

Submissions on Urban Intensification District Plan Variation

Topic: Medium Density and Business Mixed Use Provisions of Urban Intensification Variation

Submitter Name: Varina Pty Ltd, submission no. 1038

1.0 Matters to Discuss

- Submitter supports overall intention of proposed variation and associated provision changes to Medium Density (MDR) and Business Mixed Use Zones however believes these have not gone far enough.
- Specifically, within the MDR zone, the increase in height standard and recognition of three-storeyed typologies is supported.
- The submission sought to encourage an increase building coverage provision in MDR from 45% to 55%. This change was rejected in Council's recommendation reporting for the following reasons:
 - Existing coverage provision provides for typologies (according to Mr Wallace); and
 - Enables space between buildings and more meaningful landscaping in development.
- Submitter wishes to emphasise that the building coverage provision with the MDR zone should be increased for the following reasons:
 - Of all the Medium Density Zoned land resource, the current provision permits only 45% of this area for buildings (an urban land resource, zoned for urban development, yet 55% cannot without resource consenting be utilised);
 - It seems illogical and incongruous that, in seeking to intensify development, over half of MDR zoned resource is not available for permitted building occupation;
 - In terms of District Plan hierarchy, the Low Density Zone allows 40% coverage and High Density Zone allows 70%. Our request of 55% is consistent with that hierarchical progression;

- In Wanaka there is a relatively large area of historic 1000 - 1012m² MDR zoned sites (i.e. Brownston / Upton / Warren and Tenby Street). An increase from 45% to 55% coverage would allow an additional 100m² of permitted ground floor development. This for example, could accommodate an extra two-bedroom unit/flat or multiple garages for parking thereby delivering tangible additional housing capacity and practical outcomes;
- Without an increase in coverage, intensification in MDR is being forced upwards, which is the most expensive and prohibitive form of development. This approach will reduce developer uptake and undermine the effectiveness of the intensification variation. In sum, Council will restrict the most cost-effective building solutions (ground floor development) in favour of cost prohibitive multi level buildings (requiring engineering, fire and structural and more generally greater costs) which is likely to lead to land owners being deterred from providing building intensification in favour of land banking. This will be counter productive to the intent of the Urban Intensification Plan Change.

Topic: Rezoning of MDR to HDR at 110 & 124 Wanaka-Luggate Highway
Removal of BRA along Golf Course boundary
MDR zoning provisions

Submitter Name: Roger Moseby, Marilyn Frances Gordon & Susan Robertson,
submission no. 1039

2.0 Matters to Discuss

- Submitter proposed the re-zoning of 110 & 124 Wanaka-Luggate Highway to be High Density instead of Medium Density due to prime location (proximity to services and amenities) and surrounding zoning. This change is supported by Council.
- Submitter proposed the removal of the BRA running along the Golf Course boundary. Council did not give a definitive recommendation on this.
- The submitter maintains that the BRA should be removed due to the allowance of better High Density outcomes.

- The BRA was originally put in place for active transport connection through to Mt Iron and it was recognised within PDP Stage 3 hearings that this buffer was not necessary, and removal would be preferable. This submission seeks this removal.
- Even if there were merit in this active transport connection, this will never come to fruition due to multiple property ownership and related timing. No developer wishes to create an access which meets a dead end (with no easements there is no ability to ensure completion).
- There is no legal easement/mechanism to enforce such an outcome. As a result, the intended linkage is highly unlikely to ever be realised however, due to the identification of the area as a BRA, will ultimately restrict built form outcomes, carrying a Non-Complying Activity Status for development within.
- This area to be lost to intensification outcomes is not insignificant. The BRA encumbers a large area of 110 Wanaka-Luggate Highway. For reference, the strip of BRA is approximately 16-20m in width. This equates to around 3800m² of area encumbered by the BRA upon 110 Wanaka-Luggate Highway. Less the 2m building setback (376m²), and accounting for 70% building coverage, this leads to potential loss of 2396m² of building area (also enabling multiple levels above). For example, being that 100m² comfortably achieves a 2-bedroom apartment, this could be 23 apartments at ground floor level alone and closer to 50 apartments if accounting for the proposed zoning (High Density) maximum height provisions..

Topic:

Rezoning of MDR to HDR at 27 Ballantyne Road
 Removal of BRA along Golf Course boundary
 Removal of triangular BRA in western area of 27 Ballantyne Road
 MDR zoning provisions

Submitter Name: Canterbury Helicopters Ltd no. 1040

3.0 Matters to Discuss

- As above, the submitter proposed the re-zoning of 27 Ballantyne Road to be High Density instead of Medium Density due to location and surrounding zoning. This change is supported by Council.

- Submitter proposed the removal of the BRA running along the Golf Course boundary. Council did not give a definitive recommendation on this.
- The submitter maintains that the BRA should be removed due to the allowance of better High Density outcomes for reasoning stated above.
- Specifically at 27 Ballantyne Road, a triangular wedge-shaped area is subject to a BRA. The background to this restriction is unclear. It appears to have been carried over from the Operative District Plan, which referred to “reserve over terminal moraine” and “stormwater treatment,” likely based on a broad geological assessment – there is no easement for any third party to utilise or develop this land for any such purpose.
- While the site does contain some low-lying depressions, it is not identified in QLDC GIS flooding or hazard mapping layers.
- We acknowledge that no site-specific engineering reporting has been provided at this stage. On that basis, we accept that the area could reasonably remain subject to a BRA. However, the current non-complying activity status is not fit for purpose.
- Instead, we submit that a site-specific rule should apply, providing for buildings within the BRA to be a Restricted Discretionary Activity, with Council’s discretion limited to stormwater management.