

Details of submitter719

Submitter:	Tony MacColl
Submitter Address:	PO Box 5245, Dunedin, Moray Place, New Zealand
Organisation:	NZ Transport Agency



## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

### Submission on Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan

To: Queenstown Lakes District Council  
Private Bag 50072  
**QUEENSTOWN 9348**

Submitter: NZ Transport Agency  
PO Box 5245  
Moray Place  
**DUNEDIN 9058**

#### **This is a submission on the following:**

Proposed District Plan.

**The NZ Transport Agency Could Not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

#### **The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:**

The proposed District Plan in its entirety.

#### **The NZ Transport Agency's submission is:**

Please see the table attached to this submission for recommended adjustments.

#### **The reasons for this submission are:**

The Transport Agency's statutory objective is to carry out its functions in a way that contributes to an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system. Some of these functions relevant in this case are:

- to promote an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system
- to manage the State highway system in accordance with the relevant legislation; and
- to assist, advise, and co-operate with approved organisations (such as regional councils and territorial authorities).

In submitting on this proposed District Plan, the Transport Agency is pursuing these objectives and functions in relation to the land transport system, including the State highway system, and contributing to the objectives of the New Zealand Transport Strategy.

#### **NZ Transport Agency wishes the consent authority to:**

The proposed District Plan be confirmed subject to adjustments as outlined in the attached table.

**The NZ Transport Agency does** wish to be heard in support of this submission.

The NZ Transport Agency would not consider presenting a joint case with others presenting similar submissions.

Dated at Dunedin this 23 day of October 2015.



**Tony MacColl**

Senior Planning Advisor

Pursuant to a delegation from  
the Chairman and the Board  
of the NZ Transport Agency

**Address for Service:**

NZ Transport Agency

PO Box 5245

Moray Place

**DUNEDIN 9058**

Phone: (03) 951 3009

Facsimile: (03) 951 3013

## NZ Transport Agency Submission

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>1 – Introduction</b>		
<b>Designations 1.7.5</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>We oppose this section being included in the proposed District Plan. We suggest the additional information requests reflects a resource consenting approach as opposed to a NOR for a Designation. We suggest this additional information is unnecessary to make a recommendation on a Notice of Requirement under Section 168 of the RMA.</p>	Delete Designations 1.7.5 from the Introduction Chapter.
<b>2 – Definitions</b>		
<b>SH6 Roundabout Works</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>We oppose this definition. The particular works described in this definition are part of a Notice of Requirement. It is inappropriate for these works to be listed in the Definition Section of the District Plan.</p>	Delete the definition 'SH6 Roundabout Works'.
<b>Utility</b>	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We note that different structures associated with many different Utility Operators are included in this definition. We suggest that structures associated with land transport should also be included to assist plan users. We therefore suggest an additional bullet point should be added to the definition of Utility as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“structures for transport on land by cycleways, rail, roads, walkways, or any other means.”</li> </ul>	<p>Amend the definition of 'Utility' by adding the bullet point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“<u>structures for transport on land by cycleways, rail, roads, walkways, or any other means.</u>”</li> </ul>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>3 – Strategic Direction</b>		
<b>3.1 Purpose</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compact and connected settlements that encourage public transport, biking and walking</li> </ul>	<b>Support</b> We support outlining the strategic direction for the management of growth, particularly the importance placed on having compact and well connected communities that encourage alternative modes of transport.	Retain 3.1 Purpose as proposed.
<b>Objective 3.2.1.5</b>	<b>Support</b> We support this policy as it recognises the importance of maintaining the functionality of infrastructure.	Retain Objective 3.2.1.5 as proposed.
<b>3.2.2 Goal</b> – The strategic and integrated management of urban growth	<b>Support</b> We support the intent to manage urban growth in an integrated way. This will ensure land use and transport decisions are made and implemented together.	Retain 3.2.2 Goal as proposed.
<b>Objective 3.2.2.1</b>	<b>Support and Amend</b> We support this objective which is encouraging urban development in a logical integrated urban form. We suggest this promotes the efficient use of physical resources such as infrastructure compared with ad hoc development which can adversely affect the efficiency of infrastructure. We also suggest the 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point of this objective should be amended by removing reference to ‘ <i>Council infrastructure</i> ’ as urban development can also affect infrastructure provided by other requiring authorities’.	Amend Objective 3.2.2.1 to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>to manage the cost of Council infrastructure; and</i></li> </ul>
<b>Policy 3.2.2.1.1</b>	<b>Support</b> We support the use of urban growth boundaries as they encourage urban growth developing in a planned and strategic way. This encourages good environmental outcomes and helps avoid costs associated with	Retain Policy 3.2.2.1.1 as proposed.



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
	unplanned infrastructure improvements and extension.	
<b>Policy 3.2.2.1.2</b>	<b>Support</b> We support the use of urban growth boundaries as they encourage urban growth developing in a planned and strategic way. This encourages good environmental outcomes and helps avoid costs associated with unplanned infrastructure improvements and extension.	Retain Policy 3.2.2.1.2 as proposed.
<b>Policy 3.2.2.1.3</b>	<b>Support</b> We support the management of urban growth by ensuring it is well connected and integrated. We also support the promotion of an efficient transport network that is integrated with alternative transport modes. This can reduce the need for new or additional infrastructure.	Retain Policy 3.2.2.1.3 as proposed
<b>Policy 3.2.4.8.1</b>	<b>Support</b> We support concentrating development and the promotion of public transport as this can have the additional benefit of promoting sustainable use of physical resources e.g. infrastructure.	Retain Policy 3.2.4.8.1 as proposed.
<b>4 – Urban Development</b>		
<b>4.1 Purpose</b>	<b>Support</b> We agree with the statements that the roading network of the District is under some pressure and that providing low density residential development in remote locations will make matters worse. We also agree that uncontrolled urban development can result in urban sprawl and a poorly coordinated infrastructure network. We support the use of urban growth boundaries as a tool to manage anticipated growth.	Retain 4.1 Purpose as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
4.2.1 Objective	<b>Support and Amend</b> Coordinating urban development with infrastructure is beneficial as it can provide good environmental outcomes and it helps avoid costs associated with unplanned infrastructure improvements and extension. We suggest the objective should be amended to replace the word 'coordinated' with 'integrated' which we consider to be a better term when considering the combined management of development and infrastructure.	Retain 4.2.1 Objective but amend to read as follows: <i>"Urban development is <del>coordinated</del> <u>integrated</u> with infrastructure and services and is undertaken....."</i>
Policy 4.2.1.2	<b>Support</b> We support the integration of urban development with infrastructure. The Transport Agency operate under a large planning window (up to 30 years) given the overall capital investment involved in maintaining and upgrading the State highway network. The NZ Transport Agency's task of planning infrastructure for the future is enhanced by development occurring as anticipated by District Plans.	Retain Policy 4.2.1.2 as proposed.
Policy 4.2.1.4	<b>Support</b> We support the use of alternative modes of transport and encourage well connected developments. We support this policy as it provides for transport choices.	Retain Policy 4.2.1.4 as proposed.
Policy 4.2.1.5	<b>Support</b> We support this policy as it promotes the development of compact urban settlements. Urban sprawl can adversely affect the safety, functionality and efficiency of transport networks.	Retain Policy 4.2.1.5 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 4.2.1.6	<b>Amend</b> We agree that sporadic urban development should be avoided to assist the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. We suggest this policy should be amended to include effects on the efficiency and functionality of transport networks.	Amend Policy 4.2.1.6 as follows: <i>"Avoid sporadic urban development that would adversely affect the natural environment, <u>the efficiency and functionality of infrastructure</u>, rural amenity or landscape values; or compromise the viability of a nearby township."</i>
4.2.2 Objective	<b>Support</b> We support the use of urban growth boundaries as they encourage urban growth developing in a planned and strategic way. This encourages good environmental outcomes and helps avoid costs associated with unplanned infrastructure improvements and extension.	Retain 4.2.2 Objective as proposed.
Policies 4.2.2.1	<b>Support</b> We support this policy as it clearly recognises that urban growth should not occur outside of the defined urban boundaries. The task of planning infrastructure for the future is enhanced by development occurring as anticipated by District Plans.	Retain Policy 4.2.2.1 as proposed.
4.2.3 Objective	<b>Support</b> We support the promotion of an integrated urban form to maximise the efficient use of infrastructure.	Retain 4.2.3 Objective as proposed.



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 4.2.3.1	<b>Support and Amend</b> This policy promotes the efficient and sustainable use of infrastructure, and active transport networks. This policy also promotes connectivity and integration. We suggest 'integration' in the first bullet point should be expanded to encompass transport and development which reflects what we think the policy is trying to achieve.	Amend Policy 4.2.3.1 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>connectivity and integration of land use and transport</i></li> </ul>
Policy 4.2.3.4	<b>Support</b> There are significant environmental advantages in utilising existing infrastructure. It also makes sense to maximise the benefits from existing investment in infrastructure.	Retain Policy 4.2.3.4 as proposed.
Policy 4.2.4.1	<b>Support and Amend</b> We support the management of the spatial growth of Queenstown. We suggest the 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet point should be amended to ensure land use is integrated with transport networks.	Amend Policy 4.2.4.1 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>land use and transport networks are integrated and the viability of public and active transport is improved</i></li> </ul>
Policy 4.2.4.2	<b>Support</b> We support maximising the efficiency of existing infrastructure networks.	Support Policy 4.2.4.2 as proposed.
4.2.6 Objective	<b>Support</b> We support the use of urban growth boundaries as a means of managing the scale and location of urban growth. We also support the proposed urban growth boundaries for Wanaka.	Support 4.2.6 Objective

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 4.2.6.1	<b>Support</b> We support this policy as ad hoc development can lead to unsustainable use of resources. We support development occurring in a planned and strategic way as it provides good environmental outcomes and it helps avoid costs associated with unplanned infrastructure improvements and extension.	Support Policy 4.2.6.1
Policy 4.2.6.2	<b>Support</b> We support maximising the efficiency of existing infrastructure. We also support urban growth developing in a planned and strategic way as it provides good environmental outcomes and it helps avoid costs associated with unplanned infrastructure improvements and extension. For these reasons we support this policy.	Support Policy 4.2.6.2
<b>6 – Landscapes</b>		
Policy 6.3.1.5	<b>Support</b> The Transport Agency operate under a large planning window (up to 30 years) given the overall capital investment involved in maintaining and upgrading the State highway network. The NZ Transport Agency's task of planning infrastructure for the future is enhanced by development occurring as anticipated by District Plans.	Retain Policy 6.3.1.5 as proposed.
Policy 6.3.2.3	<b>Support</b> Urban sprawl can adversely affect the safety, efficiency and functionality of State highways	Retain Policy 6.3.2.3 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 6.3.5.5	<b>Support</b> Multiple single accesses can adversely affect the safety, efficiency and functionality of the State highway. For this reason we support the promotion of shared accesses.	Retain Policy 6.3.5.5 as proposed.
<b>7 – Low Density Residential</b>		
Policy 7.2.1.1	<b>Support</b> We support this policy as it requires development to locate in areas serviced by infrastructure and consideration of the capacity of infrastructure networks. This promotes the sustainable use of infrastructure.	Retain Policy 7.2.1.1 as proposed.
7.2.7 Objective	<b>Support</b> We support encouraging development to efficiently utilise existing infrastructure and minimise effects on infrastructure and roading networks. This can reduce the need for infrastructure upgrades and new infrastructure.	Retain 7.2.7 Objective as proposed.
Policy 7.2.7.3	<b>Amend</b> We support this policy but suggest development should be integrated with all transport networks and not just active transport networks.	Amend Policy 7.2.7.3 as follows: <i>Development is integrated with <u>all transport networks</u>, and improves connections to, public transport services and active transport networks (tracks, trails, walkways and cycleways).</i>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
7.2.10 Objective	<b>Amend</b> Add an additional policy to recognise potential reverse sensitivity effects from State highway traffic noise.	Add an additional policy to 7.2.10 Objective as follows: <i>7.2.10.3 <u>Ensure all new and altered buildings for residential and other noise sensitive activities (including community uses) located within the State highway road noise effects area are designed to meet internal sound levels of AS/NZ 2107:2000</u></i>
Rule 7.4.10.2	<b>Amend</b> We suggest it is appropriate to reserve discretion over parking and access, safety, efficiency and impacts to on-street parking but suggest the rule should be amended to specify the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road.	Amend Rule 7.4.10.2 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Parking and access: safety; <u>and efficiency of the roading network</u>, and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours</i></li> </ul>
Rule 7.4.22	<b>Amend</b> We suggest it is appropriate to reserve control over parking and access, safety, efficiency and impacts to on-street parking but suggest the rule should be amended to specify the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road.	Amend Rule 7.4.22 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Parking and access: safety; <u>and efficiency of the roading network</u>, and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours</i></li> </ul>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Rule 7.5.9</b>	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We suggest an additional rule be added to address potential reverse sensitivity effects from State highway traffic noise for those noise sensitive activities that locate within the road noise effects area.</p>	<p>Add an additional Rule 7.5.9.3 as follows:</p> <p><u>7.5.9.3 Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, located within:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of 70km/h and greater, or</u></li> <li>• <u>40 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of less than 70 km/h.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Shall be designed, constructed and maintained to ensure that the internal noise levels do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ2107:2000.</u></p>
<b>Rule 7.6.1</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that visitor accommodation is a controlled activity with control reserved over parking and access, safety and efficiency. For proposed visitor accommodation requiring access to a State highway, it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 7.6.1 to read as follows:</p> <p><u>Applications for Controlled activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified-, except for</u></p> <p><u>7.6.1.1 visitor accommodation adjacent to the State highway where the road controlling authority shall be deemed an affected party.</u></p>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rule 7.6.2	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that residential development is a restricted discretionary activity with discretion restricted to parking and access, safety and efficiency. For proposed residential development requiring access to a State highway, it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 7.6.2.1 as follows:</p> <p><i>Residential development, except for residential development adjacent to the State highway where the road controlling authority shall be deemed an affected party.</i></p>
<b>8 – Medium Density Residential</b>		
Policy 8.2.5.1	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We support the promotion of alternative modes of transport.</p>	Retain Policy 8.2.5.1 as proposed.
8.2.7 Objective	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We support encouraging development to efficiently utilise existing infrastructure and minimise effects on infrastructure and roading networks. This can reduce the need for infrastructure upgrades and new infrastructure.</p>	Retain 8.2.7 Objective as proposed.
Policy 8.2.7.2	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We support the policy requiring medium density development to consider the capacity of infrastructure networks. However, we suggest the policy should be reworded to reflect those specific capacity matters that need to be considered.</p>	<p>Amend 8.2.7.2 as follows:</p> <p><i>.....trail/trail networks, and is designed in a manner consistent with the capacity to ensure that it does not adversely affect the safety, efficiency and functionality of infrastructure networks.</i></p>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 8.2.7.3	<b>Amend</b> This policy should be amended to clarify what outcome is required.	Amend Policy 8.2.7.3 to read as follows: <i>Access and parking is located and designed to <del>optimise</del> <u>maintain the</u> efficiency and safety of the transport network and minimise impacts to on-street parking.</i>
Policy 8.2.9.2	<b>Amend</b> This policy as worded is trying to address noise, vehicle access and parking effects on residential areas. We suggest that these same effects can affect the transport networks and should be included.	Amend 8.2.9.2 to read as follows: <i>Visitor accommodation shall be designed in a manner to <del>limit</del> <u>mitigate the adverse effects on residential areas</u> associated with noise, vehicle access and parking on <u>transport networks and residential areas</u>.</i>
Policy 8.2.9.3	<b>Support</b> We support the promotion of alternative modes of transport.	Retain Policy 8.2.9.3 as proposed.
8.2.11 Objective	<b>Support</b> We are ambivalent about the rezoning of the land on the north side of SH6 between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive to Medium Density Residential. However, if it is to be rezoned then we consider it imperative that the adverse traffic effects associated with medium density residential development on State Highway 6 (SH6) are minimised.	If this area of land is to be re-zoned Medium Density Residential then this policy should be retained as proposed.
Policy 8.2.11.2	<b>Support</b> We support this policy which recognises that storm water associated with development should not adversely affect SH6.	Retain Policy 8.2.11.2 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Policy 8.2.11.4</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We support this policy that proposes to avoid new State highway accesses in this complex roading environment.</p> <p>We also support the two notes at the bottom of this policy. One which requires developers to consult with the road controlling authority regarding road network designs. The other note highlights the need to obtain s93 notices for subdivisions adjacent to this section of SH6 which is a requirement under the Government Roding Powers Act 1989.</p>	Retain Policy 8.2.11.4 and the advice notes as proposed.
<b>Policy 8.2.11.5</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We suggest that it is important that this road is constructed to a standard that is fit for purpose as it could potentially serve an important connector function within the transport network.</p>	Retain Policy 8.2.11.5 as proposed.
<b>Policy 8.2.11.6</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We support the promotion of alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>We also support the requirement to consult with the Transport Agency regarding this policy as the links and facilities need to be integrated into the State highway network.</p>	Retain Policy 8.2.11.6 as proposed.
<b>8.2.13 Objective</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We support this objective as it recognises that measures need to be taken when incompatible land uses are located in close proximity to each other.</p>	Retain 8.2.13 Objective as proposed.
<b>Policies 8.2.13.1</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We suggest the proposed policy is appropriate as it will reduce potential conflict and protect amenity values of properties adjacent to State highways.</p>	Retain Policy 8.2.13.1 as proposed.



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Rule 8.4.11.2</b>	<p><b>Support and Amend</b></p> <p>We support the requirement of a traffic impact assessment and its linkage with Rule 8.5.3 as a change in land use in this location has the potential to adversely affect the State highway.</p> <p>We suggest it is appropriate to reserve discretion over parking and access, safety, efficiency and impacts to on-street parking but suggest the rule should be amended to specify the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road.</p>	<p>Retain Policy 8.4.11.2 with the following amendment to the 7<sup>th</sup> bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Parking and access: safety, <u>and efficiency of the roading network</u>, and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours</i></li> </ul>
<b>Rule 8.4.23</b>	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We suggest it is appropriate to reserve control over parking and access, safety, efficiency and impacts to on-street parking but suggest the rule should be amended to specify the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 8.4.23 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Parking and access: safety, <u>and efficiency of the roading network</u>, and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours</i></li> </ul>
<b>Rule 8.4.26</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>Commercial Activities should not be a Permitted Activity in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Commercial Activities by definition can have varied and significant effects and the most appropriate way to manage these is via activity status. This activity status should be changed.</p>	<p>Change the activity status of Rule 8.4.26 to Non-complying.</p>
<b>Rule 8.4.28</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>This rule prescribes Visitor Accommodation as a Controlled Activity while Rule 8.4.23 does the same. However, both Rules have different matters over which Control is reserved. We suggest this rule should be deleted and other matters, if appropriate, added to Rule 8.4.23.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 8.4.28</p>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rules – Standard 8.5.2	<p><b>Support and Amend</b></p> <p>We suggest this standard will assist in mitigating potential reverse sensitivity effects associated with State highway traffic noise. However, we suggest this rule is applicable to all buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise adjacent to all state highways, not just the section between Lake Hayes and Frankton on SH6.</p>	<p>Amend Rules – Standard 8.5.2 as follows:</p> <p>8.5.2.1 <i>For buildings located within 80m of <u>a State Highway 6</u> <del>between Hansen Road and the Shotover River</del></i></p> <p><i>Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, and located within 80 metres of <u>the seal edge of a State Highway 6</u> <del>between Lake Hayes and Frankton</del> shall be designed, <u>constructed and maintained to meet ensure</u> that the internal noise levels <u>do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ2107:2000.</u></i></p>
Rules – Standard 8.5.3	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We support the controls that are proposed under this standard as it will ensure the safety, efficiency and functionality of SH6 is not compromised by development of the land fronting the State highway between Hansen Road and Ferry Hill Drive.</p>	Retain Rules – Standard 8.5.3
Rules – Standard 8.5.3.1a	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We suggest an amendment to ensure the proposed roading connections are accurately described.</p>	<p>Amend Rules – Standard 8.5.3.1a as follows:</p> <p><i>a Ensures connections to the State highway network are only via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access <u>Road</u> Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive</i></p>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rules – Standard 8.5.3.2	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We suggest a major concern with development on the northern side of SH6 in this location is addressing how pedestrian connectivity will be provided. It is reasonable to expect a significant number of pedestrians living on one side of the State highway will want to walk to the commercial activities located on the other side of the State highway. This potentially significant safety impact requires more detailed assessment at the time of consenting.</p>	<p>Add another traffic impact assessment matter to Rules – Standard 8.5.3.2 as follows:</p> <p><u>g Integration with pedestrian and cycling networks, particularly the cross SH6 connections.</u></p>
Rules – Standard 8.5.3.2c	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We suggest an amendment to ensure the proposed roading connections are accurately described.</p>	<p>Amend Rules – Standard 8.5.3.2c as follows:</p> <p><i>c. An access network design via Hansen Road, the Eastern Access Road Roundabout, and/or Ferry Hill Drive, and the avoidance of any new access to the State highway network</i></p>
Rules – Standard 8.5.8.1	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We suggest the setback from State highways is too small. We suggest this should be increased to improve the amenity of residents in this zone and reflect the setback requirements of the Low Density residential Zone.</p>	<p>Amend Rules – Standard 8.5.8.1 as follows:</p> <p><i>8.5.8.1 Road boundary setback: 3m, except for state highway boundaries which shall be 4.5m.</i></p>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rule 8.6.1	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that visitor accommodation is a controlled activity with control reserved over parking and access, safety and efficiency. For proposed visitor accommodation requiring access to a State highway, it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 8.6.1 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>Applications for Controlled activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified, except for</i></p> <p><u>8.6.1.1 visitor accommodation adjacent to the State highway where the road controlling authority shall be deemed an affected party.</u></p>
<b>9 – High Density Residential</b>		
9.2.6 Objective	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We support encouraging development to efficiently utilise existing infrastructure and minimise effects on infrastructure and roading networks. This can reduce the need for infrastructure upgrades and new infrastructure.</p>	Retain 9.2.6 Objective as proposed.
Policy 9.2.6.2	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We support the promotion of alternative modes of transport.</p>	Retain Policy 9.2.6.2 as proposed
Policy 9.2.6.4	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>This policy should be amended to clarify what outcome is required.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 9.2.6.4 as follows:</p> <p><i>Ensure access and parking is located and designed to optimise <u>the</u> connectivity, efficiency and safety <u>of the transport network</u>.</i></p>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Objective 9.2.7</b>	<b>Add a new Objective 9.2.7</b> We suggest a new objective should be added, similar to 8.2.13 of the Medium Density Residential Zone, to manage reverse sensitivity effects.	Add a new Objective 9.2.7 as follows: <u>9.2.7 Objective – Manage the development of land within noise affected environments to ensure mitigation of noise and reverse sensitivity effects.</u>
<b>Policy 9.2.7.1</b>	<b>Add a new Policy 9.2.7.1</b> We suggest a new Policy should be added to manage reverse sensitivity effects in the High Density Residential Zone.	Add a new Policy 9.2.7.1 as follows: <u>9.2.7.1 All new and altered buildings for residential and other noise sensitive activities (including community uses) located within 80m of the State highway shall be designed to meet internal sound levels of AS/NZ 2107:2000.</u>
<b>Rule 9.4.4</b>	<b>Amend</b> We suggest it is appropriate to reserve discretion over parking and access, safety and efficiency but suggest the rule should be amended to specify the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road.	Amend Rule 9.4.4 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Parking and access arrangements and the safety and efficiency of the roading network.</u></li> </ul>
<b>Rule 9.4.6</b>	<b>Oppose</b> These Commercial Activities should not be a Permitted Activity in the High Density Residential Zone. Commercial Activities by definition can have varied and significant effects and the most appropriate way to manage these is via activity status. This activity status should be changed.	Change the activity status of Rule 9.4.6 to Restricted Discretionary or full Discretionary.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Rule 9.4.9</b>	<b>Amend</b> We suggest it is appropriate to reserve control over parking and access, safety, efficiency and impacts on on-street parking but suggest the rule should be amended to specify the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road.	Amend Rule 9.4.9 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Parking and access: safety, and efficiency of the roading network, and impacts to on-street parking and neighbours</i></li> </ul>
<b>Rule 9.4.10</b>	<b>Amend</b> We suggest it is appropriate to reserve discretion over parking and access, safety, efficiency and impacts on on-street parking but suggest the rule should be amended to specify the safety and efficiency of the adjacent road.	Amend Rule 9.4.10 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Parking and access arrangements: safety, and efficiency of the roading network, and potential impacts on-neighbours' amenity and on-street parking.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Rule 9.5.9.1</b>	<b>Amend</b> We suggest the setback from State highways is too small. We suggest this should be increased to improve the amenity of residents in this zone and reflect the setback requirements of the Low Density Residential Zone.	Amend Rule 9.5.9.1 as follows: <i>9.5.9.1 Road boundary setback: 2m, except for state highway boundaries which shall be 4.5m.</i>
<b>Add a new Rule 9.5.9.3</b>	<b>Add a new Rule 9.5.9.3</b> We suggest an additional rule be added to address potential reverse sensitivity effects from State highway traffic noise for those noise sensitive activities that locate within the road noise effects area.	Add an additional Rule 9.5.9.3 as follows: <i>9.5.9.3 Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, located within 80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway shall be designed, constructed and maintained to ensure that the internal noise levels do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ2107:2000.</i>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<p><b>Rule 9.6.1</b></p>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that visitor accommodation is a controlled activity with control reserved over parking and access, safety and efficiency. For proposed visitor accommodation requiring access to a State highway, it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 9.6.1 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>Applications for Controlled activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified., except for</i></p> <p><u>9.6.1.1 visitor accommodation adjacent to the State highway where the road controlling authority shall be deemed an affected party.</u></p>
<p><b>Rule 9.6.2</b></p>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that residential development and some visitor accommodation are restricted discretionary activities with discretion restricted to parking and access, safety and efficiency. For those activities requiring access to a State highway, it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 9.6.2 to read as follows:</p> <p><u>9.6.2.1 Residential development involving the development of 4 or more dwellings that do not require direct access to a State highway.</u></p> <p><u>9.6.2.2 Visitor accommodation that does not require direct access to a State highway.</u></p>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>11 – Large Lot Residential</b>		
<i>Add a new Objective 11.2.3</i>	<b>Add a new Objective 11.2.3</b> We suggest a new objective should be added, similar to 8.2.13 of the Medium Density Residential Zone, to manage reverse sensitivity effects.	Add a new Objective 11.2.3 as follows: <u>11.2.3 Objective – Manage the development of land within noise affected environments to ensure mitigation of noise and reverse sensitivity effects.</u>
<i>Add a new Policy 11.2.3.1</i>	<b>Add a new Policy 11.2.3.1</b> We suggest a new Policy should be added to manage reverse sensitivity effects in the High Density Residential Zone.	Add a policy to 7.2.10 Objective as follows: <u>11.2.3.1 All new and altered buildings for residential and other noise sensitive activities (including community uses) located within the State highway noise effects area shall be designed to meet internal sound levels of AS/NZ 2107:2000.</u>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Rule 11.5.4</b>	<p><b>Add a new Rule 11.5.4.1</b></p> <p>We suggest an additional rule be added to address potential reverse sensitivity effects from State highway traffic noise for those noise sensitive activities that locate within the road noise effects area.</p>	<p>Add a new Rule 11.5.4.1 as follows:</p> <p><u>11.5.4.1 For buildings located adjacent to a State highway.</u></p> <p><u>Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, located within:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of 70km/h and greater, or</u></li> <li>• <u>40 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of less than 70 km/h.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Shall be designed, constructed and maintained to ensure that the internal noise levels do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ2107:2000.</u></p>
<b>12 – Queenstown Town Centre</b>		
<b>Policy 12.2.4.1</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>The encouragement of multi modal transport use with a reduction in vehicle use promotes the sustainable use of the transport networks.</p>	Retain Policy 12.2.4.1 as proposed.
<b>Policy 12.2.4.2</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>A compact town centre with a network of pedestrian linkages contributes to the sustainable management of the transport network.</p>	Retain Policy 12.2.4.2 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 12.2.4.4	<b>Support</b> This policy will contribute to the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 12.2.4.4 as proposed.
Policy 12.2.4.5	<b>Support</b> This policy will contribute to the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 12.2.4.5 as proposed.
Policy 12.2.4.6	<b>Amend</b> Traffic issues associated with visitor accommodation can affect more than just pedestrians and cyclists, i.e. they can also affect the safety and efficiency and functionality of the roading network	Amend Policy 12.2.4.6 to read as follows: <i>Encourage visitor accommodation to be located and designed in a manner that minimises traffic issues that may otherwise affect the <u>safety, efficiency and functionality of the roading network</u>, and the <u>safety and amenity of pedestrian and cyclists</u>, particularly in peak periods.</i>
Rule 12.4.2	<b>Amend</b> This rule should be expanded to include the safety and efficiency of the roading network.	Amend Rule 12.4.2 to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The location, provision, and screening of access and parking, traffic generation, and travel demand management, with a view to <u>maintaining the safety and efficiency of the roading network</u>, and <u>minimising private vehicle movements to/from.....</u></i></li> </ul>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rule 12.6.1	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that visitor accommodation is a controlled activity with control reserved over parking and access, safety and efficiency. For proposed visitor accommodation requiring access to a State highway, it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 12.6.1 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>Applications for Controlled activities shall not require the written consent of other persons and shall not be notified or limited-notified., except for</i></p> <p><u>12.6.1.1 visitor accommodation adjacent to the State highway where the road controlling authority shall be deemed an affected party.</u></p>
<b>15 – Local Shopping Centre Zone</b>		
15.2.3 Objective	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>This zone is located within a complex transport environment. Activities locating in this zone have the potential to adversely affect the adjacent State highway and wider transport network.</p>	Retain 15.2.3 Objective as proposed.
Policy 15.2.3.3	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>Inappropriately directed lighting can distract motorists and adversely affect the safety of the adjacent road.</p>	Retain Policy 15.2.3.3 as proposed.
Policy 15.2.3.4	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>This zone is located within a complex transport environment. Some activities, e.g. high traffic generating activities would have adverse environmental effects in this location.</p>	Retain Policy 15.2.3.4 as proposed.



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 15.2.3.5	<b>Support</b> This zone is located within a complex transport environment. Activities locating in this zone have the potential to adversely affect the adjacent State highway and wider transport network.	Retain Policy 15.2.3.5 as proposed.
Rule 15.4.3.2	<b>Support with Amendments</b> The safety and efficiency of the transport network is an important consideration for any development of this site.	Amend Rule 15.4.3.2a by adding the following requirement: <i>(vi) No direct access to the State highway.</i>
Rule 15.4.4	<b>Support</b> We agree that access, parking, traffic generation and travel demand management are important matters for consideration.	Retain Rule 15.4.4 as proposed.
Rule 15.5.1	<b>Support and Amend</b> We support the careful management of traffic effects on the State Highway 6/Hansen Road intersection, but suggest the development of this site may have effects on other components of the State highway network and should be considered also.	Amend Rule 15.5.1 to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The traffic effects of additional building coverage on the State highway, particularly with regard to the intersection between Hansen Road and State Highway 6.</i></li> <li>•</li> </ul>
Rule 15.5.4	<b>Support</b> We support the restrictions placed on the development of this site and the proposed activity status. This should mitigate some of the potential adverse traffic effects of development of this site.	Support Rule 15.5.4 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rule 15.6.2	<b>Oppose</b> It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that Building Coverage is a restricted discretionary activity (Rule 15.5.1) with discretion restricted over State highway traffic effects. We suggest it is appropriate for the Transport Agency as the road controlling authority, to assess State highway traffic effects. Therefore, the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.	Delete Rule 15.6.2
<b>21 – Rural</b>		
Policy 21.2.1.3	<b>Support</b> We support the recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain Policy 21.2.1.3 as proposed.
Policy 21.2.1.5	<b>Support</b> Inappropriate light spill can cause glare to motorists which can adversely affect the safety of the State highway.	Retain Policy 21.2.1.5 as proposed.
21.2.4 Objective	<b>Support</b> We support the recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain 21.2.4 Objective
Policy 21.2.4.2	<b>Support</b> We support the recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain Policy 21.2.4.2 as proposed.
Policy 21.2.9.6	<b>Support</b> Commercial activities locating in the Rural Zone should not adversely affect the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain policy 21.2.9.6 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Rule 21.5.2</b>	<b>Support and Amend</b> This rule will assist in addressing potential reverse sensitivity effects from State highway traffic noise. However, we suggest an additional Rule (21.5.2.1) should be added to address potential reverse sensitivity effects from State highway traffic noise for residential dwellings located within the noise effects area.	Retain Rule 21.5.2 and add an additional Rule 21.5.2.1 as follows: <u>Any new dwelling, located within:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of 70km/h and greater, or</u></li> <li>• <u>40 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of less than 70 km/h.</u></li> </ul> <u>Shall be designed, constructed and maintained to ensure that the internal noise levels for dwellings do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ2107:2000.</u>
<b>Rule 21.5.22</b>	<b>Support</b> It is appropriate to have access safety and transportation effects as a matter for discretion to maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain Rule 21.5.22 as proposed.
<b>Rule 21.5.24</b>	<b>Support</b> This rule will contribute to the sustainable management of the State highway.	Retain Rule 21.5.24 as proposed.
<b>Rule 21.5.39</b>	<b>Support</b> This rule will contribute to the sustainable management of the State highway.	Retain Rule 21.5.39 as proposed.



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Rule 21.6.1</b>	<b>Support</b> It is appropriate that the Transport Agency is deemed an affected party to those activities where access to the State highway is required.	Retain Rule 21.6.1 as proposed.
<b>Rule 21.7.1.5a</b>	<b>Support</b> The use of common accesses and providing good linkages for alternative forms of transport promotes the sustainable use of the transport network.	Retain Rule 21.7.1.5a as proposed.
<b>Rule 21.7.2.5a</b>	<b>Support</b> The use of common accesses and providing good linkages for alternative forms of transport promotes the sustainable use of the transport network.	Retain Rule 21.7.2.5a as proposed.
<b>22 – Rural Residential &amp; Rural Lifestyle</b>		
<b>Policy 22.2.2.2</b>	<b>Support</b> The Transport Agency operates under a large planning window (up to 30 years) given the overall capital investment involved in maintaining and upgrading the State highway network. The NZ Transport Agency's task of planning infrastructure for the future is enhanced by development occurring as anticipated by District Plans.	Retain Policy 22.2.2.2 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 22.2.2.3	<b>Support</b> The Transport Agency operate under a large planning window (up to 30 years) given the overall capital investment involved in maintaining and upgrading the State highway network. The NZ Transport Agency's task of planning infrastructure for the future is enhanced by development occurring as anticipated by District Plans.	Retain 22.2.2.3 as proposed.
22.2.4 Objective	<b>Support</b> This objective supports the sustainable use of physical resources (infrastructure).	Retain 22.2.4 Objective as proposed.
Policy 22.2.4.1	<b>Support</b> This objective supports the sustainable use of physical resources (infrastructure).	Retain Policy 22.2.4.1 as proposed.
Policy 22.2.4.2	<b>Support</b> This policy will contribute to the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 22.2.4.2 as proposed.
22.2.5 Objective	<b>Support</b> We support the recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain 22.2.5 Objective
Policy 22.2.5.1	<b>Support</b> We support the recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain Policy 22.2.5.1 as proposed.
Rule 22.4.9	<b>Support</b> It is appropriate to reserve control over traffic generation, parking and access to maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain Rule 22.4.9 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rule 22.4.10	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>It is appropriate to reserve control over access safety and transportation effects to maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network.</p>	Retain Rule 22.4.10 as proposed.
Rule 22.5.5	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>This rule should be amended to add the minimum setback requirements from a State highway to ensure buildings are not erected in areas where there are high potential for adverse effects.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 22.5.5 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>The minimum setback of any building from a road boundary shall be 10m, <u>except for State highways where the minimum setback shall be 20m, and except in the Rural Residential Zone at the north of Lake Hayes, the minimum setback from Speargrass Flat Road shall be 15m.</u></i></p>
Rule 22.6.1	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that Home occupation is a controlled activity with control reserved over access safety and transportation effects. For proposed home occupation requiring access to a State highway, it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 22.6.1 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>Controlled activity Home occupation (<b>Rule 22.4.9</b>), <u>except where access is onto a State highway.</u></i></p>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rule 22.6.2	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that visitor accommodation is a controlled activity with control reserved over access safety and transportation effects. For proposed visitor accommodation requiring access to a State highway, it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 22.6.2 to read as follows:  <i>Controlled activity Visitor Accommodation within a Visitor Accommodation subzone (Rule 22.4.10), except where the access is onto a State highway.</i></p>
<b>23 – Gibbston Character Zone</b>		
Policy 23.2.1.9	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>Inappropriate light spill can cause glare to motorists which can adversely affect the safety of the State highway.</p>	Retain Rule 23.2.1.9 as proposed.
Policy 23.2.4.3	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>This policy supports the promotion of a safe and efficient transport system.</p>	Retain Rule 23.2.4.3 as proposed.
Rule 23.4.14	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>It is appropriate to reserve control over access, vehicle crossing location and carparking to maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network.</p>	Retain Rule 23.4.14 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rule 23.4.16	<b>Support</b> It is appropriate to reserve control over the parking and access and the safety and efficiency of State Highway 6.	Retain Rule 23.4.16 as proposed.
Rule 23.5.6	<b>Support but add an additional rule</b> We support the proposed setbacks but consider an additional rule be added to address potential reverse sensitivity effects from State highway traffic noise for those noise sensitive activities that locate within the road noise effects area.	Add a new Rule 23.5.6.1 as follows: <u>23.5.6.1 For buildings located adjacent to a State highway.</u> <u>Any new residential buildings, or buildings containing activities sensitive to road noise, located within:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>80 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of 70km/h and greater, or</u></li> <li>• <u>40 metres of the seal edge of a State Highway that has a speed limit of less than 70 km/h.</u></li> </ul> <u>Shall be designed, constructed and maintained to ensure that the internal noise levels do not exceed 35 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside bedrooms or 40 dB LAeq(1 hr) inside other habitable spaces in accordance with AS/NZ2107:2000.</u>
Rule 23.5.8	<b>Support</b> Inappropriate light spill can cause glare to motorists which can adversely affect the safety of the State highway.	Retain Rule 23.5.8 as proposed.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Rule 23.5.11	<b>Support</b> It is appropriate to reserve discretion over access safety and transportation effects to maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Retain Rule 23.5.11 as proposed.
Rule 23.6.1	<b>Support</b> It is appropriate that the Transport Agency is deemed an affected party to those activities where access to the State highway is required.	Retain Rule 23.6.1 as proposed.
Rule 23.6.2	<b>Oppose</b> It is inappropriate to not require the written approval of some persons for some activities. We note that winery and farm buildings are controlled activities with control reserved over parking and access and the impact on the safety and efficiency of State Highway 6. For these activities it is only the Transport Agency, as the road controlling authority, that can assess the access and the safety and efficiency of the State highway. Therefore, in these instances the Transport Agency should be deemed an affected party and its written approval sought. If this is not obtained then these applications should be processed as limited-notified applications.	Amend Rule 23.6.2 to read as follows: <i>Controlled activity winery and farm buildings (Rule 23.4.16), <u>except where the access is directly onto a State highway.</u></i>
<b>27 – Subdivision &amp; Development</b>		
Policy 27.2.1.5	<b>Support</b> It is appropriate to address the effects of anticipated land uses at the time of subdivision.	Retain Policy 27.2.1.5 as proposed.



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 27.2.1.6	<b>Support</b> Integrating transport and land use is an important consideration in the sustainable management of the transport network. It is important that these matters are considered at the time of subdivision.	Retain Policy 27.2.1.6 as proposed.
Policy 27.2.2.4	<b>Support</b> This policy supports the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 27.2.2.4 as proposed.
Policy 27.2.2.5	<b>Support</b> This policy supports the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 27.2.2.5 as proposed
Policy 27.2.2.6	<b>Support</b> This policy supports the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 27.2.2.6 as proposed.
27.2.5 Objective	<b>Support</b> It is appropriate to ensure infrastructure and services can accommodate the likely land use activities.	Retain 27.2.5 Objective as proposed.
Policy 27.2.5.1	<b>Amend</b> We support this policy but suggest the wording should be amended to ensure subdivision roading is integrated safely with the existing roading network.	Amend Policy 27.2.5.1 to read as follows: <i>Integrate subdivision roading with the existing road networks in <del>an</del> a safe and efficient manner that reflects expected traffic levels and the provision for safe and convenient walking and cycling.</i>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 27.2.5.2	<b>Support</b> This policy supports the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 27.2.5.2 as proposed.
Policy 27.2.5.3	<b>Support</b> This policy supports the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 27.2.5.3 as proposed.
Policy 27.2.5.5	<b>Support</b> This policy supports the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 27.2.5.5 as proposed.
27.2.6 Objective	<b>Support</b> It is fair and reasonable to expect subdividers and developers to provide financial contributions for infrastructure extensions or upgrades that are necessary to mitigate the effects of their subdivision and development.	Retain 27.2.6 Objective as proposed.
Policy 27.2.6.1	<b>Support</b> It is fair and reasonable to expect subdividers and developers to provide financial contributions for infrastructure extensions or upgrades that are necessary to mitigate the effects of their subdivision and development.	Retain Policy 27.2.6.1 as proposed.
Policy 27.2.8.2	<b>Amend</b> We note this policy considers existing and proposed accesses for rural areas. We suggest the location of accesses in other areas should also be considered.	Amend the 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet point of Policy 27.2.8.2 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i><u>The location of existing or proposed accesses and easements for access and services.</u></i></li> </ul>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Rule 27.5.1</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>We question whether it is appropriate to have no minimum lot area for subdivisions within Rural and Gibbston Character Zones. In the absence of minimum site sizes in these zones, it is difficult to establish likely demand for new or enhanced infrastructure. It also encourages ad hoc development with no strategic direction/overview.</p>	Amend and provide a minimum lot size for subdivisions within the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone.
<b>Rule 27.6.1.2</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We suggest it is appropriate to have exceptions where Esplanade Reserves should not be required.</p>	Retain Rule 27.6.1.2 as proposed.
<b>Rule 27.9.2</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>We suggest it is appropriate that the Transport Agency is considered an affected party to applications for subdivisions that are adjacent to or has access to a State highway.</p>	Retain Rule 27.9.2 as proposed.
<b>Rule 27.10.1.1</b>	<p><b>Support and Amend</b></p> <p>It is a requirement of the Government Roding Powers Act (1989) that a section 93 notice be obtained, declaring that the road is in fact road for the purposes of the subdivision, for those properties requiring access to a Limited Access Road. We suggest this rule should be amended to correctly what is required and from whom.</p>	Amend Rule 27.10.1.1 to read as follows: <i>Attention is drawn to the need to obtain a <u>Section 93 notice consent from the Minister of Transport NZ Transport Agency for all subdivisions with access onto State highways that are declared Limited Access Roads (LAR).....</u></i>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>28 – Natural Hazards</b>		
<b>Policy 28.3.1.1</b>	<b>Amend</b> Some infrastructure has locational requirements. It is therefore not always possible to locate infrastructure outside of areas susceptible to natural hazards.	Amend Policy 28.3.1.1 to read as follows: <i>Where practicable, ensure assets or infrastructure are constructed and located so as to avoid or mitigate the potential risk of damage to human life, property, infrastructural networks and other parts of the environment.</i>
<b>Policy 28.3.2.5</b>	<b>Support</b> Some infrastructure has locational requirements. It is therefore not always possible to locate infrastructure outside of areas susceptible to natural hazards	Retain Policy 28.3.2.5 as proposed.
<b>30 – Energy And Utilities</b>		
<b>Purpose 30.1.2 Utilities</b>	<b>Support</b> We agree with the description regarding: the importance of utilities; the high capital cost involved in establishing and maintaining utilities; their locational requirements; and their susceptibility to reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain the Purpose 30.1.2 Utilities as proposed.
<b>30.2.4 Objective</b>	<b>Amend</b> The location of land use developments can greatly influence energy consumption. This objective should be amended to recognise this.	Amend 30.2.4 Objective to read as follows: <i>The location of land use developments, site layout and building design takes into consideration energy efficiency and conservation.</i>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Policy 30.2.4.5	<b>Amend</b> Whilst we support the intent of this policy we suggest it should be amended to recognise that land use developments and transport networks need to be designed together to provide integrated outcomes which will assist in reducing energy consumption.	Amend Policy 30.2.4.5 to read as follows: <i>Land use developments and transport planning should be integrated Transport networks should be designed so that the number, length and need for vehicle trips is minimised, and reliance on private motor vehicles is reduced, to assist in reducing energy consumption.</i>
Policy 30.2.6.5	<b>Support</b> This policy supports the sustainable management of the transport network.	Retain Policy 30.2.6.5 as proposed.
30.2.7 Objective	<b>Amend</b> Some infrastructure has locational requirements. It is therefore not always possible to locate infrastructure outside of areas of high landscape value or special character areas. Similarly it is not always possible to mitigate all the effects of locating in these areas.	Amend 30.2.7 Objective as follows: <i>Where practicable, avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of utilities on surrounding environments, particularly those in or on land of high landscape value, and within special character areas.</i>
<b>35 – Temporary Activities &amp; Relocated Buildings</b>		
Policy 35.2.1.5	<b>Support but add an additional rule</b> We support the requirement for traffic management plans as a means to ensure event and filming traffic effects are mitigated. However, we note that there is no rule to give effect to this policy. We suggest a rule should be added that requires temporary traffic management plans for large scale temporary events.	Retain Policy 35.2.1.5 as proposed and add an additional rule to give effect to this Policy.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Policy 35.2.1.8</b>	<b>Support but add an additional rule</b> Informal airports can adversely affect the safety of the State highway. However, we note that there is no rule to give effect to this policy. We suggest a rule should be added to ensure the effects of the operation of informal airports do not adversely affect the State highway.	Retain Policy 35.2.1.8 as proposed and add an additional rule to give effect to this policy.
<b>Rule 35.4.8</b>	<b>Support</b> We support limits set around permitted Temporary Events. We suggest that it is appropriate to have an activity status of Discretionary Activity (Rule 35.4.1) for those Temporary Events that exceed these limits.	Retain Rule 35.4.8 as proposed.
<b>36 – Noise</b>		
<b>36.2.1 Objective</b>	<b>Support</b> We support the recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain 36.2.1 Objective as proposed.
<b>Policy 36.2.1.2</b>	<b>Support</b> We support the recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain Policy 36.2.1.2 as proposed.
<b>Rule 36.4.1</b>	<b>Support</b> We support the recognition that sound from vehicles on public roads is a permitted activity.	Retain Rule 36.4.1 as proposed.



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>37 – Designations</b>		
<b>Whole of section (pages 37–1 to 37–29)</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>We oppose the format that has been applied to the whole of the Designations section of the plan. The designations are not listed in numerical sequence, which makes the Plan lacking in certainty, and difficult to use and interpret.</p>	Review and correction of section 37 of the Plan to list designations in numerical order.
<b>C.22 Designation 29 – QLDC Events Centre and Aquatic Centre</b>	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>Designation 29 contains a number of errors and inaccuracies which require correction. Specifically, these include:</p> <p>Heading “A. Conditions for the Events Centre” is redundant and unnecessary.</p>	Delete the heading
<b>Condition 1</b>	The legal descriptions included on page 37–41 do not relate to the area that is shown as designated on Map 33, nor do they match the legal descriptions included in condition 1 (page 37–42).	Review and correction of Designation 29 to correctly identify the site.
<b>Condition 2</b>	The condition references a structure plan which is not included in the Plan.	Insert the structure plan that is referenced in the condition.
<b>Condition 11 (b)</b>	The condition requires a setback of 20 metres from State highway 6A. The designated site does not appear to have frontage to State highway 6A, and as such this reference should be deleted. We support the required 20 metre setback from State highway 6.	Delete reference to State highway 6A; retain setback required from State highway 6.
<b>Condition 12 (b)</b>	The condition requires a setback of 20 metres from State highway 6A. The designated site does not appear to have frontage to State highway 6A, and as such this reference should be deleted. We support the	Delete reference to State highway 6A; retain setback required from State highway 6.

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>Condition 13 (d)</b>	<p>required 20 metre setback from State highway 6.</p> <p>The condition requires a setback of 50 metres from State highway 6A. The designated site does not appear to have frontage to State highway 6A, and as such this reference should be deleted. We support the required 50 metre setback from State highway 6.</p>	<p>Delete reference to State highway 6A; retain setback required from State highway 6.</p>
<b>Condition 23</b>	<p>The existing sign located at the intersection of State highway 6 and Joe O'Connell Drive is permitted to display site related information only. This condition should also be imposed on designation 29, as the display of non-site related signage can have an effect on road safety.</p>	<p>Insert the following:  <u>g) The sign shall display site related messages only.</u></p>
<b>Condition 25</b>	<p>This condition is unclear as to the proposed location for additional signage should the Grant Road site access be utilised. We consider that any site-related signage for the Grant Road access point should be located adjacent to that access, not on State highway 6.</p>	<p>Amend the condition as follows:  <i>If Grant Road is utilised in terms of providing vehicular access to the QEC, then an entry sign can be established <u>at the entrance off Grant Road</u> that advertises activities undertaken within the QEC.</i></p>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<p><b>Advice note</b></p>	<p>We are concerned that the organisers of large scale events at the Queenstown Events Centre may not consider the potential effects of such events on the safe and efficient operation of State highway 6. We would encourage the organisers of any such events to engage with the Transport Agency during the planning of the event and to determine the need for a temporary traffic management plan for the duration of the event. As different events will have different effects, it is not possible to frame an appropriate condition for this designation, however the Transport Agency would be satisfied with the introduction of an advice note.</p>	<p>Insert an advice note as follows:</p> <p><u>Advice Note</u></p> <p><u>Where events on the site may generate traffic that changes the normal operation of State highway 6 and/or the safety of road users (motorists, cyclists or pedestrians), early engagement with the NZ Transport Agency is recommended. Under the Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management, a Temporary Traffic Management Plan may be required to be prepared and approved by the Transport Agency prior to implementation. This process may take up to two months.</u></p>



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
<b>41 – Jacks Point</b>		
Policy 41.2.1.25	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>This policy supports the sustainable management of the transport network.</p>	Retain Policy 41.2.1.25 as proposed.
Rule 41.5.6	<p><b>Amend</b></p> <p>We support restrictions regarding State highway access to the Jacks Point Zone.</p> <p>Currently access to the Jacks Point Zone is via Maori Jack Road. Recently there was a Plan Change Hearing to incorporate Henley Downs with the Jacks Point Zone. This Rule indicates that this plan change has been adopted yet we are not aware of any decision regarding this.</p> <p>The proposed rules do not reflect the threshold limits that were agreed to at the Hearing. We therefore request the rules regarding State highway access should be amended to reflect what was agreed at the Henley Downs Hearing.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 41.5.6 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>41.5.6.1 Access from State Highway 6 shall be only at the intersections at Maori Jack Road and Woolshed Road, as shown on the Structure Plan.</i></p> <p><i>41.5.6.2 <del>No more than 500 residential units may be built within the R(HD) and R(SH-HD) Activity Areas without the Woolshed Road intersection being completed and available for use. The Woolshed Road access shall not be used until that road's intersection upgrade with State Highway 6 has been completed and available for use.</del></i></p> <p><i>41.5.6.3 No more than 300 residential units/titles may be built, or no more than 2,400 vehicle movements per day (weekly average) may be generated, whichever is the lesser, within</i></p>

Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
		<i>the EIC, R(HD) and R(SH-HD) Activity Areas of the Jacks Point Zone until the Woolshed Road intersection upgrade is completed and available for use.</i>
<b>Rule 41.6.2.5</b>	<b>Support</b> For accesses onto the State highway it is appropriate to require the approval of the NZ Transport Agency as the requiring authority for State highways.	Retain Rule 41.6.2.5 as proposed.
<b>Proposed District Plan Maps</b>		
<b>Map 21 – Wanaka Central</b>	<b>Amend</b> The State highway on this map reads “ <i>Wanaka-Luggate Hwy State Highway 6</i> ”. This is incorrect. This State highway should be labelled “ <i>State Highway 84</i> ”.	Amend Map 21 Amend the labelling of the State highway as follows: <del><i>Wanaka-Luggate Hwy State Highway 6</i></del> <u><i>State Highway 84</i></u>
<b>Mapping of State Highway Designations</b>	<b>Neutral</b> The mapping of the State highway designations is unclear with some shown in a red and black hatching, and some un-labelled. This results in uncertainty for Plan users.	Use a consistent method of labelling State highway designations throughout the District.
<b>Mapping of all Designations</b>	<b>Neutral</b> The mapping of designations appears to have omitted numbering in many cases. This uncertainty can make the Plan difficult to use.	Insert appropriate references to enable specific designations to be identified.



Specific Provision	Requested Decision with Reasons	We Seek the Following from the Local Authority
Map 18, Map 24B	<p><b>Neutral</b></p> <p>There is an inconsistency between the two maps regarding the mapping of the whole of designation 318; it appears on Map 24B but not on Map 18.</p>	Amend the appropriate map to correct the inconsistency.
Unlabelled designation, Map 21	<p><b>Neutral</b></p> <p>Map 21 includes an unlabelled designation on the southern side of State highway 6 at Wanaka. It appears likely that this designation should be labelled 95 to reflect Schedule 37.2. This uncertainty means it is not possible to fully determine the effect of the designation on the operation of State highway 6.</p>	Amend the map to include the correct annotation; or delete the unlabelled designation from Map 21
Unlabelled designation, Map 31	<p><b>Neutral</b></p> <p>Map 31 includes an unlabelled designation on the northern side of the intersection of State highway 6 and Tucker Beach Road. It appears likely that this designation should be labelled 344 to reflect Schedule 37.2. This uncertainty means it is not possible to determine the effect of the designation on the operation of State highway 6.</p>	Amend the map to include the correct annotation; or delete the unlabelled designation from Map 31
Designation 29, Map 33	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>Map 33 identifies the extent of the Queenstown Event Centre Designation, number 29. The boundaries of the area identified do not match the two legal descriptions included in Schedule 37.2 (page 37–41) of the Plan.</p>	Correct the boundaries of designation number 29.
Unlabelled designation, Map 33	<p><b>Oppose</b></p> <p>Map 33 includes an unlabelled designation on the southern side of State highway 6A at Frankton. This uncertainty means it is not possible to determine the effect of the designation on the operation of State highway 6A.</p>	Delete the unlabelled designation from Map 33