

Schedule of Existing Easements to remain			
Purpose	Burdened Land	Shown	Creating Document
Right to Convey Water	Lot 1	AB, B, CC, D, E	E1 6967109.11
	Lot 2	AA, M	
Right to Store, Pump and Convey Water	Lot 2	L	E1 6960303.6
	Lot 1	F	
Right to Convey Water	Lot 1	AB, G	E1 6960303.7
	Lot 2	AA	
Right to Convey Electricity	Lot 1	G	E1 6960303.8
Right of Way	Section 9 SD 423850	R	
Right to Convey Water	Lot 1	AB	E1 9014910.2
	Lot 2	AA, AC, M, WB	
	Lot 2	H	
Right to Store, Pump and Convey Water	Lot 2	L	E1 9320443.6
Right to Convey Telecommunications	Lot 2	H	
Right of Way, Right to Transform and Convey Electricity, Right to Convey Telecommunications	Lot 2	H	E1 6967109.11
	Lot 2	L, Z	
	Lot 2	I	
Right of Way	Lot 2	L, Z	E1 6960303.3
	Lot 2	I	E1 9014910.2

Schedule of Existing Easements in Gross			
Purpose	Burdened Land	Shown	Creating Document
Right to Convey Electricity	Lot 1	F	E1 6960303.5
	Lot 1	AB, B, CC, D, E	
Right to Establish an Electricity Transformer	Lot 2	AA, L, M	E1 6967109.6
	Lot 2	H	
Right to Convey Telecommunications	Lot 2	L	E1 6967109.8
	Lot 1	F	
Right of Way (Pedestrian Access and Mountain Biking Access)	Lot 2	J	E1 6967109.5
	Lot 2	K	
Right of Way (Passports and Hand Over Take Off Point)	Lot 2	K	

Existing Covenants and Consent Notices
 Area shown as CC & BB are subject to Consent Notice E1697109.3 (also affects Part Lot 3 and 5DP)
 Area AA is subject to Consent Notice E16960303.2
 Area GG is subject to Land Covenant in E1 6967109.9
 Lots 1 are subject to an existing Water Supply Scheme Covenant in Deed 704603

LEGEND

QLDC PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN ZONE BOUNDARY	---
NFS-HPL BOUNDARY	---

FOR DISCUSSION - 06.09.24


Rev.	Date	Revision Details	By
A	16.05.24	Boundary updates and easements added	LH
B	24.05.24	Boundary and easement updates	LH
C	07.06.24	DP and amendments to Lot 1	LH
D	01.07.24	QLDC zones and LUC classes added	LH

298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855 QLDC ZONES AND LUC CLASSIFICATIONS

Client		D. Stretch		Job No.		Drawing No.	
SURVEYED	-	16540	01	16540		01	
DESIGNED	-	Scale		1:2000 @ A1		SHEET 004	
DRAWN	LH	23.04.24	1:4000 @ A3				
CHECKED	-	Date: 8 Level		MT NIC 2000		E	
APPROVED	-						

NOTES:
 ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE IN METERS UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE.
 ANY PERSON USING CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD DRAWINGS AND OTHER DATA ACCEPTS THE RISK OF USING THE DRAWINGS AND OTHER DATA IN ELECTRONIC FORM WITHOUT REQUESTING AND CHECKING THEM FOR ACCURACY AGAINST THE ORIGINAL HARD COPY VERSIONS. COPYRIGHT OR THE DRAWING IS RESERVED.

Back 29/09/24



- Proposed building platform
- Proposed boundaries
- Proposed curtilage area

Shed with residential unit consented by RM110721

Lombardy poplar shelterbelt consented by RM110721

Clumps of lombardy poplars consented by RM110721

Established building platform with an existing dwelling and greenhouse extending beyond the platform, consented under RM120747.

vivian+espie
 resource management and landscape planning
 vivian+espie Limited Resource Management and Landscape Planning
 Physical Address: 1/2318 Gladys Drive, Forest Hill, Queensland
 Tel: +64 3 441 4100 Fax: +64 3 441 4190 Web: www.vivianespie.co.nz

TITLE		
Structural Landscape Plan		
DRAWING NUMBER	DRAWN BY	DATE
2367.01	JM	16/09/2024
SCALE	FILE NAME	
1:4000	2367.01 Stretch.vwx	

B. Bels 29/09/24

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT CHRISTCHURCH
I TE KŌTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA
KI ŌTAUTAHI**

Decision No. [2023] NZEnvC 188

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND of appeals under clause 14 of the First Schedule of the Act against decisions of the Queenstown Lakes District Council on Stage 2 of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan

BETWEEN WAKATIPU EQUITIES LIMITED

(ENV-2019-CHC-065)

(... continued on separate page)

Appellants

AND QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Respondent

Court: Environment Judge J J M Hassan
Environment Commissioner J T Baines
Environment Commissioner M C G Mabin

Hearing: In Chambers at Christchurch, on the papers

Submissions: S Scott, M Wakefield and R Mortiaux for the respondent
M Baker-Galloway and L McLaughlan for Anderson Lloyd parties
A J Logan for Otago Regional Council
R Wolt for Boxer Hill Trust
W Goldsmith for Waterfall Park Developments Ltd

Last case event: 19 May 2023

Date of Decision: 5 September 2023

Date of Issue: 5 September 2023



DECISION OF THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
Topic 31: National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land 2022

- A: The Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone ('WBRAZ') of the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan ('PDP') is not 'General Rural Zone' or 'Rural Production Zone' for the purposes of cl 3.5(7)(a)(i) of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 ('NPS-HPL').
- B: Nor is the Lifestyle Precinct ('LP') sub-zone of the WBRAZ.
- C: Nor is land notified as LP, but down-zoned to WBRAZ by PDP first instance decisions, and now subject to an appeal seeking LP.
- D: Therefore, cl 3.5(7)(a)(i) NPS-HPL does not apply to or affect our consideration of relief in any of the Topic 31 appeals.

REASONS

Introduction

[1] This decision is on certain appeals in Topic 31 in the staged determination of appeals in the review of the PDP.¹ It concerns the proper application, in the consideration of relief in those appeals of the NPS-HPL.²

[2] Topic 31 concerns appeals seeking site-specific relief with respect to the WBRAZ including its Lifestyle Precinct sub-zone ('Precinct'). It is not in dispute that the appeals by Wakatipu Equities Ltd (ENV-2019-CHC-065) and the others in the List of Appellants each concern land categorised by the New Zealand Land

¹ The relevant appeals are by Wakatipu Equities Ltd and as set out in the List of Appellants.

² The NPS-HPL was approved by the Governor-General under s52(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) on 12 September 2022 and came into force on 17 October 2022.

Resource Inventory as having a Land Use Capability ('LUC') of 1, 2 or 3. That gives rise to the issues those parties seek be determined concerning the proper interpretation and application of the NPS-HPL.

[3] At the request of the parties, the decision is on the papers.³ For ENV-2019-CHC-090 as to the appeal by Waterfall Park Developments Limited ('WPDL'), it supplements the findings to be made in the interim decision that will be issued shortly. For all other appeals in the List of Appellants, this decision will in due course inform our decisions or determinations on their relief.

The issues for determination

[4] As the parties have agreed, the issues for determination are as follows:

- (a) Is the WBRAZ (excepting the LP) to be treated as 'general rural' or 'rural production' for the purposes of cl 3.5(7)(a)(i) NPS-HPL?
- (b) Is the LP (of the WBRAZ) to be treated as 'general rural' or 'rural production' for the purposes of cl 3.5(7)(a)(i) NPS-HPL?
- (c) Does land notified as LP, but downzoned to WBRAZ by the Council's decision, and now subject to an appeal seeking LP, fall within the ambit of the exception in cl 3.5(7)(b)(ii) of the NPS-HPL?

The statutory framework and principles for interpretation

Section 75(3) RMA – district plans must give effect to the NPS-HPL

[5] The court has the same power, duty and discretion as QLDC had in respect of the appealed decisions (s290). District plans must give effect to the NPS-HPL as a national policy statement (s75(3)). Legislation, including both s75(3) RMA

³ Parties proposed that this could be by judge alone determination under s279 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA'). However, as the issues pertain to the relief we may entertain in each relevant appeal, we consider the better course is that we address this as a decision

and the NPS-HPL, applies “to circumstances as they arise” (s11 Legislation Act 2019 ‘LA’).

[6] Therefore, the court must satisfy itself that any relief pursued in Topic 31 appeals concerning land in LUC 1, 2 or 3 would not compromise the requirement that the PDP gives effect to the NPS-HPL.⁴

Legal principles

[7] The NPS-HPL is secondary legislation within the meaning of the LA and its meaning is to be ascertained from its text and in light of its purpose and context (s10(1), LA). That is also the case for the National Planning Standards 2019 (‘PS’) (provisions of which apply in the interpretation of the NPS-HPL and the PDP).⁵ We are satisfied that those statutory interpretation principles are materially in keeping with the authorities counsel referred to.⁶ However, the interpretive exercise in this case differs somewhat in that we must consider how the NPS-HPL, in tandem with the PS, applies in the consideration of the WBRAZ.

Consideration of extraneous documents is not necessary

[8] Counsel invited us to interpret the NPS-HPL and WBRAZ in light of extraneous documents. Counsel for QLDC referred to a guide to the implementation of the NPS-HPL published by the Ministry for the Environment

⁴ It is not disputed that none of the land in the appeals is “identified for future urban development” as defined in Cl 1.3 of the NPS-HPL. Our interpretation of the NPS proceeds on that premise.

⁵ National planning standards prepared under s58D are secondary legislation as prescribed by s58E RMA. They serve to assist achievement of the RMA purpose and to set out requirements or other provisions as to the structure, format or content of regional policy statements and regional and district plans (s58B). They serve to address what the Minister considers is required for various purposes including “national consistency” and supporting the implementation of other national policy and regulatory instruments (s58B). They must give effect to national policy statements (s58C).

⁶ QLDC submissions at [3.2], AL submissions at [26], referring to *Powell v Dunedin City Council* [2005] NZRMA 174 (CA) at [35] and *Brownlee v Christchurch City Council* [2001] NZRMA 539 at [25] and earlier authority including *Canterbury Regional Council v Christchurch City Council* (2001) 7 ELRNZ 97(EnvC) at [32] and [35].

(‘MfE Guide’).⁷ Counsel for Wakatipu Equities Ltd and the other Anderson Lloyd parties⁸ (‘AL’) and WPDL referred to a raft of materials concerning the PDP and the Wakatipu Basin including analyses by experts involved in work for the preparation of the variation that resulted in the WBRAZ, evidence tendered to the court in PDP appeals, and earlier decisions of the court.⁹

[9] The MfE Guide does not have any formal statutory force for interpretive purposes. The other material referred to us strays well beyond the legitimate bounds of statutory interpretation. In any case, we find each of the relevant statutory instruments sufficiently clear without the need to draw from such extraneous sources.

Overview of the NPS-HPL

Objective and policies as to highly productive land

[10] The NPS-HPL has a single objective (in cl 2.1):

Highly productive land is protected for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations.

[11] The NPS-HPL specifies several associated policies (cl 2.2), including:

Policy 1: Highly productive land is recognised as a resource with finite characteristics and longterm values for land-based primary production.

⁷ <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/NPS-Highly-Productive-Land-Guide-to-implementation.pdf>. Referred to in QLDC submissions at [7.23].

⁸ The parties in this group are Anthony, Sarah and Samuel Strain, Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited, DE, ME Bunn and LA Green, Middleton Family Trust, Morven Ferry Limited and Wakatipu Equities Limited.

⁹ Materials of this nature were referred to us by counsel for Strain, Wakatipu Equities Limited, Barnhill Corporate Trustee Limited, Bunn, Green, Morven Ferry Limited, Middleton Family Trust and WPDL.

- Policy 4: The use of highly productive land for land-based primary production is prioritised and supported.
- Policy 5: The urban rezoning of highly productive land is avoided, except as provided in this National Policy Statement.
- Policy 6: The rezoning and development of highly productive land as rural lifestyle is avoided, except as provided in this National Policy Statement.
- Policy 7: The subdivision of highly productive land is avoided, except as provided in this National Policy Statement.
- Policy 8: Highly productive land is protected from inappropriate use and development.
- Policy 9: Reverse sensitivity effects are managed so as not to constrain land-based primary production activities on highly productive land

[12] Central to the design of the NPS-HPL are directions for the mapping of highly productive land and, following that, its identification in regional policy statements and identification and protection through district plans. As that response to the NPS-HPL will extend over several years, the NPS-HPL includes a transitional regime in cl 3.5(7).

Meaning of highly productive land during the transition under cl 3.5(7)

[13] The definition of “highly productive land” in NPS-HPL takes us to cl 3.5(7), i.e. (emphasis added):

highly productive land means land that has been mapped in accordance with clause 3.4 and is included in an operative regional policy statement as required by clause 3.5 (but see clause 3.5(7) for what is treated as highly productive land before the maps are included in an operative regional policy statement and clause 3.5(6) for when land is rezoned and therefore ceases to be highly productive land).

Cl 3.5(7)(a)

[14] Clause 3.5(7) relevantly reads:¹⁰

Until a regional policy statement containing maps of highly productive land in the region is operative, each relevant territorial authority and consent authority must apply this National Policy Statement as if references to highly productive land were references to land that, at the commencement date:

- (a) is
 - (i) zoned general rural or rural production; and
 - (ii) LUC 1, 2, or 3 land

[15] Given that the land in each of the relevant appeals is in one or other of those LUCs, the issues for determination turn on the proper meaning of “zoned general rural or rural production” as it is used in cl 3.5(7)(a)(i). As to that meaning, cl 1.3(4) NPS-HPL relevantly specifies:¹¹

A reference in this National Policy Statement to a zone is: . . .

- (b) for local authorities that have not yet implemented the Zone Framework Standard of the National Planning Standards, a reference to the nearest equivalent zone.

[16] That direction intends that we must examine the WBRAZ (including the Precinct) against the various zone classes specified in PS8.

¹⁰ The exception in cl 3.5(7)(b) does not apply as it is common ground that none of the subject land is “identified for future urban development” and none is “subject to a Council initiated, or an adopted, notified plan change to rezone it from general rural or rural production to urban or rural lifestyle”.

¹¹ Clause 1.3(4) applies because QLDC has not yet implemented the PS Zone Framework Standard. Counsel informed the court that QLDC has an exemption from doing so in Section 17.5 of the PS (for a period of 7 years).

The PS8 zone classes for comparison

[17] We can set aside a number of those zone classes as having no relevance. The PS8 zone classes of potential interest in terms of nearest equivalence to the WBRAZ are:

(a) “General Rural Zone” described as:

Areas used predominantly for primary production activities, including intensive indoor primary production. The zone may also be used for a range of activities that support primary production activities, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.

(b) “Rural Production Zone” described as:

Areas used predominantly for primary production activities that rely on the productive nature of the land and intensive indoor primary production. The zone may also be used for a range of activities that support primary production activities, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.

(c) “Rural Lifestyle Zone” described as:

Areas used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment on lots smaller than those of the General rural [sic] and Rural Production zones, while still enabling primary production to occur.

Meaning of “areas used predominantly for” as used in the PS8 zone classes

[18] In PS8 the descriptions of General Rural Zone, Rural Production Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone each use the phrase “areas used predominantly for”. We find that phrase has its plain ordinary meaning. “Areas” refers to the spatial dimensions of the zone as depicted on the PDP planning maps. “Used” refers to the purpose

served by the zone.¹² “Predominantly” means “mainly”.¹³ The phrase as a whole refers to what the main purpose of the zone in question is.

[19] We find that meaning of the phrase best serves to give effect to the NPS-HPL concerning “highly productive land”. That is in the sense that it would most effectively ensure the proper application of cl 3.5(7), in terms of the objective and policies of the NPS-HPL, pending the completion of the mapping and follow up changes to regional policy statements and district plans as the NPS-HPL directs. In particular, pending that exercise, the risk to be addressed concerns loss of LUC 1, 2 or 3 land that could in due course be mapped and managed as highly productive land through updated district plan controls. Hence, what cls 3.5(7) and 1.3(4) call for is an examination of what the main purpose of the relevant existing district plan zone is to best enable the protective aims of the NPS-HPL to be realised.

When is LUC 1, 2 or 3 land ‘highly productive land’ to which cl 3.5(7) applies?

[20] Land in the appeals that is LUC 1, 2 or 3 is to be treated as highly productive land to which cl 3.5(7) NPS-HPL applies if the district plan zone in which it is located is nearest in equivalence to either PS8 General Rural Zone or Rural Production Zone. The district plan zone must be treated as being nearest in equivalence to one or other of those PS8 zone classes if that zone is used predominantly for (i.e. mainly serves) primary production purposes as those PS8 zone classes describe.

[21] If by such analysis the district plan zone in question is more nearly equivalent to one of the other PS8 zone classes (e.g. Rural Lifestyle Zone), cl 3.5(7) does not apply. That is the case whether or not such land is LUC 1, 2 or 3.

¹² *The New Zealand Oxford Dictionary*, use: 1 cause to act or serve a purpose.

¹³ *The New Zealand Oxford Dictionary*, predominant: 2 being the strongest or main element.

Approach to our analysis of whether cl 3.5(7) applies

[22] There are several steps in our analysis of whether cl 3.5(7) applies to the consideration of the relief in the relevant appeals:

- (a) an initial further question raised by submissions is whether we are to treat the WBRAZ as including the Precinct sub-zone or whether we treat the Precinct separately for the purposes of the NPS-HPL;
- (b) subject to that, our further analysis includes consideration of the following matters that help inform our ultimate answer:
 - (i) the history leading to the inclusion of the WBRAZ in the PDP;
 - (ii) the design of the PDP overall including as to the rural environment; and
 - (iii) the objectives, policies and other provisions of the WBRAZ including the Precinct sub-zone.

Is the Precinct a separate zone from the WBRAZ for the purposes of the NPS-HPL?

Introduction

[23] The importance of the question is in whether the consequences under cl 3.5(7) NPS-HPL would be the same for LUC 1, 2 and 3 land within the Precinct as within the remainder of the WBRAZ.

[24] The PDP refers to the Precinct as a “sub-zone”.¹⁴ For instance, the first paragraph of 24.1 Zone Purpose reads:

¹⁴ Another example of sub-zones is the Ski Area Sub-zones within the Rural Zone. In broad terms they are similarly connected zones in that case providing an essentially self-contained regime for ski field operation and development.

This chapter applies to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (Rural Amenity Zone) and its sub-zone, the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (Precinct). The purpose of the Zone is to maintain or enhance the character and amenity of the Wakatipu Basin, while providing for rural living and other activities.

[25] As noted, the NPS-HPL refers to “zone” and directs us to consider which of the zoning classes in PS8 the subject district plan zone is nearest in equivalence to. Neither the NPS-HPL or the PS expressly recognise ‘sub-zones’. PS12 refers to the following spatial planning constructs:

Zones A zone spatially identifies and manages an area with common environmental characteristics or where environmental outcomes are sought, by bundling compatible activities or effects together, and controlling those that are incompatible.

Overlays An overlay spatially identifies distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions.

Precincts A precinct spatially identifies and manages an area where additional place-based provisions apply to modify or refine aspects of the policy approach or outcomes anticipated in the underlying zone(s).

[26] There is a degree of overlap in those descriptions. Zones and precincts each spatially identify and manage areas.¹⁵ However, the PS signals that a precinct would tend to sit within the zone it serves. That is:

- (a) a zone would tend to prescribe the overarching objectives and intentions for an area by way of “outcomes” and related controls; and

¹⁵ We do not further consider ‘overlays’ as they are not in issue. However, overlays as defined would appear to serve a different qualifying purpose in relation to zones than do precincts. Common examples of these in district plans include special natural, cultural, heritage or landscape overlays (“values”) or natural hazard overlays (“risks”) that may serve to restrict what may otherwise be enabled.

- (b) a precinct may then refine or otherwise modify that by way of further “place-based” provisions and refinements of the zone’s policy approach.

Submissions

QLDC and ORC

[27] Counsel for QLDC and ORC treat the WBRAZ and Precinct as separate zones for the purpose of applying the NPS-HPL. That is they submit that cl 3.5(7) NPS-HPL applies to the WBRAZ except in the Precinct.

[28] Counsel for QLDC submit that, by design, the WBRAZ and the Precinct operate separately. They refer to the fact that the Zone Purpose statement describes the Precinct as being applied to specific areas of land within the broader WBRAZ that have capacity to absorb additional rural living development. They point out that Obj 24.2.5 and its supporting policies provide direction to support enablement of ‘rural living’ in certain areas throughout the Basin. They submit that the Precinct serves a distinctly different purpose than does the remainder of the WRBAZ, as reflected in objectives, policies and rules.¹⁶

Other parties

[29] For AL, Ms Baker-Galloway submits that the Precinct is not a standalone zone but exists only as an overlay or precinct within the parent WBRAZ.¹⁷ Counsel for Boxer Hill Trust (‘BHT’) and WPDLC adopt those submissions.¹⁸

¹⁶ QLDC reply at [2.1]-[2.4].

¹⁷ Submissions for AL, dated 28 April 2023, at [12].

¹⁸ Submissions for BHT, dated 28 April 2023, at [15], [17]; submissions for WPDLC, dated 28 April 2023, at [3].

The Precinct is not a separate zone for the purposes of the NPS-HPL

[30] We find the better interpretation is that the Precinct is not a separate zone for the purposes of the NPS-HPL. While it is not unnecessarily unsound for the PDP to provide for sub-zones (at least pending QLDC's implementation of the PS Zone Framework Standard), we find that on a proper reading of the NPS-HPL the WBRAZ is to be treated as a single zone that includes the Precinct.

[31] That is because the Precinct is designed as a nested component of the WBRAZ subject to its overarching purposes. Those purposes are essentially as are expressed in SO 3.2.5.8 and Obj 24.2.1 as to the maintenance or enhancement of the landscape character and visual amenity values "of the Basin". Reinforcing the integrated nature of the WBRAZ and its Precinct, SO 3.2.5.8 commences "Within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone". Similarly, the 24.1 Zone Purpose statement explains:

This chapter applies to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (Rural Amenity Zone) and its sub-zone, the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (Precinct). The purpose of the Zone is to maintain or enhance the character and amenity of the Wakatipu Basin, while providing for rural living and other activities.

[32] We acknowledge that the Precinct has its own Obj 24.2.5. However, that objective includes a proviso that reinforces the overarching purpose of the WBRAZ in those matters (i.e. "provided landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced"). Nor is the Precinct self-contained in regard to associated policies and rules, accepting that the Precinct provides greater enablement of rural living opportunities than other areas of the WBRAZ. We discuss relevant rules later in this decision. It is sufficient to record that several Ch 24 and 27 rules as to the control of activities apply WBRAZ-wide, including within the Precinct. Those rules are intended to serve the overarching objectives of the WBRAZ.

[33] Therefore, the Precinct does not meet the specifications for “zones” in PS12.

[34] On the other hand, the Precinct comfortably accords with the specifications for “precincts” in PS12 in that it spatially identifies and manages those sub-areas of the Basin where additional place-based provisions apply to modify or refine aspects of the WBRAZ’s policy approach. In relation to the Precinct, the WBRAZ is what PS12 refers to as the “underlying zone”. That is in the sense that the zoning maps encompass the Precinct within the WBRAZ being the rural environment zone for the Basin.

[35] Nothing in the NPS-HPL (nor the associated PS) invites an interpretation of cl 3.5(7) that would treat the Precinct separately from the WBRAZ of which it is part.

Implications for comparative analysis of WBRAZ with PS8 zoning classes

[36] It follows that we treat the WBRAZ as a whole, including the Precinct, when determining whether the zone is predominantly used for primary production purposes. We record however, that we would have reached the same conclusion for the WBRAZ whether or not we counted the Precinct as a component of it. That is because we find that the WBRAZ is not nearest in equivalence to either PS8 General Rural Zone or Rural Production Zone as it is not used predominantly for primary production activities.

History of the WBRAZ

[37] In the development of the PDP, the WBRAZ is a relative latecomer. Its genesis as a variation in the plan review is discussed in the court’s first Topic 30 decision in *Barnhill Corporate Trustee Ltd v Queenstown Lakes District Council*.¹⁹

¹⁹ *Barnhill Corporate Trustee Ltd v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2022] NZEnvC 58 at [3]-

[38] As originally notified, the PDP did not treat the Wakatipu Basin as a separate planning unit. Land of the Basin was included in the PDP's Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones. Concerns about that approach were raised by the IHP²⁰ who heard submissions in Stage 1 of the plan review. The nub of their concerns was that the full discretionary activity status accorded to subdivision under the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones would not allow for proper careful assessment of development and could give rise to the related "potential to cumulatively and irreversibly damage the character and amenity values" of the Basin contrary to the PDP's strategic intentions.²¹

[39] Picking up on the IHP's recommendations, QLDC commissioned the *Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study*.²² That underpinned and informed a variation that proposed to replace the former zones with what is now the WBRAZ.

Overall design of approach of the PDP to the 'rural environment'

[40] In PDP Part 1: Introduction, it is explained that the rural environment is split "into several zones to allow different provisions to apply to each". That is to allow development in each zone "to be reflective of the effects anticipated" by the PDP (with "District Wide Matters" applying over all zones) (provision 1.6.10).

[41] Queenstown-Lakes District is internationally renowned for its landscapes. Its economy is predominantly visitor-based and heavily reliant on effective

[8].

²⁰ The independent hearings panel comprised Denis Nugent (Chair), Rachel Dimery, Trevor Robinson and Quentin Smith.

²¹ *Barnhill Corporate Trustee Ltd* at [4] referring to an extract from para [8] of the 1 July 2016 Minute of the panel that heard submissions on the notified PDP provisions, as quoted by QLDC Hearing of Submissions on Proposed District Plan, Report and Recommendations of Independent Commissioners Regarding Chapter 24 and Wakatipu Basin Planning Maps, Report 18.1 at [101].
<https://www.qldc.govt.nz/media/kqzdfmuj/report-18-1-chapter-24-wakatipu-basin.pdf>.

²² *Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study*, Final Report March 2017, prepared for Queenstown Lakes District Council by Barry Kaye, Kelvin Norgrove and Bridget Gilbert.

landscape protection. Related to that, the PDP recognises there are competing priorities in the management of the District’s so-termed “rural environment”. For instance, in Ch 3 Strategic Direction 3.1A Strategic Issues refers to:

Strategic Issue 2: Growth pressure impacts on the functioning and sustainability of urban areas, and risks detracting from rural landscapes, particularly its outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes.

[42] Furthermore, the PDP’s enablement of agricultural land uses is qualified, as is reflected in strategic objective SO 3.2.1.7 (emphasis added):

Agricultural land uses are enabled **provided those** uses are consistent with:

- a. the protection of the landscape values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes;
- b. the maintenance of the landscape character of Rural Character Landscapes and the maintenance or enhancement of their visual amenity values; and
- c. the maintenance of significant nature conservation values.

[43] The PDP also recognises that there is a helpful synergy between landscape protection and the enablement of farming. For example, the introduction to Ch 6: Landscapes & Rural Character (under 6.2 Values) contains the following statements (emphasis added):

The District’s landscapes are of significant value to the people who live in, work in or visit the District. The District relies in a large part for its social and economic wellbeing on the quality of the landscape, open spaces and the natural and built environment. Those landscapes also have inherent values, particularly to Tangata Whenua. ...

The open space or open character of rural land are key elements of the landscape character that can be vulnerable to degradation from subdivision, development and non-farming activities. **The prevalence of large farms and landholdings contributes to the open space and rural working character of the landscape.**

The predominance of open space over housing and related domestic elements is a strong determinant of the character of the District's rural landscapes.

[44] As aspects of that design, the PDP includes mapping overlays over the various zones for a variety of protective and other purposes including in relation to:

- (a) outstanding natural features and landscapes ('ONFL'); and
- (b) rural amenity landscapes.

The five general zoning classes for the rural environment and purposes

[45] With the addition of the WBRAZ, the PDP now provides for five classes of zone for its rural environment. Dedicated zone chapters are included in the PDP (their provisions applying in conjunction with Ch 27: Subdivision and Development). In summary those zones and their described purposes (from introductory text in each chapter) are as follows:

Zone	Chapter	Purpose
Rural	21	The purpose of the Rural Zone is to enable farming activities and provide for appropriate other activities that rely on rural resources while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape values, ecosystem services, nature conservation values, the soil and water resource and rural amenity.
Rural Residential	22	... provide residential living opportunities on the periphery of urban areas and within specific locations amidst the Rural Zone. In both zones a minimum allotment size is necessary to maintain the character and quality of the zones and the open space, rural and natural landscape values of the surrounding Rural Zone.
Rural Lifestyle		
Gibbston Character	23	The purpose of the Gibbston Character zone is to provide primarily for viticulture and commercial activities with an affiliation to viticulture within the confined space of the Gibbston Valley.

WBRAZ	24	The purpose of the Zone is to maintain or enhance the character and amenity of the Wakatipu Basin, while providing for rural living and other activities.
-------	----	---

[46] The Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone each closely compare with the described predominant purposes of the PS8 General Rural Zone and Rural Production Zone. That is in the primacy they accord to enablement of farming and viticulture respectively. In the case of the Gibbston Character Zone, Obj 23.2.1 recognises synergy between protection of landscape character and values and the enablement of viticulture and other activities, i.e:

The economic viability, character and landscape values of the Gibbston Character Zone are protected by enabling viticulture and other appropriate activities that rely on the rural resource of the Gibbston Valley and managing the adverse effects resulting from other activities locating in the Zone.

[47] The purposes of the other rural environment zones materially differ in those terms. In the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones, primacy is given to providing residential living opportunities. In the WBRAZ, primacy is given to maintaining or enhancing the character and amenity of the Basin (while providing for rural living and other activities).

Relevant design elements of the WBRAZ

[48] The WBRAZ applies to the mapped dimensions of the Wakatipu Basin as are broadly depicted in the following Figure 1 (which is a reproduction of the map in Sch 24.8 of the 24 identified Landscape Character Units ('LCUs') of the Basin):




Figure 1 – Map of LCUs in PDP Sch 24.8

Objectives

[49] There are five objectives and several associated policies prescribed for the WBRAZ:

- (a) Obj 24.2.1 as noted is that landscape character and visual amenity values in the Wakatipu Basin are maintained or enhanced;
- (b) Obj 24.2.2 is that non-residential activities maintain or enhance amenity values;
- (c) Obj 24.2.3 is that reverse sensitivity effects are avoided or mitigated where rural living opportunities, visitor and tourism activities, community and recreation activities occur;
- (d) Obj 24.2.4 is that subdivision and development, and use of land, maintains or enhances water quality, ecological quality, and recreation values while ensuring the efficient provision of infrastructure;
- (e) Obj 24.2.5 is that rural living opportunities in the Precinct are enabled, provided landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced.

Policies

Policies to implement Obj 24.2.1

[50] Policies pertaining to Obj 24.2.1 are directed to the maintenance or enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values of the Basin and its LCUs. For example, Pol 24.2.1.6 is:

Provide for farming, commercial, community, recreation, tourism related and other non-residential activities that rely on the rural land resource, subject to maintaining or enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values.

Policies to implement Obj 24.2.3

[51] Policies pertaining to Ob 24.2.3 on reverse sensitivity give essentially equal recognition to the range of anticipated activities in the WBRAZ, including productive farming and rural living and non-residential activities:

24.2.3.2 Ensure reverse sensitivity effects on rural living and non-residential activities are avoided or mitigated.

24.2.3.3 Support productive farming activities such as agriculture, horticulture and viticulture in the Rural Amenity Zone by ensuring that reverse sensitivity issues do not constrain productive activities.

Policies to implement Obj 24.2.4

[52] Pertaining to Obj 24.2.4, the following policy as to improvement of the water quality of Lake Hayes pertains to productive farming as a use of land as well as to subdivision, development and other uses:

24.2.4.2 Restrict the subdivision, development and use of land in the Lake Hayes catchment, unless it can contribute to water quality improvement in the catchment commensurate with the nature, scale and location of the proposal.

Policies to implement Obj 24.2.5

[53] The policies associated with Obj 24.2.5 as to the Precinct provide a comparatively more favourable policy setting for rural living development than for the balance of the WBRAZ. However, that is also qualified with reference to the maintenance or enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values (Pol 24.2.5.1 – 24.2.5.3).

Associated rules on enabled activities

[54] As we have described, parts of the WBRAZ are recognised to have “capacity to absorb rural living development”. Greatest relative enablement is provided in Precinct areas in which “sympathetically located and well-designed rural living development which achieves minimum and average lot sizes, is anticipated, while still achieving the overall objectives of” the WBRAZ (24.1 Zone Purpose). In the balance of the WBRAZ, enablement of subdivision, use and development is attuned to assigned landscape capacity ratings within particular LCUs (and some areas within them) (Pols 24.2.1.1A, 24.2.1.1B). That rating is according to a six-point evaluative scale (i.e. Very Low – High).

[55] Consistent with the primary purpose of maintaining or enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values, the enablement of primary production is qualified in associated rules. Farming activity and farm buildings are a permitted activity. However, a farm building that exceeds a maximum gross floor area of only 50m² defaults to a restricted discretionary activity (r 24.5.13). Discretion is available to decline a consent application for a larger farm building if it is adjudged to be in an inappropriate location or unacceptable character, scale and form or external appearance. Other classes of permitted activity as to retail sales of farm produce and roadside stalls signal some preference for small cottage farming in the WBRAZ. However, other classes of permitted activity (subject to standards) include residential, residential visitor accommodation and small scale commercial recreational activities (Table 24.1).

[56] A range of residential density and lot size standards apply. These are included in Ch 24 and paralleled in Ch 27 in regard to subdivision (e.g. rr 27.5.9, 27.5.20, 27.5.21, 27.5.18A). Within the Precinct these are relatively more enabling of rural living development (rr 24.5.1.1, 24.5.1.2). In the remainder of the WBRAZ, there are a mix of standards designed to apply within a number of specified LCUs (r 24.5.1.6) that are typically enabling of subdivision for rural living development rather than primary production purposes. The default non-complying activity minimum net 80 ha standard applies elsewhere in the WBRAZ (r 24.5.1.5). Insofar as that is a much larger minimum lot size, it is somewhat consistent with enablement of continuing farming activities. However, as noted, that is subject to the purpose of the WBRAZ which pertains to the maintenance or enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values.

[57] On our analysis of those provisions, they are essentially consistent with the described purpose of the WBRAZ. They do not assign that any primacy, in a purposive sense, to primary production activities but rather contemplate farming as one of the range of activities that are enabled. That enablement is qualified however by the primary purpose of the WBRAZ as to the maintenance or enhancement of landscape character and visual amenity values.

Submissions

QLDC and ORC

[58] As we have noted, the submissions for QLDC and ORC proceed on the basis that the Precinct should be treated as separate from the balance of the WBRAZ for the purposes of consideration of cl 3.5(7). For the reasons we have given, we do not accept that to be the proper interpretation of the NPS-HPL. Their approach is misdirected in that it does not treat the WBRAZ as a whole in comparison to the PS8 zoning classes.

[59] Counsel for QLDC examine the design elements of those parts of the WBRAZ outside Precinct areas in terms of what they signify as to development

expectations. They submit that these favour treating the WBRAZ (other than the Precinct) as nearest in equivalence to the PS General Rural Zone.²³

[60] Counsel refer to the deliberate inclusion of a 80 ha minimum lot size standard in the originally notified Wakatipu Basin variation. They characterise this as a deliberate shift in the regulatory regime that strongly indicates that additional rural living is not anticipated in these areas of the WBRAZ.²⁴ Counsel note the reference to provision for farming in Pol 24.2.1.6 and the fact that this is a permitted activity further supported by the reverse sensitivity Pol 24.2.3.3.²⁵

Other parties

[61] AL, BHT and WPDL submit that the nearest PS8 equivalent to the WBRAZ is Rural Lifestyle Zone with the consequence that cl 3.6(7) NPS-HPL does not apply to the Basin. Counsel characterise the WBRAZ as incompatible with the PS's descriptions of the Rural General and Rural Production Zones in that these are used primarily for a production purpose.²⁶

[62] Counsel for AL further submit that the WBRAZ should not be considered in a vacuum but with reference to other PDP rural environment zones and their purposes (in addition to Ch 26 Earthworks). Furthermore, they analyse the applicable standards and other rules as to maximum gross floor area and maximum volumes for earthworks across zones, submitting that those in Ch 24 do not enable farming activities to the extent that would be reasonably anticipated in an area "used predominantly for farming". Rather, in their submission it more closely resembles those of an area "used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment". They point out that the Ch 24 density standards for subdivision and residential development are similar to those for the Rural Lifestyle

²³ QLDC submissions dated 4 April 2023, at [7.21].

²⁴ QLDC submissions dated 4 April 2023, at [7.13]-[7.20].

²⁵ QLDC submissions dated 4 April 2023, at [7.18].

²⁶ AL submissions dated 28 April 2023, at [13].

Zone, in many parts of the WBRAZ. That includes many of the LCUs outside of the Precinct.²⁷

[63] Mr Goldsmith makes similar submissions for WPDL.²⁸ He also invites the court to take judicial notice of the fact that that range of lot sizes does not accord with the size of landholdings one would expect to find in the General Rural Zone where land is used predominantly for primary production activities.²⁹

The WBRAZ is not used predominantly for primary production activities

[64] Through the lens of the objectives and associated policies and related rules, we find that the WBRAZ is not used predominantly for primary production activities. That is the case for each subset of those activities described in PS8.

[65] Plainly that is the position within the Precinct. We find it is also the position for the balance of the WBRAZ. That is not to say the WBRAZ does not enable and encourage farming. Rather, it seeks to enable that as a permitted activity and extend it some protection from reverse sensitivity threats. But that is as part of a collection of anticipated activities all of which are subject to the direction to maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Basin and its LCUs. Encouragement and enablement of farming is in recognition of the value it has for maintaining landscape character and visual amenity values. In essence, the centrality of “rural amenity” in the WBRAZ title reflects its core purpose.

[66] What remains of the Basin’s productive farming heritage is an important component of the landscape character that the WBRAZ seeks to maintain or enhance. As the court has previously observed, it remains character-defining. However, the predominant purpose of the WBRAZ is to maintain or enhance

²⁷ AL submissions at [50]-[59], Appendix 2.

²⁸ WPDL submissions, at [8].

²⁹ WPDL submissions, at [27].

landscape character and visual amenity values. Insofar as farming activities are enabled, that is on an expressly qualified basis that is not in keeping with either of the PS8 classes that trigger cl 3.5(7), i.e. General Rural Zone and Rural Production Zone.

[67] The history whereby the WBRAZ came to be included in the PDP is of some relevance as further supporting that interpretation. As we have noted, the independent commissioners who heard submissions in Stage 1 did not raise concern as to whether the prior zoning treatment of the Basin was inadequate in providing for productive farming. Indeed neither Rural Residential nor Rural Lifestyle zoning is particularly enabling of that. Rather, they were concerned that the full discretionary activity status accorded by that former zoning would cumulatively cause loss of landscape character and amenity values contrary to the PDP's strategic intentions. The *Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study* was very much focussed on those same concerns and is the foundation of the notified WBRAZ. The changes made to that notified WBRAZ do not change its designed purpose in those terms. Rather they have served to reinforce and refine them.

[68] In particular, that is in terms of significantly qualifying and confining the application of the former universally applied 80 ha minimum net site area standard as a trigger to non-complying subdivision.

[69] The 80 ha non-complying subdivision regime continues to apply to some LCUs within the Basin. However, as the court's interim decision in *Barnhill Corporate Trustee Ltd* records, the only parts of the Basin where there remain lots in excess of 160 ha is in LCU 1: Malaghans Valley and LCU 20: Crown Terrace.³⁰ We infer from our evidential findings in our Topic 30 decisions that the Basin's productive farming is now essentially confined to those remnant areas.

³⁰ *Barnhill Corporate Trustee Ltd v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2022] NZEnvC 58 at [46].

The WBRAZ is nearest in equivalence to the PS8 Rural Lifestyle Zone

[70] In terms of its detailed design, the WBRAZ does not align particularly well with what PS8 describes as a Rural Lifestyle Zone.

[71] Terms such as “residential lifestyle” are not used. Perhaps ‘rural lifestyle’ would be closer to what the WBRAZ has in mind as a main type of usage provided for in the WBRAZ (alongside other usage, notably including farming which in some parts of the WBRAZ could well be productive farming). Nor is the hierarchy of lot sizes as between the three noted PS zone classes and described for the Rural Lifestyle Zone particularly demonstrated in the design of the rural environment chapters of the PDP. Rather, the PDP zones, including the WBRAZ, tend to display a more complex somewhat disorderly approach in those terms.

[72] However, the WBRAZ is similar to the PS8 Rural Lifestyle Zone zoning class in the fact that it mainly provides for:

... a ... lifestyle within a rural environment ..., while still enabling primary production to occur.

[73] In those terms, we find that the WBRAZ has most equivalence to PS8 Rural Lifestyle Zone. We are satisfied that our interpretation is not inconsistent with the NPS-HPL objective (in cl 2.1) and its associated policies. It follows that nothing in s75(3) RMA impedes our consideration of the range of zoning outcome options available within the scope of the appeals highly productive land.

Outcome

[74] Therefore, we find that:

- (a) the WBRAZ is not a PS General Rural or Rural Production Zone for the purposes of cl 3.5(7)(a)(i) NPS-HPL;
- (b) nor is the Precinct (whether or not a sub-zone of the WBRAZ));

- (c) nor is land notified as Precinct, but down-zoned to WBRAZ by PDP first instance decisions, and now subject to an appeal seeking Precinct; and
- (d) therefore, cl 3.5(7)(a)(i) does not apply to or affect our consideration of relief in the appeals.


For the court



J J M Hassan
Environment Judge

List of appellants

ENV-2019-CHC-065	Wakatipu Equities Limited
ENV-2019-CHC-056	A, S and S Strain
ENV-2019-CHC-086	Barnhill Corporate Trustee Ltd and D E, M E Bunn and L A Green
ENV-2019-CHC-088	Morven Ferry Limited
ENV-2019-CHC-036	Burgess Duke Trust
ENV-2019-CHC-038	Boxer Hill Trust
ENV-2019-CHC-074	Slopehill Joint Venture
ENV-2019-CHC-047	M P Henry
ENV-2019-CHC-090	Waterfall Park Developments Limited
ENV-2019-CHC-055	Middleton Family Trust



AFFECTED PERSON'S APPROVAL



FORM 8A

Resource Management Act 1991 Section 95



RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICANT'S NAME AND/OR RM

David Stretch & Colleen Flemmer



AFFECTED PERSON'S DETAILS

I/We Anthony Bodle, Graeme Todd, Nichola Paterson & Robina Bodle

Are the owners/occupiers of
18 & 44 Jeffery Road



DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

I/We hereby give written approval for the proposal to:

Undertake a two lot subdivision of 298 Crown Range Road, as per the attached plans.

The proposal also includes variations to conditions of Consent Notice 6587109.3 & Covenant 9490097.1 to remove the conditions relating to future subdivisions, as they relate to the application site.

at the following subject site(s):

298 Crown Range Road



I/We understand that by signing this form Council, when considering this application, will not consider any effects of the proposal upon me/us.



I/We understand that if the consent authority determines the activity is a deemed permitted boundary activity under section 87BA of the Act, written approval cannot be withdrawn if this process is followed instead.



WHAT INFORMATION/PLANS HAVE YOU SIGHTED



I/We have sighted and initialled ALL plans dated and approve them.

See attached

[Handwritten signature]
AMB



APPROVAL OF AFFECTED PERSON(S)

The written consent of all owners / occupiers who are affected. If the site that is affected is jointly owned, the written consent of all co-owners (names detailed on the title for the site) are required.

A	Name (PRINT) Anthony Bodle	
	Contact Phone / Email address	
	Signature	Date

B	Name (PRINT) Graeme Todd	
	Contact Phone / Email address 0274330457 <i>graeme.todd@walker.com</i>	
	Signature <i>[Handwritten Signature]</i>	Date 21-10-24

C	Name (PRINT) Nichola Paterson	
	Contact Phone / Email address	
	Signature	Date

D	Name (PRINT) Robina Bodle	
	Contact Phone / Email address 0274 884488 <i>robina.bodle@gmail.com</i>	
	Signature <i>RM Bodle</i>	Date 21/10/24

Note to person signing written approval

Conditional written approvals cannot be accepted.


There is no obligation to sign this form, and no reasons need to be given.

If this form is not signed, the application may be notified with an opportunity for submissions.

If signing on behalf of a trust or company, please provide additional written evidence that you have signing authority.



Section	Lot	Area (ha)	Area (sq ft)	Area (ac)	Area (m ²)	Area (sq mi)
Section 15	15	41.64	100,000,000	25,000	100,000,000	0.0156
Section 9	9	41.64	100,000,000	25,000	100,000,000	0.0156
Section 3	3	41.64	100,000,000	25,000	100,000,000	0.0156
Section 1	1	41.64	100,000,000	25,000	100,000,000	0.0156



NOTES
 HIGHWAY AREA INDICATED BY PAPER E-1 IN CONNECTION TO BE EMBLEMED WITH THE RIGHT TO ACCESS
 IN FAVOUR OF CLDC OR TO BEY WITH CLDC TO BE CONVEYED

FOR DISCUSSION - 06.09.24


CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
 LAND CONSULTANTS - LAND INVESTMENT - FARMING CONSULTANTS
 100/101/102/103/104/105/106/107/108/109/110/111/112/113/114/115/116/117/118/119/120/121/122/123/124/125/126/127/128/129/130/131/132/133/134/135/136/137/138/139/140/141/142/143/144/145/146/147/148/149/150/151/152/153/154/155/156/157/158/159/160/161/162/163/164/165/166/167/168/169/170/171/172/173/174/175/176/177/178/179/180/181/182/183/184/185/186/187/188/189/190/191/192/193/194/195/196/197/198/199/200/201/202/203/204/205/206/207/208/209/210/211/212/213/214/215/216/217/218/219/220/221/222/223/224/225/226/227/228/229/230/231/232/233/234/235/236/237/238/239/240/241/242/243/244/245/246/247/248/249/250/251/252/253/254/255/256/257/258/259/260/261/262/263/264/265/266/267/268/269/270/271/272/273/274/275/276/277/278/279/280/281/282/283/284/285/286/287/288/289/290/291/292/293/294/295/296/297/298/299/300/301/302/303/304/305/306/307/308/309/310/311/312/313/314/315/316/317/318/319/320/321/322/323/324/325/326/327/328/329/330/331/332/333/334/335/336/337/338/339/340/341/342/343/344/345/346/347/348/349/350/351/352/353/354/355/356/357/358/359/360/361/362/363/364/365/366/367/368/369/370/371/372/373/374/375/376/377/378/379/380/381/382/383/384/385/386/387/388/389/390/391/392/393/394/395/396/397/398/399/400/401/402/403/404/405/406/407/408/409/410/411/412/413/414/415/416/417/418/419/420/421/422/423/424/425/426/427/428/429/430/431/432/433/434/435/436/437/438/439/440/441/442/443/444/445/446/447/448/449/450/451/452/453/454/455/456/457/458/459/460/461/462/463/464/465/466/467/468/469/470/471/472/473/474/475/476/477/478/479/480/481/482/483/484/485/486/487/488/489/490/491/492/493/494/495/496/497/498/499/500/501/502/503/504/505/506/507/508/509/510/511/512/513/514/515/516/517/518/519/520/521/522/523/524/525/526/527/528/529/530/531/532/533/534/535/536/537/538/539/540/541/542/543/544/545/546/547/548/549/550/551/552/553/554/555/556/557/558/559/560/561/562/563/564/565/566/567/568/569/570/571/572/573/574/575/576/577/578/579/580/581/582/583/584/585/586/587/588/589/590/591/592/593/594/595/596/597/598/599/600/601/602/603/604/605/606/607/608/609/610/611/612/613/614/615/616/617/618/619/620/621/622/623/624/625/626/627/628/629/630/631/632/633/634/635/636/637/638/639/640/641/642/643/644/645/646/647/648/649/650/651/652/653/654/655/656/657/658/659/660/661/662/663/664/665/666/667/668/669/670/671/672/673/674/675/676/677/678/679/680/681/682/683/684/685/686/687/688/689/690/691/692/693/694/695/696/697/698/699/700/701/702/703/704/705/706/707/708/709/710/711/712/713/714/715/716/717/718/719/720/721/722/723/724/725/726/727/728/729/730/731/732/733/734/735/736/737/738/739/740/741/742/743/744/745/746/747/748/749/750/751/752/753/754/755/756/757/758/759/760/761/762/763/764/765/766/767/768/769/770/771/772/773/774/775/776/777/778/779/780/781/782/783/784/785/786/787/788/789/790/791/792/793/794/795/796/797/798/799/800/801/802/803/804/805/806/807/808/809/810/811/812/813/814/815/816/817/818/819/820/821/822/823/824/825/826/827/828/829/830/831/832/833/834/835/836/837/838/839/840/841/842/843/844/845/846/847/848/849/850/851/852/853/854/855/856/857/858/859/860/861/862/863/864/865/866/867/868/869/870/871/872/873/874/875/876/877/878/879/880/881/882/883/884/885/886/887/888/889/890/891/892/893/894/895/896/897/898/899/900/901/902/903/904/905/906/907/908/909/910/911/912/913/914/915/916/917/918/919/920/921/922/923/924/925/926/927/928/929/930/931/932/933/934/935/936/937/938/939/940/941/942/943/944/945/946/947/948/949/950/951/952/953/954/955/956/957/958/959/960/961/962/963/964/965/966/967/968/969/970/971/972/973/974/975/976/977/978/979/980/981/982/983/984/985/986/987/988/989/990/991/992/993/994/995/996/997/998/999/1000

298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855

Lot	Area (ha)	Area (sq ft)	Area (ac)	Area (m ²)	Area (sq mi)
Lot 1	3.07	7,500,000	1,875	7,500,000	0.0029
Lot 2	41.64	100,000,000	25,000	100,000,000	0.0391

Lot	Area (ha)	Area (sq ft)	Area (ac)	Area (m ²)	Area (sq mi)
Lot 1	3.07	7,500,000	1,875	7,500,000	0.0029
Lot 2	41.64	100,000,000	25,000	100,000,000	0.0391

208



Proposed building platform
 Proposed boundaries
 Proposed carriage area

TITLE		
Structural Landscape Plan		
DRAWING NUMBER	DESIGN BY	DATE
2367.01	JM	18/09/2024
SCALE	FILE NAME	
1:4000	2367.01 Stretch.vwx	

vivian + esple

vivian + esple Studio
 1/11/19 Gladstone Place, Sydney NSW 2015
 Phone: +61 2 9251 2000 Fax: +61 2 9251 2001
 www.vivian-esple.com.au


Handwritten initials/signature

END


Zone	Subdivision Name	Section	Area	Classification
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	46	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	47	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	48	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	49	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	50	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	51	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	52	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	53	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	54	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	55	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	56	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	57	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	58	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	59	8,522.26	E1 50871931
Rural	Clark Fortune McDonald	60	8,522.26	E1 50871931

LEGEND
 O.C.C. REPOSED DISTRICT PLAN ZONE BOUNDARY
 NPS-PP-30 JUNE 1987

FOR DISCUSSION - 06.09.24



CLARK FORTUNE MCDONALD
 LAND DEVELOPER - LAND DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING CONSULTANTS
 (INCORPORATED) 15000 150 STREET WEST, SUITE 100
 VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA V6P 1G6



298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855
ALDC ZONES AND LUC CLASSIFICATIONS

Zone	Area	Classification
Rural	Lot 1	E1 50871931
Rural	Lot 2	E1 50871931
Rural	Lot 3	E1 50871931

Area 30.15 ha - equivalent to 100% of the original lot area

D. Swick

Scale	Sheet No.	Project No.
1:2000 @ A1	01	16540
1:4000 @ A3		

MT NIC 2000



AFFECTED PERSON'S APPROVAL



FORM 8A

Resource Management Act 1991 Section 95

RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICANT'S NAME AND/OR RM

David Stretch & Colleen Flemmer

PERSON AFFECTED PERSON'S DETAILS

I/We Anthony Bodle, Graeme Todd, Nichola Paterson & Robina Bodle
Are the owners/occupiers of
18 & 44 Jeffery Road

☰ DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

I/We hereby give written approval for the proposal to:
Undertake a two lot subdivision of 298 Crown Range Road, as per the attached plans.
The proposal also includes variations to conditions of Consent Notice 6587109.3 & Covenant 9490097.1 to remove the conditions relating to future subdivisions, as they relate to the application site.

at the following subject site(s):
298 Crown Range Road



I/We understand that by signing this form Council, when considering this application, will not consider any effects of the proposal upon me/us.



I/We understand that if the consent authority determines the activity is a deemed permitted boundary activity under section 87BA of the Act, written approval cannot be withdrawn if this process is followed instead.

📄 WHAT INFORMATION/PLANS HAVE YOU SIGHTED



I/We have sighted and initialled ALL plans dated and approve them.

See attached



APPROVAL OF AFFECTED PERSON(S)

The written consent of all owners / occupiers who are affected. If the site that is affected is jointly owned, the written consent of all co-owners (names detailed on the title for the site) are required.

A	Name (PRINT) Anthony Bodle	
	Contact Phone / Email address 021 334 119 APBODLE@GMAIL.COM	
	Signature 	Date 22/10/24

B	Name (PRINT) Graeme Todd	
	Contact Phone / Email address	
	Signature	Date

C	Name (PRINT) Nichola Paterson	
	Contact Phone / Email address	
	Signature	Date

D	Name (PRINT) Robina Bodle	
	Contact Phone / Email address 0274 884488 robinabodle@gmail.com	
	Signature 	Date 21/10/24

Note to person signing written approval

Conditional written approvals cannot be accepted.

There is no obligation to sign this form, and no reasons need to be given.

If this form is not signed, the application may be notified with an opportunity for submissions.

If signing on behalf of a trust or company, please provide additional written evidence that you have signing authority.



Feature	Dimension	Area	Comments
Right-of-Way	Lot 1	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 2	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 3	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 4	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 5	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 6	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 7	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 8	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 9	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 10	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 11	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 12	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 13	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 14	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 15	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 16	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 17	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 18	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 19	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 20	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 21	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 22	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 23	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 24	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 25	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 26	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 27	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 28	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 29	44.8	11.8287194
Right-of-Way	Lot 30	44.8	11.8287194



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
 298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
 LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855

Lot	Area	Comments
Lot 1	3.07 ha	
Lot 2	41.64 ha	
Lot 3	30.44 ha	

298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855

Lot	Area	Comments
Lot 1	3.07 ha	
Lot 2	41.64 ha	
Lot 3	30.44 ha	


NOTES
 HIGHLIGHTED AREA INDICATED BY PAPER PATCH TO BE LITHE ELEMENTS WITH THE RIGHT OF ACCESS
 IN FAVOR OF CLARK ON TO WEST WITH CLARK (DP 108 COMBINED)

FOR DISCUSSION - 06.09.24

Handwritten signature and initials.

System	Required Land	System	Creating System
Right of Way	Lot 1	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 2	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 3	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 4	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 5	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 6	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 7	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 8	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 9	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 10	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 11	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 12	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 13	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 14	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 15	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 16	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 17	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 18	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 19	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 20	461 000 000	E 138071916

System	Required Land	System	Creating System
Right of Way	Lot 1	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 2	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 3	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 4	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 5	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 6	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 7	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 8	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 9	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 10	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 11	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 12	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 13	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 14	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 15	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 16	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 17	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 18	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 19	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 20	461 000 000	E 138071916



NOTES
 IDENTIFIED AREA INDICATED BY PAPER LINES IS TO BE EITHER SEGMENTS WITH THE RIGHT TO ACCESS
 IN FAVOUR OF BLOCK 10 TO WEST WITH QUICQUO BE CONVEYED

FOR DISCUSSION - 06.09.24

CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
 298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
 LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855


D. Sketch

Area	16540	01
Scale	1:2000 @ A1	
Project	1:4000 @ A3	
Client	MT NIC 2000	E

Area Data for registered Rights of Way and Easements

System	Required Land	System	Creating System
Right of Way	Lot 1	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 2	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 3	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 4	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 5	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 6	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 7	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 8	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 9	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 10	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 11	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 12	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 13	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 14	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 15	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 16	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 17	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 18	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 19	461 000 000	E 138071916
Right of Way	Lot 20	461 000 000	E 138071916

RFB
 A



<small>vivan+espie is a registered trademark of Vivian+Espie Pty Ltd. All rights reserved. 70 Bell Street, Sydney, NSW 1585, Australia. Tel: +61 (0)2 9339 9339. Fax: +61 (0)2 9339 9340. Web: www.vivan+espie.com.au</small>			
TITLE	Structural landscape Plan		
DRAWING NUMBER	2367.01	DESIGNER	JM
SCALE	1:4000	FILE NAME	2367.01 Sketch.vwx
		DATE	16/09/2024

Handwritten signature and initials: [Signature]



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
 LAND SURVEYING & ENGINEERING, PLLC
 2000 W. 10TH AVENUE, SUITE 100
 DENVER, CO 80202

FOR DISCUSSION - 06.09.22



298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855

DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
11/13/21	FINAL	DFM

DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
11/13/21	FINAL	DFM

DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
11/13/21	FINAL	DFM

Handwritten signature/initials


2/27

System	Node	Flow	Capacity
Right of Way	Lot 1	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 2	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 3	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 4	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 5	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 6	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 7	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 8	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 9	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 10	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 11	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 12	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 13	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 14	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 15	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 16	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 17	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 18	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 19	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 20	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 21	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 22	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 23	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 24	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 25	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 26	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 27	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 28	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 29	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 30	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 31	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 32	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 33	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 34	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 35	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 36	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 37	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 38	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 39	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 40	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 41	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 42	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 43	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 44	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 45	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 46	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 47	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 48	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 49	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 50	1	1.00000000

LEGEND

QDC PREPARED DISTRICT PLAN ZONE BOUNDARY

NSP-PP-BOUNDARY



FOR DISCUSSION - 06.09.24

CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD

298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION

LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855

QDC ZONES AND LUC CLASSIFICATIONS


System	Node	Flow	Capacity
Right of Way	Lot 1	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 2	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 3	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 4	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 5	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 6	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 7	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 8	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 9	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 10	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 11	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 12	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 13	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 14	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 15	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 16	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 17	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 18	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 19	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 20	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 21	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 22	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 23	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 24	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 25	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 26	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 27	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 28	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 29	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 30	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 31	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 32	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 33	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 34	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 35	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 36	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 37	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 38	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 39	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 40	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 41	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 42	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 43	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 44	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 45	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 46	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 47	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 48	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 49	1	1.00000000
Right of Way	Lot 50	1	1.00000000

16540 01

1:2000 @ A1

1:4000 @ A2

MT NIC 2000 E




WATER RESOURCES

CONSENT APPLICATION

Form 1

Version 1.0 - 15/01/2014



RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICANT NAME AND/OR FIRM

David Stretch & Colleen Flemmer

PERSONS DETAILS

I/We Anthony Bodle, Graeme Todd, Nichola Paterson & Robina Bodle

Are the owners/occupiers of
18 & 44 Jeffery Road

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

I/We hereby give written approval for the proposal to:

Undertake a two lot subdivision of 298 Crown Range Road, as per the attached plans.

The proposal also includes variations to conditions of Consent Notice 6587109.3 & Covenant 9490097.1 to remove the conditions relating to future subdivisions, as they relate to the application site.

at the following subject site(s):
298 Crown Range Road

I/We understand that by signing this form Council, when considering this application, will not consider any effects of the proposal upon me/us.

I/We understand that if the consent authority determines the activity is a deemed permitted boundary activity under section 87BA of the Act, written approval cannot be withdrawn if this process is followed instead.

WHAT INFORMATION/PLANS HAVE YOU SIGHTED

I/We have sighted and initialled ALL plans dated and approve them. See attached

Handwritten signature: Robina Bodle
11/1/13



APPROVAL OF AFFECTED PERSON(S)

The written consent of all owners / occupiers who are affected. If the site that is affected is jointly owned, the written consent of all co-owners (names detailed on the title for the site) are required.



Name (PRINT)

Anthony Bodle

Contact Phone / Email address

Signature

Date



Name (PRINT)

Graeme Todd

Contact Phone / Email address

Signature

Date



Name (PRINT)

Nichola Paterson

Contact Phone / Email address

021 0636636

nichipaterson@queenstown.com

Signature

N Paterson

Date

23/10/24



Name (PRINT)

Robina Bodle

Contact Phone / Email address

0274 384488

robina.bodle@gmail.com

Signature

Robina Bodle

Date

21/10/24

Note to person signing written approval

Conditional written approvals cannot be accepted.

There is no obligation to sign this form, and no reasons need to be given.

If this form is not signed, the application may be notified with an opportunity for submissions.

If signing on behalf of a trust or company, please provide additional written evidence that you have signing authority.





CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
 LAND SURVEYOR
 1000 N. 10TH ST. SPOKANE, MT 59202

1. N/A
 2. N/A
 3. N/A
 4. N/A
 5. N/A
 6. N/A
 7. N/A
 8. N/A
 9. N/A
 10. N/A
 11. N/A
 12. N/A
 13. N/A
 14. N/A
 15. N/A
 16. N/A
 17. N/A
 18. N/A
 19. N/A
 20. N/A
 21. N/A
 22. N/A
 23. N/A
 24. N/A
 25. N/A
 26. N/A
 27. N/A
 28. N/A
 29. N/A
 30. N/A
 31. N/A
 32. N/A
 33. N/A
 34. N/A
 35. N/A
 36. N/A
 37. N/A
 38. N/A
 39. N/A
 40. N/A
 41. N/A
 42. N/A
 43. N/A
 44. N/A
 45. N/A
 46. N/A
 47. N/A
 48. N/A
 49. N/A
 50. N/A
 51. N/A
 52. N/A
 53. N/A
 54. N/A
 55. N/A
 56. N/A
 57. N/A
 58. N/A
 59. N/A
 60. N/A
 61. N/A
 62. N/A
 63. N/A
 64. N/A
 65. N/A
 66. N/A
 67. N/A
 68. N/A
 69. N/A
 70. N/A
 71. N/A
 72. N/A
 73. N/A
 74. N/A
 75. N/A
 76. N/A
 77. N/A
 78. N/A
 79. N/A
 80. N/A
 81. N/A
 82. N/A
 83. N/A
 84. N/A
 85. N/A
 86. N/A
 87. N/A
 88. N/A
 89. N/A
 90. N/A
 91. N/A
 92. N/A
 93. N/A
 94. N/A
 95. N/A
 96. N/A
 97. N/A
 98. N/A
 99. N/A
 100. N/A

298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855

NOTES
 1. THIS SUBDIVISION IS BEING SUBMITTED FOR RECORD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE MONTANA SUBDIVISION ACT, CHAPTER 10, TITLE 70, M.T.S.A.
 2. THE TOTAL AREA OF THIS SUBDIVISION IS 169,540 SQUARE FEET OR 3.85 ACRES.
 3. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 1 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 4. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 2 IS 69,540 SQUARE FEET OR 1.59 ACRES.
 5. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 3 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 6. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 4 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 7. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 5 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 8. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 6 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 9. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 7 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 10. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 8 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 11. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 9 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 12. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 10 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 13. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 11 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 14. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 12 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 15. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 13 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 16. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 14 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 17. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 15 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 18. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 16 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 19. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 17 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 20. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 18 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 21. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 19 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 22. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 20 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 23. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 21 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 24. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 22 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 25. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 23 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 26. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 24 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 27. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 25 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 28. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 26 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 29. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 27 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 30. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 28 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 31. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 29 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 32. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 30 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 33. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 31 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 34. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 32 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 35. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 33 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 36. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 34 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 37. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 35 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 38. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 36 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 39. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 37 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 40. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 38 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 41. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 39 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 42. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 40 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 43. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 41 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 44. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 42 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 45. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 43 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 46. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 44 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 47. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 45 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 48. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 46 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 49. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 47 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 50. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 48 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 51. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 49 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 52. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 50 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 53. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 51 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 54. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 52 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 55. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 53 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 56. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 54 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 57. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 55 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 58. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 56 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 59. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 57 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 60. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 58 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 61. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 59 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 62. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 60 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 63. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 61 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 64. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 62 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 65. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 63 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 66. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 64 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 67. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 65 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 68. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 66 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 69. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 67 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 70. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 68 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 71. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 69 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 72. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 70 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 73. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 71 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 74. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 72 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 75. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 73 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 76. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 74 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 77. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 75 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 78. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 76 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 79. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 77 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 80. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 78 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 81. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 79 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 82. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 80 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 83. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 81 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 84. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 82 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 85. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 83 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 86. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 84 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 87. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 85 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 88. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 86 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 89. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 87 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 90. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 88 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 91. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 89 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 92. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 90 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 93. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 91 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 94. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 92 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 95. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 93 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 96. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 94 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 97. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 95 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 98. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 96 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 99. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 97 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 100. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 98 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 101. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 99 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.
 102. THE TOTAL AREA OF LOT 100 IS 100,000 SQUARE FEET OR 2.28 ACRES.




FOR DISCUSSION 06.09.24

D. Specht

169,540 01
 1,000 sq ft
 1,000 sq ft
 MT NMC 2000: E

Handwritten signature

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10



NOTES
 1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO CENTERLINE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 2. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO CENTERLINE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 3. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO CENTERLINE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

FOR DISCUSSION - 06.09.24



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
 LAND SURVEYORS & ENGINEERS
 100 FORTUNE STREET, SUITE 101
 WILSON, BC V9A 1A1


NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
 LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Handwritten notes:
 100
 10/10/24



AFFECTED PERSON'S APPROVAL



FORM 8A

Resource Management Act 1991 Section 95

RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICANT'S NAME AND/OR RM

David Stretch & Colleen Flemmer

AFFECTED PERSON'S DETAILS

I/We Mark Weldon

Are the owners/occupiers of
Lot 2 Deposited Plan 461855

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

I/We hereby give written approval for the proposal to:
Undertake a two lot subdivision of 298 Crown Range Road, as per the attached plans.
The proposal also includes variations to conditions of Consent Notice 6587109.3 & Covenant 9490097.1 to vary the conditions relating to future subdivisions, as they relate to the subject site. For the purpose of clarity, the variation only relates to this proposed subdivision, and, for clarity, conditions restricting future subdivision on the resultant lots will be reimposed, ~~and~~ and this APA

at the following subject site(s):
298 Crown Range Road

- PLEASE TICK I/We understand that by signing this form Council, when considering this application, will not consider any effects of the proposal upon me/us.
- PLEASE TICK I/We understand that if the consent authority determines the activity is a deemed permitted boundary activity under section 87BA of the Act, written approval cannot be withdrawn if this process is followed instead.

WHAT INFORMATION/PLANS HAVE YOU SIGHTED

PLEASE TICK I/We have sighted and initialled ALL plans dated and approve them. See attached



APPROVAL OF AFFECTED PERSON(S)

The written consent of all owners / occupiers who are affected. If the site that is affected is jointly owned, the written consent of all co-owners (names detailed on the title for the site) are required.

A	Name (PRINT) Mark Weldon	
	Contact Phone / Email address mark@terrasancta.co.nz	
	Signature 	Date Jan 10, 2025


B	Name (PRINT)	
	Contact Phone / Email address	
	Signature	Date

C	Name (PRINT)	
	Contact Phone / Email address	
	Signature	Date

D	Name (PRINT)	
	Contact Phone / Email address	
	Signature	Date

Note to person signing written approval

Conditional written approvals cannot be accepted.
 There is no obligation to sign this form, and no reasons need to be given.
 If this form is not signed, the application may be notified with an opportunity for submissions.
 If signing on behalf of a trust or company, please provide additional written evidence that you have signing authority.





FOR DISCUSSION - 03.09.2

CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
ENGINEERS ARCHITECTS
QUERQUENON | DUNEDIN | CHRISTCHURCH | GORE

Tel: (03) 441 6644, Email: enq@cfm.co.nz, www.cfm.co.nz 301 Leaver Drive, P.O. Box 550 Queenstown
S:\103165001\16540\16540-01_Crown Range Subdivision_4Scheme Plan_REV2.dwg

Rev	Date	Revised Details	By
C	07/03/24	Sheet Added	UH

298 CROWN RANGE ROAD SUBDIVISION
LOTS 1 & 2 BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 DP 461855

Client: **D. Stretch**

NO DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE IN ACTION UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE. THESE PLANS CONTAIN MECHANICAL DRAWINGS AND OTHER DATA ACCEPTED BY THE ENGINEER OR ARCHITECT FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE DESIGN. THE ENGINEER OR ARCHITECT IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE DATA PROVIDED TO THEM WITHOUT RECORDING AND CHECKING THAT THE DATA IS CORRECT. THE ENGINEER OR ARCHITECT IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE DATA PROVIDED TO THEM WITHOUT RECORDING AND CHECKING THAT THE DATA IS CORRECT.

STATUS	DATE
SUBMITTED	
DESIGNED	
DRAWN	14
CHECKED	
APPROVED	

JOB NO	DRAWING NO	SHEET NO
16540	01	02
Scale		1:500 @ A1
Scale		1:1000 @ A3
Date of Issue		MT NIC 2000
Date of Issue		E