

2 December 2019  
Our Reference 716148

**The Property Group Limited**  
Level 3 Craigs Investment Partners House  
5 Mile Centre  
Grant Road, Frankton  
Queenstown

**SUBMISSIONS ON THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW: STAGE 3B**  
**Under Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991**

To Queenstown Lakes District Council  
Private Bag 50072  
Queenstown 9348

By Email [pdpsubmissions@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:pdpsubmissions@qldc.govt.nz)

Address: Mandalea Properties Limited  
Goldstream Properties Limited  
C/- The Property Group Limited  
Level 3 Craigs Investment Partners House  
5 Mile Centre  
Grant Road, Frankton  
Attn: Quinn McIntyre

**1. Submitters**

1.1 On behalf of **Mandalea Properties Limited (MPL)** as landowner of 164 Arthurs Point Road, Arthurs Point (Lot 1 DP 20925), and **Goldstream Properties Limited (GPL)**, we submit on the Queenstown Proposed District Plan Review Stage 3b (PDP) rezoning as it relates to:

1.1.1 The application of the Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Visitor Accommodation Subzone (VAS) that replaces to ODP Rural Visitor zoning in Arthurs Point;

1.1.2 The introduction of the Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) Overlay in Arthurs Point; and

1.1.3 The PDP Chapter 46 Rural Visitor standards.

1.2 MPL and GPL oppose the proposed rezoning and new standards as it applies to Arthurs Point, as notified.

1.3 The reasons for the submission and relief sought are set out below.

- 1.4 Specifically, it is sought that the Operative District Plan (ODP) Rural Visitor Zone (RVZ) that applies at Arthurs Point be retained.
- 1.5 The submitters could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

## 2. Application of Proposed Zoning and ONL

- 2.1 The PDP Stage 3b applies a rezoning of the Arthurs Point ODP RVZ to become MDR with a VA overlay. The rezoning goes further by expanding the ONL area. Both of these changes have a profound impact on 164 Arthurs Point Road.
- 2.2 While this submission is focussed on 164 Arthurs Point Road it also relates to the potential impact of the rezoning of the RVZ generally in Arthurs Point, and specifically to the application of the ONL.
- 2.3 Arthurs Point (or more accurately Arthurs Point north) is a geographically and visually defined area with a unique sense of place and identity. This means that while the effects of development can be contained, taking out existing or consented developments, the available area for further development is limited.
- 2.4 The replacement of the RVZ by the MDR and VAS rules significantly alters the ability for residential and visitor accommodation development of scale in Arthurs Point, particularly for the few larger sites such as 164 Arthurs Point Road. Not only are the bulk and location controls of the MDR more stringent, but with more onerous standards (such as vehicle provision and parking requirements) development outcomes are heavily constrained.
- 2.5 This is in stark contrast to the relatively enabling controls of the ODP RVZ, which provides for a myriad of development opportunities to respond to both the landscape as well as the market. In an environment with high demand and limited opportunity to accommodate new development, restricting built-form outcomes would seem to be counterproductive to both residential provision and economic development within Arthurs Point North.
- 2.6 The PDP rezoning sought would also appear to be inconsistent with the established and evolving visitor accommodation environment that has developed organically in Arthurs Point. While an overlay might appear to deliver an acceptable outcome, the nett effect of constraining the built form and more rigorously controlled visitor accommodation provisions will undoubtedly start to constrain or undermine the areas visitor accommodation economic driver.
- 2.7 The ODP RVZ was intended to provide a unique set of land uses, which appropriately integrated with the landscape in developing a special character, being high quality designed visitor accommodation of various sizes blended into the rural landscape. Attempting to achieve this outcome through more restrictive zoning provisions sought in the PDP is simplistic and unlikely to succeed and may in fact serve to undermine the areas intrinsic values by 'suburbanising' the built form.
- 2.8 Another key consideration for the future nature and form of Arthurs Point North is the drive to deliver on Council's stated desire for increasing utilisation of public transport. Fundamental to achieving such an outcome is creating nodes with sufficient density (and intensity) to support the sustainable provision of services. Restricting residential supply and

visitor accommodation (and in turn other commercial drivers) seem counter-productive to the Council's own goals.

- 2.9 This is even more important in Arthurs Point because of the increasing constraint from the Edith Cavil Bridge over the Shotover River, which would require substantial investment (and time) to rectify. It is therefore considered likely that until a solution to this constraint can be provided, public transport will need to be prioritised over private motor vehicle.
- 2.10 There is also a direct correlation between providing intensity to support public transport and the provision of built form which support full accessibility (one of the key objectives outlined on Council's "looking beyond the year 2050' visioning document). Providing dwellings that are attractive to those less-abled (elderly, disabled) requires the provision of lifts. These are simply uneconomical for the low-scale dwellings associated with the MDR zone.
- 2.11 With respect to the proposed expansion of the ONL area, we have reviewed the Draft Landscape Assessment report by Helen Mellsop and agree that this is already one of the most developed RVZs in the District, however the intrinsic value of this zone has been reduced due to a weak integration of landscape attributes and lack of consistency in built style and form which has started to undermine the intrinsic character. We are of the view that the zone's character should be drawing heavily upon its landscape and integrate more seamlessly to define a sense of place and identity, and this requires a framework for landowners and developers to work within to shape potential amenity.
- 2.12 Applying standardised zoning and ONL delineation is not an appropriate approach in this instance and may in fact result in less than ideal outcomes sought by all parties. Such a control over these areas through rezoning is unlikely to motivate landowners to undertake the works necessary to remove overgrown exotic vegetation and weeds and unlock the true natural values of the more acute landscape features that lie beneath.
- 2.13 We believe that the opportunity exists to develop exceptional, world-class facilities at Arthurs Point that not only integrate with the landscape but in fact showcase its natural features. It is anticipated that with well-considered design controls within the District Plan, Council would have a sufficient set of tools to ensure that each and every application is assessed on its merits and that a special character can be achieved that showcases the landscape in this corner of the District.
- 2.14 The current RVZ suffers from the absence of an agreed development framework or a Structure Plan. Developing a Structure Plan for Arthurs Point would ensure that the future of the area in particular the RVZ land meets the needs of the district but would also manage the expectations of developers and ensure that future applications for resource consent run more efficiently. This would be of substantial benefit for Council, developers and the community alike.
- 2.15 Adopting these recommendations will also provide Arthurs Point the opportunity to shape a different type of visitor accommodation offering, that not only integrates with, but indeed showcases the rural environment and high value landscape that exists in this location. Creating a distinct identify and offering must be considered a positive complimentary economic benefit to the district, and not competition to the town centre.

### 3. PDP Rural Visitor Zone (Chapter 46)

- 3.1 The PDP RVZ introduces bulk and location standards that significantly reduce the development potential of sites where visitor accommodation would be considered appropriate i.e. in the current Arthurs Point RVZ, an establishing alpine environment that caters to a range of visitor accommodation activities.
- 3.2 Arthurs Point has, in recent times, seen an increase in both residential and visitor accommodation activities that has given it its own unique environment. Most have been of highly quality and in alignment with the local aesthetic. Where 'less-than-ideal' outcomes have been encountered, this is largely due to the lack of any cohesive vision or design control standards.
- 3.3 Zoning standards should focus on enabling both residential and visitor accommodation of varying scale that supports the existing character, amenity and environment. For example, development that maintains or enhances the surrounding character or environment through appropriate / graduated landscape responses away from Arthurs Point Road towards Mt Dewar (north) / Shotover River (south).
- 3.4 Specifically, in the PDP RVZ, residential activity is not anticipated, which is a significant change from the ODP. Whilst residential activity is not a priority in the zone, it should not be explicitly discouraged through a Non-Complying Activity consent status, which is considered a high-risk consenting process.
- 3.5 With regards to the proposed standards, the permitted building height standard is halved from 12m<sup>1</sup> (for visitor accommodation) to 6m<sup>2</sup>, which is a significant reduction of development and yield from the current situation. The proposed maximum height is slightly more favourable in the PDP MDR zoning (7m).
- 3.6 A number of 4 storey buildings already exist with additional consented to this scale. Halving the height control now would create a different development outcome from that that exists.
- 3.7 The addition of a building size<sup>3</sup> rule of 500m<sup>2</sup> at ground level is unusual, and it is unclear what such a control seeks to achieve. A building coverage control would be a typical approach to controlling landscape, amenity and scale of development on a site, however this is also a significant constraint on development opportunity from the ODP.
- 

<sup>1</sup> ODP, Rule 12.4.5.2(i)(a)

<sup>2</sup> PDP, Rule 46.5.1

<sup>3</sup> PDP, Rule 46.5.2

- 3.8 The standard for glare<sup>4</sup> is not opposed to ensure the amenity of adjoining / surrounding properties are maintained.
- 3.9 The proposed setback controls<sup>5</sup> have been simplified to one setback requirement compared with the ODP and is not opposed.

#### **4. Relief Sought**

- 4.1 The PDP rezoning from Arthurs Point RVZ (ODP) to MDR and ONL is inappropriate and presents a drastic change and limitation of development from the current situation. This introduces a significant unreasonable impediment on landowners and developers.
- 4.2 The submitters seek that the current ODP RVZ zoning and standards should remain in place for Arthurs Point, and the site specifically (146 Arthurs Point Road).

#### **5. MPL and GPL wish to be heard in support of their submission.**

- 6. If others make a similar submission, we would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.**

Prepared by

*Natasha*

---

<sup>4</sup> PDP, Rule 46.5.3

<sup>5</sup> PDP, Rules 46.5.4 and 46.5.5

**Natasha Rivai**

Senior Planner

Mobile: 027 293 3190

Email: [NRivai@propertygroup.co.nz](mailto:NRivai@propertygroup.co.nz)