a particular land use is currently a Controlled or Discretionary (Restricted) Activity, then the Council has limited its scope to considering only particular matters when assessing the resource consent application. In this particular instance, we understand that the District Plan does not set out any transportation-related issues to which the Council will have regard when considering an application made for such activities under the current Airport Mixed Use Zone.

This being so, in our view there are only limited differences in transportation outcomes between the provisions presently set out in the District Plan and what is proposed. In other words, provided that there is compliance with the various rules set out in Section 14 (Transport) of the District Plan, transportation issues will not feature in the assessment of effects of any application for a Controlled or Discretionary (Restricted) Activity under the existing Airport Mixed Use Zone, or a Permitted Activity under the proposed Airport Mixed Use Zone.

Consequently, any differences from a transportation perspective arise from those activities which are presently listed as Discretionary, Non-Complying or Prohibited Activities, and which under the proposed zoning would become Permitted or Discretionary (Restricted) Activities.

Proposed Permitted Land Uses

As previously identified, the majority of the land uses that are enabled by the proposed provisions are already envisaged by the existing Airport Mixed Use Zone. We have therefore considered the likely implications of the change in activity status for land uses that are proposed to be Permitted Activities within the revised Airport Mixed Use Zone and which are currently listed as having some other status. We understand these to be:

- Visitor accommodation (under operative rule 6.2.3.5(ii) this is a Prohibited Activity);
- Commercial activity (under operative rule 6.2.3.4(ii) this is a Non-Complying Activity);
- Industry (under operative rule 6.2.3.3 (ii) this is a Discretionary Activity).
- Conference facilities (under operative rule 6.2.3.4(i) this is a Non-Complying Activity);
- Office Accommodation and Land Transport Facilities no longer have site standards applied to them (operative rules 6.2.5.1(iv) and (v) respectively);
- Retail no longer has the zone standard applied to it (operative rule 6.2.5.2(iii)).

In evaluating the implications of these change, we have paid particular regard to proposed Objective 6.3.1.2. This limits the land use activities at the airport to being “*airport-related*” and provided to “*support or complement the functioning of the airport*”, and thus activities which establish within the zone should relate to the function of the airport in some way.

Visitor Accommodation

Although visitor accommodation would be permitted, we understand that this will be specifically targeted at passengers staying for just one night, and who have either a late-night arrival or an early-morning departure. Under the existing zoning, such passengers would need to travel to or from their (town centre) hotel at the time of their flight. These journeys would still be made under the proposed zoning, but the travel times would be different. Overall however, there would be no change in the number of trips generated and consequently this land use will not have any net effect on the traffic generation of the airport.

Commercial and Industrial Activities

Under the District Plan definitions, commercial activity also includes retail and we have allowed for this within our assessment. However, any commercial activity would need to be similarly related



to the airport's activities, thereby immediately precluding any operators who primarily rely on being able to sell to the general public to be commercially viable.

As a result, we consider that the number and type of these activities is necessarily limited, and those that could establish will generate only low volumes of traffic.

Conference Facilities

If meeting rooms or conference facilities were to develop, it is possible that attendees will fly into the airport and remain there for the meeting/conference. However, it is also possible that the facilities would be used by those that are already in the town and who would therefore travel to the airport by other means. The traffic generation of travel to a meeting/conference varies according to the number of attendees and the vehicle occupancy. For example, for a large meeting attendees may arrive by minivan or other organised travel, or share a taxi. In other instances, attendees may travel independently in smaller groups.

Again however, such conferences would need to support the airport's activities. On this basis, we consider that the number and scale of such conferences will necessarily be limited and because of this, it would appear unlikely that any meeting rooms or conference facilities would be of a significant size.

Office Accommodation / Land Transport Facilities

Under the operative District Plan, office accommodation can only be provided as part of an activity undertaken within the Airport Mixed Use Zone, and land transport facilities are limited to garaging (including servicing of tour buses), courier sorting/distribution centre, car valet services and rental car facilities. These restrictions would be removed under the proposed provisions, although there is still a requirement that such activities are related to, and support the functioning of, the airport.

From our knowledge of other airports, we consider it is possible that under the proposed provisions a freight distribution depot or warehousing dealing with goods flown in/from the airport could be operated. However, warehousing and freight distribution is one of the lowest traffic generating land uses (the typical trip rate is 2 vehicle movements per day per 100sqm GFA), meaning that any traffic-related effects of this will be negligible.

Retail

At present, retail sales are restricted to areas within the airport terminal and to goods that serve the needs of the travelling public, and the proposed provisions remove this restriction. However, although retail activities would be able to take place elsewhere within the Mixed Use Zone, there is still an overarching requirement that such activities are related to, and support the functioning of, the airport. As set out above, this precludes any retailers who primarily need to be able to sell goods to members of the public to be commercially viable, and thus in practice, we consider that only specialist retail will be able to establish. This has a greatly-reduced traffic generation rate compared to retail that is targeted at the public.

Summary

Having reviewed the proposal, there are a number of land uses that could establish as of right under the provisions which are currently not Permitted or Controlled Activities. However in each case, we consider that the requirement for them to be airport-related and to support or complement the functioning of the airport means that the extent of any associated traffic generation will be very limited. Any activities which cannot meet this requirement are Discretionary (Restricted) Activities, for which transportation matters remain a matter of discretion. In our view, this is appropriate as it



provides opportunity for the Consent Authority to consider that potential transportation effects arising that are not already anticipated within the zone.

Summary

The proposed provisions will result in a number of land uses becoming Permitted Activities. However, in practice, either these are already Controlled or Discretionary (Restricted) Activities where transportation issues are not within the scope of the Council to consider, or we consider that they are sufficiently restricted in scope by the proposed provisions such that they will have negligible effects on the transportation networks.

Consequently, we consider that the proposed revisions to the Airport Mixed Use Zone will have negligible transportation-related effects compared to the current provisions included in the District Plan.

I trust that this is of assistance, but please do not hesitate to contact me if you require anything further or clarification of any issues.

Kind regards

Carriageway Consulting Limited

Andy Carr

Traffic Engineer | Director

Mobile 027 561 1967

Email andy.carr@carriageway.co.nz



Appendix 4. Section 32 Report Landscape Rural Zone Gibbston Character



Section 32 Evaluation Report

Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone

Contents

Section 32 Evaluation Report: Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone	2
1. Purpose of the report	2
2. Statutory Context	2
3. Iwi Management Plans	5
4. Regional Planning Documents	7
5. Resource Management Issues	10
6. Purpose and Options	22
7. Scale and Significance Evaluation	36
8. Evaluation of proposed Objectives Section 32 (1) (a)	36
9. Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32 (1) (b)	61
10. Efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions	89
11. The risk of not acting	89
References	89

Section 32 Evaluation Report: Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone

1. Purpose of the report

Section 32 of the *Resource Management Act 1991* (the Act) requires objectives in plan change proposals to be examined for their appropriateness in achieving the purpose of the Act, and the policies and methods of those proposals to be examined for their efficiency, effectiveness and risk in achieving the objectives (MFE, 2014).

Accordingly, this report provides an analysis of the key issues, objectives and policy response to be incorporated within the Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone chapters of the Proposed District Plan.

As required by section 32 of the RMA, this report provides the following:

- An overview of the applicable **Statutory Policy Context**.
- Description of the **Non-Statutory Context** (strategies, studies and community plans) which have informed proposed provisions.
- Description of the **Resource Management Issues** which provide the driver for proposed provisions
- An **Evaluation** against Section 32(1)(a) and Section 32(1)(b) of the Act, that is:
 - Whether the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the RMA's purpose (s32(1)(a)).
 - Whether the provisions (policies and methods) are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives (S32(1)(b)), including:
 - identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives,
 - assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives, and
 - summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions.
- A **level of detail** that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal (s32(1)(c)).
- Consideration of **Risk**.

2. Statutory Context

Resource Management Act 1991

The purpose of the Act requires an integrated planning approach and direction, as reflected below:

5 Purpose

- (1) *The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.*
- (2) *In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—*
 - (a) *sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
 - (b) *safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*
 - (c) *avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

The assessment contained within this report considers the proposed provisions in the context of advancing the purpose of the Act to achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The

District's landscapes and natural environment are highly recognised and valued. The Council's Economic Development Strategy 2015 states:

'The outstanding scenery makes the District a highly sought after location as a place to live and visit.' And, 'The environment is revered nationally and internationally and is considered by residents as the area's single biggest asset.'

The Queenstown Lakes District is one of the fastest growing areas in New Zealand and the recent estimates (refer to more detail in the Strategic Directions Section 32 report) predict that the District will continue to experience significant population growth over the coming years, largely off the back of strong forecasted growth in visitors. A strategic policy approach is essential to manage future growth pressures in a logical and coordinated manner to promote the sustainable management of the valued landscape, nature conservation, productive land and infrastructure resources within the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone.

Section 31 of the Act outlines the function of a territorial authority in giving effect to the purpose of the Act:

31 Functions of territorial authorities under this Act

(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district:

(a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district

Section 31 provides the basis for objectives, policies, and methods within a District Plan, to manage the effects of use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.

Consistent with the intent of Section 31, the proposed provisions of the Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone Chapters enable an integrated approach to the management of the multiple resources within the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone.

Section 6 Matters of National Importance is of direct relevance to the Rural and Landscape chapters.

6 Matters of National Importance

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

(a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:

(b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:

(c) the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:

(d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:

(e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:

(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:

(g) the protection of protected customary rights

Section 7 Other matters also includes a number of matters directly relevant to these chapters.

7 Other matters

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to—

- (a) kaitiakitanga:*
- (aa) the ethic of stewardship:*
- (b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:*
- (ba) the efficiency of the end use of energy:*
- (c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:*
- (d) intrinsic values of ecosystems:*
- (e) [Repealed]*
- (f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:*
- (g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:*
- (h) the protection of the habitat of trout and salmon:*
- (i) the effects of climate change:*
- (j) the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy.*

In particular, Section 7(b) requires regard is had to the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources. The Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone contain land utilised for primary production purposes.

Local Government Act 2002

Section 14 - Principles relating to local authorities

Sections 14(c), (g) and (h) of the Local Government Act 2002 are also of relevance in terms of policy development and decision making:

- (c) when making a decision, a local authority should take account of—*
 - (i) the diversity of the community, and the community's interests, within its district or region; and*
 - (ii) the interests of future as well as current communities; and*
 - (iii) the likely impact of any decision on the interests referred to in subparagraphs (i) and (ii):*
- (g) a local authority should ensure prudent stewardship and the efficient and effective use of its resources in the interests of its district or region, including by planning effectively for the future management of its assets; and*
- (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority should take into account—*
 - (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and*
 - (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and*
 - (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations*

As per Part II of the RMA, the provisions emphasise a strong intergenerational approach, considering not only current environments, communities and residents but also those of the future. They demand a future focussed policy approach, balanced with considering current needs and interests. Like the RMA, the provisions also emphasise the need to take into account social, economic and cultural matters in addition to environmental ones.

Section 14(g) is of relevance in so far as a planning approach emphasises that the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone comprises the majority of the District's valued landscapes, surface of waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity and rural productive land resources.

Having regard to these provisions, the planning approach is to not interpret these provisions through a single lens, but to manage the resource for the benefit of the District and wider region. The approach through this review is to provide a balanced framework in the District Plan to manage these resources appropriately. Furthermore, there is an emphasis on presenting the provisions in a manner that is clearly interpreted to facilitate effective and efficient District Plan administration.

3. Iwi Management Plans

When preparing or changing a district plan, Section 74(2A)(a) of the RMA states that Council's must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district.

The following iwi management plans are relevant:

The Cry of the People, Te Tangi a Taurira: Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008 (MNRMP 2008)

Section 3.4, Takitimu Me Ona Uri: High Country and Foothills contain the following policies that have specific regard to subdivision and development:

3.4.2 High Country Pastoral Farming

Policy 1. Encourage sustainable pastoral farm land management practice whereby impacts on soil, vegetation and water quality are minimised.

3.4.8 Access and Tourism

Policy 2. Development that includes building activity should consider specific landscape and geographical features and the significance of these to Ngāi Tahu Whānui. Activity whereby buildings will protrude above ridgelines or displace site of cultural significance should be avoided.

Part 3.5.10: General Water Policy: includes,

Policies:

3. Protect and enhance the mauri, or life supporting capacity, of freshwater resources throughout Murihiku.

4. Manage our freshwater resources wisely, mō tātou, ā, mō ngā uri ā muri ake nei, for all of us and the generations that follow.

5. Promote the management of freshwater according to the principle of ki uta ki tai, and thus the flow of water from source to sea.

6. Promote catchment management planning (ki uta ki tai), as a means to recognise and provide for the relationship between land and water.

16. Prioritise the restoration of those waterbodies of high cultural value, both in terms of ecological restoration and in terms of restoring cultural landscapes.

17. Ensure that activities in upper catchments have no adverse effect on mahinga kai, water quality and water quantity in lower catchments.

Part 3.5.19: Riparian Zones, includes the following policies:

Policy 6. Avoid stock access to riparian zones and streambeds, except when required for intermittent vegetation control.

Policy 7. Encourage fencing of streams to protect riparian vegetation, and promote healthy riparian establishment.

3.4.14 Protecting Sites of Significance in High Country and Foothill Areas

Policy 6. Avoid compromising unidentified, or unknown, sites of cultural significance as a consequence of ground disturbance associated with land use, subdivision and development.

Section 3.5, Southland Plains: Te Rā a Takitimu contains the following policies that have specific regard to subdivision and development:

3.5.2 Wastewater

9. Encourage creative, innovative and sustainable approaches to wastewater disposal that make use of the best technology available, and that adopt principles of waste reduction and cleaner production (e.g. recycling grey water for use on gardens, collecting stormwater for a pond that can then be used for recreation in a new subdivision).

3.5.7 Subdivision and Development

Policies 1- 18 of the MNRMP contain a range of policies that are relevant to Subdivision and Development, and cover iwi involvement in planning processing and plan development, and interaction with developers and iwi, particularly where there may be significant effects, long term planning and cumulative effects, avoiding adverse effects on the natural environment and advocating for the use of esplanades reserves.

Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005 (KTKO NRMP 2005)

Part 10: Clutha/Mata-au Catchments *Te Riu o Mata-au* outlines the issues, and policies for the Clutha/Mata-au Catchments. Included in this chapter is a description of some of the Kāi Tahu ki Otago values associated with the Clutha/Mata-au Catchments. Generic issues, objectives and policies for all catchments across the Otago Region are recorded in Chapter 5 Otago Region.

The following policies are of particular relevance;

5.3.4: Bank Erosion:

Policy 43. To discourage activities on riverbanks that have the potential to cause or increase bank erosion.

Policy 44. To encourage the planting of indigenous vegetation from the local environs to help reduce continual erosion of the edge of rivers.

5.3.4: Land Use and management

Policy 54. To promote land use that suits the type of land and climatic conditions.

Policy 55. To encourage the exclusion of stock from waterways.

Policy 56. To oppose the draining of wetlands. All wetlands are to be protected.

Policy 57. To require a programme to monitor the effect of stock and agricultural activity on groundwater quality be established.

Policy 58. To promote integrated riparian management throughout entire catchments.

Policy 59. To oppose the indiscriminate use of chemicals or poisons in or near waterways.

5.6.4 Cultural Landscapes General Policies

Subdivisions:

1. *To discourage subdivisions and buildings in culturally significant and highly visible landscapes.*
2. *To encourage a holistic planning approach to subdivisions between the Local Government Agencies that takes into account the following:*
 - i. *All consents related to the subdivision to be sought at the same time.*
 - ii. *Protection of Kāi Tahu ki Otago cultural values.*
 - iii. *Visual amenity.*
 - iv. *Water requirements.*
 - v. *Wastewater and storm water treatment and disposal.*
 - vi. *Landscaping.*
 - vii. *Location of building platforms.*
3. *To require that where any earthworks are proposed as part of a subdivision activity, an accidental discovery protocol is to be signed between the affected papatipu Rūnaka and the Company .*
4. *To require applicants, prior to applying for subdivision consents, to contact Kāi Tahu ki Otago to determine the proximity of the proposed subdivision to sites of significance identified in the resource inventory.*
5. *To require public foot access along lakeshores and riverbanks within subdivisions.*

Land Use 10.2.3 Wai Māori Policies in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment

9. *To encourage the adoption of sound environmental practices, adopted where land use intensification occurs.*
10. *To promote sustainable land use in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment.*
11. *To encourage all consents related to subdivision and lifestyle blocks are applied for at the same time including, land use consents, water consents, and discharge consents.*

4. Regional Planning Documents

Operative Regional Policy Statement 1998

Section 74 of the Act requires that a district plan prepared by a territorial authority must “give effect to” any operative Regional Policy Statement. The operative *Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998* is the relevant regional policy statement to be given effect to within the District Plan.

The operative RPS contains a number of objectives and policies of relevance to this plan change, specifically Objectives 5.4.1 to 5.4.4 (Land) and related policies which, in broad terms promote the sustainable management of Otago’s land resource by:

- Maintaining and enhancing the primary productive capacity and life supporting capacity of land resources;
- Avoid, remedy or mitigate degradation of Otago’s natural and physical resources resulting from activities utilising the land resource;
- Protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Objective 9.4.3 (Built Environment) and related policies are relevant and seek to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of Otago's built environment on Otago's natural and physical resources, and promote the sustainable management of infrastructure.

These objectives and policies highlight the importance of the rural resource both in terms of the productive resources of the rural area and the protection of the District's outstanding natural features and landscapes.

Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2015

Section 74 of the Act requires that a District Plan must "have regard to" any proposed regional policy statement.

The Proposed RPS was notified for public submissions on 23 May 2015, and contains the following objectives and policies relevant to landscape, Rural Zone and the Gibbston Character Zone:

Proposed RPS 2015 Objective	Objectives	Policies	Relevance to the review of the Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone chapters
The principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi are taken into account in resource management decision.	1.1	1.1.1, 1.1.2	Statutory Acknowledgement Areas in the Queenstown Lakes District associated with the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 are located within the Rural Zone. In addition, the lakes and rivers and majority of indigenous vegetation is contained within the Rural Zone. Refer to the respective Section 32 reports for these.
Kai Tahu values, rights and customary resources are sustained	1.2	21.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3	The Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Character Zone chapters manage land that is of interest and value in terms of culture and practices, ancestral lands, water, site, wahi tapu and other taoka.
The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced	2.1	2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.1.7	Without falling out of scope or unnecessarily duplicating functions, the integrated management of resources includes the management of activities with regard to freshwater values, margins of water bodies, soil values, ecosystem and biodiversity values, recognising values of natural features and landscapes.
Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced	2.2	2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6, 2.2.14, 2.2.15, Schedule 4, Schedule 5	The Rural Zone contains the majority of the District's land that contains significant natural areas, outstanding natural features and landscapes, special amenity landscapes and the soil resource for the productive use of land.
Natural resource systems and their	2.3	2.3.1, 2.3.2	Applying an integrated approach to the management of Otago's physical resources to

interdependencies are recognised.			achieve sustainable management. To ensure that effects of activities on the whole of a resource are considered when that resource is managed by sub-units.
Protection, use and development of natural and physical resources recognises environmental constraints.	3.1	3.1.1	The Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone contain areas of varying sensitivity that may create opportunities or constraints for activities seeking to utilise the respective resource.
Risk that natural hazards pose to the communities are minimised.	3.2	3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11	The Rural Zone and Gibbston Zone contain land that is subject to natural hazards. Many non-farming activities including residential activity require resource consent as a discretionary activity and this provides the Council with the opportunity to assess the risk of natural hazards to development proposals.
Good quality infrastructure and services meet community needs. Infrastructure of national and regional significance is managed in a sustainable way. Energy supplies to Otago's communities are secure and sustainable.	3.4 and 3.5	3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.5.3,	While much of the Districts infrastructure is located within urban areas. Roads, Airports, and utilities pass through or affect the development potential of the Rural Zone and Gibbston Zone. Also, often the resource is located within the Rural areas. The creation and maintenance of these need to be managed to be protected and to avoid impacts on users and receivers.
Energy Supplies to Otago's communities are secure and sustainable	3.6	3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.6.4, 3.6.5, 3.6.6	Much of the District's energy supplies are located within the Rural Zone, noting the Hydro Generation zone is not in the scope of stage 1 of review.
Urban growth is well designed and integrates effectively with adjoining urban and rural environments.	3.8	3.8.1, 3.8.2, 3.8.3	The maintenance of rural landscape values and retention of soil resource is co-dependant on the strategic planning of urban areas and the certainty provided by the identification of urban growth boundaries.
Public access to areas of value to the community is maintained or enhanced.	4.1	4.1.1	Public trails are contained within the rural zone. Public access is often raised as an issue that presents both opportunities and constraints for development proposals and the maintenance of productive activities.
Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production.	4.3	4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.6	Notwithstanding the value of the landscape and recreational resources to the District, The rural economy is an important component and the protection of the soil resource is recognised. The retention of productive farms can also

			assist with the maintenance of large landholdings that contribute to the predominance of open spaces and low intensity of housing and subdivision of land for rural lifestyle purposes.
Otago's communities can make the most of the natural and built resources available for use.	4.4	4.4.3	Both permitted farming and viticulture and horticulture activities, in addition to other development proposals that seek to locate in the rural areas can degrade ecosystem health and recognition for opportunities to enhance existing areas.
Adverse effects of using and enjoying Otago's natural and built environment are minimised	4.5	4.5.1, 4.5.4, 4.5.5, 4.5.6, 4.5.7, 4.5.8	People are drawn to the rural areas for a wide range of farming and entrepreneurial opportunities and recreational activities. How these activities are managed will impact the communities' experience of the resource.

The evaluation and provisions have regard to the Proposed RPS. In particular, there are consistencies in the application of the Proposed RPS Schedule 4 '*Criteria for the identification of outstanding natural features and landscapes*' and the proposed District Plan assessment matters in outstanding natural landscapes and features, for guiding decision makers when considering proposals for activities within identified outstanding natural landscapes and features.

5. Resource Management Issues

This review seeks to address a number of key issues (detailed below), whilst also strengthening the existing provisions by providing more targeted objectives and policies, making the Plan easier to understand and improving certainty to what activities are permitted in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character zones and whether they require a resource consent.

The resource management issues set out in this section have been identified from the following sources:

- Wanaka Land Demands – Review of the Wanaka Structure Plan (2007)
- Plan Change 05b – Glenorchy Township Zone Boundary 'The Bible Terrace'
- Plan Change 07 – Residential Flats
- Plan Change 09 – Farm Buildings on Outstanding Natural Features
- Plan Change 13 – Kioromoko
- Plan Change 14 – Makarora Rural Lifestyle Zone
- Plan Change 18 – Mt Cardrona
- Plan Change 20 – Wanaka Urban Boundary
- Plan Change 21 – Queenstown Urban Boundary
- Plan Change 24 – Community and Affordable Housing
- Plan Change 28 – Trails
- Plan Change 33 – Non-Residential Activities in the Residential, Rural Living and Township Zones
- Plan Change 48 – Signs
- Plan Change 49 – Earthworks
- Hawea Community Plan 2003
- Luggate Community Plan 2003
- Makarora Community Plan 2003
- Tomorrow's Queenstown

- Wanaka 2020
- Rural General Zone Monitoring Report 2009
- Rural Living Zones Monitoring report 2009
- Informal Airports Research Report 2012
- QLDC Liquefaction Hazard 2013, prepared by Tonkin and Taylor Limited
- Otago regional Council Natural hazard reports
- 'When is enough, enough? Dealing with cumulative effects under the Resource Management Act. A paper by Philip Milne for Horizons Regional Council. 2008
- Read Landscapes Limited 'Report to Queenstown Lakes District Council on appropriate landscape classification boundaries within the District, with particular reference to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features' 2014.
 - Peer review on the Wakatipu component by Ben Espie landscape planner
 - Peer review on the Wanaka/Upper Clutha component by Anne Steven landscape architect
- Read Landscapes Limited 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment' 2014.
- 'High Level Review of Proposed District Plan Provisions – Landscape Issues' Ben Espie Landscape Planner. 20 November 2014.
- National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011.
- Ministry for the Environment. 2011. *National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011: Implementation Guide*. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment.
- National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014
- Otago Regional Council Regional Policy Statement 1998
- Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan, 2005
- Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008
- Dairy NZ. Sustainable Dairying Water Accord.
- Relevant legislative changes enacted since the Plan became operative

Consultation

Consultation on the District Plan Review and management of the rural zones was initiated in 2010 and included the following:

- Rural Discussion Document and Brochure in 2010, with feedback invited via the Council's website
- A series of articles in the Otago Daily Times titled 'Our Rural Future' in 2010, with opinion pieces from Anne Steven (Landscape Architect), Clive Geddes (Former Mayor), Council staff, Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society), Peter Constantine (Planner) and Richard Burdon (Farmer).
- Meeting with Federated Farmers and farmers at Mt Burke 11 May 2010
- Meeting with Department of Conservation 28 November 2011
- Meeting with Upper Clutha Environmental Society (UCES) 28 November 2011
- Meeting with the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust 10 January 2012
- Meeting with the NZTA 24 May 2012
- Meeting with NZIA and NZILA 30 April 2012
- Meeting with planning commissioners 11 October 2012
- Stall and posters at the Lake Hayes and Wanaka A & P Shows 2012
- Meeting of the Council's Resource Management Focus Group 2014 and 2015
- January 9 – February 10 2015 Draft provisions and Section 32 reports placed on the Council's website and circulated to persons on the Council's District Plan Review distribution list, persons with an interest in the changes and statutory consultation parties required by the RMA
- Written feedback from in the order of 40 persons/groups
- Meeting with Federated Farmers 16 February 2015

- Attended and spoke at the Hawea Community Association Meeting 10 January 2015 at Lake Hawea.
- Invited to meeting with Farmers 10 February 2015 at Wanaka, all from Upper Clutha area except Mark Hasselman from Glenorchy.

The key issues are:

Issue 1: The management of the District's landscapes

Introduction

The District's landscapes are of significant value to the people who live, work or visit the District, and need to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, development and use.

The existing provisions have been operative in the order of ten years. A number of plan changes have resolved issues that have arisen, whilst monitoring reports and decisions on resource consents have identified issues associated with the existing provisions.

The planning rules for managing subdivision and development in the Rural General Zone are unique compared to many other parts of rural New Zealand in that there is no minimum allotment size for landholdings in the Rural General Zone. What this does is prevent any 'development right' for residential subdivision and development, associated with a minimum landholding area, but requires proposals for subdivision and development to prove that the development would be appropriate in terms of effects on the landscape.

Whilst the existing provisions place emphasis on whether a proposal will be appropriate in terms of adverse effects on the landscape resource, on the other hand, the absence of a minimum allotment size (along with associated plan provisions) does not establish an easily measurable baseline on the potential limit of the capacity of the landscape to absorb development.

When subdivision and development are proposed, the existing provisions require an appraisal of the development site to determine whether the landscape values are one of an 'outstanding natural feature', 'outstanding natural landscape', 'visual amenity landscape' or, 'other rural landscape'. On this basis an assessment of the proposal is undertaken against a prescribed suite of 'assessment criteria'. All such activities generally fall into the class of a 'discretionary' resource consent, which, in broad terms means that the Council can assess any matters relevant to the application, and can decline applications.

The Council's Rural Monitoring Report 2009, examined the effectiveness of the existing operative provisions and reflected on the amount of residential subdivision and development that had been consented in the Rural General Zone.

The Monitoring Report had a particular focus on subdivision and development in the Wakatipu Basin, an area which has received a relatively high number of resource consent applications and approvals for subdivision and development. The Wakatipu Basin has also been subject to private plan changes to create rural lifestyle living and resort activities and accommodation.

A key theme of the Rural Monitoring Report 2009 was whether the existing provisions were effectively managing cumulative effects of residential subdivision and development. The Monitoring Report identified that the cumulative effects of development pressure within the Wakatipu Basin were not being effectively managed. The report identified a lack of connection between the objectives and policies of the landscape categories identified within the Plan and the assessment matters. The report suggested that these could more explicitly outline the desired landscape outcome, particularly for the areas subject to the 'Visual Amenity Landscapes category' assessment criteria.

Wakatipu Basin

Other work associated with this review focusing on the Wakatipu Basin is a study by Read Landscapes Limited, titled 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment 2014'. The Read Landscapes study examined the landscape of the Wakatipu Basin and made recommendations on the options of future management of subdivision and development. This study includes consideration of the benefits of changing the planning rules to require a minimum allotment size in the Wakatipu Basin, and areas within the Wakatipu Basin where the landscape has capacity for additional subdivision and development or has reached a threshold. The report also provided a critique of the existing assessment criteria provisions.

The findings of the Read Landscapes study suggested that the existing 'discretionary regime' is the best way to manage subdivision and development in the Wakatipu Basin, and the existing assessment criteria should be clarified, with the inclusion of performance standards to help assess the merits of subdivision and development.

The Read Landscapes study also concluded that the most appropriate way to encourage development to locate where it is appropriate from a landscape perspective is to rezone those locations to Rural Lifestyle, an existing zone already established in parts of the Wakatipu Basin. The Rural Lifestyle zone requires a site size of not less than one hectare with an average site size of two hectares over the area to be subdivided.

Proposed rezoning of identified areas of the Rural General zone in the Wakatipu Basin to Rural Lifestyle Zone

The Read Landscapes report identified the following locations as being capable of supporting rural lifestyle subdivision and development without substantial impact on the Wakatipu Basin's landscape values:

- The 'Hawthorn Triangle' area
- The Fitzpatrick Basin
- Mooney Road area
- Alec Robins Road area
- An extension to the existing Rural Lifestyle zone at the Dalefield Road area

The reasons these areas are suitable for Rural Lifestyle zoning are set out in the Read Landscapes Limited report¹. It is noted these areas have been considered in a landscape management perspective on the wider Wakatipu Basin.

These areas have either had a degree of subdivision and development occurred, or has capacity for residential subdivision at the density provided in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. In the case of these areas, establishing a density baseline of 2ha average, with lots up to 1ha protects these areas from higher intensity subdivision and development.

District Wide Rural General Zone

A deficiency with the existing 'Visual Amenity Landscape' landscape provisions is that they anticipate the maintenance, if not the creation of, a specific type of landscape, being 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense'. However, much of the land subject to the provisions has a different landscape character.

Parts of the District's rural areas within the existing 'visual amenity landscape' comprise a rural working landscape, characterised by relatively large paddocks and an absence of domestic buildings and associated activities and curtilage that can reduce the open character characterised by pastoral farming. In areas, the predominant introduced vegetation patterns are for sheltering stock and paddocks, rather than creating amenity and shelter associated with housing. The landscape character of these areas, and the management

¹ Read Landscapes Limited 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment' 2014.

of them with regard to subdivision and development do not benefit from the existing visual amenity landscape provisions.

Generally, the assessment criteria are regarded as complex and repetitive, particularly with regard to the matters relating to cumulative effects. In particular, the Visual Amenity Landscape criteria have a focus on maintaining and enhancing 'arcadian' and 'pastoral in the poetic sense'² landscape values. While these attributes may be present in some areas of the Wakatipu Basin, they do not represent the landscape character of the other areas, yet must be applied to large parts of the District when assessing resource consent application for subdivision and development. Many areas are classified as a visual amenity landscape by default because they do not have the attributes of an ONF or ONL (District Wide or Wakatipu Basin). This further highlights the potential unsuitability of the visual amenity landscape.

Although the process for assessing proposals is strict, this matter may be a reason why there have been a relatively high number of residential building platforms approved in the Wakatipu and Wanaka Basins. It is difficult to suggest, or for the Council to quantify when the amount of consented development has reached a cumulative adverse effect, when the provisions in the operative District Plan tend to anticipate the creation of a 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense' landscape.

Much of the existing 'Visual Amenity landscape' of the Rural General Zone has a landscape character, typified by a rural working environment and larger landholdings. For instance, areas such as the Wanaka and Hawea Basins, Luggate and parts of the Crown Terrace are for the most part located within the visual amenity landscape but do not exhibit the characteristics of an 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense' visual amenity landscape.

Landscape Categories

As described above, all subdivision and development is subject to assessment criteria which require an analysis of the development site to determine what landscape category applies. With the exception of a few areas where Environment Court rulings have determined the landscape classification, and these are contained in Appendix 8 (Landscape Categories) of the operative District Plan, most applications are subject to this process. Furthermore, decisions on resource consent applications, both determined by the Council and the Environment Court that take a specific view on the landscape classification the proposal is located within, make that judgement for the purposes of a specific application. Unless directed by the Environment Court, a decision on a resource consent cannot amend the District Plan to include the decision made on the location of a landscape line.

The existing process does not constitute efficient resource management practice. Identifying the landscape classification will provide certainty.

The Council's project to identify the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features commenced prior to the Government indicated making changes to Part 2 of the RMA (section 6, matters of national importance³, being '*the protection of specified outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development*'). Identifying these features and including them in the planning maps will provide certainty to the community and will enhance the effective and efficient administration of the District Plan. While these changes have not been advanced, there is a direction from

² QLDC Operative District Plan part 4.2.4. District Wide, Landscape, issues, Maintenance and enhancement of Visual Amenity landscapes.

Also refer to Read Landscapes Limited 'Report to Queenstown Lakes District Council on appropriate landscape classification boundaries within the District, with particular reference to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features' 2014. Ss 3.1.1 – 3.1.4

³ Report of the Minister for the Environment's Resource Management Act 1991 Principles Technical Advisory Group. February 2012. <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/tag-rma-section6-7/tag-rma-section6-7.pdf>.

Ministry for the Environment. 2013. *Improving our resource management system. A discussion document*. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment. <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/improving-our-resource-management-system-discussion-document.pdf>

other national and regional planning provisions that it is best practice for district councils to identify matters of national importance (outstanding natural landscapes and features, and significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna). Such planning provisions include the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2015⁴ and the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry Consultation Document June 2015⁵.

Read Landscapes Limited has undertaken to categorise the outstanding natural landscapes and features of the District (Attachment 1a). The assessment is not a study based on first principles. It builds on the landscape categorisation partially completed throughout the District and contained with Appendix 8 of the operative District Plan. References have also been drawn from decision on resource consents and plan changes that relate to development proposals at specific locations.

The study was peer reviewed by two local landscape architects (Attachments 1b and 1c), familiar with the existing planning rules and experienced with landscape assessments in the district. A further landscape assessment by Paul Smith of Vivian and Espie limited has been undertaken in the southern part of the Upper Clutha area (Attachment 1d).

The study, subsequent peer reviews and commentary has formed the basis of the identified outstanding natural features and landscapes.

The district contains landscapes of national significance that are internationally renowned and require protection from inappropriate development. The identification of the district's outstanding natural landscapes and features is a significant advancement of the effective protection and management of the District's landscapes through this review.

Objective and Policies

The operative district wide landscape chapter has one stated objective:

Subdivision, use and development being undertaken in the District in a manner which avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity values.

A review of decisions on notified resource consent applications indicates the District Wide Landscape and Rural General Zone objectives and policies are often overlooked. A reason may be that decision makers, having worked through a long and complex set of prescribed assessment criteria which seek to identify whether the actual and potential effects on the environment will be minor, see little merit in trawling through policy derived from an objective which seeks the same.

While the objective is the foundation of the provisions, it is considered the related 43 (more or less) policies grouped into 17 themes primarily contained in the existing District Wide chapter do not offer appropriate specificity and value over and above the assessment criteria, many of which are structured and phrased as policies in themselves.

The existing suite of objective, policies and assessment criteria would benefit from clarification, consolidation and require linkage to the proposed strategic directions chapter.

Issue 2: The management of Farming Activities

Existing and anticipated farming activities (Reverse Sensitivity)

⁴ <http://www.orc.govt.nz/Publications-and-Reports/Regional-Policies-and-Plans/Regional-Policy-Statement/Otago-Regional-Policy-Statement-Review/>

⁵ <http://mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/consultations/proposed-national-environmental-standard-for-plantation-forestry/>

A range of activities are expected to occur in the rural areas that create odour, noise and dust, traffic generation and heavy vehicle traffic. Provided these effects do not constitute a genuine nuisance or health risk, they shall be accepted as anticipated components of rural activities.

It is acknowledged the Rural Zone is considered by many a desirable place to live and to also undertake commercial activities. It is important to recognise the importance of farming and established activities to the District and protect the viability of farming.

Rural Amenity

Intensive farming activities have the potential to generate significant and sustained traffic generation, odour, noise, lighting and visual effects. The effects of more intensive farming, particularly a change in the intensity of pastoral farming practices has the potential for amenity effects on neighbouring residential neighbours and a reduction in rural amenity values where these effects are apparent from public areas.

The operative provisions have standards relating to factory farming, with permitted standards for pig and poultry factory farming. In the Hawea and Luggate area there has been a relatively recent shift from traditional pastoral sheep farming to dairy farming and dairy grazing supported by irrigation. The resultant visual changes to the landscape from the use of pivot and linear irrigators and the consistent lush pasture must be accepted as an anticipated change within the ambit of permitted farming activities⁶. The management of the take and use of ground and surface water and the discharge of contaminants to land and water are a function of the Regional Council⁷.

Activities associated with more intensive types of pastoral farming such as dairy farming have the potential to create adverse effects on rural amenity associated with milking sheds, large buildings for housing animals and effluent storage ponds.

These activities have the potential for noise, odour and visual amenity effects associated with the hours of operation of milking sheds, and the sustained and repetitive use and the location of plant and materials that generate noise and odour.

While farm buildings are anticipated in the rural areas, large buildings used for intensive farming and associated infrastructure can also have the potential for adverse effects on landscape values.

The management of the potential effects on rural amenity from intensive farming is an important resource management issue.

Contamination of water bodies from dairy grazing stock

Dairy farming constitutes a more intensive use of land with generally higher numbers of stock located in relatively small areas, than traditional pastoral deer, sheep and beef farming grazing situations. In particular, higher intensities can occur where dairy grazing stock are break-fed or wintered in relatively small paddocks and supplemented with food.

Where dairy grazing stock have access to water bodies, the potential for stock to damage riparian areas and contaminate water bodies is higher in than traditional lower intensity farming.

Stock entering water bodies has the potential for contamination resulting from pugging, release of sediments and turbidity. Livestock grazing on the banks of water bodies can cause damage to riparian areas, reducing the ability for vegetation to establish which can affect fauna habitat, and degrade amenity values. Livestock,

⁶ The removal of indigenous vegetation which requires a resource consent and/or where earthworks resource consents are required is a different matter that is recognised as having potential for biodiversity and landscape effects, and is not an anticipated farming activity.

⁷ Section 30(1)(e)-(f) RMA

by grazing on the banks of water bodies and entering them to drink, directly input animal wastes to waterways. The resulting pollution degrades water bodies and amenity values.

Dairy farming and its effects are relevant to the function of the territorial authority to '*achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district*' (S31(1)(a) RMA), and currently falls within the ambit of permitted farming activities in the operative District Plan. .

It is necessary to manage the potential adverse effects of land uses where the stocking rates are higher and the nature and scale of the type of stock could have a higher potential for adverse effects on water bodies and riparian areas than less intensive forms of farming. The potential adverse effects that can result from stock degrading water bodies is not only a water quality issue. Degraded riparian areas can reduce indigenous biodiversity, landscape and amenity values.

It is proposed to add a new policy and rule that complements the functions of the Otago Regional Council by encouraging dairy grazing stock to be kept out of water bodies and the immediate margins.

Introducing a new rule to encourage the exclusion of dairy grazing stock from water bodies will also complement the Dairy NZ, The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord⁸. In particular, this will address the circumstances where there is the potential for a third party or person not bound to the Accord to graze dairy stock.

This is because the Accord excludes dairy grazing situations where the land is used under a third party grazing arrangement between the owner of dairy cattle and another landowner for the purpose of temporary grazing. Or, where land that is owned or leased by the same person or entity as the milking platform but which is not regularly used for dairy grazing.

The Accord's definition of 'land used regularly for dairy grazing' is *Land used each year for grazing dairy cattle throughout the off-season (i.e. that part of the year when cows are not being milked)*.

In these instances there is no obligation to comply with the Accord and it cannot be relied upon in the absence of provisions under RMA plans. The introduction of a rule in the District Plan will encourage persons responsible for grazing dairy cattle to exclude stock from water bodies, irrespective of them being bound to The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord.

The Otago Regional Council, Regional Plan: Water, Rule 12.C.0.1 prohibits any activity that would contaminate a water body. The rule is effects based and has qualifiers with regard to any odour being 'objectionable', or a 'conspicuous' oil or grease film, scum or foam. A District Plan rule could intervene with the use of land in a certain way that is likely to result in an adverse effect that would not achieve sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This could include excluding stock from riparian areas and water bodies where the nature of the grazing activity would be more likely than not to have an adverse effect.

Excluding dairy grazing stock from water bodies and requiring an identified buffer area to ensure riparian areas are not damaged manages rural amenity values and wider landscape values. , In this regard the proposed rule is within the scope of the function of a territorial authority and district plans to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district. Protecting waterbodies and riparian areas from degradation is relevant to Section 6 – Matters of National Importance:

6 Matters of National Importance

⁸ <http://www.dairynz.co.nz/media/209792/Sustainable-Dairying-Water-Accord.pdf>

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

- (a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (c) the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:*
- (d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:*
- (e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:*
- (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (g) the protection of protected customary rights*

Parts (a), (b), (d) and (e) are relevant as a function of territorial authority in this context. The provisions would not overlap the rules of the Otago Regional Plan: Water, these have a specific focus on water quality.

Farm Buildings

The operative District Plan places significant emphasis on the protection of the landscape resource through the 'discretionary regime' resource consent process. The majority of resource consent applications for subdivision and development in the rural area are processed on a notified basis.

An exception exists for buildings used for farming activity (with the exception of residential activity and residential buildings). Plan Change 9 'Farm Buildings on outstanding natural features' established rules which encourage farmers to locate farm buildings outside of outstanding natural features. It does so by requiring a controlled activity class of resource where certain qualifiers are met and a restricted discretionary class of resource consent for the location of buildings if the qualifiers are not met.

The Council has the ability to decline a restricted discretionary class of resource consent, while in the case of a controlled activity, the Council must grant the consent but can impose conditions relevant to the specified matters of control.

As stated in Plan Change 9⁹, it is acknowledged that farmers play a very important role in the stewardship of the landscape and that farm buildings are an integral part of this function. Through the outcome of the plan change, the Council accepted that where there is a landholding of over 100 hectares, certain requirements are met associated with the density of buildings, elevation, and the proposal is a genuine farm building, the building should be allowed as a controlled activity, subject to controls on external appearance, servicing and location.

Having investigated the administration of the rule and in particular noted the difference in complexity, time, and information requirements for farm buildings (as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity resource consent) compared to non-farming buildings (Discretionary activity resource consent), the rule is effective in that it provides for farm buildings while protecting the landscape resource and visual amenity.

It is considered however, the administration of the rules has resulted in inefficiencies. The costs associated with even small scale, simple resource consents are not trivial. Currently, the deposit fee for a controlled

9

http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/OldImages/Files/District_Plan_Changes/Plan_Change_9_downloads/Council_Decision/PC_9_Decision_on_farm_buildings_on_natural_features.pdf

activity consent is \$768.75, and Council planning officer's time is currently recovered at a rate in the order of \$117.00 per hour, in addition to administration cost recovery and a \$100 deposit fee for monitoring. It is reasonable for an applicant to expect to pay in the order of \$650.00 - \$1500.00 inclusive of GST for a simple, controlled activity resource consent application for a farm building.

In the context of the costs of a relatively small farm building such as a hay, silage or implement shed, a kitset variety, without services could be in the order of \$8,000 - \$15,000 inclusive of GST plus construction costs. The ratio to costs of obtaining resource consent relative to the cost of the building could be in the order of 15%.

While the protection of the landscape is a significant resource management issue, the administration of the District Plan and associated costs passed onto applicants associated with administration of the District Plan are also relevant considerations of the review and evaluation of the appropriateness under section 32.

It is considered that efficiencies can be made without a reduction in landscape and rural amenity protection. The existing standards generally provide for landscape protection, and with the addition of standards to control colour, bulk and location, it is considered both reasonable and efficient that farm buildings can be allowed as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with the existing rule for farm buildings and the addition of standards to control colour and location.

Issue 3: Effective and Efficient Resource Management

The construction and alteration of buildings located within a building platform requires resource consent as a controlled activity under the operative District Plan. The established approach is that a controlled activity resource consent is generally considered to provide an acceptable balance between an applicant being certain consent would be granted, and the Council being able to ensure developments are undertaken in accordance with the specified matters of control.

In the Rural General Zone, these include location, external appearance, access and servicing. Aspects of these matters of control are considered inefficient because the merits of whether a building is appropriate in that location have already been considered as part of the consent to identify a building platform.

In addition, site specific matters have been addressed and any mitigation considered appropriate or necessary will be attached to the approval associated with that building platform. These are generally registered on the site's computer freehold register in the form of a consent notice (subdivision) or covenant (resource consent for residential activity/building platform).

Generally these conditions will set out controls on the bulk, height, and colour of buildings, servicing, and any landscaping requirements. A departure from these requirements would result in enforcement or the requirement to apply for resource consent for a variation to these conditions, which require a 'discretionary' class of resource consent.

Without undermining the emphasis on managing the visual effects of buildings, ensuring development is consistent with the conditions attached to the 'approval in principle', and the importance of protecting the district's landscape resource, it is considered standards can be introduced that enable the construction and alteration to buildings as a permitted activity subject to performance standards controlling colour and the bulk and location of buildings.

It is acknowledged that the Council would not have as much control over landscaping. It is also considered that the emphasis on any landscaping would be better dealt with at the time of subdivision, particularly where integrated landscaping affecting the entire area to be subdivided would be beneficial.

The adequacy of servicing can be assessed through the building consent process and applications would be subject to compliance checks with the District Plan and other conditions, as for all building consent applications.

Issue 4: Commercial Activities

There is a lack of specificity in the operative District Plan's objectives and policies relating to non-farming activities and non-residential activity. The maintenance of rural amenity values and a pattern of development consistent with the expectations of inhabitants is an important determinant of the character and amenity of the rural area.

In addition, the objectives and policies do not specifically recognise the desire for some commercial activities whether passive or recreational to locate within the Rural General Zone. It is acknowledged that in some cases these activities could enhance the experiences available within the district.

The acknowledgement that there is a place in the Rural Zone for some types of commercial activities, subject to intensity and scale is an important resource management issue.

Issue 5: Managing the existing Ski Area Subzones

The operative provisions recognise the importance of the skiing and tourism industry to the District and notwithstanding the location of ski fields amidst the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes they provide significant concessions within the existing identified Ski Area Subzones, chiefly being that the landscape categories and assessment matters for development do not apply to skiing activities within the Ski Field Subzones. The provisions should reinforce the encouragement of ski area activities within these subzones.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the objectives and policies can be improved. However, there are not any significant matters identified in this zone that need changing.

Issue 6: Managing the Gibbston Character Zone

The purpose of the Gibbston Character Zone is to provide primarily for viticulture and commercial activities with an affiliation to viticulture within the confined space of the Gibbston Valley.

The zone is recognised as having a distinctive character and sense of place. The soils and microclimate within this area and the availability of water have enabled development for viticulture to the extent that this is an acclaimed wine producing area.

The zone has experienced residential subdivision and development. This creates the potential to degrade the distinctive character and create conflict with established and anticipated intensive viticulture activities.

The operative provisions provide concessions for activities with an affiliation to viticulture, and the landscape categories do not apply, notwithstanding the location of the zone in what is otherwise part of an outstanding natural landscape. There is concern that residential subdivision and development in the eastern part of the zone has diminished the soil resource for viticulture activities.

The on-going vitality of viticulture activities in the zone is an important resource management issue. The effectiveness and efficiency of the provisions can be improved. However, overall, there are not any significant issues identified in this zone.

Efficiencies similar to those identified in the Rural General zone exist, where the construction of buildings within an approved platform could be introduced as a permitted activity.

Issue 7: Miscellaneous and existing Provisions

Provisions to be retained

Where no significant issues have been identified, provisions will be retained. Where relevant, changes to phrasing are considered prudent to assist with clarity, and the structure and layout of the proposed district plan.

There are also areas of the Rural General zone where resource consents have been given effect to, or longstanding activities have rendered the existing zoning and provisions no longer appropriate. These include areas where an urban subdivision has been established or the land is located within the proposed urban growth boundary. In these cases an urban zone is likely to be more appropriate. The identification of these areas and specific provisions are identified in the residential s32 evaluations.

Activity status of activities not specified in the provisions

The proposed structure of the Rural Zone provisions has a more prescriptive framework and focus than the operative District Plan provisions. Where an activity is not specified by the provisions (i.e. an activity based framework) resource consent would be required because the activity is not contemplated. Section 76(4)(e) of the Act provides a territorial authority the discretion to apply such a rule.

This framework is logical and provides clarity and assists with understanding whether or not an activity requires a resource consent or not. In addition, it is difficult to anticipate every potential activity that may seek to locate in the rural zones and requiring a resource consent for these activities that are not contemplated as a non-complying status directs attention¹⁰ to the objectives and policies of the District Plan to determine whether they are appropriate and meet the purpose of the RMA.

Assessment of these applications against the relevant policies of the Strategic Directions, District wide and urban growth policies allow a holistic view to be taken of whether an activity is appropriate.

Plan Change 35 – Queenstown Airport Air Noise Boundaries

Where provisions of this Plan Change are settled they have been included.

Residential Flat

The operative provisions in the Rural General zone require a controlled activity resource consent for a residential flat. Of note, the respective rule does not contain any specified matters of control.

The 'General' assessment matters in provision 5.4.1 state:

(iii) In the case of Controlled and Discretionary Activities, where the exercise of the Council's discretion is restricted to the matter(s) specified in a particular standard(s) only, the assessment matters taken into account shall only be those relevant to that/these standard(s).

(iv) In the case of Controlled Activities, the assessment matters shall only apply in respect to conditions that may be imposed on a consent.

Whilst the assessment matters at the end of the Rural General Chapter contain 'general' matters it is doubtful whether these matters are applicable in both a technical and practical sense to residential flats.

¹⁰ Section 76(4)(e) and Section 104D RMA 1991

In the Gibbston Character Zone, the provisions are silent on residential flats, therefore, residential flats are a permitted activity pursuant to Operative District Plan Rule 5.7.3.1 'Permitted Activities'.

Residential flat as a land use sits within the ambit of residential unit. The Operative District Plan's Transportation provisions require car parking and access as permitted standards and, any servicing related aspects can be controlled via the building approval process.

Provisions relating to buildings are provided for in the respective bulk and location or building platform requirements.

For these reasons the permitted status of residential flat will be reviewed.

6. Purpose and Options

The purpose of the Landscape Chapter is to recognise the landscape as a significant resource to the District and to protect it from inappropriate subdivision and development.

The purpose of the Rural Zone is to provide for farming activities and manage the effects of other activities seeking to utilise the rural land resource (ie, skiing, commercial recreation activities, mining, forestry and industrial activities). The Rural Zone contains the majority of the District's outstanding natural landscapes and features and nature conservation values.

The purpose of the Gibbston Character Zone is to provide for farming activities, specifically viticulture and affiliated commercial activities.

The Landscape (Strategic Direction and Landscape Chapter) and Rural Zone provisions have a direct relationship with each other because the majority of the District's landscape resource is located within the Rural Zone. The landscape categories and rules directly associated with the landscape categories are contained within the Rural Zone.

Strategic Directions

The objectives and policies of the Strategic Directions chapter of the proposed District Plan are relevant to this assessment.

In general terms, and within the context of this review, these goals and objectives are met by:

- Protecting the landscape resource from inappropriate subdivision and development;
- Enabling anticipated farming activities in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone;
- Recognising the important role of tourism and the interrelationship with landscape and the Rural areas;
- Identifying and providing for Rural Lifestyle subdivision and development within the Wakatipu Basin where the landscape has capacity to absorb that development;
- Protecting amenity values in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone;
- Creating efficiencies in the administration of the District Plan and reducing costs for the community;
- Avoiding commercial activities that have the potential to undermine the amenity of the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone and the role of commercial centres;
- Avoiding urban subdivision and development not located within the urban growth limits;

Determining the most appropriate methods to resolve the issues identified will enable the Plan to give effect to the Otago RPS, the relevant parts of the Strategic Directions chapter, and ultimately meet the purpose of the RMA.

As required by section 32(1)(b) RMA, the following section considers various broad options considered to address each issue, and makes recommendations as to the most appropriate course of action in each case.

Broad options considered to address issues

Issue 1: The management of the District's landscapes

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with targeted modification where necessary

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions **(Recommended)**

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Amend operative provisions	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives and policies do not align with the Proposed Strategic Directions chapter. • The integrity of the existing objective and policy framework has been weakened by subdivision in the rural environment at an urban density. The landscape resource is subject to potential degradation from further urban subdivision in the Rural General zone. • It is recognised that the assessment criteria are overly complex, repetitive and would benefit from improvement. • It is inefficient to continue with the case-by-case classification of landscape categories. • The issue of cumulative effects of subdivision and development, particularly in the existing visual amenity landscape areas is not being adequately managed. • Retaining the existing approach of determining landscape classification on a case by case basis is inefficient for the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation). • The identified deficiencies and absence of a connection with the strategic directions chapter would be likely to remain. • Minor changes to provisions which are considered less than effective and inefficient would be unlikely to resolve the inefficiencies highlighted in the Rural Monitoring report 2009. • Perceived cost associated with imposing landscape lines on the maps, irrespective of whether a development is proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation). • The changes may result in a perceived or actual loss of development potential. • Perceived cost associated with imposing landscape lines on the maps, irrespective of whether a development is proposed.

	<p>applicants, council and does not promote effective and efficient administration of the District Plan.</p>		
<p>Benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains the established approach which parties are familiar with. • Low cost for Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaining but improving the existing provisions may reduce some of the current ambiguity with the application of the existing rules. • Including the landscape lines provides certainty to applicants, the council and wider community, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining the basis and structure of the existing assessment criteria but reducing identified deficiencies will improve on the existing framework, which has a strong emphasis on protecting the landscape resource, without removing important elements and criteria themes that have been established. • Strengthens linkages with the proposed Strategic Directions chapter. • Removes identified inefficiencies with the existing provisions. • Identification of landscape categories will provide more certainty of the expectations of landscape management in certain areas. • Manage identified issues and deficiencies such as cumulative effects and promotes more effective management of these issues. • Recognises the relationship between the landscape resource and tourism based commercial and recreational activities. • Removes lengthy District Plan text and provides opportunity for more concise statement of issues, objectives and policies. • Identification of areas within the Wakatipu Basin with capacity for Rural Lifestyle development provides the opportunity for rural lifestyle living in targeted areas, potentially reducing the pressure for subdivision and

			<p>development in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including the landscape lines provides certainty to applicants, the council and wider community,
Ranking	3	2	1

Issue 2: The management of Farming Activities

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with targeted modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Amend provisions where necessary	Option 3: Change the entire rules
Costs	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing policy is not clear and could be more effective. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy farming and grazing of dairy cows is relatively new to the District. There is a potential for the contamination of water bodies if more intensive forms of farming are established and not effectively managed. Persons responsible for dairy grazing stock are not always bound to the 'The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord', therefore, the Accord does not cover all potential situations where dairy stock could enter and contaminate water bodies. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inefficient resource management practice for the Council. Cost to the community for applying for resource consents and variations for 	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified, the provisions exist but can be clarified and strengthened by policy. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost to farmers who graze dairy stock to ensure stock are excluded from water bodies. Potential overlap with management plans required by dairy companies, however, the proposed rule addresses situations that may not be covered by plans such as the Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has less control, therefore potential for buildings to be located in visually sensitive areas compared to the existing level of control. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential landscape effects associated with location of farm buildings in 	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High cost to the Council for amending relative to the relatively minor changes identified as necessary. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost to farmers who graze dairy stock to ensure stock are excluded from water bodies. Potential overlap with Otago Regional Council rules. Potential overlap with management plans required by dairy companies, however, the provisions could address situations that may not be covered by plans such as the Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High cost to the Council for amending relative to the changes necessary.

	<p>anticipated development activities.</p>	<p>inappropriate locations.</p>	<p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential landscape effects associated with location of farm buildings in inappropriate locations. • The qualifiers in the rule for controlled activity status set a relatively high bar in terms of ensuring a low density of buildings. removing these would reduce this benchmark.
<p>Benefits</p>	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low cost for Council. • Ability for complete control over all farm buildings. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less regulation for landowners and dairy grazers. • Less liability for persons responsible for dairy grazing stock to ensure compliance with provisions. 	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clearer parameters for activities that may impinge on the viability of farming activities. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages dairy grazers to exclude stock from water bodies. • Safeguards water bodies and riparian areas. • Addresses gaps in dairy company management plans implemented through The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord associated with whether the land is 'regularly grazed' or the person responsible for the stock have contractual obligations with the dairy companies. • Is a more simple and direct rule than the Otago Regional Council effects based rule, and the exclusion of stock will promote the sustainable management of 	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clearer parameters for activities that may impinge on the viability of farming activities. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages farmers to exclude stock from water bodies. • Safeguards water bodies and riparian areas. • Addresses gaps in dairy company management plans implemented through The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord associated with whether the land is 'regularly grazed' or the person responsible for the stock have contractual obligations with the dairy companies. • Is a more simple and direct rule than the Otago Regional Council effects based rule, and the exclusion of stock will promote the sustainable management of

		<p>natural and physical resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects the margins of waterbodies. The Otago Regional Council rule does not appear to address this matter. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiencies for owners of larger landholdings >100ha. 	<p>natural and physical resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects the margins of waterbodies. The Otago Regional Council rule does not appear to address this matter. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could create standards that are easier to comprehend and administer.
Ranking	3	1	2

Issue 3: Effective and Efficient Resource Management

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with targeted modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Modification to all the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Amend Operative provisions	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inefficient resource management practice. • Cost to the community for applying for resource consents and variations for anticipated development activities. • The deficiencies in the rule structure create inefficiencies and create unnecessary layers of complexity. • The existing rule phrasing and resultant administration makes the District Plan difficult to understand and interpret for a lay person. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed 'permitted' range of colours is conservative. • Potential for visibility of buildings to increase, reduced control on landscaping on a site by site basis. • Short term inefficiency to the council where it would be likely to change internal processes to the review of servicing aspects via the building consent process. • Cost for Council to review the rules. • Reduced control of development by the Council. (however the development is already allowed and subject to conditions on the underlying approval of the building platform). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost to the Council relative to benefits from the changes compared to targeting identified issues. • Minor amendments to all provisions are addressed.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains the established approach which parties are familiar with. • Retains a relatively high level of control for the Council to manage the effects of activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides the community the opportunity to develop to a permitted activity and avoid costs and time associated with the resource consent process. • Increased efficiency for district plan administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides the community the opportunity to develop to a permitted activity and avoid costs and time associated with the resource consent process. • Increased efficiency for district plan administration.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low cost for Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for water and wastewater disposal are Building code requirements. Efficiencies to the Council and the applicant to remove this component from RMA reporting requirements. • Place emphasis on landscaping at the subdivision, reduced burden on individual landowners for landscape design. 	
Ranking	3	1	2

Issue 4: Commercial Activities

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with targeted modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Maintain with modification where necessary	Option 3: Comprehensive modification
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing policy does not distinguish between commercial activities that have a genuine affiliation with the Rural Zone, nor do they appropriately justify why some commercial activities may be more appropriate than others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs to the Council through the plan change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High costs relative to the changes necessary.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low cost for Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters as to what type of commercial activity may be appropriate. Identifies the importance of vitality of commercial centres. Recognises the importance of commercial tourism and commercial recreation activities to the District. Provides consistency with the proposed strategic direction, including policy that recognises the diversification of farms to tourism and visitor related activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same benefits as Option 2.
Ranking	3	1	2

Issue 5: Managing the existing Ski Area Subzones

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with modification where necessary **(Recommended)**

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Minor modifications	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing policy does not justify the concession available to activities in the ski field sub zone. The existing policy does not recognise the benefits of tourism to the District's economy and wellbeing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost for Council Large and potentially significant impact on ski field operators relative to any benefits identified in the issues.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters that enable skiing activities within the ski area subzones. Encourages consolidation of ski area activities within the sub zones, this principle is already established in the operative District Plan. Recognises the importance of commercial tourism and commercial recreation activities to the District. Provides consistency with the proposed strategic direction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for greater control on ski field activities, or conversely potential for more enabling activities.
Ranking	2	1	3

Issue 6: Managing the Gibbston Character Zone

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Minor modifications	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing policy does not justify the existing exception available to winery activities. Some of the existing policies is not consistent with the strategic directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost for Council Large and potentially significant impact on landowners and viticulture in the Gibbston Valley relative to any benefits identified in the issues.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters that enable winery buildings and viticulture activities within the Gibbston Character Zone. Recognises the importance of viticulture, commercial tourism and commercial recreation activities to the District. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for greater control on residential activity. Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters that enable winery buildings and viticulture activities within the Gibbston Character Zone.
Ranking	2	1	3

Issue 7: Miscellaneous and existing Provisions

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Minor modifications	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the existing policies do not justify the presence of the specific rules. • Many of the existing policies are not consistent with the strategic directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost for Council • Large and potentially significant impact on landowners relative to any benefits identified in the issues.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters to assist with the consideration of applications for resource consent for these activities. • Provides tangible policy for the existing rules. • Include provisions made operative by other plan changes where appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for greater control of identified activities.
Ranking	2	1	3

7. Scale and Significance Evaluation

The level of detailed analysis undertaken for the evaluation of the proposed objectives and provisions has been determined by an assessment of the scale and significance of the implementation of the proposed provisions. In making this assessment, regard has been had to the following, namely whether the objectives and provisions:

- Result in a significant variance from the operative District Plan.
- Have effects on resources that are considered to be a matter of national importance in terms of section 6 of the Act
- Adversely affect those with specific interests, e.g., Tangata Whenua.
- Involve effects that have been considered implicitly or explicitly by higher order documents.
- Impose increased costs or restrictions on individuals, communities or businesses.

The level of detail of analysis in this report is moderate-high. The landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone chapters contain resources of strategic importance to the District, region and nation. Many elements of the Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone chapters build on existing approaches within the operative District Plan, so there is not a significant change in policy direction.

However, a number of the provisions take general existing approaches further in terms of implementation. For example, the Operative District Plan sets out a framework of none, or very limited development right for non-farming activities, and for residential activity. The proposed objectives take these established principles further by providing for advancements including: the identification of landscape categorisations (lines); permitting farm buildings that would otherwise be a controlled activity; and providing more targeted, informed policy for non-farming activities that could be contemplated in the zones.

Other reasons for the moderate-high detail of analysis include that the provisions set an important direction for the balance of the District Plan. An example is the location of commercial recreation and commercial activities in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone. The District's economy is largely based on the benefits derived from tourism and the landscape resource. The exemptions provided to ski area activities are not appropriately contemplated in the operative District Plan Provisions. Nor is the issue of commercial activities locating within the rural areas adequately guided.

The detail of analysis is high. The provisions are both high level and detailed in terms of the application and administration of the rules and assessment

8. Evaluation of proposed Objectives Section 32 (1) (a)

The identification and analysis of issues has helped define how Section 5 of the RMA should be articulated in terms of the Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Character Zones, This has informed a determination of the most appropriate objectives to give effect to Section 5 of the RMA in light of the issues.

Section 32(1)(a) requires an examination of the extent to which the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. The following objectives serve to address the key Strategic issues in the District:

<i>Proposed Objective</i>	<i>Appropriateness</i>
<p>Objective 6.3.1 (Landscape)</p> <p>The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.</p>	<p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA)</p> <p>This objective establishes the framework for a wide range of landscape related provisions. The District contains high quality landscapes that are of national importance and these shall be recognised and provided for when considering development (S6 and 6(b) RMA). The Council, in exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to the ethic of stewardship (S7(a) of the Act) and the broad range of rural landscapes with amenity values (S7(c) of the Act).</p> <p>The objective sets the framework for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises the importance of landscape to tangata whenua as indicated by the iwi management plans in section 3 of this report. • Recognises that cultural and geological elements contribute to landscape values. Establishes a basis for policy to identify landscape categories and for them to be identified on the planning maps. • Establishes a basis for subdivision and development proposals to be assessed against the applicable assessment criteria. • Recognises the interrelationship between the location of urban growth boundaries and the landscape resource, with regard to future proposals for plan changes. • Discourages the establishment of urban subdivision by way of resource consent within the rural zones. • Recognises the importance of pastoral farming on large landholdings is an important determinant of landscape character. <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised.
<p>Objective 6.3.2 (Landscape)</p> <p>Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.</p>	<p>Identifies the matter of cumulative effects of subdivision and development.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the Rural areas have established rural lifestyle development, a substantial amount of subdivision and development has been approved in these areas and the landscape values of these areas are vulnerable to degradation from further subdivision and development. It is realised that rural lifestyle development has a finite capacity if the District’s distinctive rural landscape values are to be sustained.</p> <p>The landscape is dynamic and will continue to change. However, land use changes associated with productive farming activities can be very different to land use changes, patterns of planting and infrastructure activities that result from subdivision and development. While a proposal on its own may not be likely to have adverse visual effects, or represent a significant adverse change in landscape character, at some point, (if not already reached in some parts of the District), a threshold will be reached where any further residential subdivision and development in a location will have significant adverse effects on the valued character of the landscape.</p> <p>The culmination of multiple subdivision and development activity will have the potential to change the character of the landscape to the point that the landscape values will diminish. This is a significant issue for the District’s landscapes.</p> <p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises</p>

the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).

The objective recognises and provides for the protection of the landscape resource in terms of S6(b) of the RMA.

The Objective has regard to the following parts of Section 7 of the RMA:

- (a) kaitiakitanga:
- (aa) the ethic of stewardship:
- (c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:
- (f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:
- (g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:

Strategic Directions:

- Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

Gives effect to the RPS:

- Objective s 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua).
- Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land).
- Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).

Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:

- Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained
- Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised.
<p>6.3.3 (Landscape)</p> <p>Protect, maintain or enhance the district’s Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).</p>	<p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District’s landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>Establishes the importance of the Districts outstanding natural features category, that they are a matter of national importance under section 6(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for the policy of the management of subdivision and development of outstanding natural features.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘ Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective s 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or

	<p>enhanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.4 (Landscape)</p> <p>Protect, maintain or enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).</p>	<p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>Establishes the importance of the District's outstanding natural landscape category, that they are a matter of national importance under section 6(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for the policy of the management of subdivision and development of outstanding natural landscapes.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced Objective 2.2 – Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.5 (Landscape)</p> <p>Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).</p>	<p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>Establishes the importance of the District's rural landscape category in terms of sections 7(c), (f) of the RMA.</p> <p>The objective replaces the operative District Plan provisions for visual amenity landscapes, recognising that the District's rural landscape values vary and the Operative District plan provisions focused on maintaining or creating a pastoral or arcadian character are not an appropriate response to managing the Districts landscapes that are below the threshold of an outstanding natural feature or landscape.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for the policy of the management of subdivision and development of rural landscapes.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.6 (Landscape) Protect, maintain or enhance the landscape quality, character and visual amenity provided by the lakes and rivers and their margins from the effects of structures and activities.</p>	<p>Recognises the importance of the District’s lakes and rivers and their contribution to the landscape resource.</p> <p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District’s landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>The lakes and rivers both on their own and, when viewed as part of the distinctive landscapes are a significant element to the national and international identity of the District and provide for a wide range of amenity and recreational opportunities. They are nationally and internationally recognised as part of the reasons for the District’s importance as a visitor destination, as well as one of the reasons for residents to belong to the area. Managing the landscape and recreational values on the surface of lakes and rivers is an important district plan function.</p> <p>The landscape values of the surface of lakes and rivers are a matter of national importance under section 6(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for the policy of the management of activities, subdivision and development which has the potential to affect the landscape values of the surface of lakes and rivers.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

	<p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.7 (Landscape)</p> <p>Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity where it contributes to the visual quality and distinctiveness of the District’s landscapes.</p>	<p>Indigenous vegetation also contributes to the quality of the District’s landscapes. Whilst much of the original vegetation has been modified the colour, texture and intrinsic value of vegetation within these landforms contribute to the distinctive identity of the District’s landscapes.</p> <p>Recognises the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the District’s distinctive landscapes.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for policy to manage the effects on landscape associated with indigenous vegetation clearance, and the opportunity for subdivision and development which constitutes a change in land use from traditional pastoral farming to consider opportunities for indigenous biodiversity protection or restoration.</p> <p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District’s landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>Recognises the interrelationship between landscape and indigenous biodiversity and nature conservation values. The objective recognises and provides for Section 6 (a), (b), (c) and has regard to sections 7(c), (f) of the RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘ Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.4.4 - Avoid Exotic vegetation with the potential to spread and naturalise. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). • Objective 10.3.1, 10.3.4 and 10.3.5 (Biota) <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.8 (Landscape)</p> <p>Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District’s landscapes.</p>	<p>The District relies, in large part for its social and economic well being on the quality of the landscape, open spaces and environmental image.</p> <p>The Objective acknowledges the existence of established skiing activities within established locations identified as sub-zones and their location amidst the District’s outstanding natural landscapes.</p> <p>Acknowledges the established viticulture commercial related activities within the Gibbston Character Zone.</p> <p>Acknowledges that tourism related activities are part of the District’s identity, the economic contribution they make and establishes a policy basis to consider the distinction between these activities and residential orientated subdivision and development.</p>

The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).

The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.

Strategic Directions:

- Relevant to 3.2.1.1 - Recognise, develop and sustain the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas as the hubs of New Zealand's premier alpine resorts and the District's economy.
- Relevant to 3.2.1.3 - Enable the development of innovative and sustainable enterprises that contribute to diversification of the District's economic base and create employment opportunities.
- Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

Gives effect to the RPS:

- Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua).
- Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land).
- Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).

Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:

- Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained
- Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and

	<p>enhanced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.1 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.</p>	<p>Sets direction for permitting farming activities and recognising established activities within the Rural Zone on the basis landscape, nature conservation and rural amenity values will be protected.</p> <p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the strong economic importance of farming activities while acknowledging the importance of the landscape, indigenous biodiversity and ecosystem services within the Rural Zone in terms of (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘ Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).

	<p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.2 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.</p>	<p>Identifies the economic importance of farming activities and protecting the soil resource for current and future productive use. The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 5.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised

<p>21.2.3 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.</p>	<p>Recognises the importance of the water resource in terms of the territorial authorities functions under s31 of the RMA.</p> <p>The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 5 of the RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.4.6 Maintain or enhance the water quality of our lakes and rivers. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.4 - Promote development and activities that sustain or enhance the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems. <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b), (d) and (g) RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with Goals 1, 4 and 5 of the draft Strategic Directions chapter.</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective s 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua).</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 5.4.1 and policy and 5.5.5 (Land)</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objectives 6.4.2, 6.4.3 and policies 6.5.2, 6.5.4 and 6.5.5.</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.4 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Manage situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated activities in the Rural Zone.</p>	<p>Recognises the existence of established rural activities and other infrastructure and activities such as roading and that activities such as residential development has an expectation to not hinder these activities, providing the rural activity is being undertaken within reasonable limits. For instance, with particular regard to aspects such as odour, noise, lighting and traffic generation.</p> <p>The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 5 of the RMA.</p>

	<p>The objective has regard to section 7(b), (d) and (g) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions: Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.5 - Maintain and promote the efficient operation of the District's infrastructure, including designated Airports, key roading and communication technology networks.</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective s 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Gives effect to RPS objective 5.4.1 and policy and 5.5.5 (Land) Gives effect to RPS objectives 6.4.2, 6.4.3 and policies 6.5.2, 6.5.4 and 6.5.5.</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.5 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Recognise for and provide opportunities for mineral extraction providing the location, scale and effects would not degrade amenity, water, landscape and indigenous biodiversity values.</p>	<p>The mineral resources of the District are important commercially. Mineral extraction, including gravel extraction and earthworks, has the potential to cause significant adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>This objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act as it recognises for mineral extraction while having regard to the potential adverse effects of these activities Section 5(b) and (c).</p> <p>The management of mineral extraction is an important issue for the District.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.5 - Maintain and promote the efficient operation of the District's infrastructure, including designated Airports, key roading and communication technology networks.. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ' Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or

	<p>development in specified Rural Landscapes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to RPS Objective 12.4.1, 12.4.2 and policy 12.5.2 (Energy)</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 4.3 – Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production. • Related Policy 4.3.6: Managing locational needs for mineral and gas exploration, extraction and processing.
<p>21.2.6 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Encourage the future growth, development and consolidation of existing Ski Areas within identified Sub Zones, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.</p>	<p>This objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act as it identifies and recognises the existence of skiing activities and established infrastructure within established ski area sub-zones. Encourages the consolidation of skiing activities and infrastructure within these areas.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

	<p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.7 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Separate activities sensitive to aircraft noise from existing airports through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wanaka: Retention of an area containing activities that are not sensitive to aircraft noise, within an airport’s Outer Control Boundary, to act as a buffer between airports and activities sensitive to aircraft noise (ASAN). • Queenstown: Retention of an area for Airport related activities or where appropriate an area for activities not sensitive to aircraft noise within an airport’s Outer Control Boundary to act as a buffer between airports and other land use activities. 	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA because it acknowledges existing provisions and new provisions established through Plan Change 35 (as reflected by the Environment Court confirmed provisions of May 2013) and Plan Change 26 relating to avoiding conflict between established airports and noise sensitive activities, or activities that have potential to hinder the efficient operation of Queenstown and Wanaka airports. The provisions have been reworded slightly to correct inconsistencies between the outcomes of Plan Change 35 and Plan Change 26. Specifically, Plan Change 26 removed reference to “a greenfields area”, and whilst this was reflected in the Court confirmed provisions of Plan Change 35, it is understood this term was not intended to apply to the Queenstown airport. As a result, the objective has been separated to reflect the specific requirements of each airport; and reference to “a greenfields area” has been removed from both.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.1 - Recognise, develop and sustain the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas as the hubs of New Zealand’s premier alpine resorts and the District’s economy. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.5 - Maintain and promote the efficient operation of the District’s infrastructure, including designated Airports, key roading and communication technology networks. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 3.4 – Infrastructure of national and regional significance is managed in a reasonable way.
<p>21.2.8 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Avoid subdivision and development in areas that are identified as being unsuitable for development.</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA because it acknowledges an established policy in the operative District Plan for existing provisions that avoid development within identified building restriction areas.</p> <p>Also establishes the ability to apply district wide policy that may restrict the ability for subdivision and development in the Rural Zone. For instance, natural hazards, landscape, noise, hazardous substances, national Environmental Standard for contaminated land.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.2 - Manage development in areas affected by natural hazards. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2.2 – Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised Objective 3.2 Risk that natural hazards pose to Otago's communities are minimised.

<p>21.2.9 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Ensure commercial activities do not degrade landscape values, rural amenity, or impinge on farming activities.</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate in terms of achieving the purpose of the RMA because it establishes that the location, scale and intensity of commercial activities can affect rural amenity, constrain established rural activities and compromise the vitality of zones where commercial activities are anticipated.</p> <p>Consistent with the following Strategic Directions objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2.1.1 Objective - Recognise, develop and sustain the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas as the hubs of New Zealand’s premier alpine resorts and the District’s economy. • 3.2.1.2 Objective - Recognise, develop and sustain the key local service and employment functions served by commercial centres and industrial areas outside of the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas in the District. • 3.2.1.4 Objective - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • 3.2.5.1 Objective - Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development. • 3.2.5.2 Objective - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. <p>Gives effects to RPS objectives 5.4.1, 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.2, 5.5.3 and 5.5.4 (Land)</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment)</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.10 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Recognise the potential for diversification of farms that utilises the natural or physical resources of farms and supports the sustainability of farming activities.</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA because it recognises the opportunity for alternative land uses on farms can help support the viability of traditional pastoral farming on large landholdings. The retention of large farming operations is a part of the character of the District’s landscape.</p> <p>Consistent with the following Strategic Directions objectives:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2.5.3 Objective - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • 3.2.5.5 Objective - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effects to RPS objectives 5.4.1, 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.2, 5.5.3 and 5.5.4 (Land)</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised • Objective 4.3 – Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production
<p>21.2.11 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Manage the location, scale and intensity of informal airports.</p>	<p>Refer to separate section 32 evaluation for informal airports</p>
<p>21.2.12 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Protect, maintain and enhance the surface of lakes and rivers and their margins.</p>	<p>The surfaces of lakes and rivers have high nature conservation, recreational and passive recreational amenity values. Controls over water-based activities are necessary to manage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effects on water quality, visual amenity, recreational and passive amenity values • Safety and congestion associated with commercial boating operations • Structures and mooring lines • Managing effects from recreational boating activities. <p>For these reasons, the objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA. The Objective recognises and provides for Section 6 – Matters of National Importance. In particular Sections 6(a), (b), (d), (e) and (g).</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1, 5.5.5 and 5.5.6 (Land).</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objectives 6.4.4, 6.4.5, 6.4.7 and 6.4.8, and policies 6.5.1, 6.5.7, 6.5.9 and 6.5.10.</p>

	<p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.13 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Enable rural industrial activities within the Rural Industrial Sub Zones, that support farming and rural productive activities, while protecting, maintaining and enhancing rural character, amenity and landscape values.</p>	<p>While the predominant land use within the Rural Zone is farming there is a range of industrial and service activities that are aligned with farming and rural productive activities and have historically located in rural areas.</p> <p>These activities of an industrial nature compliment and support farming and rural productive activities and include fencing and agricultural contractors yards, firewood operations, sawmills, factories and fabrication yards.</p> <p>Many of these activities, due to their scale and nature, are not ideally suited to industrial areas located within or adjacent to urban areas and by necessity seek to locate in rural areas. Consequently there are a number of established nodes on rural industrial development throughout the District.</p> <p>The objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA to recognise for rural service based and industrial in appropriate locations within the Rural Zone.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘ Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the

	<p>character of our landscapes.</p> <p>Gives effects to RPS objectives 5.4.1, 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.2, 5.5.3 and 5.5.4 (Land)</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised • Objective 4.3 – Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production
<p>23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone)</p> <p>Protect the economic viability, character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA because it sets the direction for permitting farming activities, with an emphasis on viticulture, affiliated winery buildings and farm buildings on the basis that landscape, nature conservation and rural amenity values will be protected.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

	<p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>23.2.2 (Gibbston Character Zone)</p> <p>Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the Act because it identifies the economic importance of farming activities and protecting the soil resource for current and future productive use.</p> <p>Acknowledges the finite area of the Gibbston Character Zone.</p> <p>Recognises the importance of managing the spread of wilding species and siltation and erosion from earthworks activities.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>23.2.3 (Gibbston Character Zone)</p> <p>Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.</p>	<p>Then objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA because it is an existing objective of the Operative District Plan that recognises the importance of the water resource to viticulture in the Gibbston Valley.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised

<p>23.2.4 (Gibbston Character Zone)</p> <p>Encourage land management practices that recognise and accord with the environmental sensitivity and amenity values of the Gibbston Character Zone.</p>	<p>Then objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA because it is an existing objective of the Operative District Plan that recognises the importance of the water resource to viticulture in the Gibbston Valley.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). • Objectives 5.4.1, 5.4.2 and policies 5.5.2, 5.5.4 and 5.5.5 (Land) • Objectives 10.4.1, 10.4.2, 10.4.3 and policies 10.5.2, 10.5.3 and 10.5.4. <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
---	--

The above objectives are considered to be the most appropriate methods of achieving the purpose of the Act, as they identify and give direction as to the how the specific issues that pertain to the management of activities in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone, and any activities that have the potential to affect the District's landscape resource, are addressed.

9. Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32 (1) (b)

The following tables consider whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives. In doing so, it considers the costs and benefits of the proposed provisions and whether they are effective and efficient. For the purposes of this evaluation the proposed provisions are grouped together by resource management issue.

(Also refer to the Table detailing broad options considered above)

Issue 1: The management of the District's landscapes

6.3.1 (Landscape)– The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.2 (Landscape)– Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.

6.3.3 (Landscape)– Protect, maintain or enhance the district's Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).

6.3.4 (Landscape)– Protect, maintain or enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).

6.3.5 (Landscape)– Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).

6.3.6 (Landscape)– Protect, maintain or enhance the landscape quality, character and visual amenity provided by the lakes and rivers and their margins from the effects of structures and activities.

6.3.7 (Landscape)– Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity where it contributes to the visual quality and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes.

6.3.8 (Landscape)– Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

21.2.1 (Rural Zone)– Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.

21.2.5 (Rural Zone)– Recognise for and provide opportunities for mineral extraction providing the location, scale and effects would not degrade amenity, water, landscape and indigenous biodiversity values.

21.2.6 (Rural Zone)– Encourage the future growth, development and consolidation of existing Ski Areas within identified Sub Zones, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.

21.2.8 (Rural Zone)– Avoid subdivision and development in areas that are identified as being unsuitable for development.

21.2.8 (Rural Zone)– Ensure commercial activities do not degrade landscape values, rural amenity, or impinge on farming activities.

23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone)– Protect the economic viability, character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.

23.3.4 (Gibbston Character Zone)– Encourage land management practices that recognise and accord with the environmental sensitivity and amenity values of the Gibbston Character Zone.

Summary and broad assessment of the environmental, economic, social and cultural costs and benefits of the provisions that will achieve these objectives:

Landscape policies:

- Provide policies to facilitate the identification of outstanding natural landscapes and outstanding natural features that are of national importance pursuant to Section 6(b) of the RMA.
- Policy that requires the assessment criteria are applied and the roll-over of existing operative provisions in Part 1.5.3.iii of the District Plan which set out why resource consents are required as part of the management of the District's landscapes.
- Emphasis on managing potential cumulative effects of subdivision and development
- Clearer hierarchy where protection is necessary and where development could be located, or expected to locate, ONF, ONL and RLC landscapes.
- New policy for lakes and rivers and Indigenous biodiversity where the landscape is relevant. The existing operative district wide chapters for Lakes and rivers and Natural Environment are removed from the proposed district plan text.
- New policies on recognition of tourism and the relationship with landscape.

Assessment Criteria

- The structure of the existing assessment criteria has been retained. The assessment criteria have been refined to assist with investigation and whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of landscape character, visual amenity, the design and density of the proposal.
- Emphasis on assessing cumulative effects from residential subdivision and development.
- The landscape assessment matters for ONL and ONF focus on the attributes of the landscape that make it qualify as an ONL or ONF and to what extent the proposed activity will degrade/have adverse effects the landscape attribute.
 - The Outstanding Natural Landscapes and features of the District comprise large areas, and within these there will be locations that will have varying degrees of sensitivity to development. Undertaking an appraisal of the criteria provided in the assessment matters will inform both proponents and

decision makers of the appropriateness of a proposed development within the ONL/ONF.

- The landscape assessment matters for the RLC focus on identifying the important attributes on a case by case basis and to what extent the proposed development will degrade/have adverse effects on the landscape. The operative District Plan presumption on maintaining a 'visual amenity landscape' - pastoral and arcadian attributes has been removed.
- Direct consideration of compensation or positive effects such as the provision of walkways, or ecological restoration.

Landscape related rules:

- Subdivision and development in outstanding natural features and landscapes is retained as a discretionary activity.
- Subdivision and development in the rural landscape classification are a discretionary activity.
- The retention of no minimum area, and therefore no development rights for residential subdivision and development.
- Farm buildings: permitted largely based on existing operative standards that would require resource consent as a controlled activity (that have been changed to permitted activity standards).
- Subdivision and development: construction within building platforms and alterations up to 30% of existing buildings outside are a permitted activity subject to new rules to control the size and colour of buildings as a balancing mechanism to the removal of the controlled activity status and broad intervention and control of landscape matters associated with the rule.
- Jetties in the Frankton Arm are a restricted discretionary activity and the landscape assessment criteria do not apply (no landscape assessment). There are a range of performance standards based on the Jetties and moorings policy and if these are not complied with the proposed jetty would be non-complying class of resource consent.

Rural Policies

- Generally based around providing for farming and established activities such as roading while managing effects on landscape, amenity and nature conservation values.
- Recognises that diversification of farming to tourism and visitor accommodation based activities may support the ongoing viability of farming and retention of large landholdings. The retention of large landholdings has the potential to support the maintenance of the landscape qualities in certain locations.

Zoning Changes

- Identification of five areas in the Wakatipu Basin with capacity from a landscape perspective to absorb residential subdivision and development to the Rural Lifestyle Zone density constituting a minimum site size of 2 hectares average and individual sites to one hectare.
- Rezoning of land at Wyuna Station from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle.

<i>Landscape classifications</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification on the District Plan maps of the following landscape classifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding natural features (ONF) • Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) • Rural Landscapes Classification (RLC) • The proposed landscape classifications replace the following existing landscape categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operative District Plan Outstanding natural landscapes Wakatipu Basin: Proposed Outstanding Natural Landscapes • Operative District Plan Visual Amenity landscape and Other Rural Landscape: Proposed Rural Landscape Classification 			
<i>Proposed provisions</i>	<i>Costs</i>	<i>Benefits</i>	<i>Effectiveness & Efficiency</i>
Policies: <i>Landscape</i> All Policies <i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.1.1 to 21.2.1.8 21.2.5.1 to 21.2.5.4 21.2.6.1 to 21.2.6.3 21.2.8.1, 21.2.8.2 21.2.9.2 to 21.2.9.5 <i>Gibbston Character Zone</i>	<i>Environmental</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will allow more subdivision and development within the areas identified as suitable for Rural Lifestyle zoning. <i>Economic</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential cost for persons who may have been intending to undertake development for the purposes of developing for profit in locations identified on the planning maps as ONL or ONF, or in the Rural Landscapes where the cumulative effects policy could reduce the probability for subdivision and development being granted (although these activities may have been likely to have been 	<i>Environmental</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhances the protection of the remaining Rural Zoned District's landscape resource for present and future generations. <i>Economic</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting the remaining landscape resource will ensure Queenstown Lakes District remains a desirable place to live and visit. Maintaining tourism and the desirability of Queenstown Lakes District as a destination. • Landscape classifications identified on the District Plan maps will save costs for applicants who currently require 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions are based on the existing structure of the operative provisions. The changes will improve the effectiveness at managing the districts landscape resource while creating efficiencies in the administration of the landscape criteria. • The provisions will be effective at managing the landscape resource to be consistent with the Operative and Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement and the proposed strategic directions chapter. • The provisions will provide more certainty and guidance for

<p>23.2.1.1, 23.2.1.3, 23.2.1.5, 23.2.1.6, 23.2.1.7, 23.2.1.8.</p> <p>23.34.4</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i></p> <p>6.4.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i></p> <p>21.3.3</p> <p>21.4</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i></p> <p>23.4.1, 23.4.5 to 23.4.20.</p> <p>23.5.1 to 23.5.8.</p> <p><i>Assessment Matters</i></p> <p>Rural Zone 21.7</p> <p>Gibbston Character Zone 23.7</p>	<p>considered unacceptable in any case).</p> <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential social and cultural cost to persons not supportive of the changes. 	<p>an assessment on a case by case basis to determine the landscape classification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer and certain District Plan provisions will reduce costs for Council, applicants and litigants associated with resource consent decisions based on clear and specific policy and assessment criteria. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More certainty and safeguards will provide for people's wellbeing by protecting the landscape resource. 	<p>persons contemplating subdivision and development and locating farm buildings. The provisions will improve efficiency by identifying the landscape categories on the District Plan maps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions will create efficiencies by clearly setting out areas where subdivision and development is not likely to be appropriate and the assessment criteria and policies will provide clearer direction on where subdivision is likely to be appropriate.
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>			
<p><i>Option 1: Impose a minimum site density standard to control subdivision and/or residential development.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The operative Rural General Zone provisions focus on the management of the landscape resource. No minimum area is identified and, consequently there is no perceived or actual development right to establish residential activity or buildings.</i> 		

- *Imposing a minimum density standard could be considered an effective tool to help manage the potential adverse effects of subdivision and development and in particular the cumulative effects of residential development. It is recognised that through the resource consent process it can be difficult to quantify whether a threshold has been reached with respect to adverse cumulative effects from subdivision and development, and that this might be more difficult where there is no minimum allotment size in the Rural Zone to use as an indicator of the appropriate intensity of residential development.*
- *Typically, a minimum density standard is imposed in rural areas to protect the soil resource and productive potential of rural land. Minimum density standards also provide a degree of certainty for inhabitants and neighbours with respect to amenity, and can provide parameters with regard to servicing and infrastructure limitations.*
- *In the context of these matters, imposing a minimum area requirement on rural land primarily to manage the impact of residential/commercial subdivision and development on the landscape could be criticised as being selected arbitrarily. The District's landscape character and ability to absorb change varies and what may be considered appropriate in one area may not suit others.*
- *For these reasons, imposing a minimum allotment size to achieve the purpose of the RMA is not more appropriate than the proposed Provisions.*

Issue 2: The management of Farming Activities

6.3.1 (Landscape) – The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.3 (Landscape) – Protect, maintain and enhance the district’s Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).

6.3.4 (Landscape) – Protect, maintain and enhance the District’s Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).

6.3.5 (Landscape) – Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).

6.3.7 (Landscape) – Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity where it contributes to the visual quality and distinctiveness of the District’s landscapes.

6.3.8 (Landscape) – Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District’s landscapes.

21.2.1 (Rural Zone) – Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.

21.2.2 (Rural Zone) - Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.

21.2.3 (Rural Zone) - Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.

21.2.4 (Rural Zone) – Manage situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated activities in the Rural Zone.

21.2.8 (Rural Zone) – Ensure commercial activities do not degrade landscape values, rural amenity, or impinge on farming activities.

21.2.11 (Rural Zone) – Manage the location, scale and intensity of informal airports.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Retention of farming as a permitted activity;

- Permit farm buildings subject to standards to protect the landscape resource in the ONL and RLC locations;
- Protect farming from activities that may seek to establish in the rural zone and constrain activities such as of a residential or commercial nature;
- Allow as a permitted activity the construction of farm buildings subject to standards on colour, location, size and height;
- Providing an exemption for small scale roadside side stalls so they do not require a resource consent;
- Retain the exemption for informal airports associated with farming activity
- The introduction of standards to control the potential effects of dairy farming buildings and infrastructure on rural amenity.
- Encouraging persons responsible for dairy grazing stock to exclude them from waterbodies by making it a prohibited activity.

Proposed Policies:

Policies:

Landscape

6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2, 6.3.1.5, 6.3.1.8, 6.3.1.10, 6.3.1.11, 6.3.1.12, 6.3.3.1, 6.3.3.2, 6.3.4.1 to 6.3.4.3, 6.3.5.1 to 6.3.5.3, 6.3.6.1, 6.3.7.1, 6.3.8.1, 6.3.8.2

Rural Zone

21.2.1.1 to 21.2.1.8, 21.2.2.1 to 21.2.2.3, 21.2.3.1, 21.2.4.1 – 21.2.4.2, 21.2.10.1 – 21.2.10.3.

Rules:

Landscape

6.4.1

Rural Zone

All Rules. Noting the new rules or rules of particular scale and significance are given particular consideration below.

(Also refer to the miscellaneous and existing operative provisions to be retained (Issue 7)).

Proposed Rule	Costs: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural	Benefits: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Rule 21.5.5</p> <p>Dairy Farming (Milking Herds, Dry Grazing and Calf Rearing)</p> <p>All effluent holding tanks, effluent treatment and effluent storage ponds, shall be located at least 300 metres from any formed road or adjoining property.</p> <p>Permitted activity standard, non-compliance results in a restricted discretionary class of resource consent.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odour. • Visual prominence. • Landscape character. • Effects on surrounding properties. <p>Rule 21.5. 6</p> <p>Dairy Farming (Milking Herds, Dry Grazing and Calf Rearing)</p> <p>All milking sheds or buildings used to house or feed milking stock shall be located at least 300 metres from any adjoining</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrespective of the required setback, there will be a reduction in the control and ability to impose conditions mitigating environmental effects due to the loss of control associated with making farm buildings a permitted activity. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has potential to impose costs on dairy farm operators by requiring buildings and related infrastructure to be located further away from road boundaries and adjoining property boundaries. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing the need to obtain a resource consent but requiring standards has the potential to create adverse effects where the prescribed 300 metre setback for the defined dairy infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides safeguards for rural amenity values by imposing controls on dairy farming milking sheds and effluent ponds, recognising it is a more intensive type of farming than traditional sheep or beef farming and having a higher potential for degrading rural amenity values. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standards are associated with making farm buildings a permitted activity. Allowing farm buildings as a permitted activity provides the opportunity for farmers to establish these buildings without the need to obtain a resource consent. • Provides for more flexibility in the rural zone for farming activities while maintaining rural amenity values. • Confirms farming as the anticipated and dominant activity in the Rural Zone. Provides certainty, economic wellbeing for farming operations, particularly large landholdings. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides certainty for persons residing adjacent to working dairy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions will provide effective management without unduly constraining permitted farming activities. • The provisions are not expected to create a high number of resource consents. • Overall, the proposed standards are considered an appropriate balance between making farm buildings permitted and managing the potential adverse effects of intensive farming activities.

<p>property or formed road.</p> <p>Permitted activity standard, non-compliance results in a restricted discretionary and discretionary classes of resource consent.</p>		<p>farms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides certainty for dairy farms as to where the infrastructure is expected to locate. 	
<p>Proposed Rule</p>	<p>Costs: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural</p>	<p>Benefits: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural</p>	<p>Effectiveness & Efficiency</p>
<p>Farm Buildings</p> <p>Rule 21.5.18 – location, landholding size and density of buildings.</p> <p>Permitted activity standard non-compliance would require a restricted discretionary activity class of resource consent.</p> <p>Rule 21.5.19 – exterior colour of buildings</p> <p>Permitted activity standard non-compliance would require a restricted discretionary activity class of resource consent.</p> <p>Rule 21.5.20 – Building Height Permitted activity standard non-compliance would require a discretionary activity class of</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The permitted activity could create adverse visual effects by removing the discretion for Council to control effects providing the qualifiers in the rule are met. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic effect associated with regulation, however the rules are introduced to balance the removal of rules that require a resource consent for any building. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for social and cultural effects on persons from building begin established as a permitted activity. these could be the location of a permitted farm building that obstructs views from adjoining residential building platforms in the Rural Zone. 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The permitted standards provide a degree of safeguards for landscape and location of buildings adjacent to water bodies. The permitted standard qualifiers are conservative and encourage buildings to be sited in sympathetic locations with recessive colours. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides the opportunity to establish farm buildings as permitted activity and dispense with the uncertainty with applying for a resource consent. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better certainty for rural landowners with expectations around constructing permitted farm buildings. 	<p>Farm Buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provisions will create efficiencies for farmers, particularly where small scale buildings are proposed where the costs of obtaining resource may be high relative to the value of the work. The permitted standards are subject to conservative criteria based on the existing standards for farm buildings and will provide effective management in the context of the landscape management provisions. The permitted activity standards are not intended to provide for all farm buildings as permitted activities. Buildings over 500m² are not uncommon and in these situations assessment would be required on a case by case basis.

<p>resource consent.</p> <p>Rule 21.5.4 – setback of buildings from water bodies.</p> <p>Permitted activity standard non-compliance would require a restricted discretionary activity class of resource consent.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The setback of buildings from waterbodies is effective in the context of the removal of a requirement for a resource consent.
Proposed Rule	Costs: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural	Benefits: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Rule 21.5.7</p> <p>Dairy Farming (Milking Herds, Dry Grazing and Calf Rearing)</p> <p>Stock shall be prohibited from standing in the bed of, or on the margin of a water body.</p> <p>For the purposes of this rule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Margin means land within 3.0 metres from the edge of the bed. • Water body has the same meaning as in the RMA, but also includes any drain or water race that goes to a lake or river. <p>Permitted activity standard, non-compliance results in a prohibited</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures will be required to exclude dairy grazing stock from water bodies by 3.0 metres. This will impose a cost associated with fencing infrastructure and time spent. However, the fencing need not be permanent. • Cost for Council to undertake monitoring and compliance with the administration of the rule. • Potential cost to persons whom do not comply with the rule and are subject to enforcement from the Council. <p>Social & Cultural</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple and direct rule to ensure that dairy grazing activity excludes stock from water bodies. By doing so there is greater certainty intensive farming practices would not degrade water bodies and riparian areas. • Reduces potential for adverse effects on water bodies and amenity values. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces costs associated with remediation to water bodies that have been damaged by grazing stock. • Assists with maintaining rural amenity and the District's environmental image that is important to tourism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of water body is consistent and complementary to the RMA and Otago Regional Council definitions of water bodies, in particular the definition of water bodies and drains as defined in the Otago Regional Plan: Water; Rule 12.C.0.1. • The rule will be efficient to interpret and comply with because it is based on a specific activity, rather than the effects of an activity. • The rule is easily complied with and is enforceable. • The rule is efficient in that it captures both land regularly used for grazing and land that is not regularly used for grazing. Therefore covering activities potentially missed by The

class of activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential social cost to dairy grazing operators ensuring compliance. 	<p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complementing regional council functions will assist with protecting social and cultural values associated with the intrinsic values of water bodies. 	Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord.
Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:			
<p><i>Option 1: Require resource consents for certain types of farming (such as dairy farming and grazing) to allow the Council to have a higher degree of control on landscape and rural amenity values.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The changes to the landscape from irrigation include linear and pivot irrigators and a change in the year-round colour of improved pasture. These aspects could be regarded as an adverse effect on the landscape. Activities such as horticulture and viticulture also fit within the proposed District Plan definition of 'Farming Activity' and the establishment of these activities would have an impact on the existing landscape.</i> <i>Pivot and linear irrigators are not buildings and are not subject to the rules of the District plan http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Planning/QLDC-Practice-Note-1-Centre-Pivot-and-Linear-Irrigators.pdf</i> 		
<p><i>Option 2: Make farm buildings permitted irrespective of location or size of the respective landholding.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The District relies upon the landscape as a significant resource for its economic, cultural and social wellbeing. It is recognised that farming activities are also a significant driver of the economy and farming activities are a key determinant of rural character and, farm buildings are an integral component of farming. Notwithstanding this, removing controls on farm buildings, particularly for larger scale buildings within the outstanding natural landscapes or on outstanding natural features would not provide effective management of the landscape resource.</i> <i>The proposed criteria provide as a permitted activity for modest sized farm buildings on what are likely to be genuine farming operations on larger landholdings at least 100ha in area, with a density of not more than one building per 25ha, currently one per 50ha. There are higher numbers of rural-residential subdivision and development on smaller landholdings and the effect of the sprawl of these buildings should be contained. It would not be appropriate to accept accessory buildings that support rural residential lifestyle</i> 		

Contamination of water bodies from dairy grazing stock

Option 1: Retain policy, but have no rule and rely on Regional Council rules, such as Rule 12.C.0.1 of the Otago Regional Plan: Water.

Option 2: Require fencing of water bodies.

activities as farm buildings for the purposes of this rule.

Contamination of water bodies from dairy grazing stock

Option 1:

- The proposed rule is purposefully different to the Regional Plan Rule in that it is an activity based rule that identifies dairy grazing as having a higher potential for contamination and degrading rural amenity values, and the intrinsic values of water bodies. The relevant Regional Plan Rule is:*

12.C.0 Prohibited activities: *No resource consent will be granted*

12.C.0.1 The discharge of any contaminant to water, that produces an objectionable odour, or a conspicuous oil or grease film, scum, or foam in any:

(i) Lake, river or Regionally Significant Wetland; or

(ii) Drain or water race that flows to a lake, river, Regionally Significant Wetland or coastal marine area; or

(iii) Bore or soak hole, is a prohibited activity.

- The proposed rule will promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources by simply excluding activities that are likely to degrade nature conservation and amenity values.*
- The Regional Council rule (Rule 12.C.0.1) has qualifiers with regard to any odour being 'objectionable', or a 'conspicuous' oil or grease film, scum or foam. The proposed rule may have a higher standard of intervention than the Regional Council Rule, because it excludes the activity outright.*

Option 2:

- This option would impose potential costs associated with fencing off water bodies to exclude stock. It is recognised that dairy stock may be grazed in one-off situations, particularly where grazing is undertaken away from the milking platform. Temporary fences*

<p><i>Option 3: Not specify a waterbody margin area.</i></p>	<p><i>can be used to comply with the rule.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It is considered best to leave the method to comply with the rule up to the persons responsible for the stock. This could be achieved by existing physical barriers such as hedgerows or by temporary electric fences.</i> <p><i>Option 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The definitions of water body and bed have been derived from the RMA interpretations. The Otago Regional Plan: Water, utilises similar definitions. For consistency and ease of interpretation, 'drains' where they flow to a lake or river have also been included, as identified in the Otago Regional Plan: Water; Rule 12.C.0.1.</i> • <i>A margin area has been set to ensure there is a buffer area between the bed of the water body and area where stock would be able to stand. This would assist with avoiding the potential for stock to trample and for excrement to enter the water body.</i> • <i>The width of the margin has been set at 3.0 metres. The margin is intended to exclude stock from directly standing on the edge of the waterbody and includes the provision for temporary fencing. The margin does not anticipate the retirement of land or riparian planting.</i> • <i>Should effective riparian planting be required, the margin may need to be wider. There is guidance available on this matter from other agencies. It is reiterated that the intention of the rule is to exclude dairy grazing stock from entering water bodies. The method for achieving compliance should be left to the persons responsible.</i>
--	---

<p><i>Option 4: Proposed Rule 21.5. 7</i></p> <p><u>Dairy Farming (Milking Herds, Dry Grazing and Calf Rearing)</u></p> <p>Do not provide as a prohibited activity and instead make it a controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The intent of the rule is to prevent intensive forms of farming degrading and creating significant adverse effects on water bodies and riparian areas. Providing the ability for a person to apply for a resource consent is counter intuitive to the encouragement to simply exclude stock from these relatively confined areas.</i> • <i>Providing the ability to apply for resource consent would be opening the door to a significant adverse effect and this would also leave the possibility for persons to apply for a resource consent on a retrospective basis. Neither of these scenarios would meet Section 5 of the RMA. The prohibited activity status is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA.</i>
---	---

Issue 3: Effective and Efficient Resource Management

6.3.1 (Landscape) Our distinctive landscapes are protected from inappropriate subdivision and development.

21.2.1 (Rural Zone) Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.

21.2. 13 (Rural Zone) Enable rural industrial activities within the Rural Industrial Sub Zones, that support farming and rural productive activities, while protecting, maintaining and enhancing rural character, amenity and landscape values.

23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone) To protect the character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Replacing the existing controlled activity resource consent requirement to build, reclad, repaint and alter buildings within a building platform with a permitted activity rule allowing these activities. Also includes allowing alterations to buildings located outside platforms, subject to a maximum area being altered.
- Permitted activities for farm buildings, buildings located within approved building platforms and alterations to buildings outside of an approved building platform, subject to controls on colour, height, coverage and location.
- Permits farm buildings where they previously required resource consent as a controlled activity, subject to controls on location, size, height and colour.

- Introducing new standards that require buildings comply with a range of colours that meet a certain hue and light reflectance value.
- Rule 21.5.16 limits the permitted size of any single building to 500m². The reason for this is to provide a control on the visual dominance of buildings. Because the operative District Plan requires that even where a building is anticipated a controlled activity resource consent is required, the Council has control over the location, external appearance, colours and landscaping. The removal of control necessitates a building size maxim to control the permitted baseline of buildings and to enable the potential visual dominance and effects on landscape character and rural amenity to be considered through a restricted discretionary resource consent.
- Rule 21.5.4 is introduced to control the location of buildings adjacent to waterbodies. As described above, the removal of the controlled activity status for buildings removes the ability of the Council to assess the potential amenity and hazard related effects associated with locating buildings near waterbodies. A restricted discretionary rule enabling the Council to consider potential adverse effects on biodiversity, landscape, visual amenity, open spaces values and hazards is considered appropriate in these instances.
- Making residential flats a permitted activity.

Proposed provisions	Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2, 6.3.1.5, 6.3.1.10, 6.3.3.1, 6.3.3.2, 6.3.4.1, 6.3.4.2, 6.3.4.3, 6.3.5.1, 6.3.6.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.1, 21.2.2, 21.2.3, 21.2.4, 21.2.5.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> 23.2.1.1, 23.2.1.4,</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council will not have the same level of control over aspects associated with the development such as 'nature conservation values', landscape plans and control on the 'external appearance' of buildings, only the colour to control the degree of visual prominence. However development would still be subject to any controls or obligations required by the subdivision consent or approval for the building platform. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for higher costs with subdivision than previously as any mitigation required for landscaping 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitting a range of reasonably conservative colours (20% LRV pre-finished steel, 30% LRV all other surfaces) will encourage applicants to utilise colours within this range to avoid applying for resource consent. • More emphasis for landscaping requirements to be at the time of subdivision. This would promote more integrated landscaping that would be responsive to the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and whether any mitigation is required. • Any more conservative controls imposed on a site by a subdivision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions will replace the need for a resource consent by permitting buildings within a range of controls to ensure that anticipated development would maintain landscape values. The provisions are effective at managing the effects of buildings on the landscape resource. • The ability to build as a permitted activity significantly increases certainty and efficiency while permitted activities will be effective at achieving objectives and policies to maintain landscape values.

<p>23.2.1.5, 23.2.1.7, 23.2.1.8</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.4.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.4 – all relevant rules 21.5 – all relevant rules 21.6 – notification provisions.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> All relevant rules.</p>	<p>would be focused at this stage, as opposed to leaving it for individual future allotment owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for higher administration costs for Council to review permitted development as part of the building consent where previously this was recovered from the resource consent. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for adverse effects due to the reduction of control. 	<p>consent notice will still apply, thus ensuring location specific landscaping or mitigation of adverse effects and associated servicing requirements are provided for.</p> <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced costs for applicants through resource consents and monitoring fees. Reduced cost for the Council through District Plan administration, including the requirement for development engineering staff to prepare RMA style reports on servicing. Removal of the potential for a ‘double up’ of processing where the existing controlled activity, matters of control for servicing (water supply, wastewater and stormwater) can be considered via the building consent application. Less delays in the overall build time and cost and more certainty for prospective development. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More certainty for people when they undertake anticipated development and small scale alterations to 	
---	---	--	--

		<p>houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on landscaping applied at the time of subdivision to mitigate the effects of infrastructure and future buildings. More certainty for future landowners with regard to landscaping expectations when they build. 	
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>			
<p><i>Option 1: Make buildings permitted with no controls on colour or maximum scale of buildings.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Would not control the effects of buildings while managing the landscape resource.</i> 		

Issue 4: Commercial Activities

6.3.1 (Landscape) The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.2 (Landscape) Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.

6.3.3 (Landscape) Protect, maintain and enhance the district's Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).

6.3.4 (Landscape) Protect, maintain and enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).

6.3.5 (Landscape) Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).

6.3.6 (Landscape) Protect, maintain or enhance the landscape values of the lakes and rivers and their margins from the effects of structures and

activities.

6.3.8 (Landscape) Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

21.2.1 (Rural Zone) Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.

21.2.2 (Rural Zone) Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.

21.2.3 (Rural Zone) Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.

21.2.4 (Rural Zone) Manage situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated activities in the Rural Zone.

21.2.5 (Rural Zone) Recognise for and provide opportunities for mineral extraction providing the location, scale and effects would not degrade amenity, water, landscape and indigenous biodiversity values.

21.2.6 (Rural Zone) Encourage the future growth, development and consolidation of existing Ski Areas within identified Sub Zones, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.

21.2.9 (Rural Zone) Ensure commercial activities do not degrade landscape values, rural amenity, or impinge on farming activities.

21.2.10 (Rural Zone) Recognise the potential for diversification of farms that utilises the natural or physical resources of farms and supports the sustainability of farming activities.

21.2.11 (Rural Zone) Manage the location, scale and intensity of informal airports.

21.2.12 (Rural Zone) Protect, maintain and enhance the surface of lakes and rivers and their margins.

21.2.13 (Rural Zone) Enable rural industrial activities within the Rural Industrial Sub Zones, that support farming and rural productive activities, while protecting, maintaining and enhancing rural character, amenity and landscape values.

23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone) Protect the economic viability, character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.

23.2.2 (Gibbston Character Zone) Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Policy that acknowledges the dependence of some commercial activities on the landscape resource and rural amenity values;
- Policy that recognises that commercial activities within the rural zones can impinge on farming activities and reduce the vitality of commercial centres;
- Retention of the majority of the existing rules relating to commercial activities in the Rural Zone;
- Increasing the permitted standard for land based outdoor commercial recreation activities from five to ten persons in any one group;
- Clarification of the existing rules relating to retail sales;
- Changing the existing permitted standard for 'other activities' to allow home occupation based commercial activities up to 150m² in the Rural Zone and 100m² in the Gibbston Character Zone;
- Non-complying activity status for industrial activities in the Rural Zone;
- Forestry activities in the ONL and ONF a non-complying activity;
- Enabling the use of informal airports as a permitted activity, subject to standards.
- Identification of a rural industry/service zone. Refer to specific section 32 evaluation.

Proposed provisions	Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.2.1.1 to 6.2.1.4, 6.2.1.7 to 6.2.1.12. 6.2.2.1 to 6.2.6.3 6.2.8.1 to 6.2..8.3</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.2.1 – 21.2.2.3 21.2.3.1 21.2.4.1 – 21.2.4.2 21.2.5.1 – 21.2.5.4 21.2.6.1 – 21.2.6.3 21.2.7.1 - 21.2.7.4</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for larger range of permitted effects for home occupation activities • Increasing outdoor recreation activities from 5 to 10 will have a potential for higher adverse effects. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential costs for commercial or industrial operators seeking to locate in the Rural Zone <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for recreational users to be affected by larger groups of outdoor 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides control to assess the effects of industrial activities. • Provides clearer parameters around what may constitute suitable commercial activities in the Rural Zones. • Provides more appropriate basis to encourage commercial activities to locate in the zone where that activity is likely to be most appropriate and recognises commercial and tourism activities that have a genuine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions would provide effective control for activities that may have an adverse impact, while enabling activities that would have a low impact such as home occupation and outdoor commercial recreation activities. • The provisions introduce efficiencies in enabling persons to provide for small scale, low impact commercial activities while clarifying the operative provisions relating to commercial activities.

<p>21.2.9.1 – 21.2.9.6 21.2.11.1 – 21.2.11.2 21.2.12.1 – 21.2.12.10 21.2.13.1 – 21.2.13.2.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> 23.3.3, 23.3.4, 23.3.6</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.4.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.3 - 21.4 and 21.5 all relevant rules.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> 23.4.1, 23.4.12 to 23.4.20 Tables 2 and 3</p>	<p>commercial recreation activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for localised amenity effects from larger range of home occupation based activities. 	<p>affiliation with the landscape resource and farming activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable controls are in place for activities based on the scale and intensity of the activity. • Provides control to manage the effects of activities on the districts outstanding natural landscapes and features as required by Part 2 of the RMA. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More certainty for commercial operators seeking to locate in the Rural Zones. • Enables small scale outdoor commercial operators to establish without the requirement to apply for a resource consent. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for a range of small scale outdoor commercial recreation opportunities without the need to obtain resource consent. • Enables people to meet their needs on their own properties as part of home occupation activities, where these activities would have a low 	
--	---	--	--

		environmental impact.	
Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:			
<i>Option 1: Make all commercial activities require a resource consent</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Would be an unnecessary level of control on small commercial activities that are appropriate in the Rural Zones and have limited environmental impacts..</i> 	

Issue 5: Managing the existing Ski Area Subzones

6.3.8 (Landscape) Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District’s landscapes.

21.2.6 (Rural Zone) Encourage the future growth, development and consolidation of existing Ski Areas within identified Sub Zones, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Policy recognising the importance of skiing activities and their consolidation within the ski area subzones;
- Retention of operative rules allowed the construction of buildings as a controlled activity;
- A rule requiring a non-complying activity resource consent for ski area activities/commercial skiing (except heli-skiing) not located within the ski area sub zones;
- Specific policy and rules for established vehicle testing activity at Waiorau Snow Farm area.

<i>Proposed provisions</i>	<i>Costs</i>	<i>Benefits</i>	<i>Effectiveness & Efficiency</i>
-----------------------------------	---------------------	------------------------	--

<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.2.8.1, 6.2.8.3</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.6.1 to 21.2.6.3</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.4.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> Table 1 and Table 8.</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains existing ski field and vehicle testing activities <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains the ongoing activities that provide for peoples well-being 	<p>The proposed provisions will assist with the identification of specific activities within the Rural Zone that make an important contribution to the district's economy and provide a recreational resource. The provisions will be effective in that they provide certainty to ski area activities within the sub zone areas while retaining control on the effects of activities.</p> <p>The provisions are enabling and maintain efficiencies to the ski field operators and established vehicle testing facilities.</p>
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>			
<p><i>Option 1: More control on the adverse effects of building and activities in sensitive landscapes. Make buildings and ski area activities a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The existing provisions are enabling and more control on the scale and intensity of activities could be considered necessary. A review of the resource consents granted for ski area activities does not however, indicate to date, that there is a valid reason to change the provisions to make ski area activity buildings a class of resource consent that could result in a development being declined.</i> 	

Issue 6: Managing the Gibbston Character Zone

6.3.1 (Landscape) The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.2 (Landscape)– Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.

6.3.8 (Landscape) - Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone) Protect the economic viability, character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.

23.2.2 (Gibbston Character Zone) Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.

23.2.3 (Gibbston Character Zone) Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.

23.2.4 (Gibbston Character Zone) Encourage land management practices that recognise and accord with the environmental sensitivity and amenity values of the Gibbston Character Zone.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Retention of the majority of existing provisions including the following changes:
 - Further enabling the construction and use of winery buildings by making them a controlled activity up to 500m², currently this is a restricted discretionary activity for the construction of any building;
 - Industrial activities associated with wineries and underground cellars a permitted activity, up to 300m²;
 - Retention of the existing policies of the Gibbston Character Zone;
 - Recognition of the Gibbston Character Zone in the landscape policy and confirmation that the landscape categorisations do not apply;
 - Retention of the assessment criteria for buildings, subject to modifications similar to the Rural Zone assessment criteria to reduce repetition and clarification;
- Refer to separate resource management issues for matters relating to effective and efficient resource management, commercial activities, informal airports and landscape for provisions affected by these issues.

Proposed provisions	Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.2.1.8, 6.2.2.3. 5.3.2.4. 5.3.9.2.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> All policies</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.4.1</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> 23.4-23.7 – All rules.</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains emphasis on managing water and soil resource. Controlling effects of activities that may impinge on viticulture. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains importance of viticulture and winery buildings and the contribution these make to the District. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for peoples welling being who rely on the resources and established infrastructure and buildings as part of the districts wine making. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions will be effective at providing for viticulture as the predominant activity, maintain amenity and controlling non-viticulture activities. • The provisions will not create inefficiencies for viticulture activities, or any established residential or commercial activities. The proposed phrasing will encourage efficient administration of the provisions.
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>			
<p><i>Option 1: Remove the existing zone, rezone to Rural Zone and apply the landscape categories.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Viticulture fits under the ambit of farming activity and the main concession for new activities is that winery buildings are a restricted discretionary activity. While the Rural Zone provisions could also control the effects of subdivision and development in this location, the framework of the Gibbston Character Zone provides more certainty for activities associated with viticulture, including winery buildings and processing and manufacturing associated with wine making.</i> 		

Issue 7: Miscellaneous and existing Provisions

6.3.5 (Landscape) Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

13.3.5 (Rural Zone) Recognise for and provide opportunities for mineral extraction providing the location, scale and effects would not degrade amenity, water, landscape and indigenous biodiversity values.

21.2.7 (Rural Zone) Separate activities sensitive to aircraft noise from existing airports through:

- **Wanaka: Retention of an area containing activities that are not sensitive to aircraft noise, within an airport's Outer Control Boundary, to act as a buffer between airports and activities sensitive to aircraft noise (ASAN).**
- **Queenstown: Retention of an area for Airport related activities or where appropriate an area for activities not sensitive to aircraft noise within an airport's Outer Control Boundary to act as a buffer between airports and other land use activities.**

21.2.8 (Rural Zone)– Avoid subdivision and development in areas that are identified as being unsuitable for development.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Proposed inclusion of policy to recognise and provide for a range of established rules.
- Existing status for the following activities substantially retained with minor modifications to phrasing or the matters of control:
 - Domestic livestock (Rule 21.4. 11)
 - Retail sales of farm and garden produce grown or produced on the site (Rule 21.4. 14) including a exemption for small scale roadside stalls
 - Commercial activities ancillary to and on the same site as recreational activities (Rule 21.4. 15)
 - Cafes and restaurants located in a winery complex within a vineyard (Rule 21.4. 17)
 - Forestry activities (Rule 21.4.2.21 and 21.4. 1)
 - Visitor accommodation (Rule 21.4.20)
 - Restrictions on activities adjacent to airports (Rule 21.4. 28 and 21.4. 29) and requirements for sound insulation within critical listening environments of activities sensitive to aircraft noise (limited to alterations and additions of existing buildings) (Rule 21.5.13) to reflect the outcomes of Plan Change 35 for the Queenstown Airport.
 - Mining activities (Rule 21.4.2.30 to 21.4.2.31)
 - Bulk and location of buildings (Table 2)
 - Factory Farming (Rule 21.4.2, 21.5.8 – 21.5.10)
 - Structures within road boundaries (Rule 21.4.2.45)
 - Retail sales associated produce grown or reared on site (Rule 21.5.14)
 - All activities relating to Closeburn Station (21.4.1 and Table 10)

Proposed provisions	Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.2.9.1, 6.2.9.2</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.1.1 – 21.2.1.8 21.2.4.1 – 21.2.4.2, 21.2.5.1 to 21.2.5.4 21.2.7.1 to 21.2.7.4 21.2.8.1 to 21.2.8.2</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> Refer to the summary above.</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement for sound insulation and/or mechanical ventilation within the Air Noise boundaries of the Queenstown Airport will add some cost to development. However, the rule reflects the Environment Court confirmed provisions filed in May 2013; and seeks to achieve an appropriate management regime for land use around the airport. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operative provisions provide control for managing potential effects on the environment. <p>Economic</p> <p>Requirement for sound insulation and/or mechanical ventilation within the Air Noise boundaries of the Queenstown Airport will contribute to protecting the Queenstown Airport from reverse sensitivity effects; supporting the efficient operation of the airport and associated economic benefits to the District.</p> <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide certainty to the nature and scale of development. • Requirement for sound insulation and/or mechanical ventilation within the Air Noise boundaries will support appropriate level of amenity for activities sensitive to aircraft noise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These provisions have not been identified as being necessary to change. • These provisions are considered to provide an effective degree of either permissiveness or control. They are not considered to create unnecessary inefficiencies.
<p><u>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</u></p>			
<p>Option 1: none identified.</p>			

10. Efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions

The above provisions are drafted to specifically address the resource management issues identified with the current provisions, and to enhance those provisions that already function well. A number of areas of the existing chapter have been removed to aid the readability of the Plan by keeping the provisions at a minimum, whilst still retaining adequate protection for the resource.

By simplifying the objectives, policies and rules (the provisions), the subject matter becomes easier to understand for users of the Plan both as applicant and administrator (processing planner). Removal of technical or confusing words and phrases also encourages correct use and interpretation. With easier understanding, the provisions create a more efficient consent process by reducing the number of consents required and by expediting the processing of those consents.

11. The risk of not acting

Section 32(c) of the RMA requires an assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. It is not considered that there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.

The issues identified and options taken forward are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. If these changes were not made there is a risk the District Plan would fall short of fulfilling its functions.

References

Also refer to any footnotes within the text

1. Read Landscapes Limited 'Report to Queenstown Lakes District Council on appropriate landscape classification boundaries within the District, with particular reference to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features' 2014. - [link](#)
 - a. Peer review on the Wakatipu component by Ben Espie landscape planner - [link](#)
 - b. Peer review on the Wanaka/Upper Clutha component by Anne Steven landscape architect - [link](#)
 - c. Read Landscapes Limited. Post review amendments 16 October 2014 - [link](#)
 - d. Landscape assessment of Criffel Station and terrace escarpments near McKay Road 'QLDC Landscape categorisation Lines' by Paul Smith landscape Architect. 20 July 2015 - [link](#)
2. Read Landscapes Limited 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment' June 2014 - [link](#)
3. 'High Level Review of Proposed District Plan Provisions – Landscape Issues' Ben Espie Landscape Planner. 20 November 2014 - [link](#)
4. Ministry for the Environment. 2014. A guide to section 32 of the Resource management Act: incorporating changes as a result of the Resource Management Amendment Act 2013. Wellington. Ministry for the Environment - [link](#)

Appendix 5. Section 32AA Evaluation for Queenstown Airport Zone Provisions

Appendix 5

Section 32AA Assessment Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone

Note: The relevant provisions from the revised chapter are set out below, showing additions to the notified text in underlining and deletions in ~~strike through~~ text (ie as per the revised chapter). The section 32AA assessment then follows in a separate table underneath each of the provisions.

Recommended Amendments to Objective 17.2.1

17.2.1 Objective – Queenstown Airport is recognised as <u>nationally significant infrastructure and a generator of nationally and regionally significant economic, social and cultural benefits.</u>
--

Appropriateness (s32(1)(a))

This recommended change to the objective is in response the Forth Procedural Minute issued by the Panel regarding the drafting of objectives. The objective now reads as an outcome or goal rather than a policy. In addition, this change also reflects that the airport itself is nationally significant infrastructure which is in accordance with the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement (PRPS).
--

Updated Policy 17.2.1.1

Recommended updated Policies 17.2.1.1
--

17.2.1.1 Airport activities are enabled, provided <u>Provide for those aviation activities necessary to enable Queenstown Airport <u>can</u> to operate in a safe and efficient manner.</u>
--

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor amendments to this policy have been recommended to improve drafting. • Reference is now made to a defined term being 'airport activities' which is defined rather than 'aviation activities' which is not defined. • Provides greater certainty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to this policy give effect to the purpose of the chapter which is to provide for a range of airport and airport related activities. • Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP through greater clarity.

New Policy 17.2.1.4

Recommended New Policy 17.2.1.4
--

17.2.1.4 <u>Promote the use of walking, cycling and public transport services and infrastructure to support or complement the functioning of Queenstown Airport.</u>
--

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises the importance of providing public transport services and infrastructure in the future. • Promotes alternative modes of transport in accordance with the Objectives and Policies of the PRPS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises the need for and importance of alternative modes of travel other than private motor vehicles. • Gives effect to Policy 4.4.6 of the PRPS.

Notified Policy 17.2.2.3 [Redrafted 17.2.3.3]

Updated of Policy 17.2.2.3 [Redrafted 17.2.3.3]	
17.2.1.4	Avoid the establishment <u>or intensification</u> of activities that are incompatible with the ongoing operation and functioning of Queenstown Airport.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. • The rewording of this policy places additional restriction on existing activities that are incompatible with the ongoing operation and functioning of the Airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises that the intensification of incompatible land uses also has the potential to adversely affect the long term sustainable use and development of the Airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises that intensification of existing activities also has the potential to adversely impact on the functioning of the Airport.

Recommended new Clarification 17.3.2

Recommended new Clarification 17.3.2	
17.3.2	<u>District Wide Clarification</u>
	<u>Advice Notes:</u>
17.3.2.1	<u>A permitted activity must comply with all the rules listed in the activity and standards tables.</u>
17.3.2.1 17.3.2.2	<u>Where an activity does not comply with a Standard listed in the Standards table, the activity status identified by the 'Non-Compliance Status' column shall apply. Where an activity breaches more than one Standard, the most restrictive status shall apply to the Activity.</u>
17.3.2.3	<u>Rules 17.2.1 to 17.2.9 and the standards contained in Table 2 apply to Queenstown Airport. Rules 17.2.10 to 17.4.12 and the standards contained in Table 3 apply to Wanaka Airport.</u>
17.3.2.4	<u>In addition to these rules, any person wishing to undertake an activity within the Aerodrome Purposes designation at Queenstown or Wanaka Airport must obtain the written approval of the requiring authority, in accordance with section 176 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</u>
17.3.2.3 17.3.2.5	<u>The following abbreviations are used within this Chapter.</u>

P	Permitted	C	Controlled
RD	Restricted Discretionary	D	Discretionary
NC	Non Complying	PR	Prohibited

General Rules:

17.3.2.6 For Airport Activities at Queenstown Airport, including the Queenstown Airport Corporation as Network Utility Operator, the Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone (Chapter 17) shall prevail over the Energy and Utilities Chapter (Chapter 30).

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds to the length and content of the PDP • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These changes will ensure that consistency with the way other chapters within the PDP have been drafted. • The advice notes and general rules will provide clarification for users of the District Plan in relation to permitted activities. • Identifying which rules are applicable to Wanaka, and which are applicable to Queenstown provides clarity for users of the District Plan. • Notifying users of the District Plan of their obligation to obtain written approval from the requiring authority for any activity within the designation at Queenstown and Wanaka Airports also provides clarity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP through greater clarity.

Recommended Amendment to Rule 17.4.1 – Permitted

Recommended Amendment to Rule – 17.4.1 Permitted

17.4.1 Any ~~airport activity or airport related activity~~ Airport Activity – Queenstown Airport, Airport Related Activity – Queenstown Airport or farming activity that which complies with all the relevant standards in Table 2 rules in section 17.5 shall be a Permitted Activity.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clarity that only those activities defined as 'Airport Activity - Queenstown Airport' or 'Airport Related Activity - Queenstown Airport' and that comply with all the relevant standards in Table 2 are permitted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP through removing inconsistencies in the chapter, improving clarity, and removing the need for unnecessary clarification. • With the inclusions of an Airport Zone in Wanaka, the reworded rule differentiates

		that this rule applies to activities at Queenstown Airport.
--	--	---

Amend Rule 17.5.5 – Building Design and Glare

Recommended Amendment to Rule – 17.5.5	
Building Design and Glare	
17.5.5.1	The exterior of B buildings situated within the landside area at Queenstown Airport shall be designed so that roof and wall colours are limited to a maximum reflectivity of 36%, except where: Trims, highlights and signage totalling up to 10% of the façade area may exceed this level and be of contrasting colour.
17.5.5.2 ^a	Any landside activity which requires the lighting of outdoor areas shall ensure that direct or indirect illumination does not exceed 10 lux at the windows of residential buildings in any adjacent Residential Zone
17.5.5.3	<u>All fixed exterior lighting on buildings associated with Airport Related Activities shall be directed away from adjacent sites and roads.</u>
*Discretion is restricted to all of the following:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited to <u>T</u>the extent of adverse effects from lighting on Residential Activities. And • The extent to which the lighting is required for operational purposes. 	

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective tool for managing adverse effects from lighting and glare on the landscape and on the night sky. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP by improving clarity, and removing unnecessary clarification. • Provides focus for key areas of glare and lighting that require management in the context of the airport setting.

Delete Notified Rule 17.5.6 – Maximum Noise – Land Based Activities

Recommended Deletion of <u>Notified</u> Rule – 17.5.6
--

Maximum Noise – Land Based Activities

~~17.5.6.1 Sound from land based activities measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802: 2008 shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within any Residential Zone, the notional boundary in the Rural Zone, or at any point within Activity Areas 1, 3, 4, 6 and 8 of the Remarkables Park Zone. On any site within the zone, land based activities shall be conducted such that the following noise levels are not exceeded at any adjacent Zone boundary:~~

~~17.5.5.2.1 Daytime (0700 to 2200 hrs) 55 dB L_{Aeq(15 min)}~~

~~17.5.5.2.2 Night-time (2200 to 0700 hrs) 45 dB L_{Aeq(15 min)} 70 dB L_{AFmax}~~

~~17.5.6.2 The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to any aircraft noise activities subject to the Queenstown Airport noise provisions managed through Designation 2.~~

~~17.5.6.3 The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to construction noise which shall be assessed in accordance with NZS6803:1999 “Acoustics – Construction Noise”.~~

~~*Discretion is limited to the extent of effects of noise generated on adjoining zones.~~

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes duplication between Chapter 17 and the provisions contained within Council’s Reply for Chapter 36 (Noise) (Redrafted Rule 36.5.15 provides adequate control of noise). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP through removing duplication, improving clarity, and removing unnecessary clarification. District wide provisions relating to Noise are contained in one place.

Amend Notified Rule 17.5.7 [Redrafted 17.5.6] – Hazardous Substances

Recommended Amendment to Notified Rule – 17.5.7 [Redrafted 17.5.6]

~~Hazardous substances must be used, stored and transported in accordance with the HSNO regulations and any CAA requirements (NB Chapter 16 Hazardous Substances of the Operative District Plan does not apply to the Airport Zone).~~

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes duplication between the District Plan and HASNO legislation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP by improving clarity, and removing unnecessary clarification.

Amend Notified Rule 17.5.9 [Redrafted 17.5.8] – Transportation

Recommended Amendment of Notified Rule – 17.4.9 [Redrafted 17.5.8]	
Transportation	
17.5.9.1	Loading and Access
	Loading and Access shall comply with the requirements specified in Section 14 Transport of the Operative District Plan.
17.5.9.2	Minimum Car Parking
	Activities undertaken within or in association with the airport terminal facility are exempt from complying with any minimum parking requirement. Except for those activities undertaken within or in association with the airport terminal facility, on-site car parking shall comply with the car parking requirements specified in Section 14 of the Operative District Plan.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove reference to the ODP provisions contained within Part 14 – Transport. This provision can be comprehensively looked at as part of Stage 2 of the District Plan review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP through removing unnecessary clarification. Provides clarity through redrafting of provision which read as an advice note.

Recommended Updated Definition – Aircraft

Aircraft	Means any machine that can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air otherwise than by reactions of the air against the surface of the earth. Excludes remotely piloted aircraft that weigh less than 15 kilograms.
----------	--

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. Could result in some potential small scale adverse amenity effects such as noise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes the potential requirement for a large number of resource consents for remotely piloted aircraft which CAA rules are tailored to specify. Provides certainty and clarification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves the effectiveness of the PDP through greater clarity.

Recommended Updated Definition – Activity Sensitive To Aircraft Noise (ASAN) Wanaka

Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) Wanaka	Means any residential activity, visitor accommodation activity, community activity and day care facility activity, but excludes activity in police stations, fire stations, courthouses, probation and detention centres, government and local government offices.
---	---

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. • The definition of 'Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) Wanaka' includes the following statement: "including all outdoor spaces associated with any educational facility". This statement is omitted from the definition "Activity Sensitive To Aircraft Noise (ASAN)" Accordingly, there could be some adverse effects on the aviation school that operates at the Airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes duplication between this definition and the definition of "Activity Sensitive To Aircraft Noise (ASAN)". • Removes unnecessary text from the PDP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the effectiveness of the PDP through greater clarity.

Recommended Updated Definition – Air Noise Boundary

<u>Air Noise Boundary</u>	<u>Means a boundary, the location of which is based on predicted day/night sound levels of Ldn 65 dBA from future airport operations. The location of the boundary is shown on the District Plan Maps.</u>
---------------------------	--

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes redundant text from the PDP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the effectiveness of the PDP through greater clarity.

Recommended Updated Definition – Airport Activity – Queenstown Airport

<u>Airport Activity = Queenstown Airport</u>	<p>Means land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aircraft operations, private aircraft traffic, domestic and international aircraft traffic, rotary wing operations, aircraft servicing, general aviation, airport or aircraft training facilities and associated offices. • Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement areas. <p>Terminal buildings, hangars, control towers, air traffic control facilities, flight information services, navigation and safety aids, rescue facilities, navigation and safety aids, lighting, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, freight facilities, quarantine and incineration facilities, border control and immigration facilities, medical facilities, fuel storage and fuelling facilities, facilities for the handling and storage of hazardous substances, and associated offices.</p>
--	---

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More accurately reflects the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the efficient

notified PDP provisions.	activities at Queenstown Airport.	implementation of the PDP through improving clarity.
--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Recommended New Definition – Remotely Piloted Aircraft

<u>Remotely Piloted Aircraft</u>	<u>Means an unmanned aircraft that is piloted from a remote station.</u>
----------------------------------	--

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This definition is consistent with Civil Aviation Authority definitions and links with the recommended updated definition for 'Aircraft'. • Cross references with the definition of 'Aircraft' which excludes 'remotely piloted aircraft', therefore providing clarity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP through removing inconsistencies in the chapter and improving the clarity of the definition for 'Aircraft'.

Appendix 6. Section 32AA Evaluation for Wanaka Airport Zone Provisions

Appendix 6

Section 32AA Assessment Wanaka Airport

Note: All provisions assessed in this report are assessed as new provisions. Any changes to the Queenstown Airport Zone provisions in Chapter 17 to accommodate the addition of a Wanaka Airport Zone are assessed in the s 32AA report on the Queenstown Airport Zone provisions (**Appendix 5**).

1. Introduction

This Section 32AA (**S 32AA**) evaluation sets out the changes proposed to the recommended planning framework for Wanaka Airport since the section 32 evaluation report relating to the site was published.¹

The underlying zoning of Wanaka Airport, and zoning proposed in the notified Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) is Rural.

On the basis of submissions on the PDP, it is now proposed that Wanaka Airport be rezoned Airport Zone.

The section 32 report relating to the Wanaka Airport site does not specifically identify any resource management issues for Wanaka Airport because at the time it was published no provisions were proposed to allow for airport activities. Rather, the airport operator relied on Designation 64 (**Designation**) to provide for its airport related activities.

2. Background

Wanaka Airport occupies approximately 68 hectares of land located approximately 2.5km to the north of Luggate, and on a distinct upper terrace adjacent to the Wanaka-Luggate Highway (State Highway 6 (**SH6**)), approximately 13km southeast of Wanaka.

Wanaka Airport is an important asset to the Upper Clutha area of the District and Central Otago District. The airport provides a hub for primarily commercial helicopter operators, helicopter maintenance, recreational flying, aviation training, warbirds and wheels museum and café, and aircraft restoration. The Wanaka Airport also hosts the biennial 'Warbirds over Wanaka' air show.

Currently the Wanaka area of the Queenstown Lakes District is experiencing one of the highest growths in permanent population and tourist numbers of any area in New Zealand. While this is in part due to Wanaka's proximity to Queenstown, it is also a reflection of the nature of its own tourist attractions, for example, Lakes Wanaka and Hawea and its ski fields.

¹ Section 32 Evaluation Report, Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone. Published 26 August 2015. Available electronically via <http://www.qldc.govt.nz/index.php/planning/district-plan/proposed-district-plan/section-32-documents/>.

The Wanaka area is part of the tourist route between Central Otago and Queenstown and the West Coast, and closely tied to tourism flows to this area.

Wanaka Airport was opened in 1983 after being relocated from a site closer to Wanaka. The initial sealed strip was lengthened to 1,200 metres in 1986 with a grassed extension and this was upgraded to a new sealed runway and taxiway by 1988.

Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited (**QAC**) (433) submitted on the PDP and questioned the efficiency of the proposed underlying Rural zoning of Wanaka Airport because third party users of the airport cannot utilise the enabling provisions of the Designation and must therefore comply with the provisions of the underlying zoning, which are incompatible with airport operations. Under the PDP the construction of a hangar and undertaking aviation activities by third parties could require a non-complying activity resource consent.

Through the outcome of the Rural Hearing it was agreed by the Panel, QAC and Council officers that it would be appropriate and that there was scope² to develop a separate planning framework for Wanaka Airport and that notified Chapter 17 Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone formed an appropriate base for the proposed rezoning.

3. Resource Management Issues

In accordance with s 32AA(1)(c) this evaluation is undertaken at a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the proposed changes. In this circumstance the recommendation is to provide a planning framework in a bespoke zone for Wanaka Airport. Therefore, the changes are considered substantial and it is considered appropriate to identify the key resource management issues identified for Wanaka Airport.

The key resource management issues set out in this assessment were identified during the hearing proceedings as part of Chapter 21 (Rural) of the PDP include the following:

Issue 1: An appropriate framework for activities at Wanaka Airport: The PDP as notified does not provide an express framework for activities at Wanaka Airport. Reliance is placed on the Designation and it has been identified that this does not meet the needs of tenants who undertake most of the development at Wanaka Airport and have financial responsibility for the developments undertaken at the airport. Only the requiring authority (QLDC), having financial responsibility for a project or work at Wanaka Airport, can rely on the Designation to establish activities which support, complement or enhance the efficient operation of the Airport.

Issue 2: Managing adverse effects of airport activities at Wanaka Airport: Adverse effects on the surrounding environment resulting from activities at Wanaka Airport need to be appropriately managed. Currently, the environmental results anticipated are expressed through conditions of the Designation. These are only applicable to the requiring authority and can only be used as a guide when assessing resource consent application. Strictly, the planning framework to assess land uses undertaken by persons other than the requiring authority is that for the Rural Zone.

² Minute concerning provisions applying to Wanaka Airport, 16 June 2016:
<http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Planning/District-Plan/Hearings-Page/Memorandums/Hearing-Process-Rescheduling-Submission-433-re-Wanaka-Airport-16-6-16-2.pdf>.

Issue 3: Managing the scale and intensity of airport related activities and ensuring that the land resource at Wanaka Airport is used for legitimate activities: QAC's (433) submission on the PDP requested a broad range of activities be defined as 'Airport Related Activities' and that these be given a permitted activity status. These include industrial, commercial, conferences and meetings, retail and restaurant activities. It is accepted that a broad range of activities could be associated with the operation of the legitimate aircraft operations at Wanaka Airport, and it is appropriate that workers and visitors have convenient access to food and amenities within the Airport complex. However, it is considered important that the nature, scale and intensity of identified activities such as retail and restaurant activities do not undermine the viability of activities that are provided for within the Wanaka Town Centre Zone, Three Parks Zone, Industrial A and B Zones and Business Mixed Use Zone.

As required by section 32(1)(b) of the RMA, the following section considers various broad options considered to address each issue, and makes recommendations as to the most appropriate course of action in each case.

Issue 1: An appropriate framework for activities at Wanaka Airport

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Amend notified PDP Rural Zone Chapter	Option 3: Create a new zone
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inefficiencies to third party operators and development at Wanaka Airport that is subject to the Rural Zone objectives and provisions. • Inefficient and poor planning practice in terms of the administration of the Rural Zone and ad-hoc granting of non-complying resource consents. • Costs and uncertainty to third party operators at Wanaka Airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulks out the Rural Zone provisions (Chapter 21 of the PDP). • A resource consent application for an aviation/airport activity would be assessed against the objectives of the Rural Zone. The objectives of the Rural Zone are not considered to provide adequate direction as to the appropriateness of activities that require resource consent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases the size of the District Plan. • Potential duplication of rules from the Rural Zone.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less bespoke planning provisions in the District Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes the requirement for stand-alone provisions in new chapter/changes to the notified Chapter 17 Queenstown Airport Mixed Use Zone. • A dedicated planning framework will provide better direction as to the appropriateness of the activities that require resource consent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More targeted provisions and environmental outcomes clearly expressed through the policies and objectives. • More detailed provisions that better provide for the anticipated land use. • Better guidance for decision makers in terms of identifying and providing for legitimate activities associated with Wanaka Airport. • Provides the opportunity for alignment with the Strategic Direction components of the PDP. • Greater integrity of the Rural Zone and PDP overall with regard to reducing the number of resource consents, in particular non-complying activity status resource consents in the Rural Zone. • Greater certainty and understanding of

			<p>expectations for those seeking to develop airport activities and airport related activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced potential for unintended outcomes that could occur through a raft of 'effects' based applications for commercial activities at the Wanaka Airport.
Ranking	3 (least preferred)	2	1 (preferred)

4. Scale and Significance Evaluation

The evaluation of the proposed objectives and provisions has been determined by an assessment of the scale and significance of the effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposed provisions. In making this assessment, regard has been had to the following, namely whether the objectives and provisions:

- Result in a significant variance from the Proposed District Plan.
- Have effects on resources that are considered to be a matter of national importance in terms of section 6 of the Act.
- Adversely affect those with specific interests, e.g., Tangata Whenua.
- Involve effects that have been considered implicitly or explicitly by higher order documents.
- Impose increased costs or restrictions on individuals, communities or businesses.

The level of detail of analysis in this report is moderate. The Airport is important infrastructure to the community, provides an important aviation hub and provides an important service and employment opportunities. The ODP and PDP did not provide a zone or stand-alone planning framework for Wanaka Airport and in this respect the recommended changes are a significant modification to the ODP and PDP. However, the recommended Wanaka Airport Zone is a relatively small area at 68 ha. Accordingly, the effects of the implementation of the proposed provisions will be contained.

5. Evaluation of proposed Objectives Section 32(1)(a)

The identification and analysis of issues has helped define how Section 5 of the RMA should be given effect to in terms of the recommended Wanaka Airport Zone. Section 32(1)(a) requires an examination of the extent to which the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. The following objectives serve to address the key Strategic issues in the District:

<p>Issue 1</p> <p>Issue 3</p>	<p>An appropriate framework for activities at Wanaka Airport</p> <p>Managing the scale and intensity of airport related activities and ensuring that the land resource at Wanaka Airport is used for legitimate activities</p>
<p>Proposed Objective</p>	<p>Appropriateness</p>
<p>At Wanaka Airport, Airport Activities and Airport Related Activities support the essential functioning of aviation activities.</p>	<p>The purpose of this objective is to set the framework for the enablement of airport and airport Related activities at Wanaka Airport so long as they are an aviation activity or provide legitimate support to the functioning and operation of Wanaka Airport.</p> <p>The outcomes sought for this objective are to ensure that legitimate airport related activities can be established at Wanaka Airport and to provide a framework to limit the scale and intensity of such activities.</p> <p>This objective is considered to be consistent with section 5 of the RMA because it promotes the sustainable management of a physical resource (Wanaka Airport) through providing the basis for the land at Wanaka Airport to be used for airport activities and legitimate airport related activities where such a use does not have adverse effects on the functioning of commercially zoned land within the Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary.</p> <p>This objective will enable Wanaka Airport to be managed, developed, and protected in a way which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being while not compromising or undermining other areas of land which are commercially zoned. The objective will promote enable the airport to grow in the most efficient way and addresses the resource management issues described above.</p> <p>The objective and resultant provisions will provide certainty for investment at Wanaka Airport and appropriate guidance for both decision makers and persons wishing to carry out activities that require a resource consent.</p> <p>The Objective is also considered to give effect to the following objectives and policies from the following higher order planning documents:</p>

- **Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 (Operative RPS)** - Objectives 9.4.1 to 9.4.3 (inclusive), as well as associated Policies 9.5.2 and 9.5.3,. In particular Objectives:

9.4.1 *To promote the sustainable management of Otago's built environment in order to:*

- (a) *Meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's people and communities; and*
- (b) *Provide for amenity values, and*
- (c) *Conserve and enhance environmental and landscape quality; and*
- (d) *Recognise and protect heritage values.*

9.4.2 *To promote the sustainable management of Otago's infrastructure to meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's communities.*

9.4.3 *To avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of Otago's built environment on Otago's natural and physical resources.*

- **Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement Decision Version 2016 (PRPS):**

Objective 4.3 Infrastructure is managed and developed in a sustainable way.

Policy 4.3.1 Managing infrastructure activities

Policy 4.3.2 Nationally and regionally significant infrastructure

Policy 4.3.3 Adverse effects of nationally and regionally significant infrastructure

Policy 4.3.4 Protecting nationally and regionally significant infrastructure

Objective 4.5 Urban growth and development is well designed, reflects local character and integrates effectively with adjoining urban and rural environments.

Policy 4.5.1 Manage urban growth and development in a strategic and co-ordinated way.

Policy 4.5.7 Integrating infrastructure with land use

• **Chapter 3 - Strategic Direction of the PDP** (reply version dated 7 April 2016):³

Objective

3.2.1.1 *The Queenstown and Wanaka town centres are the hubs of New Zealand's premier alpine resorts and the District's economy.*

Policy

3.2.1.1.2 *Avoid commercial rezoning that could undermine the role of the Queenstown and Wanaka town centres as the primary focus for the District's economic activity.*

3.2.1.1.3 *Promote growth in the visitor industry and encourage investment in lifting the scope and quality of attractions, facilities and services within the Queenstown and Wanaka town centres*

Objective

3.2.1.3 *The key function of the commercial core of the Three Parks Special Zone is sustained and enhanced, with a focus on large format retail development.*

Objective

3.2.1.3A *Enhance and sustain the key local service and employment functions served by commercial centres and industrial areas outside of the Queenstown and Wanaka town centres and Frankton.*

Policy

3.2.1.3A.1 *Avoid commercial rezoning that would undermine the key local service and employment function role that the centres outside Queenstown, Wanaka and Frankton fulfil.*

Objective

3.2.1.4 *The significant socioeconomic benefits of tourism activities across the District are provided for and enabled.*

³ Schedule 2 of Council's Right of Reply, Streams 01A and 01B, dated 7 April 2016:
<http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Planning/District-Plan/Hearings-Page/Hearing-Stream-1b/Right-of-Reply-01A-and-01B/QLDC-T01B-Right-of-Reply-Schedule-2-Matthew-Paetz-27598014-v-1....pdf>.

	<p><i>Policy</i> 3.2.1.4.1 <i>Enable the use and development of natural and physical resources for tourism activity where adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i></p> <p><i>Objective</i> 3.2.8.1 <i>Maintain and promote the efficient and effective operation, maintenance, development and upgrading of the District's existing infrastructure and the provision of new infrastructure to provide for community wellbeing.</i></p> <p><i>Policy</i> 3.2.8.1.1 <i>Ensure that the efficient and effective operation of infrastructure is safeguarded and not compromised by incompatible development.</i></p>
--	---

Issue 2	Managing adverse effects of airport activities at Wanaka Airport
Proposed Objective	Appropriateness
<p>Provision for the requirements of Queenstown and Wanaka Airports is balanced with achieving an acceptable level of amenity for those using the airports and for those residing on neighbouring land.</p>	<p>Wanaka Airport is surrounded by Rural zoned land except to the north where the 'Windermere' Rural Visitor Zone is located. The Airport is located approximately 2.5km to the north of Luggate and approximately 13km southeast of Wanaka. There are several residencies established, and several building platforms approved in the vicinity of the Airport. The operational needs of Wanaka Airport need to be provided for while managing the amenity values of the surrounding environment.</p> <p>The purpose of this objective is to acknowledge that appropriate limits must be placed on the effects generated by Airport or Airport Related Activities to enable a mix of uses to occur without any one use being inappropriately compromised by the effects of another. In addition, this objective, along the associated provisions, is consistent with section 5 of the RMA as it will balance the promotion of the enablement of people and communities with the need to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment. Requiring the management of amenity effects will ensure that consideration is given to rural context within which Wanaka Airport is located and is consistent with section 7(c).</p> <p>Achieving the proposed objective will result in a more efficient use of resources than the notified Rural zoning provides for and will provide for the development of Wanaka Airport in a way that will maintain the amenity values and environmental quality of the surrounding area.</p>

The proposed objective is also considered to give effect to the following objectives and policies from the following higher order planning documents:

- **Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 (Operative RPS)**

9.4.1 *To promote the sustainable management of Otago's built environment in order to:*

- (a) *Meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's people and communities; and*
- (b) *Provide for amenity values, and*
- (c) *Conserve and enhance environmental and landscape quality; and*
- (d) *Recognise and protect heritage values.*

9.4.3 *To avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of Otago's built environment on Otago's natural and physical resources.*

- **Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2016 (PRPS)**

Objective

4.3 *Infrastructure is managed and developed in a sustainable way*

Policy

4.3.4 *Protect infrastructure of national or regional significance, by all of the following:*

- a) *Restricting the establishment of activities that may result in reverse sensitivity effects; and*
- b) *Avoiding significant adverse effects on the functional needs of such infrastructure; and*
- c) *Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects on the functional needs of such infrastructure;*

- **Chapter 3 - Strategic Direction of the PDP** (reply version dated 7 April 2016)⁴ - The Objective is consistent with Goals 3.2.1 and 3.2.5 of the Strategic Directions Chapter of the PDP. The relevant Objectives and Policies are as follows:

⁴

Schedule 2 of Council's Right of Reply, Streams 01A and 01B, dated 7 April 2016:

<http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Planning/District-Plan/Hearings-Page/Hearing-Stream-1b/Right-of-Reply-01A-and-01B/QLDC-T01B-Right-of-Reply-Schedule-2-Matthew-Paetz-27598014-v-1....pdf>.

	<p><i>Objective</i></p> <p>3.2.1.6 <i>Diversification of land use in rural areas providing adverse effects on rural amenity, landscape character, healthy ecosystems, and Ngai Tahu values, rights and interests are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i></p> <p><i>Objective</i></p> <p>3.2.5.2 <i>The quality and visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes are maintained and enhanced.</i></p>
--	---

Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32(1)(b)

The following tables consider whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives. In doing so, it considers the costs and benefits of the proposed provisions and whether they are effective and efficient. For the purposes of this evaluation the proposed provisions are grouped together by resource management issue.

Issue 1	An appropriate framework for activities at Wanaka Airport	
Issue 3	Managing the scale and intensity of airport related activities and ensuring that the land resource at Wanaka Airport is used for legitimate activities	
<p><u>Objective</u></p> <p>17.2.2 At Wanaka Airport, Airport Activities and Airport Related Activities support the essential functioning of aviation activities.</p> <p><u>Policies</u></p> <p>17.2.2.1 - 17.2.2.4 (incl.)</p> <p><u>Rules</u></p> <p>17.4.10 - 17.4.23 (incl.) 17.5.10 - 17.5.15 (incl.)</p>		
Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires update to the notified PDP provisions. More permissive planning framework than the PDP Rural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall framework enables third parties to establish airport or airport related activities which accord with the anticipated use of the zone without having to obtain resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The addition of a dedicated planning framework for Wanaka Airport will provide more certainty for investment of third parties in Airport Activities at Wanaka Airport.

<p>Zone, and this could be perceived as reduction in regulation/ environmental protection compared to the Rural Zone rules, noting that generally, a pragmatic view has been taken to resource consent applications for hangars and airport activities under the ODP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy and rules managing specified airport related activities will have a cost in terms of resource consent requirements. The rules that limit the maximum area of an activity for retail and identified commercial activities will capture legitimate activities that exceed 100m² or cumulatively 1000m². However legitimate activities will accord with the policies and objectives and therefore would be likely to obtain resource consent. • The cost of applying for a resource consent is considered appropriate in the context of the certainty provided in ensuring the Wanaka Airport land resource is used for Airport Activities and legitimate Airport Related Activities and of protecting the viability of the commercial zones within Wanaka's Urban Growth Boundary. 	<p>consent either under the Airport Zone provisions or under the incompatible Rural Zone objectives and policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rules in particular 17.4.10 – 17.4.13, 17.4.15 – 17.4.23 inclusive, will ensure that existing and future Airport Activities and infrastructure are recognised and provided for within the District Plan at Wanaka Airport. This is twofold in regard to providing certainty for investment at Wanaka Airport associated with Airport and Airport Related Activities. In particular Rules 17.4.11 and 17.4.12 permit Airport Activities and Airport Related Activities. The other rules are to avoid the establishment of inappropriate activities from locating within the Wanaka Airport Zone. Rules 17.4.10, 17.4.15 - 17.4.23 inclusive are intended to provide a basis to manage the nature, scale and intensity of retail and commercial activities. <p>Both 'Airport Activity' and 'Airport Related Activity' are recommended defined terms in the PDP. Their inclusion within policies 17.2.2.1-17.2.2.4 (incl.) provide clarity as to what activities can be anticipated at Wanaka Airport. This clarity reduces the costs of uncertainty in the regulatory environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended policies (17.2.2.1 – 17.2.2.3) and rules (17.5.13 – 17.5.15) that regulate the nature, scale and intensity of identified commercial activities will reduce efficiency by the need for operators to obtain a resource consent. However this a small efficiency cost compared to the substantial benefit of the effectiveness of ensuring the Wanaka Airport land resource is used for Airport Activities and legitimate Airport Related Activities and of protecting the viability of the commercial zones within Wanaka's Urban Growth Boundary. The need for intervention to ensure commercial activities are legitimate are set out in paragraphs 4.12 – 4.13 of Mr Tim Heath's evidence. • Providing specific rules and standards for Wanaka Airport, separate to the Queenstown Zone is considered to have a small cost in terms of efficiency associated with drafting provisions. It is also acknowledged that the Hearing Panel's Minute concerning provisions applying to Wanaka Airport, 16 June 2016, at paragraph 6 where the Chair stated: <i>We do note that we would prefer not to see a proliferation of site specific zones and would be more favourably disposed to a single Airport Zone than two very similar zones.</i> This comment has been taken into account when drafting of the recommended provisions. However it is considered that the Wanaka Airport has substantially different environmental characteristics, scale and intensity to Queenstown Airport and it is considered that separating the respective provisions is more efficient overall, and provides better certainty to plan readers. • The proposed provisions are an efficient means of
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additionally, the range of Airport Related activities provided for (permitted activity Rule 17.4.12) and the listing of other activities as non-complying (Rule 17.4.10) gives additional clarity about activities that are appropriate or inappropriate within the zone. Rules 17.4.15 to 17.4.23 inclusive make specific activities non-complying or prohibited, further advancing the certainty of land uses at the recommended Wanaka Airport Zone. • Rules 17.4.11 and 17.4.12 that make Airport Activities and Airport Related Activities permitted will provide greater certainty and more efficient consenting/regulatory procedures for those partaking in Airport and Airport Related activities, resulting in economic benefits. Additionally these permitted activity rules will help to protect the ability of Airport or Airport Related Activities to establish and operate in the zone. • The standards 17.5.13 - 17.4.15 (incl.) limit the nature and scale of Airport Related Activities by placing restrictions on gross floor area and hours of operation. This will ensure that Wanaka Airport is appropriately served and a range of land uses are 	<p>implementing the objective, providing for an organised and holistic approach for utilising Wanaka Airport as a physical resource, without undue regulation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions will enable third party operators to carry out airport and airport related activities, without having to obtain resource consent in accordance with the incompatible provisions of the Rural Zone. • The proposed policies and methods (rules) are appropriate for achieving proposed Objective 17.2.2
--	--	--

	<p>established that promotes the sustainable management of the airport without compromising the role and function of the Wanaka Town Centre and other commercial zones within the Wanaka Urban Growth Boundary.</p>	
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>		
<p>Option 1: Recommend that the definition of 'Airport Related Activities' is curtailed to exclude retail and restaurant activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option is not favoured because it is accepted that a wide range of ancillary activities are necessary to support Aviation Activities and the general operation of Wanaka Airport. Therefore, the most appropriate option is to regulate the nature, scale and intensity of ancillary activities to ensure that these are legitimate ancillary activities and that they do not have adverse effects on the viability of the commercial areas of Wanaka. 	
<p>Option 2: Make all retail or commercial activities a non-complying activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option is not favoured because it does not appropriately recognise that legitimate ancillary retail and commercial activities will have a positive effect on Wanaka Airport and no significant adverse cumulative effects. 	

<p>Issue 2</p>	<p>Managing adverse effects of airport activities at Wanaka Airport</p>
<p><u>Objective</u></p> <p>17.2.3 Provision for the requirements of Queenstown and Wanaka Airports is balanced with achieving an acceptable level of amenity for those using the airports and for those residing on neighbouring land.</p>	

<p><u>Policy</u></p> <p>17.2.3.2</p> <p><u>Rules</u></p> <p>17.4.10 - 17.4.16 (incl.) 17.5.10 - 17.5.15 (incl.)</p>		
<p>Costs</p>	<p>Benefits</p>	<p>Effectiveness & Efficiency</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost in terms of the constraint on activities seeking to locate within these setbacks or to breach these rules. • Environmental cost in that these provisions set the baseline for permitted activities. The rules allow buildings to locate up to 5 metres from the zone boundary at a height of 10 metres. These recommended rules are consistent with the conditions of Designation 64, however are comparatively more lenient than the Rural Zone (Chapter 21 Rules) that would require a greater setback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides the ability to manage the adverse effects of activities and effects on activities particularly as viewed from outside the zone For instance Rule 17.4.13 provides control over design and appearance. Rule 17.5.12 controls the light spill on to adjacent sites. • Provides certainty as to the nature and scale of activities of activities within the zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions are effective in that they provide for airport related activities including the necessity for large, utilitarian buildings and the functional requirements. • The provisions are efficient in that they do not include rules that are considered unnecessary.

Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:		
Option 1: Making buildings a permitted activity, instead of controlled as recommended.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered important that the Council retains control over servicing at this location. The controlled status provides certainty for development on the basis that the servicing related constraints and issues can be resolved. It is also considered important to retain control over the design and appearance of buildings in the context of the surrounding Rural zoned land.

Recommended New Definition – Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport

Airport Activity – Wanaka Airport	<p>Means land used wholly or partly for the landing, departure, and surface movement of aircraft, including but not limited to:</p> <p>(a) aircraft operations, rotary wing aircraft operations, helicopter aprons, and associated touch down and lift off areas, aircraft servicing, general aviation, navigational and safety aids, lighting.</p> <p>(b) Runways, taxiways, aprons, and other aircraft movement or safety areas.</p> <p>(c) Terminal buildings, hangars, air traffic control facilities, flight information services, navigation and safety aids, rescue facilities, lighting, car parking, maintenance and service facilities, catering facilities, quarantine and incineration facilities, medical facilities, fuel storage and fuelling facilities, and associated offices.</p>
--	--

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
• None identified, with the exception of	• Provides clarity and removes	• Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP

any airport activity that has been omitted.	necessity for a lengthy table of permitted activities.	<p>through removing inconsistencies in the chapter, improving clarity, and removing unnecessary clarification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the effectiveness of the PDP through greater clarity.
---	--	---

Recommended New Definition – Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport

Airport Related Activity – Wanaka Airport	Means any retail activity, cafes and other food and beverage facilities, administrative offices, industrial and commercial activities, provided they are connected with and ancillary to the use of the Airport. Also includes aviation schools, space research and associated activities, facilities and activities associated with veteran, vintage and classic aircraft operations, aviation museums and aero recreation. Also includes Temporary Activities associated with Air Shows, Conferences and Meetings, and rental vehicles, valet activities, signage and public transport facilities. Includes Military Training Operations. Also includes grazing and the keeping of livestock for land management purposes.
---	--

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The broad range of activities provides the opportunity for unrelated commercial activities to establish at Wanaka Airport. However this cost is reduced and managed by the policies and rules that ensure that the identified commercial activities are legitimate ancillary activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clarity and removes necessity for a lengthy table of permitted activities. • Provides certainty to plan users of the activities that are related to airport activities. • Provides a benefit for legitimate ancillary airport activities to be established without the need to apply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves the efficient implementation of the PDP through removing inconsistencies in the chapter, improving clarity, and removing unnecessary clarification. • Improves the effectiveness of the PDP through greater clarity.

	for resource consent (if all the standards for activities located in the Wanaka Airport Zone, Rule 17.5.10-17.5.15 are also met).	
--	---	--