

**APPENDIX 2**  
**Summary of the Decisions Requested and**  
**Further Submissions Received**



**SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED FOR  
PLAN CHANGE 50 – QUEENSTOWN TOWN  
CENTRE ZONE EXTENSION**

**INCLUDING PRIMARY AND FURTHER SUBMISSIONS**

## Michael Legge

| Submission Number   | Position                          | Topic              | Decision Requested   |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| 50/01/01            | Oppose                            | Plan Change itself | Plan Change will result in environmental and visual damage of high rise approach, will turn town into surfers paradise. Request an understanding that plan change can be scrapped by future councils (or by ratepayer referendum). |
| Further Submissions |                                   |                    |  |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                         |                    |  |
| F50/49/08           | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |                    |  |

## Phebe Darkin

| Submission Number | Position         | Topic              | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|---|
| 50/02/01          | Oppose (in part) | Affordable Housing | Submitter is owner of Cabin 112 at Lakeview Holiday Park, and considers that concession will need to be made with regard to housing issues. A large number of families and people could be displaced with resulting pressure on an already tight rental market. Submitter fearful that she will not be able to afford a market rental in Queenstown. Great potential for the plan change to have a very negative social impact if this process is not handled sensibly and sympathetically. |
| 50/02/02          |                  | Cabins             | Requests that Cabin owners remain on site through extension of lease where they are not affected by development process.  |

## Reid Investment Trust

| Submission Number   | Position                          | Topic                           | Decision Requested  |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 50/03/01            | Support (in part)                 | Town Centre Transition Sub-Zone | Submitter supports deletion of paragraphs explaining the Town Centre Transition Sub-Zone (TCTSΖ) in section 10.2.2, however requests subsequent changes to the TCTSΖ as a result of PC50. |
| Further Submissions |                                   |                                 |   |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                         |                                 |   |
| F50/10/01           | BSPL (support)                    |                                 |   |
| F50/24/01           | John Thompson (oppose)            |                                 |   |
| F50/49/07           | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |                                 |   |
| 50/03/02            | Support                           | Isle Street sub zone            | Submitters supports the rezoning of Isle Street Sub Zone and Beach Street Blocks.   |

| Submission Number          | Position                 | Topic                             | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |
|                            | F50/10/02                | BSPL (oppose)                     |  |
|                            | F50/49/07                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |
| 50/03/03                   | Oppose                   | Lakeview sub zone                 | Submitter opposes the rezoning of Lakeview sub-zone, and seeks deletion of Lakeview sub-zone (both in maps and reference to the Lakeview sub-zone in the text).  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |
|                            | F50/46/07                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |
| 50/03/04                   | Oppose                   | Town Centre Transition Sub-Zone   | <p>The submitters land is controlled by the provisions of the TCTS. If PC50 is to be adopted, the submitter seeks that the TCTS be deleted and seeks the following relief relating to the TCTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 10.2.2 - Remove reference to the TCTS.</li> <li>2. Rule 10.6.5.1(i)(b) (Building coverage) - delete subsection (b) in its entirety.</li> <li>3. Rule 10.6.5.1(iv)(c)(Street scene) - delete subsection (c) in its entirety.</li> <li>4. Rule 10.6.5.1(vii)(c) (Residential Activities) - delete the word "except that" at the end of paragraph (c) and delete the entirety of the following bullet point relating to the TCTS.</li> <li>5. Rule 10.6.5.1(xi)(a) and (b) (Building height and façade) - delete subsections (a) and (b) in entirety</li> <li>6. Rule 10.6.5.1(xii) (Premises licensed for the Sale of Liquor) - delete this rule in its entirety.</li> <li>7. Rule 10.6.5.2(i)(a)(Building and Facade Height) - delete the fourth, fifth and sixth bullet points in their entirety.</li> <li>8. Rule 10.6.5.2(ii)(b)(Noise) - delete reference to the TCTS.</li> <li>9. Rule 10.10.2(v)(Assessment Criteria) -delete entire criterion (relating to Visitor Accommodation in the TCTS).</li> <li>10. 10.10.2(vii)(b)(Assessment Criteria) - delete sub clause (b) relating to the TCTS.</li> <li>11. 14.2.4.1(i) (Minimum Parking Space Numbers) - delete reference to the TCTS.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |
|                            | F50/24/01                | John Thompson (oppose)            |  |

| Submission Number          | Position                          | Topic | Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |       |                    |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                         |       |                    |
| F50/27/14                  | Man Street Properties (support)   |       |                    |
| F50/28/14                  | Any Old Fish Company (support)    |       |                    |
| F50/26/14                  | The Dairy Guest House (support)   |       |                    |
| F50/49/07                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |       |                    |

**David Odell**

| Submission Number          | Position      | Topic                               | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 50/04/01                   | Oppose        | Plan Change itself                  | Submitter opposes the plan change for rezoning and high density development and seeks that Lakeview site should be excluded from high density development. |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |               |                                     |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter     |                                     |  |
| F50/10/03                  | BSPL (oppose) |                                     |  |
| 50/04/02                   |               | Traffic, Parking and Infrastructure | Plan change will only compound traffic and parking problems.   |
| 50/04/03                   |               | Growth Limits                       | Submitter proponent of growth limits applied successfully in areas such as Aspen and Boulder.  |
| 50/04/04                   |               | Lakeview sub zone                   | Submitter considers that Lakeview site should be utilised as another park.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |               |                                     |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter     |                                     |  |
| F50/10/04                  | BSPL (oppose) |                                     |  |
| 50/04/05                   |               | Frankton Business Area              | The idea that the town centre is at risk due to development at Frankton has no merit.  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |               |                                     |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter     |                                     |  |
| F50/10/05                  | BSPL (oppose) |                                     |  |
| 50/04/06                   |               | Existing Town Centre                | Existing town centre should be beautified, and supported with a parking friendly centre with areas of recreational open space.                             |

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b> | <b>Topic</b>       | <b>Decision Requested</b>   |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|
| 50/04/07                 |                 | Affordable Housing | The existing cabins provide an important source of housing that already exists, for families trying to live and work in Queenstown. The plan change will displace people, including families, elderly and disabled and fledgling business owners.   |
| 50/04/08                 |                 | Cabins             | Campground and cabins provide income. Cabin leases should be extended and cabins renovated.   |
| 50/04/09                 |                 | Convention Centre  | Submitter considers that Lakeview site should be developed as a park and parking instead of a convention centre and considers that the private sector should build the hotel/convention centre by the airport where there is more room, parking and no taxpayer risks. The Council should consider other options. |

### Daniela Bagozzi

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b> | <b>Topic</b> | <b>Decision Requested</b>  |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 50/05/01                 | Oppose          | Heritage     | Many of the cabins on this site have heritage value, represent a link with the past of Queenstown as a family holiday resort and represent a tourist attraction. The submitter is the holder of a Licence to Occupy for Cabin 151 Earnslaw Terrace (let as worker accommodation). This cabin does not have of itself heritage value, but most of the surrounding ones do. The income I derive from this cabin is negligible, and does not determine my views. Submitter requests that the Cabins and Cribs be allowed to stay. |

### Further Submissions

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b> |                                     |  |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| F50/10/06                | BSPL (oppose)    |                                     |  |
| 50/05/02                 |                  | Cabins                              | The cabins provide a return to QLDC through Ground Rent (with submitter paying \$5400 p.a.)  |
| 50/05/03                 |                  | Convention Centre                   | Too many cities and holiday resorts have built (and some are still considering building) large Convention Centres, which prove very expensive for the local authority funding or subsidising them. International trends suggest there is no need for more convention centres. The submitter requests that no convention centre be built. |
| 50/05/04                 |                  | Traffic, Parking and Infrastructure | Submitter considers that more infill housing and/or high rise buildings in Queenstown (be they residential or hotel developments), add to infrastructure, traffic management and other costs. The submitters requests that a moratorium be placed on new high rise buildings in Queenstown.  |

| Further Submissions |               |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter     |
| F50/10/07           | BSPL (oppose) |

#### David Stringer

| Submission Number | Position         | Topic  | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|------------------|--------|---|
| 50/06/01          | Oppose (in part) | Cabins | The submitter is opposed to the removal of 'Kiwiana' cribs/batches on Antrim Street and Earnslaw Street and seeks Antrim Street and Earnslaw Street cribs/batches be retained by partial exclusion of zone extension over this part of Lakeview site. |

| Further Submissions |               |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter     |
| F50/10/08           | BSPL (oppose) |

#### Tai Ward-Holmes

| Submission Number | Position         | Topic  | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|------------------|--------|---|
| 50/07/01          | Oppose (in part) | Cabins | The submitter is opposed to the removal of 'Kiwiana' cribs/batches on Antrim Street and Earnslaw Street and seeks Antrim Street and Earnslaw Street cribs/batches be retained by partial exclusion of zone extension over this part of Lakeview site. |

| Further Submissions |               |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter     |
| F50/10/08           | BSPL (oppose) |

#### Robins Road Limited

| Submission Number | Position         | Topic                             | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 50/08/01          | Oppose (in part) | Expansion of Plan Change boundary | The submitter considers that the plan change does not, on balance, rigorously analyse options to alleviate the issues associated with the identified shortage of land zoned as "Town Centre" and that plan change should have included the Gorge Road and Robins Road corridors and their ability to accommodate mixed use zoning. |

Seeks amendment of PC50 to include all areas on the periphery of the Town Centre Zone so that properly developed mixed use zones can be established as a whole for areas that include commercial and mixed use

| Submission Number          | Position                          | Topic                   | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
|                            |                                   |                         | activity in close proximity to the CBD.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |                         |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                         |                         |   |
| F50/10/09                  | BSPL (oppose)                     |                         |   |
| F50/35/04                  | Kelso and Chengs (support/part)   |                         |   |
| F50/49/04                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |                         |   |
| 50/08/02                   |                                   | Inadequate Consultation | The failure to consider areas on the periphery is highlighted by the failure to consult with parties in these areas. The consultation boundaries are considered to be constrained and as such, submitter considers that a failure to consultation has occurred. |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |                         |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                         |                         |   |
| F50/49/04                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |                         |   |

#### D J and E J Cassells

| Submission Number          | Position                          | Topic                               | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 50/09/01                   | Oppose (in part)                  | Traffic, Parking and Infrastructure | The submitter has raised general concerns relating to traffic and parking and has reserved the right to oppose this aspect of the proposed plan change   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |                                     |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                         |                                     |  |
| F50/49/06                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |                                     |  |
| 50/09/02                   |                                   | Scale, Height and Density           | The submitter has raised general concerns relating to the scale, height and density and has reserved the right to oppose this aspect of the proposed plan change.  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |                                     |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                         |                                     |  |
| F50/49/06                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |                                     |  |
| 50/09/03                   |                                   | Convention Centre                   | The submitter has raised general concerns relating to the convention centre and Lakeview proposal and queries the justification and nature of this part of the plan change. Submitter wishes to reserve the right to oppose this aspect of the proposed plan change. |



| Further Submissions |  |
|---------------------|--|
|---------------------|--|

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| F50/49/06 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|

50/09/04

Inconsistent with Queenstown Town Centre Zone

The submitter has raised general concerns that the plan change will be inconsistent with the nature and amenity of the CBD and Queenstown. Submitter wishes to reserve the right to oppose this aspect of the proposed plan change.

| Further Submissions |  |
|---------------------|--|
|---------------------|--|

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| F50/49/06 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|

### Brecon Street Partnership Ltd

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic              | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|
| 50/10/01          | Support (in part) | Plan Change itself | PC50 is supported, in part, as it is broadly appropriate to provide for the continued strategic development of Queenstown as the centre of the District into the future by way of appropriate intensification on land that is:<br>(i) well connected and within easy working distance of existing centre; and<br>(ii) sufficiently set back from that core area that it can accommodate greater development height and intensity without significantly impacting upon the intimate character area. |

| Further Submissions |  |
|---------------------|--|
|---------------------|--|

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                      |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|
| F50/27/01 | Man Street Properties (support/part) |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|

|           |                                     |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| F50/28/01 | Any Old Fish Company (support/part) |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|

|           |                                      |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|
| F50/26/01 | The Dairy Guest House (support/part) |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|

50/10/02

Lakeview sub zone - Height

PC50 is, in places, unjustifiably conservative and does not reflect a successful balancing of the need to maximise the potential efficiency of land. No sound resource management, environmental effects, effectiveness or efficiency, urban design or town planning grounds to promote building heights of up to 26m in height within that part of the Lakeview sub-zone that relates the most poorly to the existing town centre "core", while suppressing the potential of that part of the sub-zone that is closest to the existing "core" to accommodate buildings to a similar or even greater height.

| Submission Number          | Position                             | Topic         | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|
|                            |                                      |               | The submitter seeks that PC50 be amended including relevant provisions and diagrams to allow building heights up to seven habitable storeys on the site at 34 Brecon Street, and any such similar increase in maximum building heights between that site and the proposed sub-zone "peak" of 26m, and incorporate complementary bulk and location requirements so as to maintain suitable amenity on adjacent sites.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                      |               |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                            |               |  |
| F50/27/01                  | Man Street Properties (support/part) |               |  |
| F50/28/01                  | Any Old Fish Company (support/part)  |               |  |
| F50/26/01                  | The Dairy Guest House (support/part) |               |  |
| 50/10/03                   |                                      | Cemetery Road | Seeks that the Plan Change be amended to provide for the placement of Cemetery Road in the eastern part of the structure plan as a permitted activity (should such improvements be agreeable between the relevant land owners and the Council at the time of development).   |
| 50/10/04                   |                                      | Rules         | <p>The submitter supports, in part, the following relevant provisions:</p> <p>(i) Figure 2: Lakeview sub-zone Structure Plan;<br/> (ii) 10.6.5.1(xiii);<br/> (iii) 10.6.5.1(xiv).</p> <p>Cemetery Road currently follows a dog-leg shape from the intersection of Brecon and Isle Streets upwards to the proposed Hay Street extension. More logical outcome to promote a legible development if, through a land-swap process, Cemetery Road was able to follow a direct and straight route from the proposed Hay Street extension along the northern edge of the sub-zone and adjoining the cemetery boundary.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to the Structure Plan, and/or amend clauses 10.6.5.1(xiii) and 10.6.5.1(xiv) to allow these to happen as permitted activities.</p> |
| 50/10/05                   |                                      | Rules         | <p>The submitter supports, in part, the following relevant provisions:</p> <p>(i) Figure 2: Lakeview sub-zone Structure Plan;<br/> (ii) Figure 3: Lakeview sub-zone Height Limit Plan;<br/> (iii) 10.6.3.3;<br/> (iv) 10.6.4;<br/> (v) 10.6.5.1(i)(d);<br/> (vi) 10.6.5.1(xi)(d);<br/> (vii) 10.6.5.1(xi)(f);</p>  |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------|---|
|                   |          |       | (viii) 10.10.2.<br><br>Seeks amendments to the height limit plan to provide for buildings at 34 Brecon St up to 19m as a controlled activity, and amend 10.6.3.3, 10.6.4, and/or 10.6.5.1(xi)(d) so as to provide, as a non notified restricted discretionary activity, buildings up to 24m height. Discretion would be restricted to the relevant matters for the Lakeview sub-zone set out in 10.2.2, and ensuring the additional building height is designed to be visually recessive and add visual interest to the remainder of the building.<br><br>An alternative to this is to set the restricted discretionary height limit at 22.5m provided that 10.6.5.1(xi)(f) was also amended so as to allow habitable space inside the 2m roof bonus, and in consequence specify that roof plant may exceed this provided that it is no greater than an additional 3m in height, is no greater than 40m <sup>2</sup> in area, and is located at least 10m from any road boundary. |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                    |       |  |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|--|
| F50/38/01         | Queenstown Gold Ltd (oppose) |       |  |
| 50/10/06          |                              | Rules | Amend Clause 10.6.5.1(i)(d) so that any building height greater than 19m at 34 Brecon St must comply with a maximum building coverage of 70%.  |
| 50/10/07          |                              | Rules | Amend the Structure Plan and Height Limit Plan to add a building setback of 17m from the existing southern boundary of the cemetery, applying to all building height above 15m (note: in the event that Cemetery Road was realigned in accordance with other submission points, all buildings would need to be clear of that road from the ground and no further setback would be required unless the road was narrower than 17m). |
| 50/10/08          |                              | Rules | Amend Clause 10.6.5.1(xiv)(a)(d) to specify a minimum 3.5m ground floor floor-to-ceiling height limit so as to remove the uncertainty that exists around interfloor and service height in a floor-to-floor requirement, and ensure the most efficient possible use of space.   |

#### Queenstown Chamber of Commerce

| Submission Number | Position | Topic             | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|---|
| 50/11/01          | Support  | Convention Centre | The submitter agrees that the construction of a Convention Centre is important to diversifying the current economic base, providing for additional visitors |

| Submission Number          | Position | Topic                             | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 50/11/02                   |          | Convention Centre                 | outside of the seasonal peaks of summer and winter, and supporting the existing businesses in the District.<br><br>The submitter supports the proposed Plan Change, and the location of the proposed Convention Centre at the Lakeview site.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |          |                                   |  |
|                            |          | <b>Submission Number</b>          | <b>Submitter</b>   |
|                            |          | F50/49/01                         | Remarkables Jet Limited (support/part)   |
| 50/11/03                   |          | Impacts Upon Existing Town Centre | Seeks to strategically stage the release of commercial capacity so it does not compete with the existing Queenstown CBD, this may be undertaken by a “health check” type provision to be included as part of the Plan Change as has been included in the “3 Parks Plan Change” in Wanaka to protect the Wanaka CBD.  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |          |                                   |  |
|                            |          | <b>Submission Number</b>          | <b>Submitter</b>   |
|                            |          | F50/10/10                         | BSPL (support)   |
|                            |          | F50/35/05                         | Kelso and Chengs (support/part)  |
|                            |          | F50/49/01                         | Remarkables Jet Limited (support/part)   |
| 50/11/04                   |          | Existing Town Centre              | Support amendment of the existing provisions of the Town Centre to provide for PC50 as opposed to the creation of a new special zone.  |
| 50/11/05                   |          | Pedestrian Links                  | Support the well-resourced provision of quality connections and the use of urban design techniques to ensure the connections between the PC50 area and the existing CBD, however, ensure that adequate resources are afforded to the development of quality urban design and attractive and safe pedestrian linkages to the existing town centre from the site |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |          |                                   |  |
|                            |          | <b>Submission Number</b>          | <b>Submitter</b>   |
|                            |          | F50/10/11                         | BSPL (support)   |

### Alan Bunting

| Submission Number | Position         | Topic                | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|---|
| 50/12/01          | Oppose (in part) | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter objects to the proposed height limits proposed within the Isle Street sub-zone, due to concerns relating to loss of sun (which will cause |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------|--|
|                   |          |       | shading in winter and summer) and seeks the retention of the existing High Density Residential Zone height limit (7 metre height limit), so as to mitigate the loss of sun and protect some of the best views of Queenstown. |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| F50/10/12 | BSPL (oppose) |
|-----------|---------------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/27/02 | Man Street Properties (oppose) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

|           |                               |
|-----------|-------------------------------|
| F50/28/02 | Any Old Fish Company (oppose) |
|-----------|-------------------------------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/26/02 | The Dairy Guest House (oppose) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

|          |                      |  |
|----------|----------------------|--|
| 50/12/02 | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter objects to the proposed site coverage and setbacks within the Isle Street sub-zone and seeks that site coverage be increased to 60% and that setbacks should be provided off all boundaries. |
|----------|----------------------|--|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/27/02 | Man Street Properties (oppose) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

|           |                               |
|-----------|-------------------------------|
| F50/28/02 | Any Old Fish Company (oppose) |
|-----------|-------------------------------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/26/02 | The Dairy Guest House (oppose) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

|          |       |   |
|----------|-------|---|
| 50/12/03 | Rates | The submitter objects to the increase in rates as a consequence of the change of town centre zoning and seeks that if a property within the Isle Street sub-zone for residential purposes that the rates be the same as High Density Residential formula. |
|----------|-------|---|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/27/02 | Man Street Properties (oppose) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

|           |                               |
|-----------|-------------------------------|
| F50/28/02 | Any Old Fish Company (oppose) |
|-----------|-------------------------------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/26/02 | The Dairy Guest House (oppose) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

|          |                      |   |
|----------|----------------------|---|
| 50/12/04 | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter objects to the fact that no provision is made for on site parking within the Isle Street sub-zone, and seeks that on site parking be provided for retail, office, visitor accommodation and residential accommodation and requests that parking should be the same as the existing High Density Residential Zone. |
|----------|----------------------|---|

| Submission Number          | Position                       | Topic | Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                |       |                    |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                      |       |                    |
| F50/27/02                  | Man Street Properties (oppose) |       |                    |
| F50/28/02                  | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)  |       |                    |
| F50/26/02                  | The Dairy Guest House (oppose) |       |                    |

|          |                      |   |
|----------|----------------------|---|
| 50/12/05 | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter objects to the potential noise from bars-restaurants and night clubs and requests that these activities not be provided for within the Isle Street sub-zone and that this is reinforced by a prohibited activity for all bars, night clubs and restaurants. |
|----------|----------------------|---|

| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                |  |  |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Submission Number          | Submitter                      |  |  |
| F50/27/02                  | Man Street Properties (oppose) |  |  |
| F50/28/02                  | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)  |  |  |
| F50/26/02                  | The Dairy Guest House (oppose) |  |  |

### Louise Wright

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                                    | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 50/13/01          | Support (in part) | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | <p>The submitter supports PC50, generally, however has concerns with the Site Standards supporting the Isle Street sub-zone.</p> <p>The submitter considers that within the Isle Street sub zone the combination of 12m height limit in conjunction with the proposed site restrictions dictates unusual built form. Dominated by the recession planes the resultant forms are asymmetrical and truncated. The submitter considers that combined sites (eg 21-23 Isle Street) give rise to aggregated forms being low, squat and again truncated edges on 3 sides and aggregate forms like this can be seen in Tauranga / Mt Maunganui. The resulting rooflines are more a reflection of the shading protections than of any character or quality in the built form. The roof bonus is marginally beneficial on single sites due to the overriding restriction on built form above 5m in height. Combined sites is encouraged by these rules to increase economic floor areas. The increase in height in this zone, combined with the restrictive planes may not provide upper level spaces of any economic merit or visual quality.</p> <p>No parking on the front boundaries may give rise to 3m driveway gaps to access rear parking areas.</p> |

|          |                   |  |   |
|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| 50/13/02 | Support (in part) | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | <p>256<br/>Grant Plan Change 50, however amend Site Standards as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider qualitative volumetric controls as opposed to maximum height limits, setbacks and recession planes. Qualitative volumetric controls should allow for higher height limits for developments that provide lower site coverage and quality forms that afford sunlight access and quality built form; or</li> <li>2. Remove sunlight recession plane restrictions;</li> <li>3. Provide for a variation over proposed height limits for quality developments.</li> <li>4. Provide Appendix 4 diagrams.</li> </ol> |
|----------|-------------------|--|---|

| Further Submissions |                                 |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                       |
| F50/10/13           | BSPL (support)                  |
| F50/27/03           | Man Street Properties (support) |
| F50/28/03           | Any Old Fish Company (support)  |
| F50/26/03           | The Dairy Guest House (support) |

#### Alan and Marie Brown

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                     | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|---|
| 50/14/01          | Oppose   | Scale, Height and Density | The submitter strongly opposes the height increase proposed in Man Street and directly against higher ground, eg the camping ground - Gorge Road. |

| Further Submissions |                                |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                      |
| F50/27/04           | Man Street Properties (oppose) |
| F50/28/04           | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)  |
| F50/26/04           | The Dairy Guest House (oppose) |

#### New Zealand Institute of Architects – Southern Branch

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                         | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 50/15/01          | Support (in part) | Use of Community Reserve Land | <p>The submitter raises concerns relating to the use of community reserve land and displacement of affordable housing.</p> <p>The lack of objectives in the proposed plan change for use as affordable housing, community services or community amenity is of concern on reserve and community land.</p> |

| Submission Number          | Position                 | Topic                             | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |
|                            | F50/49/02                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |
| 50/15/02                   |                          | Affordable Housing                | <p>The lack of objectives in the proposed plan change for use as affordable housing, community services or community amenity is of concern on reserve and community land.</p> <p>The submitter therefore request that 30 percent of any residential uptake on reserve and council owned land be for community housing.</p>   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |
|                            | F50/49/02                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |
| 50/15/03                   |                          | Need for Plan Change              | <p>The submitter raises concerns relating to the need for the plan change and notes that there appears to be no analysis of existing empty office space or land in the town centre, given that there appears to be office space within the town centre still to be built or empty. The submitters concern is that the expanded area of the town centre is too large as proposed and will grossly undermine the existing town centre.</p> |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |
|                            | F50/10/14                | BSPL (support)                    |  |
|                            | F50/49/02                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |
| 50/15/04                   |                          | Convention Centre                 | <p>The submitter considers that the location of the conference centre is too far from the town centre for walking and the associated commercial activity will struggle.</p>  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |
|                            | F50/10/15                | BSPL (support)                    |  |
|                            | F50/49/02                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |
| 50/15/05                   |                          | Assessment Matters                | <p>The submitters states that the plan change proposes to add additional objectives and policies to the Queenstown town Centre Objectives around achieving quality urban design and building design.</p>   |



| Submission Number   | Position                          | Topic | Decision Requested  |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|---|
|                     |                                   |       | The submitter seeks that the proposed assessment matters addressing urban design outcomes be replaced with one assessment matter which requires an urban design panel review mechanism. In the Council's Urban Design Strategy it states that every council project should be the subject of Urban Design Review by the panel. Introduce new assessment matter as follows: " A positive review by the QLDC Urban Design Panel". |
| Further Submissions |                                   |       |   |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                         |       |   |
| F50/24/02           | John Thompson (oppose)            |       |   |
| F50/49/02           | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |       |   |

### Maximum Mojo Holdings Limited

| Submission Number   | Position                     | Topic                | Decision Requested  |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 50/16/01            | Support (in part)            | Isle Street sub zone | <p>The submitter supports and wishes PC50 to be approved, however, this support is conditional upon two key factors.</p> <p>Firstly, that the proposed Lakeview Sub-Zone is not confirmed unless the proposed Isle Street Sub-Zone is also confirmed. Without the Isle Street Sub-Zone, the Lakeview Sub-Zone would be an isolated piece of commercial zoning, separate from the QTCZ. Both sub-zones are intricately linked in terms of the appropriate expansion of the QTCZ. The submitter believes that the sub-zones cannot be separated.</p> <p>Secondly, whilst a rigorous planning, architectural and urban design analysis has been given to the Lakeview Sub-Zone, the submitter considers that the same level of detailed assessment (from the same disciplines prescribed above) should occur for the Isle Street Sub-Zone. The Isle Street Sub-Zone has to be controlled and developed in a matter befitting its important location next to, and overlooking the QTCZ.</p> |
| Further Submissions |                              |                      |   |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                    |                      |   |
| F50/10/16           | BSPL (support)               |                      |   |
| F50/24/03           | John Thompson (support/part) |                      |   |
| F50/60/01           | Berry & Co (support)         |                      |   |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------|--|
| 50/16/02          |          | Isle Street sub zone | <p>For a number of practical reasons, the two rectangular shaped blocks located to the north of Man Street (within the Isle Street Sub-Zone) should both included in the expansion of the QTCZ.</p> <p>These reasons include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The re-zoning of the area would constitute a natural progression of the town centre.</li> <li>2. This area is located between commercial and non-residential activities in all directions.</li> <li>3. There is a non-residential focus in this area at present due to the existence of the nearby QTCZ to the south, Commercial Precincts to the north, large pedestrian movements to and from the Gondola and the Council's camping ground. If approved, the Lakeview Sub-Zone will considerably add to the commercial focus in this location.</li> <li>4. The existing commercial and non-residential uses already undertaken from this area.</li> <li>5. The decreasing residential population as commercial and visitor accommodation activities increase in numbers.</li> <li>6. The location of this area next to the large 24 hour commercial car parking building.</li> </ol> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter            |  |
|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| F50/60/02         | Berry & Co (neutral) |  |
| 50/16/03          |                      | <p>Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions</p> <p>Whilst the 12m height limit is considered appropriate, more detailed work needs to be undertaken as to the potential loss of outlook from a number of properties. This assessment should also take into consideration the existing height rules - which will have some effect on removing views from a number of properties. The submitter also believes that with a number of reasonably narrow sites within the Isle Street Sub-Zone, buildings will struggle to gain 12m in height due to the proposed recession planes. The 2m roof bonus will become redundant for many sites.</p> <p>the submitter believes further assessment should be undertaken by the Council in terms of the exact makeup of the presently proposed recession planes, especially considering the mixed use of the Isle Street Sub-Zone. The submitter believes that the recession planes should either be scrapped and another design solution put forward, or the angle/height of the recession planes are relaxed. Whilst recession planes have some benefits, many properties will not be able to maximise the 12m height limit at all, or alternatively, oddly shaped/slanted buildings will occur under the presently proposed rule.</p> |

| Submission Number          | Position                 | Topic                                    | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |  |   |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                         |   |
|                            | F50/24/04                | John Thompson (support/part)             |   |
|                            | F50/60/03                | Berry & Co (support)                     |   |
| 50/16/04                   |                          | Isle Street sub zone - Building Setbacks | The submitter acknowledges that internal setbacks will have some benefit of allowing natural light to penetrate into a building or buildings. However, the proposed internal setbacks could create small narrow tunnels between sites, which will most likely end up as dead or redundant space. The submitter also considers that the internal setbacks will disrupt the continuity of the road frontages within the Isle Street Sub-Zone. The submitter considers that further consideration should be given to demonstrate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the internal setbacks, especially when taking into account fire rating issues as prescribed under the Building Act 2004. |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |  |   |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                         |   |
|                            | F50/10/17                | BSPL (support/part)                      |   |
|                            | F50/24/05                | John Thompson (support)                  |   |
|                            | F50/60/04                | Berry & Co (support)                     |   |
| 50/16/05                   |                          | Isle Street sub zone                     | The submitter believes that further and substantial assessment needs to occur in relation to the provisions that apply to the Isle Street Sub-Zone. This is especially the case if the Council truly wants to create a high quality urban mixed use environment.  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |  |   |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                         |   |
|                            | F50/10/16                | BSPL (support)                           |   |
|                            | F50/60/05                | Berry & Co (support)                     |   |

### Christopher Mace and Queenstown Trust

| Submission Number | Position | Topic             | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 50/17/01          |          | Lakeview sub zone | The Submitter is the owner of 15 Brunswick Street and the Trust owns 3, 5, 9 and 11 Brunswick Street. The Submitter seeks that Council ensures that Plan Change 50 contains adequate provisions and controls to ensure |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic             | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 50/17/02          |          | Lakeview sub zone | <p>that:</p> <p>(a) The proposed roading network in the Lake View sub-zone can efficiently and safely cater for the increased traffic arising from the proposed expansion of the CBD. The current corner between Man Street and Thomson Street to the northwest of the submitter's landholdings may well prove unsafe and inefficient in dealing with increased traffic flows. The proposed Lake View Structure Plan indicates that this roading alignment will not now be altered (as previously proposed).</p> <p>(b) Sufficient car parking will be provided within the wider area proposed to be zoned Town Centre, to avoid traffic or parking congestion or other adverse amenity impacts on residential neighbours.</p> <p>(c) Development of the land zoned reserve for hot pools (or other uses) will be subject to detailed controls to avoid any adverse effects on neighbouring residential properties including noise, light, odour and traffic. This contemplated change of use has potential for adverse effects including noise, shadowing, light spill, odour, visually bland or dominant buildings, walls and fences and effects arising from pedestrian and vehicle entrance arrangements. It will be important that the planning framework addresses these matters, ensuring that activities on this site appropriately avoid, remedy or mitigate any such offsite effects.</p> <p>The submitter requests the following relief:</p> <p>(a) That the Lake View Structure Plan incorporate an appropriate realignment of Thompson Street to create a more safe and efficient road environment for that road and its intersection with Man Street;</p> <p>(b) That the Decision on Plan Change 50 be based on evidence that the roading network, public parking provision and on-site parking rules are adequate to accommodate the land use activities proposed and protect the amenity of neighbouring residences;</p> <p>(c) That the rules for the reserve land proposed to front Thompson Street in the Lake View Structure Plan relating to noise, light spill, vehicle and pedestrian access, odour and building, wall and fence controls be strengthened as necessary to protect the amenity of nearby residential properties and public places is appropriately protected;</p> <p>(d) That noise rules for the wider zone be strengthened as necessary to ensure the amenity of properties and public places within and beyond the zone is appropriately protected.</p> <p>(e) Such other relevant planning controls, requirements or remedies in relation to protection of neighbouring residential amenity as may arise once detailed evidence in support of the Plan Change has been heard.</p> |

| Submission Number          | Position                   | Topic | Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                            |       |                    |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                  |       |                    |
| F50/34/01                  | Ngai Tahu Tourism (oppose) |       |                    |

### Marjory Pack and John Allan

| Submission Number | Position         | Topic                | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|---|
| 50/18/01          | Oppose (in part) | Isle Street sub zone | <p>The submitters own 16 Isle Street, which lies within that part of Isle Street Sub Zone. The submitters oppose the rezoning of their land to Isle Street sub-zone given the residential character of the area and the level of amenity they currently enjoy. However, in the event that the land is rezoned, they seek amendments to the proposed rules, site and zone standards and include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezoning</li> <li>2. S32 Report</li> <li>3. Policy 2.1: Amenity</li> <li>4. Policy 3.2: Built Form</li> <li>5. 10.2.4 – Proposed Policy 1.2</li> <li>6. 10.2.4 – Proposed Policy 1.5</li> <li>7. 10.2.4 – Objective 4 5</li> <li>8. 10.6.3.2 – i Buildings located in the town centre</li> <li>9. 10.6.3.2 - iii Premises Licensed for the Sale of Liquor</li> <li>10. 10.6.3.2 – iv Visitor Accommodation</li> <li>11. 10.6.4 – Non-Notification of Applications</li> <li>12. 10.6.5 – i Building Coverage</li> <li>13. 10.6.5 – iv Street Scene</li> <li>14. 10.6.5 – vii Residential Activities</li> <li>15. 10.6.5 – xi Building and Façade Height (i) Recession Planes</li> <li>16. 10.6.5 xv Premises Licensed for the Sale of Liquor in the Lakeview sub-zone and the Isle Street sub-zone.</li> <li>17. 10.6.5.2 I Building and Façade Height</li> <li>18. 10.6.5.2 ii Noise</li> <li>19. 10.6.5.2 iv Retail Activities in the Lakeview sub-zone and the Isle Street sub-zone.</li> </ol> |

| <b>Further Submissions</b> |               |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| Submission Number          | Submitter     |
| F50/10/18                  | BSPL (oppose) |

|          |                               |   |
|----------|-------------------------------|---|
| 50/18/02 | Adequacy of Section 32 report | The s32 report also contains broad statements such as 'the changes are appropriate' and 'that benefits outweigh the costs' without fully analysing the costs and benefits. This does not fulfil the requirements of s32 and the submitters consider that that has led to the potential effects and implications of the rezoning not |
|----------|-------------------------------|---|

| Submission Number | Position | Topic  | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|--|--|
| 50/18/03          |          | Isle Street sub zone - Objectives and Policies | <p>being fully considered.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to the wording of Policy 2.1 is supported and seeks retention of this policy as notified.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to the wording of Policy 3.2 is supported and seeks retention of this policy as notified.</p> <p>That proposed Policy 1.2 be deleted, or the proposed Policy 2.1 is rewritten to provide greater clarity on the meaning of the word 'suitable'.</p> <p>Introduce the following objective and policies:<br/> <u>"Proposed Objective 4</u><br/> <u>A high quality, attractive environment within the Isle Street sub-zone where visitor accommodation, high density residential and small scale commercial activities will be the predominant use, and development will be sensitive to existing residential activities.</u></p> <p><u>Policy 4.1</u><br/> <u>To provide a mixed use environment by enabling the establishment of the following activities:</u><br/> · <u>Small scale commercial activities;</u><br/> · <u>high quality visitor accommodation; and</u><br/> · <u>well-designed high density residential activities.</u></p> <p><u>Proposed Policy 4.2</u><br/> <u>To achieve an urban environment and a built form that responds to the site's location and creates an attractive, vibrant and liveable environment that is well connected with the adjoining town centre.</u></p> <p><u>Proposed Policy 4.3</u><br/> <u>To develop a desirable place to visit, live and work by requiring a high quality of built form and landscaping, which will contribute to the visual amenity of the area and acknowledge the changing character and amenity of the Isle Street sub-zone.</u></p> <p><u>Proposed Policy 4.4</u><br/> <u>To enable the establishment of small scale commercial activities to meet demand for growth within the Queenstown town centre area, and to avoid the development of large scale retail activities."</u></p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter   |
|-------------------|---|
| F50/24/06         | John Thompson (oppose/part)                       |
| F50/27/13         | Man Street Properties (support/part, oppose/part) |
| F50/28/13         | Any Old Fish Company (support/part, oppose/part)  |

| Submission Number          | Position                 | Topic   | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                                  |  |
|                            | F50/26/13                | The Dairy Guest House (support/part, oppose/part) |  |
| 50/18/04                   |                          | Transport Section - Objectives and policies       | That the wording of Policy 4.15.1 remains unchanged.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |   |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                                  |  |
|                            | F50/24/07                | John Thompson (oppose)                            |  |
| 50/18/05                   |                          | Rules   | <p>Amend 10.6.3.2 Controlled Activities i as follows:</p> <p><i>"i Buildings located in the town centre outside the special character area <u>and outside of the Lakeview sub-zone</u></i></p> <p><i>Buildings in respect of design, appearance, signage and servicing requirements within the Isle Street sub-zone, <del>(which may include directional street maps for buildings, and servicing requirements within the Isle Street sub-zone)</del>, lighting, materials and impact on the streetscape. (Refer District Plan Map No. 36.)"</i></p> <p>That the following rule be included in the Plan:</p> <p><i><u>"10.6.3.2 Controlled Activities</u></i></p> <p><i><u>iii Premises licensed for the Sale of Liquor within the Isle Street sub-zone</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(c) Premises within the Isle Street sub-zone which are licensed for the sale of liquor under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989, for the consumption of liquor on the premises between the hours of 7am and 11pm with respect to the scale of the activity, car parking, retention of amenity, noise and hours of operation. This rule shall not apply to the sale of liquor.</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i><u>• To any person who is living on the premises;</u></i></li> <li><i><u>• To any person who is present on the premises for the purpose of dining."</u></i></li> </ul> <p><i>10.6.3.3 Discretionary Activities</i></p> <p><i><u>"(v) Premises licensed for the Sale of Liquor within the Isle Street sub-zone</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Premises within the Isle Street sub-zone which are licensed for the sale of liquor</u></i></p> <p><i><u>under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989, for the consumption of liquor on the premises</u></i></p> <p><i><u>between the hours of 11pm and 7am with respect to the scale of the activity, car</u></i></p> <p><i><u>parking, retention of amenity, noise and hours of operation. This rule shall not apply</u></i></p> <p><i><u>to the sale of liquor.</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i><u>• To any person who is living on the premises;</u></i></li> </ul> |

| Submission Number          | Position  | Topic            | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|---|------------------|--|
|                            |   |                  | <p><i>• To any person who is present on the premises for the purpose of dining."</i></p> <p>That Rule 10.6.3.2(iv) be retained as notified.</p> <p>That Site Standard 10.6.5.1I(e) is retained as notified.</p>  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |   |                  |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter   |                  |  |
| F50/24/08                  | John Thompson (oppose)                            |                  |  |
| F50/27/13                  | Man Street Properties (support/part, oppose/part) |                  |  |
| F50/28/13                  | Any Old Fish Company (support/part, oppose/part)  |                  |  |
| F50/26/13                  | The Dairy Guest House (support/part, oppose/part) |                  |  |
| 50/18/06                   | Oppose (in part)                                  | Non-notification | The submitter is opposed to 'noise' being included within the notification clause 10.6.4, given that noise can adversely impact on adjoining sites, affecting the ability to use outdoor living areas and the ability to sleep. Seeks that provision 10.6.4 is not amended as proposed.  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |   |                  |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter   |                  |  |
| F50/24/09                  | John Thompson (oppose)                            |                  |  |
| 50/18/07                   |   | Rules            | <p>The submitter seeks amendments to 10.6.5 Site Standards (iv street scene), which currently proposes a reduction of 0.5 metres from the 2 metre setback required under the High Density Residential zone rules.</p> <p>Amend Site Standard 10.6.5 iv as follows:<br/>iv street scene<br/><i>"(e) In the Isle Street sub-zone, the maximum setback of any building from road boundaries shall be <del>1.5</del> 2.5 metres.</i><br/><i>(g) In the Isle Street sub-zone, the minimum setback of any building from other site boundaries shall be <del>1.5</del> 2 metres."</i></p> <p>Amend the wording of Site Standard 10.6.5 iv to provide for a 2 metre setback from internal boundaries where the subject site is located adjacent to a site containing a residential unit built prior to XXXXXX.</p> <p>Site Standard 10.6.5 vii Residential Activities be retained as notified.</p> <p>Amend 10.6.5 Site Standards xi Building and Façade</p> |



| Submission Number          | Position               | Topic | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------|--|
|                            |                        |       | Height (e), to reduce the maximum height limit to 10 metres given the existing character of the zone. Delete reference to the Isle Street sub-zone under 10.6.5 Site Standards xi Building and Façade Height (f). Please refer detailed explanation and supporting plans to this submission point.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                        |       |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter              |       |  |
| F50/24/10                  | John Thompson (oppose) |       |  |
| 50/18/08                   |                        | Rules | <p>Delete any reference to the Isle Street sub-zone from Site Standard 10.6.5 xv.</p> <p>Include a new Discretionary Activity as follows:<br/> <u>"10.6.3.3 Discretionary Activities</u><br/> <u>V Noise from Premises Licensed for the Sale of Liquor in the Isle Street subzone.</u><br/> <u>(a) Sound from premises licensed for the sale of liquor 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 other site in this zone:</u><br/> <u>(i) night-time (2200 to 0800 hrs) 50 dB LAeq(15 min)</u><br/> <u>(ii) night-time (2200 to 0800 hrs) 70 dB LAFmax</u><br/> <u>(b) Sound from premises licensed for the sale of liquor which is received in another zone shall comply with the noise limits set in the zone standards for that zone.</u><br/> <u>(c) The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to construction sound which shall be assessed in accordance and comply with NZS 6803: 1999.</u><br/> <u>(e) The noise limits in (a) shall not apply to sound from sources outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008. Sound from these sources shall be assessed in accordance with the relevant New Zealand Standard, either NZS 6805:1992, or NZS 6808:1998.</u><br/> <u>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."</u></p> <p>Delete Zone Standard 10.6.5.2 I (a) Bullet Points 7 to 10 inclusive.</p> <p>Retain Zone Standard 10.6.5.2 ii as notified.</p> <p>The Zone Standard 10.6.5.2 iv is amended as follows:<br/> <u>"(i) Retail activities in the Lakeview sub-zone and the Isle Street sub-zone shall not exceed a maximum gross floor area of 400m<sup>2</sup> per tenancy.</u><br/> <u>(ii) <del>Retail</del> Commercial activities in the Isle Street sub-</u></p> |

| Submission Number   | Position               | Topic | Decision Requested  |
|---------------------|------------------------|-------|---|
|                     |                        |       | <i>zone shall not exceed a maximum gross floor area of 400m<sup>2</sup> per tenancy."</i> |
| Further Submissions |                        |       |   |
| Submission Number   | Submitter              |       |   |
| F50/24/11           | John Thompson (oppose) |       |   |

### Margaret Walker

| Submission Number   | Position                           | Topic                               | Decision Requested   |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 50/19/01            | Oppose                             | Beach Street Block                  | The Submitter opposes the rezoning of Beach, Hay, Lake, and Man Street to QTCZ and requests that this be declined.   |
| Further Submissions |                                    |                                     |  |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                          |                                     |  |
| F50/32/02           | IHG and Carter Queenstown (oppose) |                                     |  |
| 50/19/02            |                                    | Rates                               | Reason for this opposition relates is that a change in the residential use will cause submitters rates to increase and will make it difficult for submitter to remain in the property submitter has resided in for 63 years.   |
| Further Submissions |                                    |                                     |  |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                          |                                     |  |
| F50/32/02           | IHG and Carter Queenstown (oppose) |                                     |  |
| 50/19/03            |                                    | Adequacy of Section 32 report       | The submitter considers that the section 32 report provides for minimal justification for the rezoning apart from stating that commercial uses on the Beach Street frontage would provide an entrance to the town centre and that it is logical to extend the town centre into this block. There is no information provided to show the benefits of the rest of the block being rezoned and as such this is not a strong justification to change the zoning. |
| Further Submissions |                                    |                                     |  |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                          |                                     |  |
| F50/32/02           | IHG and Carter Queenstown (oppose) |                                     |  |
| 50/19/04            |                                    | Traffic, parking and infrastructure | Changing the zoning without containing provisions is not good planning and will increase the parking problem in the area. The change to the QTCZ also removes the need for any provisions of carparking being provided on  |

| Submission Number   | Position                           | Topic | Decision Requested   |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|-------|--|
|                     |                                    |       | site. This change would add to the problems of parking that already exists outside submitters property. There is no carparking available for people to park when they come to visit due to workers in the town centre parking outside submitters property all day and most of the night. Carparking is important and should be retained. |
| Further Submissions |                                    |       |  |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                          |       |  |
| F50/32/02           | IHG and Carter Queenstown (oppose) |       |  |

|          |  |                           |   |
|----------|--|---------------------------|---|
| 50/19/05 |  | Beach Street Block-Height | <p>If the QTCZ is approved there is a need to amend the plan provisions relating to height under 10.6.5.2. The height provisions do not include any provisions for sections 10, 11, and 18 Blk VIII. If the plan change is approved the submitter seeks that these sections be added to the following clause:</p> <p>"For land legally described as Section 14, 15, 16, 17 Block VIII Town of Queenstown, Lots 1 and 2 DP444132 abd Lot 1 DP7187 Zone Standard 7.5.5.3(v) will apply for all building heights".</p> |
|----------|--|---------------------------|---|

| Further Submissions |                                    |  |  |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                          |  |  |
| F50/32/02           | IHG and Carter Queenstown (oppose) |  |  |

### Heritage New Zealand

| Submission Number | Position | Topic    | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|----------|--|
| 50/20/01          | Neutral  | Heritage | <p>The submitter seeks that the plan change provide for the recognition of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The heritage values of the Thompson Street cribs as discussed in the Heritage Impact Assessment and Addendum ('HIA') prepared by New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd;</li> <li>2. The status of existing protected heritage trees in the plan change;</li> <li>3. The potential effects on the Queenstown Cemetery as a result of proposed Lakeview sub zone.</li> </ol> |
| 50/20/02          | Neutral  | Heritage | <p>The submitter notes that the HIA supporting the plan change identifies the presence of heritage cribs, the best examples being located on Thompson Street. The HIA notes that "these should be retained where possible, or at least recorded prior to removal to the equivalent of a Level 4 from the heritage New Zealand building archaeology guidelines (AGS1 Guidelines for investigation and recording of buildings)".</p>   |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                        | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|------------------------------|---|
|                   |          |                              | <p>If removal of the cribs must occur, given their identified heritage significance in their current location, Heritage New Zealand would encourage the Council to consider options for the retention of a small number of the Thompson Street cribs as representative examples of this period of Queenstown's development from domestic tourism base into a major international tourist destination.</p> <p>If retention is not possible Heritage New Zealand encourages the Council to facilitate the relocation of the cribs in order to avoid their demolition.</p>   |
| 50/20/03          | Neutral  | Heritage-Queenstown Cemetery | <p>Figure 3 Lakeview sub-zone Height Limit Plan provides for opportunity for increased building height (up to 12 metres) on land adjacent to Queenstown Cemetery. The plan change also allows for greater site coverage.</p> <p>Whilst the cemetery is recognised in the Inventory of Protected Features as a Category 2 heritage item, the heritage rules are not able to influence the form of development on adjoining sites.</p> <p>The Queenstown Height Study included in the application notes that:<br/> "Opportunity for increased height is also recognised in the Brecon Street are, but the potential increase is limited by Queenstown Cemetery and the prominence of the area in important view shafts and vistas...Crucial to this study are the heritage values of the cemetery, which include the gravestones and monuments and the stories they have to tell about the history of the town, but also the physical setting high on the lake beach terrace with views out to the mountains and the town".</p> <p>The submitter requests that the effects of adjoining development on the setting of the cemetery should be taken into consideration as part of the change and considers it important that the cemetery is not marginalised by overly dominant buildings and lack of connection to the wider zone.</p> <p>The concerns raised about the marginalisation of the cemetery will be of particular concern if Cemetery Road is stopped in the future and this location becomes available for development.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter     |
|-------------------|---------------|
| F50/10/19         | BSPL (oppose) |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                   | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------|---|
| 50/20/04          | Neutral  | Heritage-Trees          | <p>The submitter notes that the HIA identifies two groups of heritage trees which benefit from protection by virtue of their recognition in the District Plan Inventory of Protected Features (references 198 and 214). (refer to submission for full description of heritage description of these trees).</p> <p>Given the identified significance of the trees as a tangible reminder of the use of this area as a recreation reserve for the people of Queenstown; and the beautification initiatives of the early residents, Heritage New Zealand considers that protected heritage trees deserve explicit recognition in the provisions of the proposed plan change. It is acknowledged that Policy 2.8 seeks to recognise and enhance heritage characteristics, however the submitter considers that the Plan would be strengthened by the direct reference to heritage trees supporting the text of this section.</p>  |
| 50/20/05          | Neutral  | Objectives and policies | <p>Heritage New Zealand seeks the following relief: That sub-paragraph 11 of the 'Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption' section associated with 'Objective 2-Amenity' be expanded as follows:</p> <p><i>"The town centres of Queenstown and Arrowtown contain many of the identified heritage buildings and structures of the District. <u>These areas also contain significant heritage trees which provide a visual reminder of attempts by the District's early settlers to enhance and beautify public spaces.</u> The policy in respect of these complements the District wide heritage policies regarding protection of heritage items by encouraging not only the retention of buildings <del>and</del>, structures, <u>and heritage trees</u> but also those more basic elements and characteristics of the built form of the town centres, such as road layout and width, site width, service lanes and pedestrian linkages."</i></p> <p>And that section 10.2.4 Objective 2, Implementation Methods (i)(b) be expanded as follows:<br/> <i>"Protection and recognition of historic buildings and precincts and <u>significant heritage trees</u> by way of Objectives, Policies and Rules and inclusion of assessment matters in the District Plan."</i></p> <p>And that the second paragraph of the 'Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption' section of 10.2.4 Objective 2 be expanded as follows:<br/> <i>"While much of the built form of the town centre is recent, there are still a number of important historical elements including the narrow streets, small frontage sites, low scale of development and facade continuity, <del>and</del> a number of historic buildings <u>and significant heritage trees.</u>"</i></p> |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic             | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|--|
|                   |          |                   | <p>And that section 10.2.4 Objective 3 Policy 3.2 be expanded as follows:</p> <p><i>"3.2 Achieve an urban environment and a built form that responds to the site's location and creates an attractive, vibrant and liveable environment that <u>retains tangible connections with the past and is well connected with the town centre.</u>"</i></p> <p>And that section 10.2.5(xvii) is expanded as follows:</p> <p><i>"(xvii) Protection and preservation of important historic buildings, <u>and heritage trees</u> and protection and development of special character areas which contribute to the identity of the town and which help to define its cultural tradition."</i></p> |
| 50/20/06          | Neutral  | Other Legislation | Any development will need to comply with the provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.   |

### Craig Stobo

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------|--|
| 50/21/01          | Oppose   | Isle Street sub zone | <p>The submitter is a ratepayer at 28 Isle Street, and therefore fall within the proposed Isle Street sub-zone.</p> <p>The submitter considers that PC50 directly contravenes the QLD Management Strategy 2007 principle 2, strategy 2 of "no further expansion beyond the current zone boundaries". It is disconcerting to see that clear agreed consensual strategy challenged after only seven years.</p> <p>The submitter finds the rationale for extending the Town Centre zone to be ill-founded. The rezoning drivers from the McDermott Miller report seem to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"-growth in the Queenstown town centre is constrained,</li> <li>-avoid a reduction in range of quality and products on offer to visitors without vehicles"</li> <li>-increase the range and quality of products on offer to assist growth"</li> </ul> <p>The submitter considers that this does not address the economics of the best use of the town centre land and that CBD land is increasingly expensive and rental costs for businesses servicing local residents are high. Landlords will want to get the highest and best value use of their land. Retail including bulk retail will inevitably continue shift to larger cheaper sites such as Gorge Rd and Remarkables Park (the zoning of which has been approved by Council) where there is room to expand. The Queenstown town centre will increasingly be servicing tourists who have different spending profiles. The Plan Change does not acknowledge that</p> |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------|--|
|                   |          |       | normal commercial services businesses and retail businesses servicing residential needs will inevitably shift to cheaper sites requiring transport solutions, while tourism businesses are unlikely to shift away due to the features of the lake and its infrastructure/gondola etc. The nature of the businesses in the CBD are changing and should be seen as complementary. Perversely, the submitter considers, that by extending the Town Centre may even mean that in the short term current CBD businesses will shift to the cheaper Isle St sub zone leaving the core cbd vacant. |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| F50/49/09 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support/part) |
|-----------|--|

|          |                   |  |
|----------|-------------------|--|
| 50/21/02 | Lakeview sub zone | The submitter has no comments on the plan change for the convention centre, but wants businesses (who will benefit) to be rated to pay for it not residents, and we do not support a location of a casino to the site. |
|----------|-------------------|--|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| F50/49/09 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support/part) |
|-----------|--|

|          |                   |  |
|----------|-------------------|--|
| 50/21/03 | Lakeview sub zone | The submitter does not support the change to allow buildings up to 26m high up against the Ben Lomond Reserve, as this would be visually disastrous. |
|----------|-------------------|--|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| F50/49/09 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support/part) |
|-----------|--|

|          |                   |  |
|----------|-------------------|--|
| 50/21/04 | Lakeview sub zone | The submitter wants confirmation that the Clouston Reserve at the corner of Man and Hay Sts will remain a reserve. |
|----------|-------------------|--|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| F50/49/09 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support/part) |
|-----------|--|

|          |                      |   |
|----------|----------------------|---|
| 50/21/05 | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter notes that the proposed mixed use is intended to be of a "high quality", but there is very little explanation of what this means, and whether existing ratepayers have to change to this "standard" and therefore request an explanation on this point. |
|----------|----------------------|---|

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b> | <b>Topic</b>         | <b>Decision Requested</b>   |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| 50/21/06                 |                 | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter notes that the new rules inexplicably permit a height of 12m above the ground level for “everyone”, but then 15.5m for anyone on the Isle and Man corner if they have 2000sq m. The submitter seeks explanation justifying why the latter have a different application. |
| 50/21/07                 |                 | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter seeks an explanation as to why there is no parking in front yards and (i) whether this will apply to new buildings or existing buildings and (ii) whether this will apply to parking in back yards or side yards.   |
| 50/21/08                 |                 | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter seeks an explanation as to why there is no recession plane restrictions for the north/north east aspects of sites.  |
| 50/21/09                 |                 | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter requests that any bars wishing to operate after 2200hrs be notified basis. The submitter does not support non-notification.   |
| 50/21/10                 |                 | Beach Street Block   | The submitter considers that the height and noise changes on the Beach St zone will affect them and seeks an explanation as to how the changes have been managed to limit impact on submitter.  |

#### **Skyline Enterprises Limited**

| <b>Submission Number</b>   | <b>Position</b>  | <b>Topic</b>       | <b>Decision Requested</b>   |
|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---|
| 50/22/01                   | Support          | Plan Change itself | <p>The submitter supports the entire plan change provisions.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the Lakeview and Isle Street sub zones will provide a logical framing of the existing QTCZ and that activities such as commercial, visitor accommodation, commercial recreation, community facilities and a convention centre are appropriate for this location. The company considers that the Isle Street sub-zone will perform an important role in housing a range of activities, while linking the QTCZ to the Lakeview sub-zone and that the location of both sub-zones provide an excellent opportunity to allow higher built form to be absorbed into this setting without creating adverse effects.</p> |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                  |                    |   |
| <b>Submission Number</b>   | <b>Submitter</b> |                    |   |
| F50/10/20                  | BSPL (support)   |                    |   |
| 50/22/02                   |                  | Convention Centre  | SEL supports the establishment of a convention centre in this location for the following reasons:   |



| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------|---|
|                   |          |       | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Central Queenstown provides an environment which is vibrant, colourful and interesting to both locals and visitors due to its settlement pattern, built form, and location next to Queenstown Bay;</li> <li>2. Persons attending conference facilities in central Queenstown will benefit from easily accessible and vast array of cafes, restaurants, bars, and retail outlets which cater for a range of clientele;</li> <li>3. In close proximity to central Queenstown are a number of large hotels and other accommodation providers, which increase the likelihood of persons walking to and from a possible convention centre as opposed to using small vehicles and coaches;</li> <li>4. A range of central Queenstown business (and further afield) will directly benefit from the construction and operation of a convention centre in central Queenstown;</li> <li>5. Central Queenstown already has an infrastructure base which can be designed and managed to handle the possible conference centre;</li> <li>6. Central Queenstown is a transportation hub for businesses that have a strong downtown presence but whose activities and operations are carried out elsewhere.</li> </ol> <p>Overall, the submitter believes the development of a convention within central Queenstown will only help to strengthen the commercial, social and civic role of this urban setting in the context of the Wakatipu Basin.</p> |

### Nigel Brown

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------|---|
| 50/23/01          | Oppose   | Isle Street sub zone | The submitter is opposed to the Isle Street sub zone (particularly the block bounded by Hay, Isle, Brecon and Man Streets) and raises specific objections relation to car parking, height limits, site coverage and the change of zoning. |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter     |                                   |   |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| F50/10/21         | BSPL (oppose) |                                   |   |
| 50/23/02          |               | Isle Street sub zone - carparking | The proposed plan change does not allow enough on site car parking. There is already a problem with the lack of parking in the area and the proposed number of parks required will not ease this problem. The submitter understands the reasoning that people staying short term in the area will bus direct from the airport, this will not happen as any accommodation will need independent travellers to maintain their capacity. |

| Submission Number          | Position      | Topic                                    | Decision Requested   |                   |           |           |               |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|--|-------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| 50/23/03                   |               | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | <p>The submitter requests that residential use of any building should follow current high density rules for the block, and for non-residential uses on site car parking should be required for staff and customers.</p> <p>The submitter consider that the proposed height limit are totally out of scale for the area especially the 15.5 metres of sites over 2,000m<sup>2</sup>. This will lead significant shading of adjoining properties and Man Street itself. The 12 metre proposal on the individual sites is too high. The current town centre works because it is mainly flat ground, however once you tackle into account the sloping sites in the Isle Street block the scale of the buildings will be overbearing.</p> <p>The submitters requests that the current high density height limits and rules for the entire block be retained. Alternatively, set a 5 metre height restriction on the Man Street rear boundaries and allow them a horizontal plane (sic) towards Man Street to a maximum height of 12 metres.</p> |                   |           |           |               |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |               |  |  |                   |           |           |               |
|                            |               |  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Submission Number</th> <th>Submitter</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>F50/10/22</td> <td>BSPL (oppose)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | Submission Number | Submitter | F50/10/22 | BSPL (oppose) |
| Submission Number          | Submitter     |  |  |                   |           |           |               |
| F50/10/22                  | BSPL (oppose) |  |  |                   |           |           |               |
| 50/23/04                   |               | Isle Street sub zone - Building coverage | <p>The submitter states that the proposed site coverage is far too intensive and will lead to minimum setbacks between properties. This will take away views of Queenstown Bay and the downtown area from any properties without frontage on to Man Street. The Isle Street block is one of the few areas in town which have great views and are within easy walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>The submitter requests that that a maximum site coverage of 55% be provided for, which would give more space between the buildings and perhaps encourage lanes and open spaces.</p>   |                   |           |           |               |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |               |  |  |                   |           |           |               |
|                            |               |  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Submission Number</th> <th>Submitter</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>F50/10/23</td> <td>BSPL (oppose)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | Submission Number | Submitter | F50/10/23 | BSPL (oppose) |
| Submission Number          | Submitter     |  |  |                   |           |           |               |
| F50/10/23                  | BSPL (oppose) |  |  |                   |           |           |               |
| 50/23/05                   |               | Rates                                    | Any residential use of a property should be rated on the basis of high density zoning, and not town centre.  |                   |           |           |               |
| 50/23/06                   |               | Lakeview sub zone                        | The submitter request that for the Lakeview sub-zone, where this has a frontage to Isle Street and Hay Street there should be a generous setback of 50 metres or a 7 metre height restriction within 50 metres of the street   |                   |           |           |               |

| Submission Number          | Position      | Topic                                    | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|---|
|                            |               |  | boundary.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |               |  |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter     |  |   |
| F50/10/24                  | BSPL (oppose) |  |   |
| 50/23/07                   |               | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | The submitter requests that the amalgamation of 2,000m2 sites should be a non-complying activity as this would mean amalgamating four sites from Isle Street to Man Street and the bulk and scale of this would be overpowering using the proposed heights and rules. |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |               |  |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter     |  |   |
| F50/10/25                  | BSPL (oppose) |  |   |

### John Thompson

| Submission Number          | Position                         | Topic                                    | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 50/24/01                   | Support (in part)                | Plan Change itself                       | The submitter supports the Plan Change, as it allows for the expansion of the Queenstown Town Centre, in a way that will provide for high quality mixed use retail, commercial and high density residential developments and requests that the plan change be approved subject below.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |  |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |  |   |
| F50/33/01                  | Watertight Investments (support) |  |   |
| F50/36/01                  | Cedric Hockey (support)          |  |   |
| 50/24/02                   | Oppose                           | Isle Street sub zone - Building coverage | The maximum coverage in site standards is proposed to be 70% in Isle Street Sub-Zone, however this is less than some other areas of the town centre, including new Lake View Sub Zone (80%).<br><br>The submitter requests that the maximum site coverage (under Rule 10.6.5.1.i.e) within the Isle Street Sub-Zone be increased to 80%, and any consequential changes. |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |  |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |  |   |
| F50/10/26                  | BSPL (support)                   |  |   |

| Submission Number          | Position                         | Topic                                      | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |  |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |  |  |
| F50/33/01                  | Watertight Investments (support) |  |  |
| F50/36/01                  | Cedric Hockey (support)          |  |  |
| F50/27/11                  | Man Street Properties (support)  |  |  |
| F50/28/11                  | Any Old Fish Company (support)   |  |  |
| F50/26/11                  | The Dairy Guest House (support)  |  |  |
| 50/24/03                   | Oppose                           | Isle Street sub zone - Acoustic Insulation | The proposed acoustic insulation requirement for residential and visitor accommodation activities within the Isle Street Sub-Zone (10.6.5.1.vii.e and 10.6.5.1.xvi) are overly prescriptive. The submitter considers that the costs and benefits have not been evaluated. The same restrictions are not imposed throughout the Town Centre Zone. The submitter requests that the provisions be deleted and any consequential amendments. |

| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |  |   |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |  |   |
| F50/33/01                  | Watertight Investments (support) |  |   |
| F50/36/01                  | Cedric Hockey (support)          |  |   |
| F50/27/11                  | Man Street Properties (support)  |  |   |
| F50/28/11                  | Any Old Fish Company (support)   |  |   |
| F50/26/11                  | The Dairy Guest House (support)  |  |   |
| 50/24/04                   | Oppose                           | Isle Street sub zone - Noise arising from premises licenced for sale of liquor | <p>In the Isle Street Sub-Zone noise from the premises licenced for sale of liquor is restricted to certain levels, between 10pm and 8am (under Rule 10.6.5.1.xv). In the adjacent zone, levels are not set, but instead Council may impose conditions on noise, between the hours of 11pm and 7am. The different treatment for the Isle Street Sub-Zone has not been justified.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the standards be amended to standard Town Centre provisions for noise arising from premises licenced for sale of liquor and any consequential changes.</p> |

| Submission Number          | Position                         | Topic | Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |       |                    |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |       |                    |
| F50/33/01                  | Watertight Investments (support) |       |                    |
| F50/36/01                  | Cedric Hockey (support)          |       |                    |
| F50/27/11                  | Man Street Properties (support)  |       |                    |
| F50/28/11                  | Any Old Fish Company (support)   |       |                    |
| F50/26/11                  | The Dairy Guest House (support)  |       |                    |

|          |        |                                   |  |
|----------|--------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 50/24/05 | Oppose | Isle Street sub zone - carparking | <p>In chapter 10 and chapter 14 (transport) there are specific provisions for parking requirements proposed (10.6.5.1.iv.f and 14.2.4.1 Table 1). The submitter considers that this will encourage use of cars and cannot be justified given the already congested town centre roading network that does not cope with current levels of traffic. Furthermore, the same requirements are not imposed on the adjacent Lakeview Sub-Zone – several activities in that zone are proposed to have no minimum parking requirements. Further, it is noted that there is a parking building just a quarter of a block down Man St from the Isle Street Sub-Zone.</p> <p>The submitter seeks the deletion of the minimum parking requirements and restrictions in the Isle Street Sub- Zone and any consequential changes.</p> |
|----------|--------|-----------------------------------|--|

| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |  |  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |  |  |
| F50/33/01                  | Watertight Investments (support) |  |  |
| F50/36/01                  | Cedric Hockey (support)          |  |  |

|          |        |  |  |
|----------|--------|--|--|
| 50/24/06 | Oppose | Isle Street sub zone - Building setbacks | <p>The Isle Street Sub-Zone has minimum setback from side boundaries of 1.5m, (10.6.5.1.g) whereas the Town Centre, the Transition Sub-Zone and the Lakeview Sub-Zone have no such restriction. This cannot be justified. The submitter seeks that deletion of this provision and any consequential changes.</p> |
|----------|--------|--|--|

| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |  |  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |  |  |
| F50/33/01                  | Watertight Investments (support) |  |  |
| F50/36/01                  | Cedric Hockey (support)          |  |  |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                                    | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|--|--|
| 50/24/07          | Oppose   | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | The recession planes off internal boundaries for the Isle Street Sub-Zone (10.6.5.1.xi.i) appear to be different than the Town Centre, and Lakeview Sub-Zone, without justification. The same provisions should apply. The submitter seeks the deletion of the recession plane requirements for internal boundaries in the Isle Street Sub-Zone and any consequential changes. |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                        |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| F50/33/01         | Watertight Investments (support) |
| F50/36/01         | Cedric Hockey (support)          |
| F50/27/11         | Man Street Properties (support)  |
| F50/28/11         | Any Old Fish Company (support)   |
| F50/26/11         | The Dairy Guest House (support)  |

|          |        |  |  |
|----------|--------|--|--|
| 50/24/08 | Oppose | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | The maximum controlled height is 12m, except in Isle St Sub-Zone where a site that is greater than 2000m <sup>2</sup> , and that has frontage on both Man and Isle St, has a maximum zone standard height of 15.5m (10.6.5.2.i.a). The requirement to have frontage on both Man and Isle Street to meet this standard is unjustified. The submitter seeks the deletion of the requirement that a site have frontage on both Man and Isle Street, to meet this zone standard and any consequential changes. |
|----------|--------|--|--|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                        |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| F50/33/01         | Watertight Investments (support) |
| F50/36/01         | Cedric Hockey (support)          |
| F50/27/12         | Man Street Properties (oppose)   |
| F50/28/12         | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)    |
| F50/26/12         | The Dairy Guest House (oppose)   |

|          |        |   |   |
|----------|--------|---|---|
| 50/24/09 | Oppose | Isle Street sub zone - Maximum retail space | The maximum retail space is 400m <sup>2</sup> per tenancy in the Isle Street Sub-Zone (10.6.5.2.iv). Breach of this standard makes an activity non-complying. Such a stringent status is not justified. The submitter seeks that this provision be deleted and any consequential changes. |
|----------|--------|---|---|

| Submission Number          | Position                         | Topic | Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |       |                    |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |       |                    |
| F50/33/01                  | Watertight Investments (support) |       |                    |
| F50/36/01                  | Cedric Hockey (support)          |       |                    |
| F50/27/11                  | Man Street Properties (support)  |       |                    |
| F50/28/11                  | Any Old Fish Company (support)   |       |                    |
| F50/26/11                  | The Dairy Guest House (support)  |       |                    |

|          |        |   |  |
|----------|--------|---|--|
| 50/24/10 | Oppose | Isle Street sub zone - Assessment Matters | <p>There is a sub set of assessment matters that are not appropriate for an area that is effectively destined to change in character, and that will be in transition for some time. The assessment matters of concern require that a building be designed so that it fits with its surroundings. This is not appropriate given the surroundings for the Isle Street Sub-Zone are single storey old houses, in a zone that contemplates new 12m plus tall buildings for mixed commercial use. The assessment matters include:</p> <p>10.10.2.iii.a, b, c, e,<br/> 10.10.2.iv<br/> 10.10.2.vii.a<br/> 10.10.2.viii.a,b,d,g<br/> 10.10.2.xiii.a,d,<br/> 10.10.2.xvi.a,c,g,<br/> 10.10.2.xvii.a,b,c<br/> 10.10.2.xvii.a,b,c,e<br/> 10.10.2.xviii.a,b,e,f,</p> <p>The submitter considers that these assessment matters will hamper the sensible transition of this zone and therefore seeks that the identified assessment matters be excluded for activities within the Isle Street Sub-Zone, where they refer to or relate to adjacent and nearby buildings, streetscape and general location.</p> |
|----------|--------|---|--|

| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                  |  |  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Submission Number          | Submitter                        |  |  |
| F50/10/27                  | BSPL (support)                   |  |  |
| F50/33/01                  | Watertight Investments (support) |  |  |
| F50/36/01                  | Cedric Hockey (support)          |  |  |

|          |        |                               |   |
|----------|--------|-------------------------------|---|
| 50/24/11 | Oppose | Adequacy of section 32 report | The submitter considers that the benefits and costs of the effects of the provisions referred to above in respect of the Isle Street Sub-Zone have not been appropriately assessed or quantified in accordance with section 32, |
|----------|--------|-------------------------------|---|

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------|---|
|                   |          |       | nor have they been assessed with regards to their suitability for giving effect to the relevant policies. |

| Further Submissions |                                  |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                        |
| F50/33/01           | Watertight Investments (support) |
| F50/36/01           | Cedric Hockey (support)          |
| F50/27/11           | Man Street Properties (support)  |
| F50/28/11           | Any Old Fish Company (support)   |
| F50/26/11           | The Dairy Guest House (support)  |

### Tim McGeorge

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                             | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 50/25/01          | Oppose   | Expansion of Plan Change boundary | The submitter seeks the expansion of the plan change to include the block of land bounded by Lake Street, Man Street, Thompson Street, and Brunswick Street. At present the submitters property is surrounded on three sides at 48 and 52 Man Street by new commercial zoning. |

### The Dairy Guesthouse 2003 Ltd

| Submission Number | Position         | Topic                | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|--|
| 50/26/01          | Oppose (in part) | Isle Street sub zone | <p>The submitter is the registered proprietor of the multi award winning visitor accommodation complex located at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 Isle Street, being legally described as Section 8 Blk XII Town of Queenstown. This property is 405m<sup>2</sup> in area; and</li> <li>• 21 Brecon Street, being legally described as Section 9 Blk XII Town of Queenstown. This property is 405m<sup>2</sup> in area.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 50 in its entirety, unless the Council undertakes a more rigorous assessment of the planning provisions that will apply to the proposed Isle Street Sub-Zone.</p> <p>The Isle Street Sub-Zone is vitally important as it provides a logical expansion of the Queenstown Town Centre Zone and greatly assists in justifying the rezoning of the Lakeview site.</p> |



The submitter supports the mixed use allowance for activities in the Isle Street Sub-Zone, however considers that the development controls for the Isle Street Sub-Zone are inappropriate and will create significant tension for a mixed use area. Based on this view, the submitter has the following issues with the planning provisions proposed for the Isle Street-Sub-Zone.

### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter           |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| F50/10/28         | BSPL (support/part) |

|          |  |  |
|----------|--|--|
| 50/26/02 | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | <p>Submitter raises concerns with the proposed building height limit and building setbacks (both from the road and internal boundaries). In relation to the building height limit, these are set out under proposed Rules 10.6.5.1(xi)(e),(f) and (i).</p> <p>Considers 12m height limit to be appropriate, however more detailed work needs to be undertaken as to the potential loss of outlook from a number of properties, particularly properties that front onto Isle Street. The submitter believes that the current ground levels should be adopted for the Isle Street Sub-Zone, as opposed to the original ground levels.</p> <p>The submitter further assessment should be undertaken by the Council in terms of the exact makeup of the proposed recession planes, especially considering the proposed mixed use of the Isle Street Sub-Zone. The submitter believes that the recession planes should either be deleted and an alternative design solution put forward, or the angle/height of the recession planes relaxed.</p> |
| 50/26/03 | Isle Street sub zone - Building setbacks | <p>Rules 10.6.5.1(iv)(e)(f) and (g) deal with building setbacks within the Isle Street Sub Zone.</p> <p>The submitter believes that there should be the ability to park vehicles within the road boundary setback.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the internal setbacks will disrupt the continuity of the road frontages within the Isle Street Sub-Zone.</p> <p>The submitter believes that provision should be made for pedestrian links to be incorporated into the two blocks contained within the Isle Street Sub-Zone, as well as providing for a service lane to run through the two blocks (in a central manner).</p> <p>Overall, the submitter believes that further and substantial assessment needs to occur in relation to the zoning provisions that apply to the Isle Street Sub-</p>  |

|          |                                     |   |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 50/26/04 | Traffic, parking and infrastructure | Council needs to adopt a lead role in dealing with, planning and provision of infrastructure servicing issues in terms of the Isle Street Sub Zone. |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---|

**Man Street Properties Limited**

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b>  | <b>Topic</b>                             | <b>Decision Requested</b>  |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 50/27/01                 | Oppose (in part) | Town Centre Transition Sub-Zone          | <p>The submitter is the registered proprietor of the podium level that exists on top of the underground Man Street car parking building. This site is 3961m<sup>2</sup> in area and legally described as Lot 1 Deposited Plan 399240.</p> <p>The submitters property is located within the TCTZ. The submitter seeks that Plan Change 50 is declined unless the TCTZ is amended to reflect those amendments set out below.</p>   |
| 50/27/02                 |                  | Town Centre Transition Sub-Zone - Height | <p>It is the submitters view that it is appropriate to deal with the lower height limit (8m) within the TCTZ within the context of Plan Change 50. This view is formed on the basis that if the Council is proposing to considerably increase building heights on the land to the north of Man Street, the overall building height equation that includes the TCTZ should be addressed at the same time.</p> <p>With the possibility of significantly increased building heights on land located to the north of Man and Thompson Streets, combined with the 12 metre building height limit for the majority of the existing QTCZ, the TCTZ will have a considerably lower building height limit than the majority of the surrounding land. This is illogical and inconsistent in a planning sense.</p> <p>The submitter now seeks amendments to the existing building height limit for its property.</p> <p>Rather than determining the building height limit from the original ground level, the submitter submits the height limit should be determined from the level of the podium. The podium level is 327.1m. This approach provides for a more efficient building style for the site, as opposed to dealing with the highly varied original topography.</p> <p>the submitter believes that a 12 metre building height limit from 327.1m is appropriate for two areas of the site, being referenced as Zones A and B (maximum height being 339.1m) in the drawing attached to the submission. Zones A and B are two roughly square areas. This recommended height limit is less than what is proposed within the Isle Street Sub-Zones.</p> |

| Submission Number          | Position               | Topic | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------|---|
|                            |                        |       | <p>In combination with the increased building height limit, the submitter also suggests two other areas within the site (being Zones C and D) where built form can be constructed to a lower building height, being four metres above the podium (maximum height 331.1 m).</p> <p>Zone C backs onto the existing building located off Shotover Street, which roughly sits between 3 metres to 4 metres above the podium level. Zone D sits to the south of the existing vehicle ramp into the building.</p> |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                        |       |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter              |       |   |
| F50/24/12                  | John Thompson (oppose) |       |   |

|          |  |   |  |
|----------|--|---|--|
| 50/27/03 |  | Town Centre Transition Sub-Zone - Building coverage | The submitter also requests that the existing maximum building coverage of 70% that applies to the TCTZ be increased to 80%. The latter coverage limit is consistent with the majority of the QTCZ .   |
| 50/27/04 |  | Town Centre Transition Sub-Zone - setbacks          | The submitter believes that a 4.5 metre minimum building setback from Man Street for its site is excessive when compared to the potential 1.5 metre maximum building setback that is being promoted within the Isle Street Sub-Zone that will adjoin Man Street. In this regard, the submitter seeks a minimum building setback of 3 metres from Man Street. |

### Any Old Fish Company Holdings Limited

| Submission Number | Position         | Topic                | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|---|
| 50/28/01          | Oppose (in part) | Isle Street sub zone | <p>The submitter is the registered proprietor of the residential property located at 37 Man Street, being legally described as Part Section 16 Block XI Town of Queenstown. This property is 533m2 in area.</p> <p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 50 in its entirety, unless the Council undertakes a more rigorous assessment of the planning provisions that will apply to the proposed Isle Street Sub-Zone.</p> <p>The Isle Street Sub-Zone is vitally important as it provides a logical expansion of the Queenstown Town Centre Zone and greatly assists in justifying the rezoning of the Lakeview site.</p> <p>The submitter supports the mixed use allowance for activities in the Isle Street Sub-Zone, however considers that the development controls for the Isle</p> |

| Submission Number          | Position                                  | Topic                                    | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|
|                            |   |  | Street Sub-Zone are inappropriate and will create significant tension for a mixed use area. Based on this view, the submitter has the following issues with the planning provisions proposed for the Isle Street-Sub-Zone.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |   |  |  |
| <b>Submission Number</b>   | <b>Submitter</b>                          |  |  |
| F50/10/28                  | BSPL (support/part)                       |  |  |
| 50/28/02                   |   | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | <p>The Submitter raises concerns with the proposed building height limit and building setbacks (both from the road and internal boundaries). In relation to the building height limit, these are set out under proposed Rules 10.6.5.1(xi)(e),(f) and (i).</p> <p>Considers 12m height limit to be appropriate, however more detailed work needs to be undertaken as to the potential loss of outlook from a number of properties, particularly properties that front onto Isle Street. The submitter believes that the current ground levels should be adopted for the Isle Street Sub-Zone, as opposed to the original ground levels.</p> <p>The submitter further assessment should be undertaken by the Council in terms of the exact makeup of the proposed recession planes, especially considering the proposed mixed use of the Isle Street Sub-Zone. The submitter believes that the recession planes should either be deleted and an alternative design solution put forward, or the angle/height of the recession planes relaxed.</p> |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |   |  |  |
| <b>Submission Number</b>   | <b>Submitter</b>                          |  |  |
| F50/24/13                  | John Thompson (support/part, oppose/part) |  |  |
| 50/28/03                   |   | Isle Street sub zone - Building setbacks | <p>Rules 10.6.5.1(iv)(e)(f) and (g) deal with building setbacks within the Isle Street Sub Zone.</p> <p>The submitter believes that there should be the ability to park vehicles within the road boundary setback.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the internal setbacks will disrupt the continuity of the road frontages within the Isle Street Sub-Zone.</p> <p>The submitter believes that provision should be made for pedestrian links to be incorporated into the two blocks contained within the Isle Street Sub-Zone, as</p>  |

| Submission Number   | Position                     | Topic | Decision Requested   |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-------|--|
|                     |                              |       | well as providing for a service lane to run through the two blocks (in a central manner).<br><br>Overall, the submitter believes that further and substantial assessment needs to occur in relation to the zoning provisions that apply to the Isle Street Sub-Zone. |
| Further Submissions |                              |       |  |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                    |       |  |
| F50/24/14           | John Thompson (support/part) |       |  |

| 50/28/04            |                              | Traffic, parking and infrastructure | Council needs to adopt a lead role in dealing with, planning and provision of infrastructure servicing issues in terms of the Isle Street Sub Zone. |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Further Submissions |                              |                                     |   |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                    |                                     |   |
| F50/24/15           | John Thompson (support/part) |                                     |   |

#### Doug and Betty Brown

| Submission Number   | Position                       | Topic              | Decision Requested  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| 50/29/01            | Oppose                         | Plan Change itself | The submitters oppose the plan change and consider that the projected height and bulk provisions would create a concrete jungle with massive transport and carparking problems. The submitters request that the plan change be amended as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend provisions to leave Isle Street/Man Street blocks as they are;</li> <li>2. Lakeview site to retain the green area used as childrens playground on corner of Hay Street and Man Street;</li> <li>3. Balance of Lakeview site to be High Density Residential zoning similar to Isle Street/Man Street blocks;</li> <li>4. Oppose PC50 being extension of CBD.</li> </ol> |
| Further Submissions |                                |                    |   |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                      |                    |   |
| F50/10/29           | BSPL (oppose)                  |                    |   |
| F50/27/05           | Man Street Properties (oppose) |                    |   |
| F50/28/05           | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)  |                    |   |

| Further Submissions |                                   |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                         |
| F50/26/05           | The Dairy Guest House (oppose)    |
| F50/49/10           | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |

### Allan Huntington

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|--|
| 50/30/01          | Oppose   | Plan Change itself | <p>The submitter opposes the extension of the QTCZ into the existing HDRZ and opposes the provision of a convention centre as a controlled activity. The submitter seeks the following relief:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lakeview to remain as HDRZ;</li> <li>2. Withdraw the change to the QTCZ;</li> <li>3. Withdraw the provision for convention centre on Lakeview; and</li> <li>4. Modify the increase in height of the existing HDRZ on Lakeview to 10 metres plus a roof form bonus of 2.0 metres.</li> </ol> |

The submitters reasoning for this is set out below.

| Further Submissions |                                   |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                         |
| F50/10/30           | BSPL (oppose)                     |
| F50/49/03           | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |

|          |                                       |  |
|----------|---------------------------------------|--|
| 50/30/02 | Lakeview sub zone - retention of HDRZ | <p>The submitter considers that the emphasis of PC50 on commercial and visitor accommodation development is at the detriment of providing HDR zoned land close to town and in accordance with the District Plan objectives and policies.</p> <p>The District Plan identifies that High Density land is used to maintain a large core of residents close to town and that High Density land is in scarce supply in Queenstown. A much higher level of good quality residential development on Lakeview would assist the vitality of QTCZ and address some of the issues with drift to Frankton.</p> |
|----------|---------------------------------------|--|

| Further Submissions |                                   |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                         |
| F50/49/03           | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |

| <b>Submission Number</b>   | <b>Position</b>                   | <b>Topic</b>   | <b>Decision Requested</b>   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| 50/30/03                   |                                   | Town Centre Capacity Issues                              | <p>The submitter considers that Frankton is now the hub for residents and Queenstown is the centre for tourists. This is the direction the community took some time ago with the development of Remarkables Park, the location of the Events Centre and Aquatic Centre as well as the large adjacent residential subdivisions.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the concern that Frankton's success will diminish Queenstown's potential is unfounded. Tourists love Queenstown for its vitality, uniqueness, its compact form and closeness to Lake Wakatipu and surrounding grandeur of mountains and lake. Tourists will gravitate to Queenstown over Frankton.</p> |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |  |   |
| <b>Submission Number</b>   | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |   |
| F50/49/03                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |   |
| 50/30/04                   |                                   | Convention Centre  | <p>The convention centre, commercial and visitor accommodation on Lakeview will diminish the opportunities for suitable long term residential population, with Queenstown's late night hospitality and part atmosphere not suitable for a well balanced mix of residential population. It may be suitable for visitor accommodation but High Density living needs to extend living areas to decks and other outdoor living spaces and not be cooped up inside. Seeks withdrawal convention centre on Lakeview site.</p>   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |  |   |
| <b>Submission Number</b>   | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |   |
| F50/49/03                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |   |
| 50/30/05                   |                                   | Lakeview sub zone - hot pools and commercial development | <p>Keeping the height at 4.5 metres curtails the development potential of the site. Keeping height consistent with adjacent land would maintain a higher value and premium for what is a community asset. An alternative location for a hot pool would be at One Mile Creek.</p>  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |  |   |
| <b>Submission Number</b>   | <b>Submitter</b>                  |  |   |
| F50/49/03                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |  |   |
| 50/30/06                   |                                   | Lakeview sub zone - Height                               | <p>Submitter is in agreement with a height increase for high density residential development on the Lakeview site but would propose 10 metre maximum with a 2</p>   |

| Submission Number   | Position                          | Topic | Decision Requested     |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------------|
|                     |                                   |       | metre roof form bonus. |
| Further Submissions |                                   |       |                        |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                         |       |                        |
| F50/49/03           | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |       |                        |

### Gillian & Donald McDonald

| Submission Number   | Position                       | Topic                | Decision Requested  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 50/31/01            | Oppose                         | Isle Street sub zone | <p>The submitters operate Browns Boutique Hotel located within the proposed Isle Street sub zone, and their specific concerns relate to the block bounded by Hay, Isle, Brecon and Man Streets and raise objections relating to the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the proposed height restrictions;</li> <li>2. the proposed site coverage;</li> <li>3. the amalgamation of small sites;</li> <li>4. proposed car parking provisions; and</li> <li>5. rating same as Town Centre.</li> </ol> |
| Further Submissions |                                |                      |   |
| Submission Number   | Submitter                      |                      |   |
| F50/27/06           | Man Street Properties (oppose) |                      |   |
| F50/28/06           | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)  |                      |   |
| F50/26/06           | The Dairy Guest House (oppose) |                      |   |

|          |  |  |  |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 50/31/02 |  | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | <p>The proposed height limits are out of scale for this area. The 15.5 metres on sites with dual frontage over 2000 metres will create a "big box" effect and is inappropriate for this zone with its sloping sections. This will create significant shading of adjoining properties. The 12 metre proposal on smaller sites is also too high.</p> <p>The town centre high limits works because buildings are on flat land. Imposing these heights on the higher contours of the Isle Street Sub Zone buildings block views and reduce property values and business viability of affected property owners in this zone.</p> <p>The submitter seeks retention of the current high density limits and rules for the Isle Street Sub Zone. Given the sloping contours, alternatively a 5 metre height restriction on the Man Street rear boundaries and allow them a horizontal plane towards Man Street to a maximum of 12 metres.</p> |
|----------|--|--|--|



| Submission Number          | Position                 | Topic                                    | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |  |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                         |  |
|                            | F50/10/31                | BSPL (oppose)                            |  |
| 50/31/03                   |                          | Isle Street sub zone - Building coverage | <p>The proposed site coverage of 70% is too intensive. This will lead to minimum set backs between properties. It will take away the views of Queenstown Bay and the downtown area from any properties without a frontage to Man Street. It will also mean there is no space for onsite parking.</p> <p>The submitter requests that rather than have separate standards for residential and non-residential as is currently the case, the maximum site coverage for all should be 55%. This would allow room for some onsite parking, and encourage open areas and lanes between buildings and create a continuation of the "village fee" like in Arrowtown and areas of the Queenstown CBD.</p>   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |  |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                         |  |
|                            | F50/10/32                | BSPL (oppose)                            |  |
| 50/31/04                   |                          | Isle Street sub zone - site amalgamation | <p>The proposal to allow the amalgamation of 2000 metre sites (four existing sites) should not be allowed. Buildings of this scale will dwarf the area and the CBD. The amalgamation of 2000 metre sites should not be allowed.</p>  |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |  |  |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                         |  |
|                            | F50/24/16                | John Thompson (oppose)                   |  |
| 50/31/05                   |                          | Isle Street sub zone - carparking        | <p>The proposed plan change does not allow for enough onsite car parking. There is a lack of street parking in down town Queenstown and local people and visitors are parking along the outer perimeters. Hay, Man, Isle &amp; Brecon Streets are very congested. It is incorrect to assume that visitors staying in town will not need cars. All our guests are independent travellers and 70% of them have cars. We have parking for 50% of our guest rooms and that is not enough.</p> <p>The submitters request that the current high density rules should apply to residential use of any building. All new commercial accommodation builds should have underground parking if there is not sufficient space for outside parking. Onsite parking for retail should be</p> |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                      | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|--|
|                   |          |                            | required for staff and customers.  |
| 50/31/06          |          | Rates                      | The existing rates for Isle /Man Streets should be retained. The higher town centre rates would be a financial burden on existing businesses in the zone.  |
| 50/31/07          |          | Lakeview sub zone - Height | The submitter request that for the Lakeview sub-zone, where this has a frontage to Isle Street and Hay Street there should be a generous setback of 50 metres or a 7 metre height restriction within 50 metres of the street boundary. |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter     |
|-------------------|---------------|
| F50/10/33         | BSPL (oppose) |

#### IHG Queenstown Ltd and Carter Queenstown Ltd

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                        | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---|
| 50/32/01          | Support (in part) | Plan Change itself           | <p>The submitter supports the plan change, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the need for additional town centre zoned land,</li> <li>- the rezoning of the land bound by Lake Esplanade, Lake Street, Man Street and Hay Street to Queenstown Town Centre Zone;</li> <li>- subject to the relief set out in this submission.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter seeks the inclusion of the land bound by Lake Esplanade, Lake Street, Man Street and Hay Street within the QTCZ, with provisions as set out in PC50 as notified (amended in accordance with the relief set out below)</p> |
| 50/32/02          |                   | Beach Street block - Noise   | <p>The submitter seeks the removal of a specific noise rule for the block of land bound by Lake Esplanade, Lake Street, Man Street and Hay Street (Noise (Rule 10.6.5.2 (ii) (b), page 10-15). Instead it seeks the application of the operative town centre-wide noise rule.</p> <p>The submitter seeks the removal of a specific noise rule for this block of land, and, instead the application of the operative town centre-wide noise rule for this block of land.</p>   |
| 50/32/03          |                   | Beach Street block - Veranda | The submitter seeks deletion of Rule 10.6.5.1 (vi) which requires the provision of a veranda along the Hay Street frontage of its land.   |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------|--|
| 50/33/01          | Support  | Isle Street sub zone | Watertight is the owner of land at 50, 52 and 54 Camp Street. The combined land area of these sites totals approximately 1500m <sup>2</sup> . The submitter seeks that 50, 52 and 54 Camp Street are conformed as part of the Queenstown Town Centre Zone. |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| F50/27/07 | Man Street Properties (support) |
|-----------|---------------------------------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/28/07 | Any Old Fish Company (support) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

|           |                                 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| F50/26/07 | The Diary Guest House (support) |
|-----------|---------------------------------|

|          |  |  |
|----------|--|--|
| 50/33/02 | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | The submitter questions the need for a recession plane control. In particular, it is considered that a 45 degree recession plane starting 5m above the boundary is overly restrictive and could result in poor design outcomes including unattractive built forms. |
|----------|--|--|

Further, there are some unclear matters with respect to the controls on height. It is questioned how easily and consistently the matter of what a 'northern boundary' will be interpreted with respect to the recession plane rule (it may, for example be more efficient to name the street boundaries to which this rule applies rather than refer to cardinal points). It is also unclear whether the rule applies for boundaries between sites held in common ownership (and it is submitted that this should not be the case). And it is unclear whether the roof bonus rule provides an exemption from the recession plane requirement, or only the overall 12 metre height limit.

The submitter seeks the removal or amendment to the internal boundary recession plan rule as it applies to the Isle Street subzone, so as to allow greater building height closer to boundaries, to clarify the rules and to exempt the rule's application from boundaries between sites held in common ownership.

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                              |
|-----------|------------------------------|
| F50/24/17 | John Thompson (support/part) |
|-----------|------------------------------|

|           |                                 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| F50/27/07 | Man Street Properties (support) |
|-----------|---------------------------------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/28/07 | Any Old Fish Company (support) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

| Submission Number          | Position                        | Topic                             | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                 |                                   |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                       |                                   |  |
| F50/26/07                  | The Diary Guest House (support) |                                   |  |
| 50/33/03                   |                                 | Isle Street sub zone - carparking | The submitter seeks the removal of the rule that seeks to prevent car parking in front yards in the Isle Street subzone. |

### Ngai Tahu Tourism Limited

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                              | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| 50/34/01          | Support (in part) | Lakeview sub zone                  | <p>The submitter supports the plan change, subject to the relief set out in this submission.</p> <p>The submitter has an interest in leasing approximately 7,500m<sup>2</sup> of land located to the west of the intersection of Man and Thompson Streets, generally indicated as 'reserve' on Figure 2 of the 'Lakeview Sub-Zone Structure Plan' (page 10-17 of the proposed plan provisions). It is NTT's intention to establish a commercial hot pool facility on this land, together with associated spa treatment rooms and ancillary retail, service and administrative activities (the scope of which have not yet been determined). This submission refers to the land as the 'lease area'.</p> <p>The submitter wishes to ensure that the proposed plan provisions do not frustrate their ability to establish such facilities upon that land. If a lease were to be granted, the proposed rules as notified would restrict the ability of NTT to establish and operate a world class hot pool facility on the land and this submission seeks to remedy that.</p> <p>The key aspects of this submission relate to the proposed rules on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car-Parking;</li> <li>- Protected Trees;</li> <li>- Active Frontages;</li> <li>- Building Height;</li> <li>- Viewshafts; and</li> <li>- Widening of Thompson Street.</li> </ul> <p>Together these rules create uncertainty as to the amount of land that would be available for use for a hot pool facility.</p> |
| 50/34/02          |                   | Lakeview sub-zone - Reserve Status | That area identified as the Lakeview Sub-Zone contains a combination of freehold and reserve land. The general split is freehold land over the western half of the sub-zone, and reserve land over the eastern half. The  |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                       | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-----------------------------|--|
| 50/34/03          |          | Lakeview sub-zone - parking | <p>Plan Change indicates the spatial reorganisation of these areas. As part of this reorganisation the 'lease area' is to change from freehold to reserve.</p> <p>It is unclear through these provisions whether the 'reserve' will be vested and gazetted as a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. It is also unclear whether any land that is vested as a reserve will also be designated in the District Plan as a reserve. If so, the rules affecting that future designation remain uncertain.</p> <p>The submitter seeks confirmation from the Council on the subsequent status of the land as a reserve and in respect of any subsequent future Designations or Notices of Requirement and the rules that apply.</p> <p>The Plan Change provisions amend the car-parking rules at pages 14-14 to 14-17.</p> <p>In most cases the plan change intends to exclude on-site parking requirements in the Lakeview sub-zone for commercial activities. The introductory rule (14.2.4.1 (i)(a)) has been amended, although it appears inadvertently, to now require car-parking throughout all of the Town Centre zones.</p> <p>The operative rule and proposed rules read as follows:</p> <p><i>"Operative District Plan Provisions:<br/>(a) Activities in the Town Centre Zones, excluding the Town Centre Transition sub-zone, which shall be subject to the existing car parking requirements.<br/>Proposed Plan Change 50 Provisions:<br/>(a) Activities in the Town Centre Zones, (excluding the Town Centre Transition sub-zone and the Town Centre Lakeview sub-zone), which shall be subject to the existing car parking requirements."</i></p> <p>This amendment appears to unintentionally require car-parking in the Town Centre zones, with the exception of the two mentioned sub-zones. A minor amendment needs to be made to reverse that.</p> <p><i>"(a) Activities in the Town Centre Zones, excluding the Town Centre Transition and Town Centre Lakeview sub-zones, which shall be subject to the existing car parking requirements."</i></p> |
| 50/34/04          |          | Lakeview sub-zone - parking | <p>With respect to the 'lease area', it is intended to establish and operate a commercial hot pools, which is closely described as a 'Commercial Recreation Activity' within the District Plan. PC50 generally excludes any on-site parking for commercial activities in the Lakeview sub-zone, with the exception of 'Commercial Recreation</p>   |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                               | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 50/34/05          |          | Lakeview sub-zone - Protected Trees | <p>Activities', 'Convention Centres' and 'Visitor Accommodation'. In the case of 'Commercial Recreation Activities' the on-site parking requirement is proposed at '1 parking space per 5 people the facility is designed to accommodate'.</p> <p>The Traffic Design Group Report (Appendix I to the AEE) suggests a maximum occupancy of 500 people, which would result in 100 on-site car-parking spaces being required for the 'lease area'. Typically each carpark occupies about 30m<sup>2</sup> (including manoeuvring space), which would result in at least 3,000m<sup>2</sup> of the 'lease area' being required for parking. This would make the hot pools project entirely unfeasible. It is noted that within the operative plan there is no parking category for 'Commercial Recreation Activities', the closest category being 'Commercial Activity' at 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup>. The submitter acknowledges that the provision of parking is necessary, however the comparison with other hot pools (Mt Maunganui and Hanmer) is not appropriate as these hot pools are destination hot pools, which result in specific vehicle trips. The proposed NTT hot pools would be associated with other activities and facilities and located close to existing forms of accommodation. Without any new hotels being constructed within the Lakeview Sub-Zone, there is almost 1,000 existing hotel rooms within a radius of 750m of the 'lease area'. The submitter already operates a fleet of mini-coaches and it would be intended to utilise these vehicles to provide a regular pick-up and drop-off service from the town centre to the hot pool facility.</p> <p>The submitter argues that the 1:5 parking ratio does not adequately accommodate unique circumstances (refer submission for more detailed analysis) including shared parking, multi-purpose visits, pedestrian accessibility. The submitter seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the requirement for Commercial Recreation Activities in the Lakeview Sub-Zone be deleted; or</li> <li>- A substantial reduction in the on-site car-parking requirements.</li> <li>- That in either case that there also be provision for car-parking requirements to be met by the use of shared off-site car-parking.</li> <li>- The identification of a publically owned communal parking facility</li> </ul> <p>The District Plan maps indicate a cluster of protected trees in the vicinity of the 'lease area'. The 'Figure 2 – Lakeview Sub Zone Structure Plan' suggests the possible location of these trees as a faintly drawn group of circles, both within the lease area, and also under the proposed 'road' and area described as a 'square'.</p> |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                               | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 50/34/06          |          | Lakeview sub-zone - Active Frontage | <p>The Planning map (#35) signals the presence of this cluster of trees with a single notation of #214. The associated 'Inventory of Protected Features (page A3-16 of the operative district plan) more fully describes this notation as representing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 Wellingtonias</li> <li>- 6 Oaks</li> <li>- 4 Cedars</li> </ul> <p>These trees are briefly discussed at pages 58 and 69 of Appendix G (NZ Heritage Properties Ltd report) to the Plan Change as being of significance. The operative heritage trees rules require that any structures be located outside of the drip-line of such trees. In the case of mature trees such as these, it is likely that an arborist would require a greater separation. Previous reports have suggested that, for example, that one of the Wellingtonia trees have a 'root protection area' radius of 11.2m, while one of Cedars may have a RPA of up to 18m.</p> <p>It would appear that a grouping of six Oak trees occur in the north-west corner of the proposed 'lease area' – and that probably one of the large Cedars(or at least its RPA) is also within the 'lease area'. The combined 'root protection area' of the Oak trees has been previously estimated at approximately 1,900m<sup>2</sup>, while the Cedar has a 'rpa' of approximately 1,100m<sup>2</sup> (of which at least half would be within the 'lease area'.</p> <p>The actual area of land that needs to be set aside for tree protection has an overall effect on the amount of usable land. The submitter seeks that the location of the trees and the tree-root protection areas be more accurately defined through this plan change.</p> <p>The Structure Plan (Figure 2 at page 10-17) indicates a solid red line around most of the eastern and the entire northern boundary of the proposed 'lease area', which represents an 'active frontage area'. This is cross-referenced to proposed Rule 10.6.5.1 (xiv) at page 10-12.</p> <p>This proposed rule is not entirely clear, however it may be interpreted to require that where any building is located along that 'active frontage' that such a building must be developed so that most of (80%) of the buildings frontage must be glazed and unobstructed. The rule also requires that any building along that frontage have a minimum depth of 8m, and that the building must have a minimum internal floor height of 4.5m. The height rules also separately provide for an additional (optional) 2m of building height that can be used for roof articulation purposes. Any breach of this</p> |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                      | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|---|
| 50/34/07          |          | Lakeview sub zone - Height | <p>rule would require a Restricted Discretionary activity resource consent.</p> <p>If a hot pool facility is developed on this land, then a building comprising reception, administration, and associated customer services areas will be required, although only along part of the northern or eastern frontage of the site. The location of existing protected trees would limit the ability to develop across the north-east part of the 'lease area'. Additional structures will also be required for customer changing facilities, maintenance etc. The location of these structures has not been confirmed, but not necessarily along the frontages of the site.</p> <p>If the intent is to vest the 'lease area' as a reserve, then in most cases it would be unusual for the development of an active retail frontage along two boundaries of a reserve. The submitter considers that while the active frontage rule has merit within the other locations shown on the 'Figure 3 - Lakeview Sub-Zone Structure Plan', that such a requirement would not be appropriate, achievable nor desirable within the 'lease area'. The constraints that apply to this particular parcel of land, as a result of the protected trees, the associated root protection areas, and the street layout of the structure plan limit the ability of this land to provide the active frontages. The submitter seeks that the active frontage rules are deleted from this area, to enable an appropriate level of design flexibility.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the 'active frontage' areas shown on the Figure 2 Structure Plan, as they relate to the 'lease area' be deleted.</p> <p>Building height within the plan change area varies considerably. The 'Figure 3 - Lakeview Sub-Zone Height Limit Plan' (page 10-18) indicates a 4.5m height limit for the 'lease area'. At Page 27 of Appendix F to the AEE (the Urban Design Peer Review) the comment is made that the hot pools will be overlooked by taller buildings to the north, and therefore a 4.5m height limit is appropriate. The report also acknowledges the presence of protected trees in the vicinity.</p> <p>However, the presence of these trees within the lease area, and other protected trees in close proximity will most likely restrict any views from these possible 'taller buildings to the north' from overlooking the 'lease area'.</p> <p>The submitter considers that a 4.5m height limit is unnecessarily restrictive.</p> |



| Submission Number | Position | Topic                          | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------------------|---|
| 50/34/08          |          | Lakeview sub-zone - viewshafts | <p>The height limit currently applying to any buildings within Recreation Reserves within the Town Centre Zone is 8m (refer page A1-20 of the District Plan).</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the proposed PC50 rules for building height within the 'lease area' are consistent with the rules for Recreation Reserves, and amended to a maximum height of 8m.</p> <p>The Plan Changes introduces the concept of 'viewshafts' which are indicated on 'Figure 2 – Lakeview sub-zone Structure Plan', however they are not cross-referenced to any rule. As a result the purpose of the viewshafts is unclear.</p> <p>In some case they occupy areas on the Structure Plan that are shown as 'white', while in others they traverse areas that are indicated as 'reserve'. In the case of the 'lease area' there are viewshafts along the eastern and western boundaries. Where a viewshaft is indicated on a plan, then it must be supported by rules, that prevent or deter certain activities such as structures, planting of trees etc, while also enabling other activities. In this case there are none.</p> <p>The end use of the viewshaft is an important consideration for the submitter, as that will impact upon the amenity and privacy of any hot pools that get developed. It is important that such viewshafts are limited to landscaping together with either pedestrian or cycle connections, but not for vehicular purposes.</p> <p>The width of the western-most viewshaft is also a matter of concern for the submitter. This is indicated as being only 8m wide. Given the likely scale of adjacent development the submitter considers that a 20m wide viewshaft should be located along this boundary. The submitter is also concerned that the viewshaft along the western boundary does not encroach upon the 'lease area', and seeks confirmation of its location.</p> <p>The submitter seeks amendment to proposed rule 10.6.5.1 (xiii), where it refers to the Structure Plan features having a potential 5m permitted variance, such that it does not apply to this viewshaft.</p> <p>While the submitter supports the general principle of viewshafts, it considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a policy and associated rule is necessary to implement an effective regime of viewshafts.</li> <li>- neither viewshaft should be located within the proposed 'lease area'.</li> <li>- that the western viewshaft should be widened to the width of a 'primary viewshafts' which appears to be approximately 20m wide.</li> </ul> |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic  | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|--|---|
|                   |          |  | - that the use of the viewshafts should be limited to landscaping and either pedestrian or cycle use, but not vehicular usage.  |
| 50/34/09          |          | Lakeview sub-zone - widening Thompson Street | The submitter states that Rule 10.6.5.1 (xiii) creates uncertainty and enables, at paragraph 3 of that rule, for an unspecified widening of Thompson/ Man Street realignment at any time. |
|                   |          |  | The submitter seeks that the third paragraph of Rule 10.6.5.1 (xiii) either be deleted, or a more precise measurement of the scope of widening be provided.                               |
| 50/34/10          |          | Lakeview sub-zone                            | The submitter seeks such other related or consequential relief that may be deemed appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission.   |

#### Kelso Investments Ltd and Chengs Capital Investments Ltd

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                             | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| 50/35/01          | Support (in part) | Expansion of Plan Change boundary | <p>The submitter generally support the case set out in PC50 that there is a need to extend the QTCZ (although the submitter is not necessarily convinced that scale of the extension proposed under PC50 is justifiable).</p> <p>The submitter own five contiguous parcels of land (refer submission for map of these land parcels), bordered by Stanley Street, Gorge Road and Shotover Street. These lots are (i) 1, 3 and 5 Shotover Street; (ii) 67 Stanley Street (with the exception of one unit); and (iii) 2 and 4 Gorge Road. These sites are currently zoned High Density Residential Sub Zone A.</p> <p>The submitter requests the rezoning to QTCZ the area bound by Shotover Street, Stanley Street, Gorge Road, Horne Creek and District Plan Designation 232 (as outlined in green in the image in this submission); or alternatively, the area (outlined in blue in the image in this submission), being land owned or substantially owned by the submitter. If this relief is not granted, the plan change should be declined in its entirety.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter           |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| F50/10/34         | BSPL (support/part) |

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| 50/36/01          | Support (in part) | Isle Street sub zone | <p>The submitter is the owner of land at 4 and 8 Isle Street, and has an interest in 2 Isle Street. The combined land area of these sites totals 1700m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The submitter supports the intention to rezone 2 to 8 Isle Street Town Centre Zone and requests that 2, 4 and 8 Isle Street are confirmed as part of the Queenstown Town Centre Zone.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                       |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| F50/27/08         | Man Street Properties (support) |
| F50/28/08         | Any Old Fish Company (support)  |
| F50/26/08         | The Diary Guest House (support) |

|          |  |  |
|----------|--|--|
| 50/36/02 | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | <p>The submitter, in addressing the building height controls, questions the need for a recession plane control. In particular, it is considered that a 45 degree recession plane starting 5m above the boundary is overly restrictive and could result in poor design outcomes including unattractive built forms.</p> <p>Further, there are some unclear matters with respect to the controls on height. It is questioned how easily and consistently the matter of what a 'northern boundary' will be interpreted with respect to the recession plane rule (it may, for example be more efficient to name the street boundaries to which this rule applies rather than refer to cardinal points). It is also unclear whether the rule applies for boundaries between sites held in common ownership (and it is submitted that this should not be the case). And it is unclear whether the roof bonus rule provides an exemption from the recession plane requirement, or only the overall 12 metre height limit.</p> <p>The submitter, therefore, requests that the internal boundary recession plan rule as it applies to the Isle Street subzone be removed or amended, so as to allow greater building height closer to boundaries, to clarify the rules and to exempt the rule's application from boundaries between sites held in common ownership.</p> |
|----------|--|--|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                       |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| F50/27/08         | Man Street Properties (support) |

| Submission Number          | Position                        | Topic                             | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                 |                                   |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                       |                                   |   |
| F50/28/08                  | Any Old Fish Company (support)  |                                   |   |
| F50/26/08                  | The Diary Guest House (support) |                                   |   |
| 50/36/03                   |                                 | Isle Street sub zone - carparking | <p>It is also questioned how reasonable and practical the rule preventing the parking of cars within front yards within the Isle Street subzone is. There are and will continue to be many residential properties where this practice can reasonably be expected to continue in this subzone. And given sites in this subzone typically have quite narrow frontages and are relatively steeply sloping, it is not clear that this standard will prove practically achievable while allowing reasonable development of a site.</p> <p>The submitter requests the removal of the rule that seeks to prevent car parking in front yards in the Isle Street subzone.</p> <p>Any such other related or consequential relief that may be deemed appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission.</p> |

#### H W Holdings NZ Limited

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                          | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 50/37/01          | Support (in part) | Lakeview sub zone              | <p>The submitter supports the plan change, including the need to identify additional town centre zoned land, subject to the relief set out in this submission.</p> <p>The submitter owns 9 contiguous titles of land located to the west of the Lakeview camp ground. This block of land comprises a total of 4,530m<sup>2</sup>; creating an almost rectangular block of land that generally measures 50m x 80m. This land all has frontage to Thomson Street. There are three adjacent separately owned titles (1,542m<sup>2</sup>) that complete this block through as far as Glasgow Street (refer submission for image of site).</p> <p>The submitter supports the inclusion of the land within the Town Centre zone; however there are concerns that the land may be significantly impacted upon by the way in which development occurs on the Council's adjacent Lakeview land.</p> |
| 50/37/02          |                   | Lakeview sub zone - Viewshafts | <p>The Lakeview Sub-Zone is based upon a Structure Plan (Figures 2 and 3 of the Proposed Plan Change provisions), which include an indicative roading layout and a series of viewshafts.</p>   |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic   | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|---|---|
| 50/37/03          |          | Lakeview sub zone -<br>Controlled Activity/Non-<br>notification of<br>Convention Centre | <p>The submitter is very concerned that this secondary view-shaft adjacent to the eastern boundary of their land will in fact become a service lane; used as the back-of-house area for the convention centre for location of skip bins, deliveries, and other low amenity aspects. The submitters land is at the same elevation at the adjoining Lakeview land and would be significantly impacted upon if the eastern edge of that land is used for service or back-of-house activities, as they would be highly visible in direct line-of-sight.</p> <p>The proposed zone provisions identify a convention centre as requiring a Controlled Activity (non-notified) resource consent approval anywhere within the Lakeview sub-zone. It is understood that the convention centre would have a footprint of approximately 7,500m<sup>2</sup>, and such a building would typically have large expanses of continuous wall, particularly along the less public edges or facades.</p> <p>The submitter requests that the Plan change provisions (including objectives, policies and methods) be amended so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any building or development within the adjoining Lakeview Sub-Zone involves a Restricted Discretionary consent process (rather than Controlled Activity);</li> <li>2. The viewshaft that runs parallel to the submitters land be limited to use for landscaping, pedestrian/ cycle purposes only (at least where that viewshaft is adjacent to the submitters property boundary).</li> <li>3. The viewshaft not be used for vehicle access purposes, at least over that part of the viewshaft that is adjacent to the submitter's property boundary.</li> <li>4. Matters of Discretion and associated Assessment Matters be included to ensure that any development of land within the Lakeview Sub Zone to the east of the submitters land be managed so that there are no service or back-of-house facilities located adjacent to the common boundary of the submitters land.</li> <li>5. Any related or consequential relief that may be deemed appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission.</li> </ol> |
| 50/37/04          |          | Lakeview sub zone -<br>Structure Plan   | <p>The submitter notes that proposed Rule 10.6.5.1 (xiii) requires that development within the Lakeview Sub-Zone occurs in accordance with the Structure Plan, with provision for a 5m variance. The submitter seeks amendments to this rule to ensure that the viewshaft is not able to be varied so that it might be located within the submitter's land.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that Rule 10.6.5.1 (xiii) be amended so that the secondary viewshaft adjacent to the submitters land cannot be located within the</p>  |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested |
|-------------------|----------|-------|--------------------|
|                   |          |       | submitter's land.  |

#### Queenstown Gold Ltd

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                             | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 50/38/01          | Support (in part) | Expansion of Plan change boundary | <p>The submitter supports the plan change, subject to the relief set out in this submission.</p> <p>The submitter owns two contiguous parcels of land, Lot 1 DP306661 and Lot 2 DP27703, on the eastern side of upper Brecon Street comprising 5,713m<sup>2</sup> (refer submission for a map that shows the location of the sites, bordered in blue).</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the area on Brecon Street currently zoned High Density Residential with a 'Commercial Precinct' overlay be rezoned to Town Centre Zone.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                         |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| F50/10/35         | BSPL (oppose)                     |
| F50/49/05         | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |

#### Memorial Property Ltd

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic              | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|
| 50/39/01          | Support (in part) | Plan Change itself | <p>The submitter supports the better utilisation of Council's landholdings in the Lakeview area through enabling more development and rationalising reserve holdings. It also supports generally the idea of a Convention Centre within the Lake View area. However, the submitter is concerned about the nature and scale of development proposed by PC50 and whether infrastructure could and should be provided to support the proposed developed. The submitter is also concerned that the plan change as currently proposed could undermine the vitality of the existing town centre and detract from those values it aims to enhance.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                      |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| F50/27/09         | Man Street Properties (oppose) |
| F50/28/09         | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)  |

| Submission Number          | Position                 | Topic                               | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                     |   |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                    |   |
|                            | F50/26/09                | The Diary Guest House (oppose)      |   |
|                            | F50/49/05                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support)   |   |
| 50/39/02                   | Oppose (in part)         | Impacts Upon Existing Town Centre   | <p>The submitter has reservations about the overall rationale of Plan PC50, noting that it represents a significant departure from the policy framework established in the current District Plan and the preferred direction promoted by Council in recent years, including to contain the spatial extent of the town centre.</p> <p>The submitter considers that much of the proposed extension of the town centre is significantly separated by distance, elevation changes and street layouts and there is a risk of a competing rather than complementary retail and office precinct emerging, which could undermine the vitality of the existing town centre. A fragmented, sprawling commercial area could emerge which lacks the walkable appeal of the current town centre.</p> |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                          |                                     |   |
|                            | <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                    |   |
|                            | F50/10/36                | BSPL (support/part)                 |   |
|                            | F50/35/06                | Kelso and Chengs (support/part)     |   |
|                            | F50/27/09                | Man Street Properties (oppose)      |   |
|                            | F50/28/09                | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)       |   |
|                            | F50/26/09                | The Diary Guest House (oppose)      |   |
|                            | F50/49/05                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support)   |   |
| 50/39/03                   |                          | Traffic, parking and Infrastructure | <p>The submitter has concerns around assumptions that the current transportation network will be little changed, when significant adverse effects under the 'status quo' are identified. It is considered that PC50 could significantly compound those adverse traffic effects. It also appears that PC50 lacks a strategy for dealing with car parking and that the road network in and around the site may prove inadequate to cater for the levels of development enabled.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about some of the assumptions that have been used for modelling, particularly traffic modelling. It considers that the land use activities enabled by the zoning could differ</p>   |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------|---|
|                   |          |       | <p>significantly from what was assumed in that modelling and, as a result, that substantially greater traffic generation could arise than has been assumed. Further, it is not always possible through reading the plan change documentation to analyse the evidence base relied upon. Some assumptions are not made clear (for example the land uses that make up the 'status quo' scenario for traffic modelling).</p> <p>The submitter requests that either identify within the District Plan an adequately sized public car parking area(s) or apply more rigorous on-site car parking standards. Further, the submitter requests amendments to ensure that the internal roading network can safely and efficiently cater for the proposed land uses.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| F50/27/09 | Man Street Properties (oppose)    |
| F50/28/09 | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)     |
| F50/26/09 | The Diary Guest House (oppose)    |
| F50/49/05 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |

|          |                             |   |
|----------|-----------------------------|---|
| 50/39/04 | Town Centre Capacity Issues | The submitter considers that the supporting report by McDermott Miller substantially underestimates the amount of unutilised commercial development capacity in the Queenstown Town Centre. |
|----------|-----------------------------|---|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| F50/49/05 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|

|          |                           |  |
|----------|---------------------------|--|
| 50/39/05 | Scale, Height and Density | The submitter is concerned that the proposed building heights in the PC50 area could detract from the visual amenity and landscape qualities of Queenstown and its surrounds. The submitter seeks the reduction of the height limits enabled to align with other comparable zonings of the operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan. |
|----------|---------------------------|--|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| F50/10/37 | BSPL (oppose)                     |
| F50/49/05 | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |



| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b> | <b>Topic</b>                      | <b>Decision Requested</b>  |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 50/39/06                 |                 | Impacts Upon Existing Town Centre | The submitter is concerned that both public and private investment could be diverted away from the existing town centre as a result of PC50, which could result in lower standards of buildings in the town centre as opportunities to redevelop existing sites are not pursued. |

#### Further Submissions

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| F50/27/09                | Man Street Properties (oppose)    |
| F50/28/09                | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)     |
| F50/26/09                | The Diary Guest House (oppose)    |
| F50/49/05                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |

|          |                   |  |
|----------|-------------------|--|
| 50/39/07 | Convention Centre | The submitter has concerns that PC50 enables via a controlled activity the development of a Convention Centre. In principle, Memorial Property Ltd supports the development of a convention centre near the Queenstown Town Centre. The submitter also agrees that the wider Lake View area is likely to contain a suitable site for such a facility. The submitter requests that either, (i) limit the location allowed via a controlled activity for a convention centre to the site shown in the attached annotated Structure Plan (refer submission), or (ii) raise the activity status of a convention centre to restricted discretionary, with a matter of discretion listed as "the suitability of the proposed location" with associated assessment matters included to address, amongst other matters, the consideration of the benefits that may be afforded to the existing town centre as a result of factors such as the walking distance for conference delegates to the existing town centre. |
|----------|-------------------|--|

#### Further Submissions

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                    |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| F50/10/38                | BSPL (support/part, oppose)         |
| F50/32/01                | IHG and Carter Queenstown (support) |
| F50/27/09                | Man Street Properties (oppose)      |
| F50/28/09                | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)       |
| F50/26/09                | The Diary Guest House (oppose)      |
| F50/49/05                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support)   |

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b> | <b>Topic</b>      | <b>Decision Requested</b>  |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| 50/39/08                 |                 | Lakeview sub zone | <p>Given the issues raised in the submitter's submission, the submitter doubts that Town Centre zoning is the most appropriate zoning for the Lake View area. Alternative zonings that more precisely control the range of activities enabled are likely to be more appropriate. This may for example be achieved with a subzone of the High Density Residential Zone (which is in fact the current zoning of the area) and if necessary the use in specific areas of other zones and overlays already used in the Plan.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that the plan change be amended as follows:</p> <p>1. Amend the plan change to apply a zoning regime to the Lake View area which enables the following activities only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o visitor accommodation</li> <li>o residential activity</li> <li>o conference facilities</li> <li>o tourism facilities</li> <li>o activities ancillary to those listed above</li> </ul> |

#### Further Submissions

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b>                  |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| F50/27/09                | Man Street Properties (oppose)    |
| F50/28/09                | Any Old Fish Company (oppose)     |
| F50/26/09                | The Diary Guest House (oppose)    |
| F50/49/05                | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |

|          |                      |   |
|----------|----------------------|---|
| 50/39/09 | Isle Street sub zone | <p>The submitter considers that the extent of the proposed Isle Street subzone and the development allowed therein needs to be rationalised. It is questioned whether that area has the appropriate attributes to convert to a town centre area. Certainly, the proposed height limits for this subzone appear inappropriate for this area. The submitter considers that subzone should either be deleted or the area which it covers should be significantly reduced, to align with the extent contemplated in 2009 Queenstown Town Centre Strategy and the 2012 consultation document regarding the District Plan review.</p> <p>The submitter seeks the deletion or reduction in size of the proposed Isle Street subzone.</p> |
|----------|----------------------|---|

| Submission Number          | Position                          | Topic | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |       |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                         |       |  |
| F50/24/18                  | John Thompson (oppose)            |       |  |
| F50/35/07                  | Kelso and Chengs (support/part)   |       |  |
| F50/49/05                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |       |  |
| 50/39/10                   |                                   | Rules | <p>As a consequence, the submitter seeks in the first instance that the plan change be declined in its entirety.</p> <p>Alternatively, that the plan change be amended as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend the plan change to apply a zoning regime to the Lake View area which enables the following activities only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o visitor accommodation</li> <li>o residential activity</li> <li>o conference facilities</li> <li>o tourism facilities</li> <li>o activities ancillary to those listed above</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Reduce the height limits enabled to align with other comparable zonings of the operative Queenstown Lakes District Plan;</li> <li>3. Either identify within the District Plan an adequately sized public car parking area(s) or apply more rigorous on-site car parking standards;</li> <li>4. Provide amendments to ensure that the internal roading network can safely and efficiently cater for the proposed land uses;</li> <li>5. Delete or reduce in size of the proposed Isle Street subzone;</li> <li>6. Either, (i) limit the location allowed via a controlled activity for a convention centre to the site shown in the attached annotated Structure Plan, or (ii) raise the activity status of a convention centre to restricted discretionary, with a matter of discretion listed as "the suitability of the proposed location" with associated assessment matters included to address, amongst other matters, the consideration of the benefits that may be afforded to the existing town centre as a result of factors such as the walking distance for conference delegates to the existing town centre.</li> <li>7. Any other related or consequential relief that may address the issues raised in this submission</li> </ol> |

| Submission Number          | Position                          | Topic | Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |       |                    |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                         |       |                    |
| F50/24/18                  | John Thompson (oppose)            |       |                    |
| F50/49/05                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |       |                    |

**Justin Wright**

| Submission Number          | Position            | Topic              | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|
| 50/40/01                   | Support (in part)   | Plan Change itself | <p>The submitter addresses a range of provisions proposed by PC50, including:</p> <p>Section 16.6.5.1 Site Standards.<br/>Lake View Sub-Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Max Building Cover 80% 10.6.5.1-i(D)</li> <li>• Glasgow St Set Back 4.5 M 10.6.5.1 - iv (d)</li> <li>• No residential on ground floor for active fronts 10.6.5.1 - vii (d)</li> <li>• No residential on ground floor for active fronts 10.6.5.1 - xi (e)</li> <li>• Max Height = as per map 10.6.5.1 - xi (d)</li> <li>• Glasgow St 2.5+25°</li> <li>• Thompson 4.5 = 45°</li> </ul> <p>Isle St SubZone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Max Cover 70%</li> <li>• Max Set Back is 1.5M to Road 10.6.5.1 iv(e)</li> <li>• No front yard parking 10.6.5.1 iv(f)</li> <li>• Minimum setback to other boundaries is 1.5M 10.6.5.1 iv(g)</li> <li>• Max Height = 12M 10.6.5.1 - xi (e)</li> <li>• Add 2M for roof form - xi (f)</li> <li>• Sunlight recession 5M+45°</li> </ul> <p>Active Fronts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.5M Above ground level.</li> </ul> <p>A number of these provisions are addressed in detail below.</p> |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                     |                    |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter           |                    |   |
| F50/10/39                  | BSPL (support/part) |                    |   |

50/40/02

The submitter seeks that the provisions amended to allow for more intensive development on the proposed Lake View Subzone and Isle St Subzone.

The submitter considers that further densification of the Queenstown Centre and Surrounds will make for a

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------|---|
|                   |          |       | more vibrant built environment, allowing for intensive development within and surrounding the existing town centre allows for development that does not require further subdivision of our open space. High density is a more sustainable development as it allows to leverage of existing infrastructure. High quality urban design creates good work and living environments. While the proposed plan change is on the right track, a more intensive development will have further benefits to the urban environment and the economy. |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                |
|-----------|----------------|
| F50/10/40 | BSPL (support) |
|-----------|----------------|

|           |                                 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| F50/27/10 | Man Street Properties (support) |
|-----------|---------------------------------|

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| F50/28/10 | Any Old Fish Company (support) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|

|           |                                 |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| F50/26/10 | The Diary Guest House (support) |
|-----------|---------------------------------|

|          |  |  |
|----------|--|--|
| 50/40/03 | Isle Street sub zone - Building coverage | The submitter wishes to see the minimum building cover on both the lake view site and the Isle St Sub zone to be increased to a minimum of 95%. For the development of these blocks to integrate into the existing urban fabric it is critical to maintain a consistency of density at ground level. |
|----------|--|--|

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter |
|-------------------|-----------|
|-------------------|-----------|

|           |                |
|-----------|----------------|
| F50/10/41 | BSPL (support) |
|-----------|----------------|

|          |  |  |
|----------|--|--|
| 50/40/04 | Lakeview sub-zone - site coverage        | The submitter wishes to see the minimum building cover on both the lake view site and the Isle St Sub zone to be increased to a minimum of 95%. For the development of these blocks to integrate into the existing urban fabric it is critical to maintain a consistency of density at ground level. |
| 50/40/05 | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | The submitter wish to see all recessions plane rules be removed from the Isle Street sub zone. The implication on building form has not been tested and will likely lead to poor building form that are a detriment to the urban form and environment.   |
| 50/40/06 | Isle Street sub zone - Height Provisions | The submitter wishes to see adoption of volumetric design controls instead of maximum height plane controls. Volumetric controls allow for flexibility in building mass. They create the condition were buildings  |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------|--|
|                   |          |       | <p>can be taller if they are thinner. The result is that a building form can be adjusted to accommodate the same area of occupation, while creating flexibility within the building lot to adjust for sun light access and view depending on the build form around the site. Volumetric design controls result in building that respond better to neighbouring buildings allowing for view and sunlight access. They also result in a modulated skyline, instead of single height block mass.</p> <p>The submitter requests the local authority to commission a report on the economics of development to ensure the proposed rules do not create a set of conditions that make the proposed plan unfeasible. Specifically at risk is the development of the building that form the Isle St extension. The ground floor retail requirements are for a min 4.5 metre inter floor height.</p> <p>The max building height allows for only 2 stories above. The height from ground floor to upper level likely require lift access to be attractive for a tenant. The rules impose additional costs of the extra volume on ground floor and the lift. Hence it may be that the proposed change imposes rules that adds cost to the building that means they are simply not feasible and thus will not be realized. This passage is critical to the connections of the urban fabric. The local authority may find that the feasibility of such a development requires a min of 6 stories to cover the increased expense of the lift and ground floor quality.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                       |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| F50/10/42         | BSPL (support)                  |
| F50/27/10         | Man Street Properties (support) |
| F50/28/10         | Any Old Fish Company (support)  |
| F50/26/10         | The Diary Guest House (support) |

|          |                                    |   |
|----------|------------------------------------|---|
| 50/40/07 | Lakeview sub zone - Structure Plan | The submitter wishes to ensure that the structure plan is amended to allow further building on the strip of land marked as reserve on the north. Higher density of building will support the vibrancy of the ground floor. Given the proximity of the massive Ben Lomond reserve adjacent to the site, there is more than adequate provision for open space already. The submitter wishes to see this urban space developed, and see the Council realise the valued added to the council owned asset. |
|----------|------------------------------------|---|

**Mark and Ann McKenzie**

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b>   | <b>Topic</b> | <b>Decision Requested</b>   |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------|---|
| 50/41/01                 | Support (in part) | Cabins       | The submitter seeks the PC50 be amended exclude the Antrim Street area of Lakeview sub-zone from the proposed plan change. Antrim Street is on the outer boundary of the plan change area and should be preserved for its cultural and historic values. |

**Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust**

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b> | <b>Topic</b>       | <b>Decision Requested</b>   |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|
| 50/42/01                 |                 | Affordable Housing | The Trust states that PC50 needs to be consistent with the objects of PC24, the Trust is seeking the provision of affordable and community housing to be included within the Plan Change. The submitter would like to discuss with Council the way in which the objects of PC24 might be delivered within PC50. |

**Joy Veint**

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b> | <b>Topic</b>              | <b>Decision Requested</b>   |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---|
| 50/43/01                 | Oppose          | Plan Change itself        | <p>The submitter raises specific concerns relating to the proposed plan change including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Economic growth should not come at the expense of losing mountains forever;</li> <li>2. The unique alpine resort town that we have now will be lost forever if Council allow high rise buildings to go up the District's mountains;</li> <li>3. We need to preserve the town's beauty for future generations to come;</li> <li>4. Just to change the zoning to allow a convention centre to go ahead on the Lakeview site is an assault on the District's natural landscape;</li> <li>5. The extension of the town centre should go out Gorge Road.</li> </ol> <p>The submitter does not support the extension of the town centre just to allow a convention centre to go ahead on the Lakeview site.</p> |
| 50/43/02                 |                 | Scale, Height and Density | No high rise buildings should be approved as it will impact on the natural landscape.   |

**Further Submissions**

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Submitter</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| F50/10/43                | BSPL (oppose)    |

|          |                                     |   |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 50/43/03 | Precedent                           | 313<br>The plan change will create a precedence for others to follow.   |
| 50/43/04 | Earthquake Risk                     | Queenstown is on many major fault lines. A huge earthquake is a serious risk to our resort.   |
| 50/43/05 | Traffic, parking and Infrastructure | Congestion on roads in the CBD is dangerous for people now. It will only get worse with traffic making its way through town to get to this high density commercial zone. The roads we use today in the CBD were built for horses in the 1860's. |
| 50/43/06 | Convention Centre                   | A convention centre should be easily accessible to all by road, with plenty of parking and no danger zones to contend with.   |
| 50/43/07 | Alternative Town Centre Expansion   | The extension of the town centre should be out Gorge Road, where there has been commercial development for the last 60 years. The development footprint is already there.   |

| Further Submissions |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                              |
| F50/10/44           | BSPL (oppose)                          |
| F50/49/12           | Remarkables Jet Limited (support/part) |

#### Douglas Veint

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|--|
| 50/44/01          | Oppose   | Plan Change itself | The submitter opposes the proposal to extend the QTCZ towards Lakeview and Isle Street sub-zones. The submitter's reasons are that it would be visually unacceptable to have high rise buildings up the hill in that area. The submitter does not believe the traffic and access problems have been allowed for and it would be more appropriate to extend in the Gorge Road area. The submitter requests that the Plan Change be abandoned in its present form and that the proposal be looked at again to extend in the direction of Gorge Road. |

| Further Submissions |                                 |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Submission Number   | Submitter                       |
| F50/10/44           | BSPL (oppose)                   |
| F50/35/03           | Kelso and Chengs (support/part) |



## Janet Sarginson

| Submission Number          | Position                          | Topic                     | Decision Requested   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 50/45/01                   | Oppose                            | Plan Change itself        | The submitter opposes the proposal of the town centre extension because of the high rise buildings and would like the Council to rethink PC50 and look again at the Proposal to include Gorge Road extension in the town centre. |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |                                   |                           |  |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                         |                           |  |
| F50/10/44                  | BSPL (oppose)                     |                           |  |
| F50/35/02                  | Kelso and Chengs (support/part)   |                           |  |
| F50/49/13                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support) |                           |  |
| 50/45/02                   |                                   | Precedent                 | Other will follow.   |
| 50/45/03                   |                                   | Scale, Height and Density | The visual impact on our mountain landscapes will be gone forever.   |

## Otago Regional Council

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                               | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 50/46/01          |          | Traffic, parking and Infrastructure | ORCs view is that it is important that present transport business planning is integrated with the preparation of the town structure plan proposed in the plan change documentation. This will provide the opportunity for positive outcomes from both planning initiatives and most importantly, for the residents and visitors to the district. Ideally, the transport business planning should be completed before the structure plan is developed. In that way, not only can the structure plan give appropriate consideration to solutions identified in the business planning, but also the changes proposed to the town centre and transport network in the structure plan. This would assist in establishing a broad development layout and that the final business plan can be integrated to ensure a coherent system. |
| 50/46/02          |          | Traffic, parking and Infrastructure | ORC recommends a review of the council's parking pricing and supply be undertaken before or during the preparation of the structure plan. The plan change signals a limitation on provision of off-street parking on the Lakeview site. The review's purpose would be test if such a limitation would have any undesired effect such as clogging of the area around the town centre with either parked vehicles or drivers circulating looking for a park. Such effects would be contrary to the strategic direction being proposed in the transport business case planning.   |

As the Lakeview site will receive a high degree of tourism, coach and public transport traffic, there is the opportunity to investigate whether the convention centre site would make for a suitable transit hub for public passenger transport, and to incorporate such provision in the wording of the plan change.

### James Penwell

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|--|
| 50/47/01          | Oppose   | Plan Change itself | <p>The submitter is opposed to the plan change on the basis that it will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide permit the construction of much higher building than currently exists;</li> <li>2. The construction will be an eyesore. Multi storey buildings will not 'blend in' to Bob's Peak, anymore than the Hilton/Kawarau Falls developments blend into the Peninsula Road;</li> <li>3. The provision is less about rezoning the area as "town centre" than it is about seeking a means to permit the construction of a conference centre, to which the submitter is also opposed;. In this sense, the plan change is misleading and dishonest.</li> </ol> <p>The submitter requests that through the elected Council to reject the plan change.</p> |

### Cath Gilmour

| Submission Number | Position      | Topic   | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|---------------|---|--|
| 50/48/01          | Not specified | Plan Change interface with District Plan Review | <p>The submitter states that the version of the Town Centres Chapter 10 into which this plan change has been incorporated is no longer extant. This old version strongly reflected the McDermott Miller strategy report, with little input at that stage from councillors or the community forum. It has changed considerably through Councillor and forum workshops and discussions between planning staff and portfolio managers.</p> <p>The submitter suggests that this is the version into which PC50 should be incorporated, assuming PC50 goes ahead in this format.</p> <p>The submitter consider that this is vital for the integrity of our District Plan, and the overall better management of Queenstown town centre. There are some quite distinctive elements of our current town centres chapter that plan PC50 should reflect - including more emphasis on having a defined entertainment hub in the innermost part of the town centre, greater emphasis on community, and active street interface of buildings.</p> |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|--|
| 50/48/02          |          | Affordable Housing | <p>Also, the change of language in our zone purpose, objectives and policies will give guidance as to how we see economic benefits versus community amenities being balanced as well as they can within the broader town centre zone.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the plan change does several times mention the concept of affordable housing, there is no commitment to providing any. This goes against one of the development principles adopted by Council in December last year and Plan Change 24. The relevant extract from council minutes of December 19, 2013, with regard to development principles is as follows:</p> <p><i>"The Chief Executive conferred with the General Manager, Planning and Development and the Manager, Resource Consenting on a further development principle which would address this concern. He suggested the following text:</i></p> <p><i>Development at the site mitigates any adverse impacts on housing affordability and ensures that equivalent affordable housing options are enabled in a manner consistent with the stakeholder deeds agreed as part of Plan Change 24.</i></p> <p><i>Councillor Gilmour also asked that the development principles refer to the continuing operation of the Queenstown Lakeview Holiday Park. Following discussion it was agreed to add the following: Considers options for the future operation of the campground. The additional development principles were added to the recommendation."</i></p> <p>The submitter highlights that nowhere has this happened. PC50 does not mention mitigation of lost affordable housing options, beyond saying that they had no guarantee of remaining beyond 2015 and that the high density housing that would be built on site would be placed to town and good quality and therefore might be cheaper to live in. This meets neither the spirit nor the intent of the development principle above.</p> |
| 50/48/03          |          | Affordable Housing | <p>In addressing affordable housing, the submitters addresses PC24, which the submitter states is important in its own right as well and in the reference to it in the above development principle (set out above). The submitter states that the final version of PC 24 is a sadly diluted model of its original self. But the wording of the development principle above - "and ensures that equivalent affordable housing options are enabled in a manner consistent with the stakeholder deeds agreed as part of plan change 24" - is a strong statement that</p>  |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                                      | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|--|---|
| 50/48/04          |          | Isle Street Sub-zone -<br>Liquor and Noise | <p>QLDC should ensure through PC50 that such a stakeholder deed is agreed to with the eventual developer/s. Further, it gives strong guidance as to the ballpark figure of affordable/community housing that such a stakeholder agreement should provide. Stakeholder deeds on plan changes under PC24 have resulted in 3 to 5% of the value of developed sites being contributed towards the community's stock of affordable/community housing, primarily through the Queenstown Community Housing Trust. The submitter states that even the Northlake development (currently under appeal but processed after the negotiated PC 24 had been finalised) has resulted in 20 titled and serviced sections being given to the Queenstown Community Housing Trust for this purpose.</p> <p>In the more than 800 pages of plan change documentation, it is interesting to note that PC24 was not mentioned once. It has just three policies ((i) To provide opportunities for low and moderate income households to live in the district in a range of accommodation appropriate for their needs, (ii) To have regard to the extent to which density, height, or building coverage contributes to residential activity affordability (iii) To enable the delivery of community housing, through voluntary retention mechanism). The submitter highlights that the relevant advice note says this is to be applied through the assessment of proposed changes to the district plan. In addition to PC50 ensuring that adequate community/affordable housing is provided, the third policy - a voluntary retention mechanism - must be addressed.</p> |
|                   |          |  | <p>The submitter states on page 3 of Stephen Chiles' noise assessment, "It is understood that it is not desired to limit nightlife to a specific part of the plan change area...". The submitter notes that there was no discussion within the report about why this should or should not be so. Nor, to the submitters knowledge, have councillors discussed the issue. However, we have had considerable discussions about this issue as part of the District Plan review, trying to strike a balance between economic vibrancy downtown and the need to ensure a level of amenity for residents and visitor accommodation on the periphery and adjacent high density zones.</p> <p>Requests that both noise and licensing requirements of the PC50 area reflect the Town Centre Transition Zone requirements of the new district plan.</p>   |
| 50/48/05          |          | Need for Plan Change                       | <p>The submitter acknowledges that the primary justification for the size of the PC50 town centre extension is to incorporate the proposed convention centre site, but query if this is the most efficient, cost</p>  |

| Submission Number          | Position                               | Topic                               | Decision Requested  |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
|                            |  |                                     | effective solution for households and business in the district.   |
| <b>Further Submissions</b> |  |                                     |   |
| Submission Number          | Submitter                              |                                     |   |
| F50/49/11                  | Remarkables Jet Limited (support/part) |                                     |   |
| 50/48/06                   |  | Outline Plan                        | The submitter consider that it would be useful to have an outline plan stage required to give more surety to the eventual shape of the plan change area and suggests the urban design panel is used when it comes to assessing both this outline plan and the buildings themselves.   |
| 50/48/07                   |  | Traffic, parking and infrastructure | The submitter agrees with the need to treat stormwater prior to putting it into the lake. Further, as a nearby residents, we have already had repeated blockages of the sewage pipes. This infrastructure may well need upgrading. Stormwater also not always adequate.   |
| 50/48/08                   |  | Rules                               | Other concerns raised relating to proposed rules include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A variety of the rules need to be looked at, for potentially unintended consequences - e.g. 10.6.5.2.6., 10.6.3.2.7.</li> <li>2. Reference should be made to cycle/rollable accessibility as well as pedestrian. Disabled access?</li> <li>3. If town centre transition zone noise and licensing RMA guidelines are used for PC50, then perhaps mechanical ventilation system et cetera one should not be required? This would be a more cost-effective solution for those landowners.</li> </ol> |
| 50/48/09                   |  | Convention Centre                   | The submitter notes that the most rosy picture of economic benefits of proposed convention centre, 466 full-time equivalents in the district. The submitter notes also that the report says full-time jobs - few of them in fact will be. NZIER on the other hand, estimate 120 full-time equivalent jobs throughout the region. Some of the other economic impacts estimated for developers of various parts of the PC50 land also look optimistic.  |
| 50/48/10                   |  | Isle Street sub zone - carparking   | The submitter questions the no parking vehicles in front yards in Isle Street subzone and what the rationale for this is and whether this is the most cost effective and efficient solution for whatever problem may have been identified? <p>The submitter notes that their own property, this outcome could well leave us with no parking at all and disagrees with the contention that the cost is minor and that it is outweighed by the (unnamed) benefit.</p>   |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                      | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|--|
| 50/48/11          |          | Lakeview sub zone - Height | The submitter notes that the Queenstown Height study does assume retention of the 'green finger' of Lakeview campground, in terms of mitigating the effects of increased height on landscape. Further, the submitter questions whether the landscape effect of the heights to be allowed in PC50 more than minor? We have been told that the graphic included in the plan change agenda is misleading, but we haven't actually seen one that looks kinder. It will be interesting to hear the commission's perspective and further evidence. |

#### Remarkables Jet Limited

| Submission Number | Position | Topic                             | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 50/49/01          | Oppose   | Plan Change itself                | <p>The submitter opposes the plan change on the following grounds:</p> <p>The Plan Change does not accord with, or assist the territorial authority to carry out its functions to achieve, the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the Act"), because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it does not give effect to Part 2 of the Act;</li> <li>• it does not meet section 32 of the Act;</li> <li>• it is not the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives of the District Plan having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness , and taking into account the costs and benefits; and</li> <li>• it is neither better than the current zoning nor better than an alternative CBD expansion .</li> </ul> <p>The Plan Change is inconsistent with the Otago Regional Policy Statement and the Otago Regional Plan.</p> <p>The purpose of the Plan Change is internally inconsistent and unclear. It is not clear whether the purpose of the Plan Change is primarily to ensure the expansion of the Town Centre.</p> <p>The submitters seeks the Plan Change be rejected, for the above and those other matters set out below.</p> |
| 50/49/02          |          | Impacts Upon Existing Town Centre | <p>The Submitter considers that the proposed expansion of the Town Centre will undermine the character and heritage of Queenstown's downtown and surrounding area, and as a result will adversely impact on its tourism appeal.</p> <p>The Plan Change in its current form will seek to draw people away from the existing CBD, both uphill and through existing, relatively narrow, residential streets. If the Town Centre requires expansion, the area to the north-east adjoining Gorge Road (an arterial road)</p>  |

| Submission Number | Position | Topic | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------|--|
|                   |          |       | <p>would create a dual opportunity to up-zone the eastern entrance to Queenstown, as well as allowing for Town Centre expansion into a largely flat, non-residential, mixed commercial and declining industrial use area. This could also take into account the availability of the high school site (expected around 2018).</p> <p>The extent of expansion of the Town Centre will have a negative impact on land values. Should the Plan Change be confirmed, there will be a likely devaluation of CBD land which will have implications for the quality of new development and redevelopment that can occur in the current CBD area.</p> <p>The staging of the proposed Town Centre expansion has not been properly considered. Sound planning would suggest a staged development should occur whereby the land closest to the current CBD would be developed first, and only then would a further stage of development be considered. The Plan Change has failed to consider the sequencing of the Town Centre expansion to ensure consolidated development of the CBD takes place, as opposed to negative effects of sporadic development.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter                           |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| F50/10/44         | BSPL (oppose)                       |
| F50/10/45         | BSPL (support/part)                 |
| F50/24/19         | John Thompson (support/part)        |
| F50/35/01         | Kelso and Chengs (support/part)     |
| F50/32/03         | IHG and Carter Queenstown (support) |

|          |                      |   |
|----------|----------------------|---|
| 50/49/03 | Need for Plan Change | <p>The submitter considers that the plan change is at odds with it's position and evidence for Plan Change 19 which indicated that there was enough town centre/commercial land available to meet demand for the next 20 to 30 years.</p> <p>Further, some of the benefits claimed have been overstated in the Plan Change documentation, as some of these benefits are considered to be no more than "additional".</p> |
| 50/49/04 | Affordable Housing   | <p>The submitter considers that the proposed Plan Change provisions will not deliver a High Density Residential outcome, if that is a desired outcome for the area.</p> <p>The Plan Change is largely silent in relation to any</p>   |



| Submission Number | Position | Topic                               | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|---|
|                   |          |                                     | residential development opportunities that could be pursued, in particular affordable housing opportunities on Council-owned land. It is likely that the other activities enabled by the Plan Change will be pursued which will push out any potential residential development.   |
| 50/49/05          |          | Adequacy of section 32 report       | The section 32(1)(b)(i) test has not been properly undertaken. The failure to meet the test under s32(1)(b)(i) renders the section 32 analysis inadequate and deficient.  |
| 50/49/06          |          | Scale, Height and Density           | <p>The Plan Change has potential to generate significant adverse amenity and traffic effects, particularly with respect to the maximum height limits.</p> <p>The Plan Change allows for development of buildings up to 28m, against the backdrop of the Ben Lomond Recreational Reserve mountains which are identified as Outstanding Natural Landscapes - Wakatipu Basin (ONL (WB)).</p> <p>The operative District Plan states that development in ONL (WB) should be avoided unless the adverse effects will not be more than minor on landscape values and visual amenity values. The proposed height limits will result in significant adverse effects that are more than minor. New urban development is also to be avoided in ONL (WB) areas.</p> |
| 50/49/07          |          | Traffic, parking and Infrastructure | The Plan Change will generate significant adverse effects on the CBD and wider road networks, including Frankton Road. The transport assessment is inadequate.  |

#### WN and PJ Labes

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|---|
| 50/50/01          |          | Plan Change itself | The submitter seeks PC50 be amended to exclude the Antrim Street area because of historic values. |

#### Val Hamlin

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|--|
| 50/51/01          |          | Plan Change itself | The submitter seeks PC50 be amended to exclude the Antrim Street area. |

#### Les and Bev Dawson (Late)

| Submission Number | Position | Topic             | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 50/52/01          |          | Lakeview sub zone | The submitters concern (along with many other locals) is that the now called Lakeview Site is being considered for high rise development. Submitter is very much |



aware that Tourism is an important part of Queenstown economy and always will be as town is known worldwide for its natural beauty. The submitter questions whether more hotels are needed.

#### Carl Loman - Loman Family Trust (Late)

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|---|
| 50/53/01          | Support  | Plan Change itself | No objection to the proposed plan change in its current stage |

#### Rebecca Richwhite (Late)

| Submission Number | Position | Topic             | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|---|
| 50/54/01          | Support  | Lakeview sub zone | <p>The submitters live in Brunswick Street, directly beneath the proposed Lakeview site, since 2012. I am a qualified architect with extensive European architectural and design experience, and take great interest in urban planning and development.</p> <p>Submitter supports QLDC's plans to develop the extended Queenstown township with vertically oriented, high density dwellings. Responding to the forecast growth of Queenstown with 'density' in mind, is the only way Queenstown's natural environment can be protected. Rather than loose itself to Frankton and an inevitable 'spring' of additional commercial centres, QLDC is seizing the opportunity to connect Lakeview with the existing fabric of Queenstown. This will allow Queenstown to remain the region's focal point and enhance the quality of living for the resident population, as well as visiting tourists. Queenstown would remain accessible to the pedestrian tourist population, whilst eliminating issues of traffic that would otherwise arise.</p> <p>Considers that Council should aspire towards what has been achieved in some of the most admired lakeside and alpine towns of Europe, where condensed built environments nestle into the base of expansive mountainous landscapes. Highlights two such examples, being Lake Como and St Moritz.</p> <p>The proposed principal of 'upward not outward', 'quality not quantity', should be applied to future development in the broader Lakes District. Submitter sees the proposed Plan Change 50 as an opportunity to hone what has begun, and to address some of the urban challenges the region is facing.</p> |

#### Further Submissions

| Submission Number | Submitter      |
|-------------------|----------------|
| F50/10/46         | BSPL (support) |

## Basil Walker

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested  |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|---|
| 50/55/01          | Oppose   | Plan Change itself | <p>The submitters property is included within the proposed plan change (within the Isle Street sub zone) and therefore formally submit against the Plan Change because the integrity of Queenstown is now being placed at a level of concern that disapproval is required.</p> <p>The submitter considers that convention centre debate and analysis has been overshadowed by an unreasonable delusional understanding of what the town was actually striving to gain by the Queenstown convention centre and completely stalled for possibly a decade by documentation of the Plan Change 50 proposal.</p> <p>The submitter states at no time have the Consultants proven a point of Need, Success or Requirement on a matter of enormous significance and most importantly whether the natural confines and boundaries of the CBD could accommodate fluctuating visitor numbers caused by a major increase in all aspects of the CBD.</p> <p>The submitter contends that:</p> <p>"there has been no absolute determination that the "Jewel of Queenstown" could not be irreparably ruined by the congestion.</p> <p>There has been no determination that the parallel tourism enjoyed under the entire Queenstown district banner is not more important than congesting the CBD.</p> <p>There has been no determination that QAC can accommodate any variation in aeroplane that their Airline customers may purchase to compete with other airlines".</p> <p>Therefore, the submitter objects to the reports that have no proof of success or mitigation of the many concerns by residents that Consultants who offer no guarantee as to their subjective opinions foist on residents. The submitter considers that the Plan Change should be tabled as a QLDC inclusion in the forthcoming 30 year plan and the Queenstown convention centre be redesigned and built immediately using Community Design and Building expertise and all Queenstown convention centre and Plan Change 50 consultative reports be dispensed with and noted .</p> |

## Adam and Kirsten Zaki

| Submission Number | Position | Topic              | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|----------|--------------------|--|
| 50/56/01          | Oppose   | Plan Change itself | The submitter is opposed to PC50 as it relates to the rezoning of the Beach Street Block.  |
| 50/56/02          | Oppose   | Beach Street Block | The imposition of the QTCZ over land owned by IHG and Carter (coprising Lot 1 DP 15307), Sections 10-11, and Sections 17 -18) has the potential to significantly |

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic   | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|-------------------|---|--|
|                   |                   |   | increase the development potential for these lots.   |
| 50/56/03          | Support (in part) | Beach Street Block-Height                         | The submitter supports the imposition of a 7 metre height limit for land located above Lot 1 DP 15307, however concerns are raised that Sections 10-11 and 18 are not controlled by Rule 10.6.5.2(i)(a) and concerns are raised that a building of 12 metres in height could be erected on these lots. The specific exclusion of any reference to Sections 10-11 and 18 needs to be rectified.   |
| 50/56/04          | Oppose (in part)  | Beach Street Block Bulk and Location Requirements | The submitter is concerned with the following matters:<br>1. That the QTCZ does not apply any internal boundaries;<br>2. That the maximum building coverage will increase from 65 percent to 80 percent;<br>3. The QTCZ does not require road setbacks;<br>4. Commercial activities can be located adjacent to the submitter's land as a permitted activity with associated noise effects;   |
| 50/56/05          | Support           | Beach Street Block                                | Seeks that Beach Street Block be amended as follows:<br>1. Only Lot 1 DP 15307 is rezoned as QTCZ and any future development within this Lot be governed by Diagram 8 and the existing QTCZ provisions (including proposed Rule 10.6.5.2(ii)(a));<br>2. The existing HDRZ continues to apply to the remainder of the land contained within the Beach Street Block, namely Lots 1-2 DP 444132, Lot 1 DP7187, Part Section VIII Town of Queenstown, Section 1-11, 15-18 Block VIII Town of Queenstown. |

#### Carl and Lorraine Holt

| Submission Number | Position          | Topic                     | Decision Requested   |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 50/57/01          | Oppose            | Plan Change itself        | The submitter is opposed to PC50 as it relates to the rezoning of the Beach Street Block.  |
| 50/57/02          | Oppose            | Beach Street Block        | The imposition of the QTCZ over land owned by IHG and Carter (comprising Lot 1 DP 15307), Sections 10-11, and Sections 17 -18) has the potential to significantly increase the development potential for these lots.   |
| 50/57/03          | Support (in part) | Beach Street Block-Height | The submitter supports the imposition of a 7 metre height limit for land located above Lot 1 DP 15307, however concerns are raised that Sections 10-11 and 18 are not controlled by Rule 10.6.5.2(i)(a) and concerns are raised that a building of 12 metres in height could be erected on these lots. The specific exclusion of any reference to Sections 10-11 and 18 needs to be rectified. |

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b>  | <b>Topic</b>                                      | <b>Decision Requested</b>  |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| 50/57/04                 | Oppose (in part) | Beach Street Block Bulk and Location Requirements | The submitter is concerned with the following matters:<br>1. That the QTCZ does not apply any internal boundaries;<br>2. That the maximum building coverage will increase from 65 percent to 80 percent;<br>3. The QTCZ does not require road setbacks;<br>4. Commercial activities can be located adjacent to the submitter's land as a permitted activity with associated noise effects;   |
| 50/57/05                 | Oppose (in part) | Beach Street Block                                | Seeks that Beach Street Block be amended as follows:<br>1. Only Lot 1 DP 15307 is rezoned as QTCZ and any future development within this Lot be governed by Diagram 8 and the existing QTCZ provisions (including proposed Rule 10.6.5.2(ii)(a));<br>2. The existing HDRZ continues to apply to the remainder of the land contained within the Beach Street Block, namely Lots 1-2 DP 444132, Lot 1 DP7187, Part Section VIII Town of Queenstown, Section 1-11, 15-18 Block VIII Town of Queenstown. |

#### Lucy Bell

| <b>Submission Number</b> | <b>Position</b> | <b>Topic</b>       | <b>Decision Requested</b>  |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| 50/58/01                 | Oppose          | Plan Change itself | The submitter raises issues associated with the accuracy of the plan change boundary line around 165 Antrim Street and set out that at least four cabins are located outside of the proposed plan change boundary. |