

Submissions on Plan Change 21 to the Mackenzie District Plan

Submission Details

Submission Number	Submitter	Support/Oppose	Decision Requested (Amendments <u>underlined</u> and deletions struck out)	Reason/Comment	Wishes to be Heard
1.	Richard Smith	Oppose	No visitor number restrictions and no limitations on visitor night stays No increased rates or additional charges on properties used for short term accommodation	Visitor accommodation has benefits for the local economy	Y
2.	James Paranihi	Oppose	No decision requested	Mr Paranihi considers he cannot give adequate or appropriate answers as he is not a permanent resident	N
3.	Lachlan Broadfoot	Support	Retain the Low Density Residential and Mixed-Use Zone provisions in Kimbell as notified	Providing flexibility of land use to support both commercial and residential options is important in small townships to encourage a sustainable and productive community	Y
4.	Kevin O'Neill	Support	Retain the Large Lot Residential Zone south of the Fairlie Golf Course as notified	No reason/comment provided	N
5.	Ann-Maree Grant	Oppose	Stronger regulation surrounding short term visitor accommodation in residential zones	Community cohesion The Queenstown Lakes District Council Visitor Accommodation Factsheet is attached to the submission	N
6.	The Burkes Pass Heritage Trust	Oppose	The Burkes Pass Rural Character Area, displayed in the Mackenzie Spatial Plan, be changed back to the Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct to accurately reflect its intended nature A Heritage Precinct consultant be engaged to develop design guidelines (as per the Tekapo Precinct)	The planning process and notification were flawed and did not follow proper procedure The "Burkes Pass Rural Character Area" has been overlaid on the original Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct but is not defined in any way. This area is considered to have special heritage	Y

			<p>The Heritage Precinct be included in Plan Change 21</p> <p>The Residential Zone, outside the Heritage Precinct, truly reflects the rural character of Burkes Pass</p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone be considered inappropriate for Burkes Pass</p>	<p>character and provides the township with a distinctive identity</p> <p>The Low or Large Lot Density Residential Zones are not suitable for the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area / Heritage Precinct</p> <p>The Mixed-Use Zone, and the potential range of activities that it could allow, is not consistent with the heritage values of the Burkes Pass Rural Character area/Heritage Precinct</p> <p>Specific worker accommodation (for workers out of the area and in greater numbers than normal residential accommodation) is not appropriate for Burkes Pass rural character</p>	
7.	Graham Batchelor	Oppose	<p>The name of the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area, displayed in the Mackenzie Spatial Plan, be changed back to The Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct to accurately reflect its intended nature</p> <p>A Heritage Precinct consultant be engaged to develop design guidelines (as per the Tekapo Precinct)</p> <p>The Heritage Precinct be included in Plan Change 21</p> <p>The Residential Zone, outside the Heritage Precinct, truly reflect the rural character of Burkes Pass</p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone be considered inappropriate for Burkes Pass</p>	<p>The planning process and notification were flawed and did not follow proper procedure</p> <p>The “Burkes Pass Rural Character Area” has been overlaid on the original Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct but is not defined in any way. This area is considered to have special heritage character and provides the township with a distinctive identity</p> <p>The Low or Large Lot Density Residential Zones are not suitable for the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area / Heritage Precinct</p> <p>The Mixed-Use Zone and the potential range of activities that it could allow is not consistent</p>	Y

				with the heritage values of the Burkes Pass Rural Character area/Heritage Precinct Specific worker accommodation (for workers out of the area and in greater numbers than normal residential accommodation) is not appropriate for Burkes Pass rural character	
8.	Jeannie Columbus	Support	Retain LLRZ-S1 as notified	Residential areas to the west and south of Twizel will have a consistent minimum lot size and it provide benefits for spatial living close to town	Y
9.	Caroline Thomson	Oppose	<p>The name of the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area, displayed in the Mackenzie Spatial Plan, be changed back to The Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct to accurately reflect its intended nature</p> <p>A Heritage Precinct consultant be engaged to develop design guidelines (as per the Tekapo Precinct)</p> <p>The Heritage Precinct be included in Plan Change 21</p> <p>The Residential Zone, outside the Heritage Precinct, truly reflect the rural character of Burkes Pass</p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone be considered inappropriate for Burkes Pass</p>	<p>The planning process and notification were flawed and did not follow proper procedure</p> <p>The “Burkes Pass Rural Character Area” has been overlaid on the original Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct but is not defined in any way. This area is considered to have special heritage character and provides the township with a distinctive identity</p> <p>The Low or Large Lot Density Residential Zones are not suitable for the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area / Heritage Precinct</p> <p>The Mixed-Use Zone and the potential range of activities that it could allow is not consistent with the heritage values of the Burkes Pass Rural Character area/Heritage Precinct</p> <p>Specific worker accommodation (for workers out of the area and in greater numbers than normal residential accommodation) is not appropriate for Burkes Pass rural character</p>	N

10.	Mackenzie Runholders	Support	Retain the Medium Density Residential and the Neighbourhood Centre Zoning of the Tekapo Saleyards as notified	The rezoning of this area will assist with future plans for the saleyards	Y
11.	Wayne Tewnion	Support	Retain the Low Density Residential zoning of Lot 1 DP 393962 (190A Mackenzie Drive, Twizel) as notified	No reason/comment provided	N
12.	Rick Ramsay	Oppose in Part	<p>Retain the areas zoned General Industrial Zone and Large Format Retail Zone in Twizel as notified</p> <p>The Rural Residential 1/Rural land, adjacent to Lake Ruataniwha (Lot 500 DP 440707), is included in Plan Change 21 and is identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct</p> <p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential. The Recreation P land south of Ruataniwha Road is retained and not zoned Town Centre</p> <p>The Musterers Hut Area is not rezoned Town Centre and is identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct. The Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct is extended to include where the Ministry of Works Project Office was located</p> <p>The Recreation P Zoning along the southside of Ruataniwha Road is retained and not zoned Town Centre. The Town Centre Zone is extended along Mackenzie Drive to Tasman Road</p>	<p>No reason/comment provided</p> <p>This land is of value for visitor accommodation given its proximity to the lake</p> <p>The green areas either side of Ruataniwha Road have a significant value to the town beyond a commercial value</p> <p>No reason/comment provided</p> <p>The green area along Ruataniwha road was created by Council to provide an open "boulevard" approach to the town. There is scope to extend the Town Centre Zone along Mackenzie Drive to Tasman Road. This expansion, coupled with the expansion north,</p>	Y

				should provide ample Town Centre zoning in Twizel	
13.	Peter Donohue and Janine Donohue	Oppose	<p>Retain the Burkes Pass Heritage Township status in Plan Change 21</p> <p>Restrict large density residential housing</p> <p>Restrict/control the type of commercial activity able to be carried out in the residential township</p>	<p>Burkes Pass is an important heritage town and contains several important historic buildings. The protection of historic buildings and special areas is important and requires careful consideration when planning developments and district plans</p> <p>Consider that the Plan as proposed does not meet the wishes of the majority, that the consultation process was insufficient, and the changed spatial plan be reviewed with formal community consultation before it is adopted</p>	Y
14.	Edward Stead	Oppose	<p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct</p>	<p>The land contains three holes of the Twizel Disc Golf Course. The course is very popular and is highly regarded by New Zealand's Disc Golf community. The course hosts New Zealand Disc Golf Association Tour competitions. Current replacement value of the infrastructure associated with the course is \$28,513.84 (GST Inclusive)</p>	Y
15.	Alex Lusby	Oppose	<p>The name of the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area, displayed in the Mackenzie Spatial Plan, be changed back to The Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct to accurately reflect its intended nature</p> <p>A Heritage Precinct consultant be engaged to develop design guidelines (as per the Tekapo Precinct)</p> <p>The Heritage Precinct be included in Plan Change 21</p>	<p>The planning process and notification were flawed and did not follow proper procedure</p> <p>The "Burkes Pass Rural Character Area" has been overlaid on the original Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct but is not defined in any way. This area is considered to have special heritage character and provides the township with a distinctive identity</p>	N

			<p>The Residential Zone, outside the heritage precinct, truly reflect the rural character of Burkes Pass</p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone be considered inappropriate for Burkes Pass</p>	<p>The Low or Large Lot Density Residential Zones are not suitable for the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area / Heritage Precinct</p> <p>The Mixed-Use Zone and the potential range of activities that it could allow is not consistent with the heritage values of the Burkes Pass Rural Character area/Heritage Precinct</p> <p>Specific worker accommodation (for workers out of the area and in greater numbers than normal residential accommodation) is not appropriate for Burkes Pass rural character</p>	
16.	Mr Michael Guerin	Support	Retain the Spatial Plan as notified	The original Spatial Plan for Burkes Pass caused concern for affected landowners and permanent residents of Burkes Pass. Of particular concern is walking/cycling tracks being implemented on private property and the related health and safety concerns as well as the labelling of “Heritage” over private property and the potential implications of this	Y
17.	Mr John Emery	Oppose	The Spatial Plan is revisited with proper formal consultation with the community before being adopted by the District Plan	Concern that changes to the original plan for Burkes Pass were made without adequate consultation and that the Low Density Residential Zone for Te Kopi-O-Opihi/ Burkes Pass, Large Lot Residential Zone, and Mixed Use Zone for Te kopi-O-Opihi/ Burkes Pass have not been adequately defined	N
18.	Ministry of Education	New Provision	Include a new Educational Facilities definition: <i>Means land or buildings used for teaching or training by childcare services, schools, or tertiary education services, including any ancillary activities.</i>	Consistent with the National Planning Standards	Y
		New Provision	Include a new Operational Need definition: <i>Means the need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because of technical, logistical, or operational characteristics or constraints</i>		

		Support in Part	<p>Amend LLRZ-O1 as follows:</p> <p><i>The Large Lot Residential Zone provides primarily for residential living opportunities, and other compatible small scale non-residential activities which are ancillary to residential activity that support and are consistent with the character and amenity values of the zone</i></p>	Education facilities fall within the scope of non-residential activity however provide the necessary social infrastructure for the surrounding facilities and are unlikely to be considered small scale
		Support in Part	<p>Amend LLRZ-R8 as follows:</p> <p>Education Facilities</p> <p>Activity Status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The education activity is undertaken within a residential building compliant with LLRZ-S2 – LLRZ-S5 and is ancillary to a residential activity; and</i> 2. <i>The maximum number of children in attendance at any one time is six, excluding any children who live on site.</i> <p>Activity status when compliance is not achieved with R8.1 and R8.2: RDIS</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>The location, design and appearance of buildings on the site.</i> b. <i>The traffic impacts including the provision of adequate onsite parking.</i> c. <i>Effects on amenity values of adjoining residential sites including noise.</i> d. <i>The adequacy of any mitigation measures</i> 	<p>Education facilities should be provided for where there is a potential for a population to support them including the LLRZ. This will support active modes of transport and reduce trip lengths and times.</p> <p>The maximum number of people should be removed as this provides unreasonable restrictions on education facilities</p>
		Support	Retain LRZ-O1 as notified	It enables other compatible activities that support the character and amenity values of the zone and is considered to encompass educational facilities

		Support in Part	<p>Amend LRZ-P1 as follows:</p> <p>Compatible Activities</p> <p><i>Provide for activities other than residential activities where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>They are ancillary to a residential activity or are consistent with the character, amenity values and purpose of the zone;</i> <i>They service the local community and do not detract from the character, amenity values or purpose of the Neighbourhood Centre or Town Centre Zones; and</i> <i>The effects of the activity, including its scale, hours of operation, parking and vehicle manoeuvring are compatible with the amenity values of adjoining sites; <u>and</u></i> <i><u>There is a functional need or operational need to establish in the zone.</u></i> 	<p>Explicit provision for activities where there is a functional or operational need to establish is necessary</p>	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend LRZ-R8 as follows:</p> <p>Educational Facilities</p> <p><i>Activity Status: PER</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The activity is an expansion to an existing activity; or</i> <i>The education activity is undertaken within a residential building and is ancillary to a residential activity; and that complies with LRZ-S2 to LRZ-S5</i> <i>The maximum number of children in attendance at any one time is six, excluding any children who live on-site.</i> <p><i>Activity status when compliance is not achieved with R8.1, R8.2 and R8.3: RDIS</i></p> <p><i>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</i></p>	<p>Educational facilities should be provided for where there is a potential for a population to support them including the LDZ. This will support active modes of transport and reduce trip lengths and times.</p> <p>The maximum number of people should be removed as this provides unreasonable restrictions on education facilities.</p>	

			<p>a. <i>The location, design and appearance of buildings on the site.</i></p> <p>b. <i>The traffic impacts including the provision of adequate onsite parking.</i></p> <p>c. <i>Effects on amenity values of adjoining residential sites including noise.</i></p> <p>d. <i>The adequacy of any mitigation measures.</i></p>		
		Support	Retain MRZ-O1 as notified	It enables other compatible activities that support the character and amenity values of the zone and is considered to encompass educational facilities	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend MRZ-P2 as follows:</p> <p>Compatible Activities</p> <p><i>Provide for activities other than residential activities where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>They are ancillary to a residential activity or are consistent with the character, amenity values and purpose of the zone;</i> 2. <i>They service the local community and do not detract from the character, amenity values or purpose of the Neighbourhood Centre or Town Centre Zones; and</i> 3. <i>The effects of the activity, including its scale, hours of operation, parking and vehicle manoeuvring are compatible with the amenity values of adjoining sites; <u>and</u></i> 4. <i><u>There is a functional need or operational need to establish in the zone.</u></i> 	Explicit provision for activities where there is a functional or operational need to establish is necessary	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend MRZ-R7 as follows:</p> <p>Educational Facilities</p> <p><i>Activity Status: PER</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p>	Educational facilities should be provided for where there is a potential for a population to support them including the MDZ. This will support active modes of transport and reduce trip lengths and times.	

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The activity is an expansion to an existing activity; or</i> 2. <i>The education activity is undertaken within a residential building and is ancillary to a residential activity; and that complies with <u>MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6 and MRZ-S10</u></i> 3. <i>The maximum number of children in attendance at any one time is six, excluding any children who live on site.</i> <p><i>Activity status when compliance is not achieved with R8.1, R8.2 and R8.3: RDIS</i></p> <p><i>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>The location, design and appearance of buildings on the site.</i> b. <i>The traffic impacts including the provision of adequate onsite parking.</i> c. <i>Effects on amenity values of adjoining residential sites including noise.</i> d. <i>The adequacy of any mitigation measures</i> 	<p>The maximum number of people should be removed as this provides unreasonable restrictions on education facilities</p>	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend LFRZ-P2 as follows:</p> <p>Other activities</p> <p><i>Avoid the establishment of activities that are not enabled by LFRZ-P1 within the Large Format Retail Zone unless they:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>are not retail activities that are more suited to a location within the Town Centre Zone;</i> 2. <i>will not detract from the character, amenity values or purpose of the Town Centre Zone;</i> <p>and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>will not result in reverse sensitivity effects with activities that are anticipated in the zone; and</i> 4. <i><u>there is a functional need or operational need to establish in the zone.</u></i> 	<p>Explicit provision for activities where there is a functional or operational need to establish is necessary.</p> <p>Educational facilities, particularly training facilities should be provided for in the LFRZ to meet the operational need</p>	

		Oppose	Amend LFRZ-R9 as follows: Education Facilities <i>Activity Status: NC DIS</i>	Educational facilities should be provided for in this zone as educational facilities are essential social infrastructure that may need to be located within industrial areas, particularly training facilities. It is acknowledged that reserve sensitivity issues need to be considered	
		Support in Part	Amend MUZ-O1 as follows: Zone Purpose <i>The Mixed Use Zone contains residential activities, along with a range of primarily small scale commercial, <u>education</u> and community activities that serve the convenience needs of the surrounding residential and rural neighbourhood or visitors</i>	Educational facilities fall within the scope of non-residential activity however provide necessary social infrastructure for the surrounding facilities and are unlikely to be considered small scale	
		Support in Part	Amend MUZ-P1 as follows: Commercial, Community, <u>Education</u> and Residential Activities <i>Enable a wide range of small-scale commercial activities, community facilities, <u>education facilities</u> and residential activities to establish and operate within the Mixed Use Zone</i>	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes schools) is provided in urban growth and development	
		Support	Retain MUZ-R8 as notified	To enable the operation of education facilities within the Mixed Use Zone	
		Support in Part	Amend NCZ-P1 as follows: Commercial, <u>Education</u> and Community Activities <i>Enable a wide range of small-scale commercial activities, <u>education</u> and community facilities to establish and operate within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone</i>	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes schools) is provided in urban growth and development	
		Support	Retain NCZ-R4 as notified	To enable the operation of education facilities within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone	

		Support	Retain GIZ-P2 as notified	There may be a functional need for educational facilities to be located within industrial zones and this policy supports that
		Oppose	Amend GIZ-R9 as follows: Education Facilities <i>Activity Status: NE <u>DIS</u></i>	Educational facilities should be provided for in this zone as educational facilities are essential social infrastructure that may need to be located within industrial areas, particularly training facilities. It is acknowledged that reserve sensitivity issues need to be considered
		Support in Part	Amend DEV1-O1 as follows: Comprehensive Development <i>The Takapō/Lake Tekapo West Development Area is developed to provide residential living opportunities and other compatible activities in a comprehensive manner, which maintains a high level of open space character, is appropriate to its landscape setting, protects important ecological values and is integrated with infrastructure, including social infrastructure</i>	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes schools) is provided in urban growth and development
		Support in Part	Amend DEV1-P4 as follows: Infrastructure <i>Ensure that any development in the Takapō/Lake Tekapo West Future Development Area is able to be serviced by reticulated water, and wastewater, and social infrastructure</i>	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes schools) is provided in urban growth and development
		Support in Part	Amend DEV2-O1 as follows: Comprehensive Development <i>The Takapō/Lake Tekapo North-West Future Development Area is developed for residential activities in a comprehensive manner, providing for a range of housing options and densities and other supporting activities, that is appropriate to its</i>	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes schools) is provided in urban growth and development

			<i>landscape setting, protects important ecological values and is integrated with infrastructure, including social infrastructure</i>		
		Support in Part	Amend DEV2-P4 as follows: Infrastructure <i>Ensure that any development in the Takapō/Lake Tekapo North-West Future Development Area is able to be serviced by reticulated water, and wastewater, and social infrastructure</i>	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes schools) is provided in urban growth and development	
19.	Sandra McHaffie	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	Do not want to be built in by multi storey buildings or have increased traffic/parking around their residence	N
20.	Owen Hunter	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	Concerns the Town Centre Zone will allow commercial building beside existing houses	Y
21.	Paul Hannagan	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The proposed plan change will chip away at cherished green spaces and will remove three holes from our international standard course	Y
22.	Tony Stringer and Jill Stringer	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The green space in the front of town is not negotiable space and is used by all residents recreationally	Y
23.	Helen Fincham-Putter	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Sports and green spaces should not be sacrificed for more visitor accommodation. The space is allocated to the Twizel Disc Golf Course	N
24.	Deidre Senior	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Frisbee golf is taking off and the 18-hole course is an asset to Twizel. The green space is a feature of Twizel and welcoming to visitors coming into the town	N
25.	Anne Deaker	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	I totally support outdoor recreation in this area. No changes to the Twizel Disc Golf Course should be made	N

26.	Robin Barlass	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Twizel Disc Golf Course is a valuable asset/attraction	N
27.	Ross Taylor	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The greenspace is more beneficial to Twizel township. Expansion on the western side of town can handle all requirements for additional buildings	N
28.	James Underwood	Oppose	Multistorey buildings are not provided for in the Plan All Recreation P land is to be retained and not rezoned under Plan Change 21	The Plan does not suit Twizel. We do not need or want multi-storey buildings. We don't want the green spaces removed. There is land available around Twizel before destroying the image of the town	N
29.	Ross Hanan	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Frisbee Golf Course has been a longstanding unique feature of Twizel. Removal of these holes will downgrade its international course validation. Access to these types of spaces is part of the bedrock of what Twizel offers to locals and visitors alike	N
30.	Trudy Hulme	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	To reduce the Twizel Disc Golf Course by three holes and make it a nonstandard course seems incredibly short sighted	N
31.	Ali Preston-Marshall	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Twizel Disc Golf Course is a wonderful asset and drawcard to the area. Rezoning it as commercial accommodation will reduce its size and appeal	N
32.	Michele O'Carroll	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Twizel Disc Golf Course should stay. We should be keeping it green space and not allow buildings in this area	N
33.	Megan Merrick	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This land is used as a community Disc Golf Course by residents and visitors and has been home of one of New Zealand's large annual Disc Golf tournaments	N

34.	Grant Hanan	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This area is the site of a number of Frisbee Golf holes that are an asset to the tourism industry and community	N
35.	Mitchell Beggs	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Frisbee Golf course is a valuable recreation area and should not be rezoned for commercial accommodation	N
36.	Andrea Shaw	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Frisbee Golf course is well used and loved by many. There are other areas that can be used for this type of change, or the area could be reduced to not interfere with the Frisbee Golf Course	Y
37.	Lister Bass	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	My land and property do not fit the objectives and policies of the Town Centre Zone description	N
38.	Craig Ure	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This area should be kept for public use and an asset for everyone	N
39.	Theresa Firman	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Twizel Disc Golf Course is a fantastic facility for the town and should be retained as green space	Y
40.	Brent Esler	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The area currently forms part of a popular recreation area and is part of a nationally recognised Disc Golf Course	N
41.	Mitch Taylor	Oppose	The rural land adjacent to the Opihi River on Geraldine-Fairlie Highway (Lot 5 of RM220008) is included in Plan Change 21 and is zoned General Industrial	The General Industrial Zone in Plan Change 21 in Fairlie is already used for industrial purposes and does not allow for future industrial use. There are also limitations on the new General Industrial areas proposed Lot 5 of RM220008 is only subject to potential flooding, and no other natural hazard risk. The	Y

				<p>submitter considers it an appropriate location for new industrial land</p> <p>The Rural land adjacent to the Opihi River would be an extension to the township and easily allows industrial businesses to be accessed without cumulative traffic safety effects as it shares the same level of servicing as other industrial land outside Fairlie</p>	
42.	Marco Brenna	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	Argyll Street is a quiet residential area, is physically separated from the Town Centre and inconsistent with the Town Centre Zone Statement. Business in this area will disturb residential properties	N
43.	Carolyn Mincham	Support in Part	<p>A horse-riding symbol is included on the Twizel trails to ensure access is protected</p> <p>The designation of Twizel trails for cycling and walking is included in Plan Change 21</p>	Local and visiting horse riders have used the trails around Twizel that the Spatial Plan has marked with walking and cycling symbols. I want to ensure that horse-riding access is preserved	Y
44.	Prue Clark	Oppose	<p>The assistance of a Heritage Planner to enhance work already undertaken</p> <p>Seek clarification in relation to the Mixed Use Zone for Burke's Pass on how it will enrich the unique value of Burkes Pass, will rates increase for current residents, will additional cost be incurred for sewerage, water and other amenities, and how will the infrastructure be advantaged if the development is an "overflow" from Tekapo i.e. workers/Tourists who are transient and not contributing to rates or community?</p>	Have a special interest in retaining the name of the Burke's Pass Heritage Precinct, acknowledging the considered and authenticated work done to date, from a childhood spent at Holbrook Station and Mt Dalgety Station	
45.	Christopher Davies	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Public green spaces once gone can never be reclaimed. The zone change impacts the Twizel Disc Golf Course and Twizel Moonbase event	N

46.	Kelli James	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	The proposed zone change extends too far away from the main commercial areas of Fairlie and is beyond what a reasonable person would expect could be considered necessary for a "pedestrian-focused environment". The area of Argyll Street could not reasonably be expected necessary to support the commercial activities and community facilities of Fairlie	N
47.	Warren Frost and Maree Frost	Oppose	<p>The name of the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area, displayed in the Mackenzie Spatial Plan, be changed back to the Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct to accurately reflect its intended nature</p> <p>A Heritage consultant be engaged to develop design guidelines (as per the Tekapo Precinct)</p> <p>The Heritage Precinct be included in Plan Change 21</p> <p>The walking and cycling connections advised in the original spatial plan be re-incorporated</p>	<p>There is no clear indication of what a "Rural Character" area is. The change of name is a quasi-European colonial attempt to subjugate the land to fit a purpose. This is not the entire story of Te Kopi-o-Ōpihi. To continue down a line of thinking that the area has a Rural Character rather than a Heritage does little to honour the past or the present conventions of UNESCO and our own country</p> <p>Use of a heritage consultant would ensure that the present stories are protected, and future stories can be clearly articulated</p> <p>An integrated cycle way through the town would avoid the compressed nature of traffic travelling through this area. With increased residential density, there will be a need for increased recreational opportunity and a walking / cycleway, as shown in the original Spatial Plan, would enable that. A cycle/walk loop will be an attraction of its own, which will lend weight to Te Kopi-o-Ōpihi being a destination in its own right. A cycle/walk loop provides an opportunity to tell the story of Ngāi Tahu and the role of this travel route to early Māori and Pakeha</p>	N

48.	Angela Davis	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Keep the frisbee golf area. It is more important for tourists to have activities. The majority of the time there is sufficient accommodation to cater for tourists	N
49.	Don Hayden	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The land contains three holes of the Twizel Disc Golf Course. The course is very popular with both novice and advanced players and is highly regarded by New Zealand's Disc Golf community	N
50.	John Cassie	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned Medium Density Residential	All properties in this area contain residential houses and have nothing to do with the Town Centre. This area does not fit the objectives and policies of the Town Centre Zone	Y
51.	Paul McKernan	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Disc Golf Course is a key part of the community of Twizel, bringing in hundreds if not thousands of people annually to the town	N
52.	Mary Murdoch	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	If this area were to be rezoned this would mean the removal of three holes from our international standard Disc Golf Course. In addition to this it is taking away from the wonderful green spaces that we have for the entrance to the town	N
53.	Frank Hocken	Oppose	Three storey buildings are not provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone A minimum density of 200m ² (three town houses on a 600m ² section) is not provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone	Allowing three storeys on a site will result in no sun for adjoining properties in winter The increased density will kill the village look of Twizel	Y
54.	Frank Hocken	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct The Recreation P land south of Ruataniwha Road is retained and not zoned Town Centre	The land has been made an avenue by a previous Community Board and Council. If sold it will spoil the effects of the village and once sold it cannot be replaced	Y

55.	Guus van Gisteren	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	There is currently only one disc golf course in Twizel. Building on the course would be a shame	Y
56.	Bruce Mincham	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Oppose the conversion of green spaces to be used for commercial (accommodation) activities	N
57.	Environment Canterbury Regional Council	Support in Part	<p>Amend the Operative District Plan definition of High Flood Risk as follows:</p> <p><i>Means areas where the product of water depth (metres) multiplied by velocity (metres per second) equals or exceeds 1, or where depths are greater than 1 metre, in areas subject to inundation during an event or 0.2% Annual Exceedance Probability.</i></p> <p>Or</p> <p>Add a new standard to the LLRZ framework to require all residential units between Glen Lyon Road and the Twizel River to be located atop the terrace to prevent development within areas subject to significant inundation</p>	Will ensure that any proposed residential building or subdivision located in an area defined as High Hazard in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement can be appropriately managed	Y
			Add Advice Notes to Standards LRZ-S4.2 and MUZ-S4.1 to highlight that authorisation may be required under the Canterbury Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw 2013 for activities occurring adjacent to small watercourses and drains	Promotes consistency with the Canterbury Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw 2013	
			<p>Amend LLRZ-S1 to ensure it is made clear that all development in the LLRZ (except for Kimbell) is required to connect to the Councils reticulated sewer network:</p> <p><i>Large Lot Residential Zone in Twizel and Fairlie</i></p> <p>1. <i>where the residential unit is connected to a reticulated sewerage system, or the</i></p>	Development not served by reticulated wastewater or stormwater infrastructure may adversely affect water quality	

			<p>residential unit is not connected to a reticulated sewerage system but the wastewater discharge is authorised by Environment Canterbury, †The minimum site area per residential unit is 2,000m² subject to the residential unit connecting to a reticulated sewerage system.</p> <p>Specific Control Area 1</p> <p>2. <u>The minimum site area per residential unit is 4,000m² subject to the residential unit connecting to a reticulated sewerage system.</u></p> <p>Specific Control Area 2</p> <p>3. <u>The minimum site area per residential unit is 1ha subject to the residential unit connecting to a reticulated sewerage system</u></p>		
			<p>Amend the LLRZ, RRZ and MUZ Chapters by inserting a new rule requiring a Restricted Discretionary Activity Consent for any activity in Kimbell or Albury that requires resource consent to discharge wastewater or stormwater to ground/water under the Regional Plan, with Discretion limited to:</p> <p>a. <u>The extent to which the location and footprint of buildings and activities (including impervious surface) affects the ability to effectively discharge wastewater/stormwater on site.</u></p> <p>Also, make any consequential amendments to the permitted activities rules</p>	<p>Development in Kimbell and Albury as it relates to wastewater and stormwater discharges remains a concern for Environment Canterbury particularly the cumulative effect on water quality</p> <p>A restricted discretionary activity status makes it clear that there are potential limitations to the development potential of these towns and that there is uncertainty about the ability to gain discharge consent. Further it would allow discharge and land use consent to be processed together. A Restricted Discretionary Status also provides the ability to refuse consent and there is a need for PC21 and the LWRP to take an integrated approach to water quality</p>	
			<p>Insert a new subdivision rule as Rule 4d of the ODP that:</p>	<p>Amendments to the subdivision rules are requested to ensure any subdivision in the LLRZ, LRZ and MUZ is listed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity with discretion limited to the size of the allotment. If this is not in scope</p>	

			<p><u>Requires a restricted discretionary activity consent for any subdivision in the LLRZ, LRZ and MUZ with discretion limited to allotment size</u></p>	<p>it is requested that Development Area Plans (DAP) are prepared for any new areas of LLRZ and LRZ in Kimbell and Albury to manage density and wastewater and stormwater discharge</p>	
			<p>Amend MUZ-S1 as follows:</p> <p><u>The minimum site area per any residential unit, or commercial/community activity that discharges wastewater to land, is:...</u></p>	<p>If the hearing panel do not want to require consent for all land use activities that involve discharge consent, Environment Canterbury requests amendments to the MUZ Density Standard so it applies to all permitted activities that require a discharge of wastewater including commercial activities and community facilities</p>	
			<p>Amendments to the relevant policies of the LLRZ, LRZ and MUZ will also be necessary and amendments to the chapter introductions as follows:</p> <p>LLR-P5 Manage development within the Large Lot Residential Zone to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>built form is of a scale and design that is compatible with the character, amenity values and purpose of the zone;</i> 2. <i>larger lot sizes are retained in areas subject to servicing constraints in Specific Control Areas 1 and 2, until such time appropriate services are in place; and</i> 3. <u><i>in areas with no reticulated sewer or stormwater services, development does not constrain the ability to effectively manage wastewater and stormwater discharges on site; and</i></u> 4. 3.4 <i>a predominance of open space over built form is maintained.</i> <p>MUZ-P3 Manage development within the Mixed Use Zone to ensure that it:</p>	<p>Will provide guidance for any consent application that breaches the density standard</p>	

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>provides a high-quality pedestrian environment;</i> 2. <i>is well-integrated with roads and public areas and positively contributes to their vibrancy;</i> 3. <i>provides a good level of amenity for residents, workers and visitors; and</i> 4. <i>is compatible with its residential setting and maintains the anticipated amenity values of any adjoining residential zone; and</i> 5. <u><i>does not constrain the ability to effectively manage wastewater and stormwater discharges on site in areas with no reticulated sewer or stormwater services.</i></u> <p>LRZ-P6 Manage development within the Low Density Residential Zone to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>built form is of a scale and design that is compatible with the character, amenity values and purpose of the zone;</i> 2. <i>larger lots sizes are retained in areas subject to servicing constraints in Specific Control Area 4, until such time appropriate services are in place; and</i> 3. <u><i>in areas with no reticulated sewer or stormwater services, development does not constrain the ability to effectively manage wastewater and stormwater discharges on site; and</i></u> 4. 34. <i>building and structures located in Specific Control Area 5 do not dominate the identified ridgeline when viewed from a public place.</i> <p>Amend the introduction section of LLRZ, LRZ, and MUZ to include the following sentence:</p> <p><u><i>The development potential of sites within Kimbell and Albury is limited by the possible need to obtain a discharge permit from Environment Canterbury for the discharge of wastewater and stormwater</i></u></p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Amend GIZ-R1 and GRZ-R2 as follows:</p> <p>GIZ-R1: Buildings and Structures</p> <p>Activity status: PER</p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. The building or structure is not located within 50m of a Low Density Residential Zone or Large Lot Residential Zone in Twizel; and</u></p> <p><u>Where</u></p> <p>2. ‡The activity complies with the following standards: GIZ-S1 Height GIZ-S2 Height in Relation to Boundary GIZ-S3 Setbacks GIZ-S4 Outdoor Storage GIZ-S5 Coverage GIZ-S6 Landscaping</p> <p>Activity status when compliance with <u>R2.1 standard(s)</u> is not achieved: <u>Controlled</u></p> <p><u>Matters of control are limited</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>hours of operation; and</u> b. <u>noise and vibration; and</u> c. <u>light spill; and</u> d. <u>effects on air quality; and</u> e. <u>length, height and alignment of boundary landscaping and bunds; and</u> f. <u>landscaping; and</u> g. <u>the setback of buildings and structures; and</u> h. <u>privacy.</u> <p>Refer to relevant standard(s)</p> <p>GIZ-R2: Buildings and Structures</p> <p>Activity status: PER</p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p>1. <u>The activity is not a heavy industrial activity; and</u></p>	<p>Promotes consistency with the Canterbury Regional Air Plan 2017 (“CARP”) which manages the discharge of containments to air and the potential effects on the receiving environment and sensitive activities</p> <p>Concern that the use of standards in the GIZ does not effectively maintain the amenity of adjoining residential zones (LLRZ and LRZ) in Twizel. Appropriate location of industrial activities to avoid discharge beyond boundaries will mitigate costs and some adverse effects</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p><u>2. The activity is not located within 50m of a Low Density Residential Zone or Large Lot Residential Zone in Twizel</u></p> <p>Activity status where compliance is not achieved with <u>R2.2: Controlled</u></p> <p><u>Matters of control are limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>hours of operation; and</u> b. <u>noise and vibration; and</u> c. <u>light spill; and</u> d. <u>effects on air quality; and</u> e. <u>length, height and alignment of boundary landscaping and bunds; and</u> f. <u>landscaping; and</u> g. <u>privacy.</u> <p>Activity status when compliance is not achieved with R2.1: RDIS</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The location, nature and scale of the activity. b. The sensitivity of the surrounding environment. c. The effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

58.	Ian Riddler	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The changes would ruin an existing recreational amenity which provides tourism, residential enrichment, and public greenspace. The public reserve is an irreplaceable asset and should be protected. The rezoning cuts out four of the 18 holes of the existing disc golf course, rendering it no longer suitable for inclusion in the New Zealand Competition circuit	N
59.	Valerie McMillan	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct The Recreation P land south of Ruataniwha Road is retained and not zoned Town Centre	Both entrances into Twizel offer the vista of wide-open green spaces, drawing the eye towards the township and the majestic mountains in the background. The re-zoning proposal will diminish this effect substantially. There is ample room elsewhere for visitor accommodation to be developed. This proposal will also have a devastating effect on Twizel's world-class disc golf course	N
60.	Ian Riddler	Oppose in Part	Amendments to the maximum noise limits	The proposed upper noise limits are excessively prohibitive, as they would exclude many common residential activities, including lawn mowers, hedge trimmers, chain saws, and power tools. I appreciate the intent to have quiet residential neighbourhoods, but the maximum noise level is too low	N
61.	Judy Norman	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This will destroy part of the Frisbee golf course. Frisbee is a fast-growing sport and a great attraction for people coming to Twizel	N
62.	John Capstick	Support	Burkes Pass is a Rural Character Area with no walking tracks and toilets established on private land	The revised Spatial Plan is more in keeping with the towns existing character	N
63.	Heather Capstick	Support	Burkes Pass be a township of rural character only	The revised changes made to the Burkes Pass Spatial Plan is that the town be of rural character with no intrusion on private land with walking tracks and subdivision	N

64.	Grant Pearson	Oppose	The Plan Change and Maps be readily available online and a substantial increase in time be made for the lodgement of submissions	The proposed maps are not easily available for viewing. There has been insufficient time for public viewing and submissions	N
65.	Jacqui De Buyzer	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This area is a lovely green area that should remain. Further commercial development in this area should not be allowed and the disc golf holes should remain	N
66.	Tina Wang	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	Argyll Street is detached from the town centre and is a residential area. Redefining the Argyll Street as a retail area will significantly disturb the peacefulness of the neighbourhood	N
67.	Craig La Hood	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The proposed change includes the loss of three Disc Golf holes and Twizels beautiful open space and would ruin the welcoming entrance to Twizel	Y
68.	Scott Aronsen	Oppose	All Recreation P land is to be retained and not rezoned under Plan Change 21 Development of high or mixed density residential development is not provided for	Our reserve areas are prized treasures and should not have the potential to be sold off for private development The intended high/mixed development goes against the spirit of people's pleasant surroundings and is out of context for the town of Twizel	N
69.	Deb Thompson-bre	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Whilst I support progress and a requirement for commercial accommodation. I do not support losing this area without a relocation plan. There is ample area down by the river that could incorporate frisbee golf along with family BBQ areas and beautification	N
70.	Belinda Kelly	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The Frisbee course is well used and a great asset to Twizel as is all the green space which makes Twizel special	Y
71.	Bevan Newlands	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not	This green space is an important area in the Twizel Disc Golf Course. The Twizel Disc Golf	N

			zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Club holds annual tournament that bring in revenue to the community and provides an activity for our people to enjoy. Our green spaces and sporting facilities need to be protected	
72.	Grant Payne	Oppose in Part	That 56-74 North West Arch are excluded from any proposed changes imposed by Specific Control Area 4	The allotments at 56-74 North West Arch opposite the Four Lakes Subdivision were specifically created and controlled with covenants to maintain the rural feel and maintain the desired spaces and standards. These covenants do not allow for further subdivision or by definition building within the 10m setback (Covenant attached). Including these properties in the Plan Change only potentially causes confusion, stress and unnecessary expense for owners of these properties.	Y
73.	Jacob Payne	Oppose in Part	The Residential 4 minimum building setback of 10m is retained in Specific Control Area 4 until the minimum site area is reduced	The proposed building setback of 2m is far too close for the size of the sections (4,000m ²). There is no need for building this close to the boundary. If the specific control area is never removed due to the cost of installing services some properties could be stuck with buildings 2m off their boundary indefinitely with no ability to subdivide	Y
74.	Road Metals Company Limited	New Zoning	Rural land legally described as Lot 2 DP 487658 and Sec 8 SO 384036 is included in Plan Change 21 and is zoned an appropriate mix of Light, General and Heavy Industry Activity in accordance with the Mackenzie Spatial Plan, as opposed to in Stage 3 of the District Plan review Amend the relevant zone statement, objectives, and any other provisions throughout the MDP to provide for the rezoning. Including, changes to	As part of the assessment of environmental effects (AEE) for RM210048, additional landscape and ecological assessments have been undertaken on the site which can be used to advance this rezoning while Waka Kotahi have also agreed to heavy vehicle movements (in a limited capacity) from an upgraded access point into the site Necessary changes to allow for the rezoning of the land to industrial	Y

			Section 5: Business Zones and any other relevant chapters. Make any necessary changes to the MDP including the rezoning of adjoining land to industrial or other appropriate zone.		
75.	Ursula Paul	Oppose	Meaningful consultation in person should occur with printed detailed information	It is impossible for a lay person to gain enough insight into all the zoning changes. Consultation should have included comprehensive community meetings and sent out information in plain English about the plan change. I oppose the plan because of these deficits in the consultation process	N
76.	Jan Spriggs	Oppose in Part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A maximum of two stories be allowed in the Medium Density Residential Zone • That a larger space is provided for the industrial zone • That the Village Centre Zone be reviewed to maintain Market Place as the heart of Twizel • That additional parking space be provided in the Village Centre • That all existing green spaces/reserves be maintained 	<p>The proposed plan change needs to cater for growth while still retaining the feel of the town</p> <p>The proposed three-story construction will block views and create significant shading</p> <p>The industrial area is not large enough to service the growing town</p> <p>The heart of Twizel is the Market Place with the large green open space. The proposed change means that Twizel will lose its heart as the shops and cafés are spread out into a long narrow band</p> <p>Twizel was built with a number of greenways and green spaces. It is important that these are maintained</p>	Y
77.	Russell King	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	We always stop for lunch when travelling and the kids love playing the disc golf course. The annual disc golf tournament attracts over a hundred players and injects thousands into the local community	Y
78.	Hannah Josli	Oppose	All Recreation P land is to be retained and not rezoned under Plan Change 21	I oppose the transformation of our green ways in the Town Centre. We should be protecting	N

				our green spaces it's what brought a lot of us to live here and why people want to visit. Disruption to the internationally recognised Frisbee golf course	
79.	Morgan Bathgate	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This area forms part of the Twizel Disc Golf course. Removing three holes would incur a significant cost to reinstall or would significantly decrease the value of the nationally recognised course. The course brings visitors to Twizel, including over three days during the annual tournament. The course is one of many between Queenstown and Christchurch, attracting visitors to stop when travelling this route	N
80.	Daniel Richards and Laura Richards	Oppose	<p>The name of the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area, displayed in the Mackenzie Spatial Plan, be changed back to The Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct to accurately reflect its intended nature</p> <p>A heritage consultant or consulting team be engaged to develop design guidelines and covenants (as per other small heritage townships or character developments of significance)</p> <p>The Heritage Precinct be included in Plan Change 21</p> <p>The Residential Zones to be carefully ruled by design guidelines and covenants if they fall within the Heritage Precinct</p> <p>The additional walkways reinstated as per the original spatial plan</p>	<p>Upset at the lack of communication and proper planning process for the Burkes Pass Spatial Plan. Outcomes of the early community meetings was the inclusion of a "Heritage Precinct" to protect the special heritage character of the area. Unfortunately, the plan was then altered from "Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct" to "Rural Character Area" and published without any further consultation from the wider community</p> <p>Inevitable that there will be future residential development within Burkes Pass. However development should be sympathetic to the historical surroundings. Clear design guideline and strict covenants need to guide architectural and landscape design for any new development. This should be driven by a heritage team potentially including a planner, architect, landscape architect and representative from Ngai Tahu</p>	Y

				Walking/cycling tracks provide for recreational opportunities, pleasant and interesting places to visit and live in, and adds to the character of an area	
81.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ)	Support	Retain the definition of Emergency Service Facilities as notified	The definition includes fire stations	Y
		New Definition	<p>Include a new definition of Emergency Aviation Movements as follows:</p> <p><u>Emergency Aviation Movements</u> <u>Means intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements associated with the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>landing or departing in an emergency</u> b. <u>emergency flights required to rescue persons from life threatening situations or to transport patients, human organs, or medical personnel in medical emergency</u> c. <u>using an airstrip due to unforeseen circumstances as a necessary alternative to an airstrip elsewhere</u> d. <u>flights required to meet the needs of a national or civil defence emergency declared under the Civil Defence Act 1983</u> e. <u>flights certified by the Minister of Defence necessary for reasons of National security in accordance with section 4 of the Defence Act</u> f. <u>undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties</u> 	Provides for intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements associated with emergencies, including undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties	
		New Objective	<p>Include a new objective in the LLRZ as follows:</p> <p><u>LLRZ-O3 Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure</u></p>	Promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Large Lot Residential Zone	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend LLRZ-P4 as follows:</p> <p><u>LLRZ-P4 Other Non-Residential Activities</u> <u>Avoid non-residential activities and buildings not provided for in LLRZ-P2, unless:</u></p>	Emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community. Strategically locating fire stations within	

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>any adverse effects of the activity do not compromise the amenity values of the surrounding area; and</i> 2. <i>the nature, scale and intensity of the activity is compatible with the character and purpose of the zone.</i> 3. <u><i>There is an operation and/or functional need for an emergency service facility to be located within the area</i></u> 	communities is essential to enable response times	
	Support in Part	Amend LLRZ-R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7 and R8 as follows: <i>Activity status: PER</i> <i>Where:</i> ... <u><i>The activity complies with LLRZ-S6</i></u>		It is vital developments are supplied with a sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply	
	New Rule	Include a new rule in the LLRZ provisions as follows: <u><i>LLRZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</i></u> <u><i>Activity status – Permitted</i></u>		Provides for intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements associated with emergencies, including undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties	
	Support in Part	Amend LLRZ-S2 as follows: <i>LLRZ-S2 Height</i> <i>1. The maximum height of a building and structure shall not exceed 8m measured above ground level.</i> <u><i>Note: Emergency service facilities up to 9m and hose drying towers up to 15m are exempt from this rule</i></u>		Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height, and hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height	
	Support in Part	Amend LLRZ-S3 as follows: <i>LLRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary</i> <i>1. Any building or structure shall comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements in APP1.</i> <u><i>Note: Emergency service facilities and hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</i></u>		Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers in relation to boundary standards	

		<p>New Standard</p> <p>Include a new standard in the LLRZ as follows:</p> <p><u>LLRZ-S6 Servicing</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>All new developments that will require a water supply, including for firefighting purposes, must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u> <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u> <p><u>Note: The above does not replace regional rules which control the taking and use of groundwater and surface water. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	<p>Will ensure all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced</p>	
		<p>New Objective</p> <p>Include a new objective in the LRZ as follows:</p> <p><u>LRZ-O3 Infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure</u></p>	<p>Promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Low Density Residential Zone</p>	
		<p>New Policy</p> <p>Include a new policy in the LRZ as follows:</p> <p><u>LRZ-P6 Servicing</u></p> <p><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes</u></p>	<p>Will ensure all land use activities in the Low-Density Residential Zone are adequately serviced</p>	

		Support in Part	<p>Amend LRZ-P5 as follows:</p> <p>LRZ-P5 Other Non-Residential Activities <i>Avoid non-residential activities and buildings not provided for in LRZ-P2 or LRZ-P4, unless:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>the activity is an expansion of an existing activity; and/or</i> 2. <i>any adverse effects of the activity do not compromise the amenity values of the surrounding area; and</i> 3. <i>the nature, scale and intensity of the activity is compatible with the character and purpose of the zone.</i> 4. <i><u>there is an operation and/or functional need for an emergency service facility to be located within the area</u></i> 	Emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend LRZ-R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8 and R9 as follows:</p> <p><i>Activity status: PER</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i><u>The activity complies with LRZ-S7</u></i></p>	It is vital developments are supplied with a sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply	
		New Rule	<p>Include a new rule in the LRZ provisions as follows:</p> <p><i><u>LRZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u></i> <i>Activity status – Permitted</i></p>	Provides for intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements associated with emergencies, including undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend LRZ-S2 as follows:</p> <p>LRZ-S2 Height 1. <i>The maximum height of any building or structures shall not exceed 8m measured above ground level.</i></p> <p><i><u>Note: Emergency service facilities up to 9m and hose drying towers up to 15m are exempt from this rule</u></i></p>	Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height, and hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height	

		Support in Part	<p>Amend LRZ-S3 as follows:</p> <p><i>LRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary</i></p> <p><i>1. Any building or structure shall comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements in APP1.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Emergency service facilities and hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</i></p>	Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers in relation to boundary standards	
		New Standard	<p>Include a new standard in the LRZ as follows:</p> <p><i>LRZ-S7 Servicing</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. All new developments that will require a water supply, including for firefighting purposes, must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</i> <i>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</i> <p><i>Note: The above does not replace regional rules which control the taking and use of groundwater and surface water. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.</i></p> <p><i>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</i></p>	Will ensure all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced	
		New Objective	<p>Include a new objective in the MRZ as follows:</p> <p><i>MRZ-O3 Infrastructure</i></p>	Promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Medium Density Residential Zone	

			<u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure</u>	
	New Policy	Include a new policy in the MRZ as follows: <u>MRZ-P6 Servicing</u> <u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes</u>		Will ensure all land use activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone are adequately serviced
	Support in Part	Amend MRZ-R1, R2, R3, R5, R6 and R8 as follows: <i>Activity status: PER</i> <i>Where:</i> ... <u>The activity complies with MRZ-S11</u>		It is vital developments are supplied with a sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply
	New Rule	Include a new rule in the MRZ provisions as follows: <u>MRZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity status – Permitted</u>		Provides for intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements associated with emergencies, including undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties
	Support in Part	Amend MRZ-S2 as follows: <u>MRZ-S2 Height</u> ... <u>3. MRZ-S2.1 does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height</u>		Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height, and hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height
	Support in Part	Amend MRZ-S3 as follows: <u>MRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary</u> <i>1. Any building or structure shall comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements in APP1.</i> <u>Note: Hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</u>		Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption hose drying towers in relation to boundary standards
	Support	Retain MRZ-S6 as notified		

		<p>New Standard</p> <p>Include a new standard in the MRZ as follows:</p> <p><u>MRZ-S11 Servicing</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>All new developments that will require a water supply, including for firefighting purposes, must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u> <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u> <p><u>Note: The above does not replace regional rules which control the taking and use of groundwater and surface water. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	<p>Will ensure all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced</p>	
		<p>New Objective</p> <p>Include a new objective in the LFRZ as follows:</p> <p><u>LFRZ-O3 Infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>Public health and safety is maintained through provision of infrastructure</u></p>	<p>Promotes the provision of infrastructure in the Large Format Retail Zone</p>	
		<p>New Policy</p> <p>Include a new policy in the LFRZ as follows:</p> <p><u>LFRZ-P4 Servicing</u></p> <p><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes</u></p>	<p>Ensures all activities in the Large Format Retail Zone are adequately serviced</p>	

		Support in Part	Amend LFRZ-R1, R2, R3, and R4 as follows: <i>Activity status: PER</i> <i>Where:</i> ... <u>The activity complies with LFRZ-S7</u>	It is vital developments are supplied with a sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.	
		Support in Part	Amend LFRZ-S1 as follows: LFRZ-S1 Height 1. <i>The maximum height of any building or structure shall not exceed 12m above ground level.</i> <u>Note: Hose drying towers up to 15m in height are exempt from this rule</u>	Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height, and hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height	
		Support in Part	Amend LFRZ-S2 as follows: LFRZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary 1. <i>Any building or structure shall comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements in APP1.</i> <u>Note: Hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</u>	Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption hose drying towers in relation to boundary standards	
		Support in Part	Amend LFRZ-S4 as follows: LFRZ-S4 Outdoor Storage ... 3. <u>Screening shall not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>	Screening of outdoor storage areas should not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities	
		New Standard	Include a new standard in the LFRZ as follows: LFRZ-S7 Servicing 1. <u>All new developments that will require a water supply, including for firefighting purposes, must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u>	Will ensure all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced	

			<p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Note: The above does not replace regional rules which control the taking and use of groundwater and surface water. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>		
		Support in Part	<p>Amend MUZ-O1 as follows:</p> <p><i>The Mixed-Use Zone contains residential activities, along with a range of primarily small- scale commercial and non-commercial and community activities that serve the convenience needs of the surrounding residential and rural neighbourhood or visitors</i></p>	Fire and Emergency supports in part MUZ-01, to the extent that the objective provides for commercial and community activities, however, does not provide for specifically non-commercial activities such as Emergency Service Activities	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend MUZ-R1, R2, R3, R4, R5,R6,R7 and R8 as follows:</p> <p><i>Activity status: PER</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i> ... <u>The activity complies with MUS-S8</u></p>	It is vital developments are supplied with a sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply	
		New Rule	<p>Include a new rule in the MUZ provisions as follows:</p> <p><u>MUZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity status - Permitted</u></p>	Provides for intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements associated with emergencies, including undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties	

		Support in Part	<p>Amend MUZ-S2 as follows:</p> <p>MUZ-S2 Height</p> <p>1. <i>The maximum height of any building or structure shall not exceed 8m above ground level.</i></p> <p><u>Note: Hose drying towers up to 15m in height are exempt from this rule</u></p>	<p>Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height, and hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height</p>	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend MUZ-S3 as follows:</p> <p>MUZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary</p> <p>1. <i>Any building or structure shall comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements in APP1.</i></p> <p><u>Note: Hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</u></p>	<p>Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption hose drying towers in relation to boundary standards</p>	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend MUZ-S5 as follows:</p> <p>MUZ-S5 Outdoor Storage</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. <u>Screening shall not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities</u></p>	<p>Screening of outdoor storage areas should not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities</p>	
		New Standard	<p>Include a new standard in the LFRZ as follows:</p> <p>MUZ-S8 Servicing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>All new developments that will require a water supply, including for firefighting purposes, must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u> 2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an</u> 	<p>Will ensure all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced</p>	

			<p><u>alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Note: The above does not replace regional rules which control the taking and use of groundwater and surface water. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>		
		Support	Retain NCZ-O1 as notified		
		Support	Retain NCZ-P1 as notified		
		Support in Part	<p>Amend NCZ-R1, R2, R3 and R4 as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: <i>PER</i></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>The activity complies with NCZ-S7</u></p>	It is vital developments are supplied with a sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply	
		New Rule	<p>Include a new rule in the NCZ provisions as follows:</p> <p><u>NCZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u></p> <p><u>Activity status - Permitted</u></p>	Provides for intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements associated with emergencies, including undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend NCZ-S2 as follows:</p> <p>NCZ-S2 Height</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The maximum height of any building or structure shall not exceed 7.5m above ground level, except a gable roof may exceed the maximum height by no more than 1m.</i> <u>The maximum height of Emergency Service Facilities shall not exceed 8m in height and</u> 	Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height, and hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.	

			<u>Hose Drying Towers shall not exceed 15m in height.</u>	
	Support in Part	Amend NCZ-S3 as follows: NCZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary <i>1. Any building or structure shall comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements in APP1.</i> <u>Note: Emergency service facilities and hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</u>		Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption for service facilities and hose drying towers in relation to boundary standards
	Support in Part	Amend NCZ-S4 as follows: NCZ-S4 Outdoor Storage ... <i>3. Screening shall not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities</i>		Screening of outdoor storage areas should not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities
	New Standard	Include a new standard in the NCZ as follows: NCZ-S11 Servicing <i>1. All new developments that will require a water supply, including for firefighting purposes, must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</i> <i>2. Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</i> <u>Note: The above does not replace regional rules which control the taking and use of groundwater and surface water. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.</u>		Will ensure all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced

			<u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u>	
	Support in Part	Amend TCZ-O1 as follows: <i>The Town Centre Zone is the primary retail destination for comparison and convenience shopping in the District, and is a focal point for the community, providing for a range of commercial, non-commercial and community-focused activities, along with activities that support the vibrancy of these areas</i>		Will enable FENZ to construct and operate fire stations in appropriate locations to ensure reasonable response times
	Support	Retain TCZ-P1 as notified		Will enable FENZ to construct and operate fire stations in appropriate locations to ensure reasonable response times
	Support in Part	Amend TCZ-R1, R2, R3 and R4 as follows: <i>Activity status: PER</i> <i>Where:</i> ... <i>The activity complies with TCZ-S8</i>		It is vital developments are supplied with a sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply
	New Rule	Include a new rule in the TCZ provisions as follows: <u>TCZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity status – Permitted</u>		Provides for intermittent aircraft and helicopter movements associated with emergencies, including undertaking firefighting or search and rescue duties
	Support in Part	Amend TCZ-S1 as follows: TCZ-S1 Height <i>1. The maximum height of any building or structure shall not exceed 10.5m above ground level.</i> <u>Note: Hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</u>		Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height, and hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height

		Support in Part	Amend TCZ-S2 as follows: <i>TCZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary</i> <i>1. Any building or structure shall comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements in APP1.</i> <u>Note: Hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</u>	Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption hose drying towers in relation to boundary standards	
		Support in Part	Amend TCZ-S4 as follows: <i>TCZ-S4 Verandahs</i> <i>1. Where any building is erected, or reconstructed or altered in a way that physically changes a road facing facade, a verandah shall be provided along the full frontage of the building to provide continuous coverage for pedestrians moving along the public footpath or place, with a minimum width of 2.8m in Fairlie, 3m in Twizel, or the width of the footpath.</i> <u>Note: Emergency Service Facilities are exempt from this rule</u>	Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption in relation to verandahs	
		Support in Part	Amend TCZ-S5 as follows: <i>TCZ-S5 Outdoor Storage</i> ... <i>3. <u>Screening shall not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities</u></i>	Screening of outdoor storage areas should not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities	
		Support	Retain TCZ-S7 as notified		
		New Standard	Include a new standard in the NCZ as follows: <i>TCZ-S8 Servicing</i> <i>1. <u>All new developments that will require a water supply, including for firefighting purposes, must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></i>	Will ensure all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced	

			<p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Note: The above does not replace regional rules which control the taking and use of groundwater and surface water. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	
	Support	Retain GIZ-O1 as notified		
	Support	Retain GIZ-O2 as notified		
	Support	Retain GIZ-P1 as notified		
	Support	Retain GIZ-P2 as notified		
	Support in Part	<p>Amend GIZ-R1, R2, R3 and R4 as follow:</p> <p><u>x. GIZ-S7 Servicing</u></p> <p><i>Matters of direction are restricted to:</i></p> <p>a. ...</p> <p>b. ...</p> <p><u>x. The provisions of the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	Requires the provision of firefighting water supply where development is not subject to a subdivision	
	New Rule	<p>Include a new rule to the GIZ provisions as follows:</p> <p><u>GIZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u></p>		

			<i>Activity status – Permitted</i>	
	Support in Part	Amend GIZ-S1 as follows: <i>GIZ-S1 Height</i> <i>1. The maximum height of any building or structure shall not exceed 12m above ground level.</i> <i><u>Note: Hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</u></i>		Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height, and hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height
	Support in Part	Amend GIZ-S2 as follows: <i>GIZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary</i> <i>1. Any building or structure shall comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements in APP1, where the boundary adjoins any residential zone.</i> <i><u>Note: Hose drying towers are exempt from this rule</u></i>		Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption for hose drying towers in relation to boundary standards
	Support in Part	Amend GIZ-S4 as follows: <i>GIZ-S4 Outdoor Storage</i> ... <i>3. <u>Screening shall not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities</u></i>		Screening of outdoor storage areas should not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities
	New Standard	Include a new standard in the GIZ as follows: <i>GIZ-11 Servicing</i> <i>1. <u>All new developments that will require a water supply, including for firefighting purposes, must be connected to a public reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></i> <i>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an</u></i>		Will ensure all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced

			<p><u>alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Note: The above does not replace regional rules which control the taking and use of groundwater and surface water. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to a development can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>		
82.	Ethan Stout	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Twizel has one of the best disc golf courses in the South Island. Each year the local club hosts a disc golf tournament. By rezoning part of the course the region would be undoing a lot of time, funding and volunteer work that it took to get the course running. Disc golf is a unique and cool sport which has physical and mental benefits	N
83.	Martin Galley	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	We have had the pleasure of running the Moonbase Twizel New Zealand Disc Golf Tour Event for the last eight years. The last two years have seen the numbers attending this event jump to over 100. Rezoning the land as Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct would lead to the loss of three holes effectively leading to the closure of the course Disc Golf is a fast growing and low cost recreational activity. Encroachment of commercial projects onto cherished greenbelt land would create an unacceptable precedent	N

84.	Department of Corrections	Support in Part	<p>Amend the Definition of “Community activities and Facilities” as follows:</p> <p><i>Community activities and facilities: means the use of land and buildings for the primary purpose of health, welfare, care, safety, education, culture and/or spiritual wellbeing, but excludes recreational activities. A community activity includes schools, day-care facilities hospitals, doctors surgeries and other health professionals, churches, halls, libraries, community centres, emergency service facilities, <u>and courthouses,</u> probation centres and detention centres.</i></p> <p>Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief is also requested</p>	<p>Remove reference to probation and detention centres.</p> <p>Align definition of “Community activities and Facilities” with wording that is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards</p>	Y
		New Definition	<p>Include a new definition of “Community Corrections Activity” as follows:</p> <p><u>Community corrections activity means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and integration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups.</u></p> <p>Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief is also requested</p>	<p>Consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards</p>	
		Support in part	<p>Amend the definition of “Residential activity “as follows:</p> <p><i>Residential activity: means the use of land and building(s) for by people’s for the purpose of permanent living accommodation, including all associated accessory buildings, leisure activities and the keeping of domestic livestock. For the purpose of this definition, residential activity shall include residential community care</i></p>	<p>Amend the definition of residential activity so that it is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards</p>	

			<p>homes for up to and including six people and management staff, and emergency and refuge accommodation.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief is also requested</p>	
	Support in Part	<p>Amend the definition of "Residential unit" as follows:</p> <p>Residential unit means a building(s) or part of a building that is used for a residential activity exclusively by residential activity which consists of a single self contained housekeeping unit, whether of one household and must include sleeping, cooking, bathing and toilet facilities or more persons, and includes accessory buildings. Where more than one kitchen facility is provided on the site, there shall be deemed to be more than one residential unit.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief is also requested</p>	Amend the definition of residential unit so that it is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards	
	New Definition	<p>Insert a new definition of Household as follows:</p> <p><u>Household: means a person or group of people who live together a unit whether or not:</u></p> <p>a. <u>any or all of them are members of the same family; or</u></p> <p>b. <u>one or more members of the group (whether or not they are paid) provides day-to-day care, support and supervision to any other member(s) of the group.</u></p> <p>Any consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief is also requested</p>	Add a new definition "household", to clarify that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement	

		Support in Part	<p>Retain LLRZ-O1 as notified</p> <p>Amend LLRZ-P1 as follows:</p> <p>Residential Activities</p> <p><i>Enable residential activities <u>and households</u> within a range of residential unit types and sizes</i></p>	Retain Objective LLRZ-01. Amend policy LLRZ-P1 to recognise accommodation activities provided by Ara Poutama
		Support in Part	<p>Retain MRZ-O1 as notified</p> <p>Amend MRZ-P1 as follows:</p> <p>Residential Activities</p> <p><i>Enable residential activities <u>and households</u> within a range of residential unit types and sizes</i></p>	Retain Objective MRZ-01. Amend policy MRZ-P1 to recognise accommodation activities provided by Ara Poutama
		Support	<p>Retain the following objectives and policies as notified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MUZ- O1 • MUZ-P1 • TCZ-O1 • TCZ-P1 • GIZ-O1 	Retain objectives and policies as listed which appropriately enable the development of communities corrections activities in commercial and mixed use zones
		Support	<p>Retain the land use activity rules applying to “residential activity” and “residential unit” in the Large Lot Residential Zone, Low Density Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LLRZ-R1 • LLRZ-R4 • LRZ-R1 • LRZ-R4 • MRZ-R1 • MRZ-R3 	Retain the permitted activity land use rules applying to residential activity and residential unit in the LLRZ, LDRZ, and MRZ
		New Rule	<p>Insert a new activity rule applying to “community corrections activity” in the Mixed Use Zone as follows:</p>	Ara Poutama requests a permitted activity rule applying to community corrections activities in the Mixed Used Zone (MUZ) to replace rule

			<u>MUZ-RX Community Corrections Activity</u> <u>Mixed Use Zone Activity Status: PER</u>	MUZ-R7 regarding enabling community corrections activity	
		New Rule	Insert a new activity rule applying to community corrections activity" in the Town Centre Zone as follows" <u>TCZ-RX Community Corrections Activity</u> <u>Town Centre Zone Activity Status: PER</u>	Ara Poutama requests a permitted activity rule applying to community corrections activities in the Town Centre Zone to replace rule TCZ-R3 regarding enabling community corrections activity	
		New Rule	Insert a new activity rule applying to community corrections activity" in the General Industrial Zone as follows" <u>GIZ-RX Community Corrections Activity</u> <u>General Industrial Zone Activity Status: PER</u>	Ara Poutama requests a permitted activity rule applying to community corrections activities in the General Industrial Zone	
85.	Lizz Carrington	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This area provides a lovely entrance to Twizel and entertainment for visitors (Frisbee Golf Course)	N
86	David Power	Support in Part	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct The existing recreation land in front of the Twizel Skate Park and incorporating the car parking area in Twizel is retained and is not rezoned Town Centre. The existing viewing corridor in this location is retained	This open space area already provides a recreational existing use and should not be changed or jeopardised The skate park already has support from Council to be extended and is also part of an existing viewing corridor that should not change or be jeopardised	Y
87.	Steve and Michelle Allan	Support	Retain the Burkes Pass Spatial Plan	The original Spatial Plan for Burkes Pass caused concern for affected landowners around walking/cycling tracks on private property. In addition, we do not support the labelling of 'Heritage' to any privately owned homes/properties	N

88.	Mackenzie A and P Society		<p>The Showgrounds is listed as a Scheduled Activity as seen in the Ashburton District Plan. If this cannot occur a Specific Control Area is requested which would apply to the Showgrounds (in its entirety) and would include the following appropriate standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A maximum building height of 10m • Road and internal boundary setbacks of 2m and compliance with the height in relation to boundary standard • The ability to carry out public recreation activities on the site as a Permitted Activity • No inclusion of impervious surface coverage 	The Association has a long-standing history within the Mackenzie District and is the largest one day show in the southern hemisphere. It is considered unlikely that there will be a significant shift away from the activities that are carried out on the Showgrounds in the short to medium future.	Y
89.	Shaun Norman	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Concern the Plan Change swallows up the Twizel International Frisbee Golf Course	N
90.	Kevin and Jodi Payne	Oppose	<p>The trail/cycleway/walkway identified in the Mackenzie Spatial Plan on the Fairlie A&P grounds is removed</p> <p>Lot 2 DP 461880 on School Road, Fairlie is rezoned Low Density or Large Lot Residential under Plan Change 21</p>	<p>This land is leased for stock grazing and hay/baleage and is not acceptable for a trail. It would impose health and safety challenges.</p> <p>While currently operating as a rural lifestyle block, we would like the opportunity in the future to subdivide as future Low Density Residential and/or Large Lot Residential Zoning which is consistent with other properties on the edge of town</p>	Y
91.	Kieran Buckham	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Greenspaces are an integral part of Twizels design and one of the best parts of the town. Many locals play frisbee golf and it brings people in from all over	N

92.	Grant and Liz Munro	Support	Retain the Burkes Pass Spatial Plan	Any changes to this plan would undermine the good developed throughout the consultation process	Y
93.	Simon Feasey	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The loss of the disc golf course outweighs some small financial gain from the sale of the land. The course is a top designation for disc golfers in the South Island	N
94.	Melissa McMullan	Oppose in Part	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	Rezoning of this area is non-sensical due to existing residential development in the street. New residential buildings in this area are being developed and are unlikely to change in future	Y
95.	Stephen Golding	Oppose	Medium and High-Density housing is not provided for in Twizel	Considers the plan change ridiculous	Y
96.	Rosemary Golding	Oppose	Development of high and medium density housing in Twizel is not provided for	Allowing high rise buildings is going to block people's views	N
97.	Jessica Mackay	Oppose	Building heights of 10-11m are not provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone The carparking requirements in the Medium Density Residential Zone are reviewed The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive is zoned Town Centre Zone instead of or in addition to the Ruataniwha Road Town Centre Zone	Twizel is loved because of its views, open space and lack of congestion. Heights of 10-11m will reduce sunlight and views. Further research and review is required Allowing multiple units up to three stories will likely result in residents parking within unformed footpath areas. This is already a problem in the holiday period and creates a hazard for walkers The area on Ruataniwha road does not integrate well with Market Place and is limited by the existing service station and motel under construction. The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive integrates better with Market Place	Y

98.	Nick Mackay	Oppose	<p>Building heights of 10-11m are not provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone</p> <p>The carparking requirements in the Medium Density Residential Zone are reviewed</p> <p>The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive is zoned Town Centre Zone instead of or in addition to the Ruataniwha Road Town Centre Zone</p> <p>The 10.5m height for buildings in the Town Centre Zone is considered in relation to the existing Market Place and further consideration is given for carparking</p>	<p>Will reduce sunlight and views. Further research and review is required</p> <p>Allowing multiple units up to three stories will likely result in residents parking within unformed footpath areas. This is already a problem in the holiday period and creates a hazard for walkers</p> <p>The area on Ruataniwha road does not integrate well with Market Place and is limited by the existing service station and motel under construction. The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive integrates better with Market Place</p> <p>Impacts of shading and views. We have insufficient carparks during holiday periods</p>	N
99.	Karen MacDiarmid	Oppose	<p>Building heights of 10-11m are not provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone</p> <p>The carparking requirements in the Medium Density Residential Zone are reviewed</p> <p>The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive is zoned Town Centre Zone instead of or in addition to the Ruataniwha Road Town Centre Zone</p>	<p>Will reduce sunlight and views. Further research and review is required</p> <p>Allowing multiple units up to three stories will likely result in residents parking within unformed footpath areas. This is already a problem in the holiday period and creates a hazard for walkers</p> <p>The area on Ruataniwha road does not integrate well with Market Place and is limited by the existing service station and motel under construction. The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive integrates better with Market Place</p>	Y

			The 10.5m height for buildings in the Town Centre Zone is considered in relation to the existing Market Place and further consideration is given for carparking	Impacts of shading and views. We have insufficient carparks during holiday periods	
100.	Ian Cartwright	Oppose	<p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct</p> <p>The Recreation P land south of Ruataniwha Road is retained and not zoned Town Centre</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will encourage undesirable, unnecessary "cash grab" short term rental accommodation Removal of key green space will negatively impact on Twizel character The green area on the southern side of Ruataniwha Road from Musterers Hut to the service station was created to create a welcoming boulevard to the town centre. Negative impact on existing frisbee golf course It's not supported by the residents 	N
101.	Air BnB	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visitor accommodation being permitted in all residential zones. Clarification is sought in regard to the use of only one unit per site for residential visitor accommodation and how this would apply to apartments/townhouses in the Medium Density Residential Zone. A standard approach to assessing impacts on amenity is recommended with the Code of Conduct approach, piloted in New South Wales Australia, given as an example 	<p>If a family were to host in a granny flat two guests and in a spare room in the main house two guests the overall number of guests would be under the cap of six which could create inconsistency within the plan if the aim is to manage impacts on traffic and amenity</p> <p>Employing a similar mechanism as part of a nationwide framework would ensure complaints can be heard independently and fairly and compliance action may be taken to deal with industry participants in violation of the Code of Conduct</p>	Y
102.	Nicola Newman	Oppose	All Recreation P land is to be retained and not rezoned under Plan Change 21	Green areas lost to high density housing or commercial use has a detrimental view on the town	N
103.	Elizabeth Kinsman	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	<p>This area should be retained as residential</p> <p>Concerns raised with the 10.5m height</p>	Y

104.	Luke Haugh	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	Business should not be able to start in this area. Nor should there be an ability to build multi-level buildings in amongst our houses. Business would result in more cars parked up and down the street	N
105.	Heather Eathorne	Oppose	Three storey buildings are not provided for in the Plan	Do not want to live beside or across the road from multi-level dwellings	N
106.	Karen Morgan	Support in Part	The location of the 'Medium Density Residential' Zones in Twizel are reconsidered and managed to ensure areas of infill are in keeping with the history of the town whilst maintaining the natural vistas	There are pockets of Twizel that are suitable for terrace style housing where shading and or privacy will not be an issue. In other areas where these issues may arise smaller single story, smaller section dwellings can achieve the same medium density residential objectives (i.e., town house living). Medium Density Residential buildings ringfencing the town centre will detract from the 'village feel'. The clear open spaces and viewing corridors in Twizel are to be protected	N
107.	Anthony Weekes	Oppose in Part	Building heights of 10-11m are not provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone The carparking requirements in the Medium Density Residential Zone are reviewed The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive is zoned Town Centre Zone instead of or in addition to the Ruataniwha Road Town Centre Zone The 10.5m height for buildings in the Town Centre Zone is considered in relation to the	Will reduce sunlight and views. Further research and review is required Allowing multiple units up to three stories will likely result in residents parking within unformed footpath areas. This is already a problem in the holiday period and creates a hazard for walkers The area on Ruataniwha road does not integrate well with Market Place and is limited by the existing service station and motel under construction. The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive integrates better with Market Place	N

			existing Market Place and further consideration is given for carparking	Impacts of shading and views. We have insufficient carparks during holiday periods	
108.	Enviro Waste New Zealand	Support in Part	Amend LLRZ-P5 as follows: 1. <i>Built form is of a scale and design that is compatible with the character, amenity values and purpose of the zone <u>and maintains the amenity values anticipated in adjacent zones</u></i>	Will ensure lawfully established activities in adjacent zones will not be unduly compromised by activities in the residential zone, resulting in reverse sensitivity effects on existing established uses	Yes
		Support in Part	Amend LLRZ-S4 as follows: 2. <i>'internal boundaries-, <u>except that where an allotment is adjacent to the Industrial Zone, any residential unit or habitable buildings within that allotment shall be setback a minimum of 20m from the Boundary adjacent to the Industrial Zone</u></i>	The existing Residential 3 Zone requires a 20m setback to be provided adjacent to an industrial zone. This rule should be retained so that dwellings do not impact on adjacent industrial activities	
		Support in Part	Amend MRS-R1 as follows: Activity status when compliance is not achieved with R1.1 or R1.2: RDIS Where: the activity complies with... <u>WRZ-S11 Waste Management</u>	To introduce a new Waste Management Standard, the non-compliance needs to be added to the list of standards to be assessed. The Standard will only apply where the density rule is triggered.	
		Support in Part	Amend MRS-R9 as follows: c. <i>Provision of /landscaping open space, <u>waste storage and on-site amenity for residents</u></i>	Waste management for retirement villages needs to be carefully planned at the design stage	
		New Standard	Include a new standard for waste management as follows: MRZ-S11 1. <i><u>Where individual bins are used, a minimum storage space for bins of 1.4m² per dwelling is provided (note: communal bins - refer to Solid Waste Bylaw). The bins must be visually screened, be accessible for residents</u></i>	Given the proposed density of one unit per 200m ² , the space allocated to waste management needs to be well designed to avoid adverse effects on amenity, and the health and safety of residents, road corridor users and collection staff. The proposed standard allows for bin storage to be of	

			<p><u>to get to the kerb without stairs or steep gradients.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where kerbside collection is employed, a kerbside space of 1m per dwelling is available without impeding the footpath.</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status where compliance is not achieved: RDIS</u></p> <p><u>Matters of direction are restricted to: RES-MD9 Waste Management</u></p>	<p>sufficient size and will ensure it is in a location that will be screened from the road</p>	
	Support in Part	Amend RESZ-MD3 as follows:	<p>c. <u>...property. Any specific setback to an Industrial Zone is intended to protect the amenity of those zones and minimise reverse sensitivity issues arising from permitted activities within the Industrial Zone</u></p>	<p>Provides an additional matter of discretion for the 20m setback. Difficult to establish a transfer station anywhere else in Twizel. Therefore, it needs to be protected from reverse sensitivity</p>	
	Support	Include new Matter of Discretion as follows:	<p><u>RESZ- MD9 Waste Management</u></p> <p><u>a. Waste management capacity, visual appearance, and accessibility.</u></p> <p><u>b. Adverse effects on the streetscape</u></p>	<p>The proposed waste management standard requires appropriate matters of discretion to enable consideration of non-compliances to the standard</p>	
	Support in Part	Amend GIZ-O1 as follows:	<p><u>The General Industrial Zone provides primarily for industrial activities and other compatible activities that do not compromise the functionality of the zone for industrial activities, as well as activities that support the functioning of industrial areas</u></p>	<p>EnviroWaste supports the objective but is concerned that compatible activities can be judged in many different ways, and which may not be appropriate to some industrial activities. The proposed additional text will ensure that industrial activities have primacy in the zone</p>	
	Oppose	Amend GIZ-P1 as follows:	<p><u>Enable a range of industrial activities and activities of a similar scale and nature to industrial activities complying with GIZ- R3 and R4, to establish and operate within the General Industrial Zone</u></p>	<p>Concerned about enabling activities that are ‘of a similar nature and scale to industrial activities’ is too vague and may lead to reverse sensitivity effects</p> <p>Concerned it will change the fabric of the industrial zones in the District so that the purpose of the zone is compromised over time.</p>	

				By narrowing the policy to only enable those activities permitted under the rules will confine the range of uses enabled. To deal with non-industrial Discretionary Activities, GIZ-P2 then applies	
		Support	No specific decision sought in relation to GIZ-P2	Support this policy as written provided the amendment to P1 is accepted	
		Support in Part	Amend GIZ-R4 as follows: Activity Status: PER <i>Where:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The activity is ancillary to a permitted activity; and</i> 2. <i>Except on rear sites, any office or showroom shall be sited at the front of buildings; and</i> 3. <i>The office gross floor area does not exceed 30 per cent of all buildings on the site; or the office gross floor area not exceed 100m²; and</i> 4. <i>The showroom gross floor area does not exceed 10 per cent of all buildings on the site</i> 	The proposed additional text puts a size limit on the most common types of activities that are likely to give rise to reverse sensitivity effects which could inhibit or discourage industry from operating in close proximity. Without such a limit and assessment through a resource consent, ancillary activities may become more than subservient to the main activity on the site	
109.	Tessa Smith	Oppose	All current subdivisions are retained as they are now and all future Large Lot Residential Zones allow for one residential unit per 4,000m ²	Having one residential unit per 2,000m ² will ruin the visual appeal of these areas and create too much traffic in an area that wasn't designed for it	N
110.	Heather Te Koeti	Oppose in Part	The existing properties within the Town boundaries zoned Residential 4 should remain 4,000m ²	The Council has an obligation to protect landowners' rights. Residential 4 properties should remain 4,000m ² as they were when the owners and neighbours purchased them	Y
111.	Lake Tekapo Enterprises	Support	Retain Development Areas 1 and 2 as notified and the relevant provisions of Plan Change 21 which give effect to the Mackenzie Spatial Plan	Whilst not enabling rezoning under the District Plan review, the proposed Development Areas provide clear direction in relation to the suitability of the land for future development and future rezoning through objectives and policies	Y

112.	Janette Hodges	Oppose	<p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct and the Recreation P land south of Ruataniwha Road is retained and not zoned Town Centre</p> <p>The old landfill dump is zoned recreational as part of Plan Change 21</p> <p>The Industrial area on the other side of Tekapo/Twizel Highway in the Mackenzie Spatial Plan is included in Plan Change 21</p> <p>Three storied buildings are not provided for</p>	<p>Greenspaces are a real part of what makes Twizel attractive</p> <p>This area is needed for recreation and sport fields</p> <p>There is not zoning in this plan for industrial over the other side of the highway</p> <p>Highrise buildings will cause shading to homes around them and will be dangerous in winter. Concerns are also raised regarding carparking</p>	Y
113.	Twizel Community Board	Oppose	<p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct</p> <p>The Recreation P land south of Ruataniwha Road is retained and not zoned Town Centre</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The attraction of Twizel has always been wide open spaces with lots of green areas • People in Twizel really value their open spaces and trail networks • The Frisbee Golf Course which hosts national events would lose part of the course, costing a huge amount to replace/relocate • The entrance to Twizel should be attractive and green to attract people in • Previous removal of green space has resulted in backlash 	Y
114.	Tim Preston-Marshall	Oppose	<p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified</p>	<p>This area is one of Twizel's most crucial green zones and the home of our world-class disc golf course. Put a new Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct elsewhere</p>	Y

			as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct.		
115.	Zoe White	Oppose	The Drive Twizel, is not subdividable down to 2,000m ²	We purchased here for the large section and less neighbours. This Plan will result in increased traffic in an area of no footpaths	N
116.	Colin Withnall and Family	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This area has always been part of Twizel's public open spaces which are a major part of Twizel's town character. Introduction of commercial buildings into this environment will severely detract from the overall design and appearance and have adverse effects on the amenities it provides including the Disc Golf Course	Y
117.	Mackenzie Properties Limited	Support in Part	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct Residential Visitor Accommodation should not be treated as a permitted activity (up to six guests) within the Medium Density Zone when a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct has been implemented. A reduced limit of 4 people is recommended.	This land forms part of the northern entrance to Twizel and provides an uninterrupted view shaft out to Ben Ohau Range The purpose of the zone changes is to control commercial visitor accommodation within certain areas, allowing up to six people in any residential zone would not achieve the desired outcome	Y
		Support in Part	Amend LRZ-S1 to ensure allotments where a reticulated sewage system is not available have a minimum allotment size of 2,000m ² Amend LRZ-S5 to allow a building coverage of 50% and a building and impervious coverage of 60%. The Recreation Active land along Ohau Road which forms part of the Twizel Golf Course is not	1500m ² is too small for appropriate sewage discharge to ground It is likely only single level buildings will be built in this zone, to comply with these percentages the houses would be relatively small It adds to the amenity of Ohau Road	

			rezoned Low Density Residential and is retained Rection Active. Residential Visitor Accommodation should not be treated as a permitted activity (up to six guests) within the Low Density Zone when a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct has been implemented. A reduced limit of 4 people is recommended	The purpose of the zone changes is to control commercial visitor accommodation within certain areas, allowing up to six people in any residential zone would not achieve the desired outcome	
		Support in Part	Amend LLRZ-S5 to allow a building overage of 35% and a building and imperious coverage of 45% Residential Visitor Accommodation should not be treated as a permitted activity (up to six guests) within the Large Lot Residential Density Zone when a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct has been implemented. A reduced limit of 4 people is recommended	The proposed percentages are too low and may be restrictive for some landowners. The purpose of the zone changes is to control commercial visitor accommodation within certain areas, allowing up to six people in any residential zone would not achieve the desired outcome	
		Support in Part	The rule framework in the Large Format Retail Zone is amended to be more flexible The Recreation P land on Ruataniwha Road is retained and not zoned Town Centre	The Town Centre Zone in Twizel is too small, particularly in relation to access and parking and has reached its capacity. The likelihood of meaningful re-development of the proposed Ruataniwha Road is minimal. An attached concept plan is attached to the submission This land creates open space and visual appeal	
		Support in Part	Amend LRFZ-R2 as follows: LFRZ-R2 Retail Activities 1. <i>The gross floor area of any individual retail activity is a minimum of 500m² 200m²; or</i> 2. <i>The activity is:</i> a. <i>a food and beverage outlet; or</i> b. <i>a service station; or</i>	The rule framework does not go far enough to encourage and enhance the future growth prospects of Twizel. The minimum floor level is too large	

			<p>c. <i>yard-base retail; or</i> d. <i>trade-based retail; or</i> e. <i>office accommodation</i></p>		
		Support in Part	<p>Amend LFRZ-R8 as follows:</p> <p>Commercial Visitor Accommodation <i>Activity Status: NC DIS</i></p> <p>Alternatively, the introduction of Precinct 2 to the block of land adjacent to Ostler Road that looks directly up to Mackenzie Drive</p>	This is an ideal spot for a hotel, as indicated in the attached concept plan	
		Support in Part	<p>Amend the assessment matters for any discretionary resource consent in the LFRZ to incorporate the following points:</p> <p>a. <i>The availability of land/space for commercial development within the Twizel Town Centre Zone and the likelihood of this space being developed within the near term.</i></p> <p>b. <i>The complementary nature of the activity proposed and how its existence may well work in conjunction with existing business within the Town Centre</i></p> <p>c. <i>The degree of vibrancy and attractiveness leading to increased wellbeing for existing residents in Twizel, which any new commercial development brings with it.</i></p>	The rule framework does not go far enough to encourage and enhance the future growth prospects of Twizel	
118.	Frances Dennison	Oppose	All Recreation P land is to be retained and not rezoned under Plan Change 21	Green areas are to be left alone. They are Twizel. Concerns raised about denser houses and higher building platforms	N
119.	Waka Kotahi	Support	Retain the definition of Access as notified	The definition in the Operative Plan is appropriate	Y
		Support	Retain the definition of Road as notified	Definition is from the National Planning Standards	
		Support	Retain LLRZ-O1 as notified	Maintains the LLRZ for residential living opportunities and small-scale non-residential activities ancillary to residential activities	

		Support	Retain LLRZ-O2 as notified	Maintains a predominance of open space and spacious character and maintains amenity values of adjacent sites
		Support	Retain LLRZ-P2 as notified	Provides for compatible activities that are ancillary to residential activities and that remain consistent with the zone and the amenity of adjacent sites
		Support in Part	LLRZ-P3: Clarification is sought on the intended threshold for 'sufficient parking' for workers accommodation in the LLRZ, and for the meaning of 'adequate parking' where these terms are used in the Plan.	The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements
		Support	Retain LLRZ-R2 as notified	Supportive of minor units that are subservient to the primary residential unit on the site
		Support in Part	LLRZ-R5: Clarification is sought on the intended threshold for adequate onsite parking for residential visitor accommodation in the LLRZ	The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements
		Support	Retain MRZ-O1 as notified	Provides for higher density living opportunities
		Support	Retain MRZ-O2 as notified	Provides for a desirable, higher density residential living environment while maintaining the amenity of adjacent sites
		Support	Retain MRZ-P2 as notified	Provides for compatible activities that are ancillary to residential activities and that remain consistent with the zone and the amenity of adjacent sites
		Support	Retain MRZ-P3 as notified	Provides for retirement living where any parking and vehicle manoeuvring provided onsite is appropriately designed
		Support	Retain MRZ-P5 as notified	Ensures safety and efficiency of State Highway 8 is maintained
		Support in Part	MRZ-R4: Clarification is sought on the intended threshold for adequate onsite parking for residential visitor accommodation in the MRZ	The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements

		Support in Part	MRZ-R7: Clarification is sought on the intended threshold for adequate onsite parking for education facilities in the MRZ	The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements
		Support in Part	MRZ-R8: Clarification is sought on the intended threshold for adequate onsite parking for existing community facilities in the MRZ	The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements
		Support in Part	MRZ-R9: Clarification is sought on the intended threshold for adequate onsite parking for retirement villages in the MRZ	The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements
		Support in Part	Amend MRZ-R10 as follows: <i>c. The traffic impacts including the provision of adequate onsite parking and loading areas, and the impacts on the wider transport network.</i> Amend MRZ-R10 to require compliance with the Transport Chapter. Clarification is sought on what the threshold for adequate onsite parking on directive of NPS-UD	No reason/comment provided. The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements
		Support in Part	Amend MRZ-S6 to ensure landscaping does not create shading effects or obscure visibility from accesses	Any landscaping should not create shading or icing issues, obstruct visibility of vehicle crossings or traffic signs
		Support in Part	Amend MRZ-S9 as follows: 1. <i>All fencing along the boundary shall be...</i> 2. <i>Any fencing adjacent to a State Highway must not have a maximum diameter that exceeds 100mm</i>	Fence posts no more than 100mm in diameter are considered frangible in the event of being struck by an errant vehicle
		Support	Retain MRZ-S10 as notified	Requires activities to obtain vehicular access from lakeside Drive and any direct access to the State Highway is a Non-Complying Activity
		Support	Retain LRZ-O1 as notified	Provides for residential living opportunities and other compatible activities that are consistent with the character and amenity values of the zone

		Support in Part	Amend RESZ-MD5 to include a matter of discretion that relates to traffic safety and to remove grammatical error '?' from Matter of Discretion MD5b	Will ensure the level of landscaping is reduced to provide visibility to the roading network. Correct a grammatical error
		Support in Part	Further consideration of adverse effects in relation to the safety of all transport users within NCZ-P3	No reason/comment provided
		Support	Retain NCZ-S4 as notified	Requires all outdoor storage of goods and any servicing areas to be screened from any public space
		Support in Part	Amend NCZ-S6 to ensure landscaping does not create shading effects or obscure visibility from accesses	Any landscaping should not create shading or icing issues, obstruct visibility of vehicle crossings or traffic signs
		Support in Part	LFRZ – Clarification is sought to the potential safety of all transport users of up zoning the land from Industrial Zone to Large Format Retail Zone	If access is required directly to the State Highway additional controls may be required
		Support	Retain LFRZ-O2 as notified	Manages adverse effects while recognising the functional and operational requirements in the zone
		Support	Retain LFRZ-P2 as notified	Avoids activities that will result in reverse sensitivity effects on activities that are support in the zone
		Support in Part	Further consideration of adverse effects in relation to the safety of all transport users within the LFRZ-P3	The new zone has the potential to increase vehicle movements in this location
		Support	Retain LFRZ-S4 as notified	Requires all outdoor storage of goods and any servicing areas to be screened from any public space
		Support in Part	Amend LFRZ-S6 to ensure landscaping does not create shading effects or obscure visibility from accesses	Any landscaping should not create shading or icing issues, obstruct visibility of vehicle crossings or traffic signs
		Support	Retain MUZ-P2 as notified	Provides for compatible activities that are ancillary to residential activities and that remain consistent with the zone and the amenity of adjacent sites

		Support in Part	Further consideration of adverse effects in relation to the safety of all transport users within MUZ-P3	No reason/comment provided	
		Support	Retain MUZ-R2 as notified	Supportive of minor units that are subservient to the primary residential unit on the site	
		Support in Part	MUZ-R5: Clarification is sought on the intended threshold for adequate onsite parking for residential visitor accommodation in the MUZ	The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements	
		Support	Retain MUZ-R5 as notified	Requires all outdoor storage of goods and any servicing areas to be screened from any public space	
		Support in Part	Amend MUZ-R7 to ensure landscaping does not create shading effects or obscure visibility from accesses	Any landscaping should not create shading or icing issues, obstruct visibility of vehicle crossings or traffic signs	
		Support	Retain TCZ-O1 as notified	Ensures the Town Centre is the primary retail destination in the district and focal point for the community	
		Support	Retain TCZ-P2 as notified	Provides for compatible activities that contribute to the vibrancy or vitality of the zone	
		Support in Part	Further consideration of adverse effects in relation to the safety of all transport users within the TCZ-P3	No reason/comment provided	
		Support	Retain TCS-S5 as notified	Requires all outdoor storage of goods and any servicing areas to be screened from any public space	
		Support in Part	Amend TCZ-R6 to ensure landscaping does not create shading effects or obscure visibility from accesses	Any landscaping should not create shading or icing issues, obstruct visibility of vehicle crossings or traffic signs	
		Support	Retain CMUZ-MD6 as notified	Considers if the reduction of road boundary landscaping is appropriate to address a traffic safety matter	

		Support	Retain GIZ-O1 as notified	Seeks to maintain the industrial zone for industrial activities and other compatible activities	
		Support	Retain GIZ-O2 as notified	Avoids incompatible activities establishing in GIZ Zone unless they do not result in reverse sensitivity	
		Support in Part	Further consideration of adverse effects in relation to the safety of all transport users within the GIZ-P3.	No reason/comment provided	
		Support	Retain GIZ-S4 as notified	Requires all outdoor storage of goods and any servicing areas to be screened from any public space	
		Support in Part	Amend GIZ-S6 to ensure landscaping does not create shading effects or obscure visibility from accesses.	Any landscaping should not create shading or icing issues, obstruct visibility of vehicle crossings or traffic signs	
		Support	Retain PREC2-P1 as notified	Provides for commercial visitor accommodation where any parking and manoeuvring is appropriately designed	
		Support in Part	PREC2-R1: Clarification is sought on what the threshold for adequate onsite parking will be	The NPS-UD does not provide for minimum car parking requirements	
		Support	Retain DEV1-O1 as notified.	Seeks to ensure the Lake Tekapo West Development Area is developed to provide residential living opportunities integrated with infrastructure	
		Support in Part	Insert a new geospatial overlay to define the boundaries of the Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve in the District Plan Maps	Will clearly indicate the boundaries of the Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve with further detail provided in LIGHT-S4	
120.	Frances Dennison	Oppose	All recreation reserves are to be left alone. No smaller sections or denser building coverage on residential sections allowed No high buildings permitted	No reason/comment provided	N

121.	Tekapo Landco Limited and Godwit Leisure Limited	Oppose	Lot 400 DP 560853, Lot 49 and 50 DP 560853 and Lot 1 DP 560853 are zoned Mixed Use Zone	The zoning of the Spatial Plan (adopted by Council in June 2021) is more accurately reflected in the proposed zoning	Y
		Oppose	Lot 401 DO 560853 is included in Plan Change 21 and is zoned Medium Density Residential Zone	The zoning of the Spatial Plan (adopted by Council in June 2021) is more accurately reflected in the proposed zoning	
		Support	Lot 401 DP 560853 is retained Medium Density Residential Zone as notified	The zoning of the Spatial Plan (adopted by Council in June 2021) is more accurately reflected in the proposed zoning	
		Oppose	The style format that rules are written is amended to remove 'where' criteria and only reference standards. 'where' criteria is moved to standards where appropriate	The notified style/format results in the rules being more confusing as the 'where' criteria appears to create standards within the activity rule	
		Oppose	The mapping is amended to be in accordance with the Spatial Plans	The mapping as notified does not follow the spatial plan zoning	
		Oppose	The accuracy of mapping is improved such that zoning/overlay/precinct should not go over State Highway boundaries and should snap to property boundaries and not leave small slivers along property boundaries	Mapping should be snapped to boundaries so that it is clear the whole property is included as that zone. Where small slivers near property boundaries are left out it increases the uncertainty to what zoning applies	
		Oppose	Remove roads from being within the zone or precinct extent, specifically paper road (parcel ID 3568134)	Approach to the zoning of roads should be Clarified. The paper road should not be included	
		Oppose	The High Density Residential or Mixed Use Zone is identified in Tekapo as per the Spatial Plan	The mapping as notified does not follow the spatial plan zoning. There is currently no High Density Zone notified and no Mixed Use Zoning used in Tekapo	
		Oppose	Amend the extent of the Tekapo No Build Zone to be over Council property and not over private	The No-Build Area disappears off the map when zoomed in. The No Build Area should	

			land. Correct zoom extent so that this overlay and the extent of it is not lost when zooming in	reflect the boundaries of the open space/reserve lot only	
		Support	Retain the Medium Density Residential Zoning of Lot 401 DP 560853 and Lots 1-50 DP 560853	Zoning is consistent with the Spatial Plan	
		Oppose	Amend mapping so that the boundaries of the MRZ are redrawn to match the Spatial Plan for Lot 401 DP 560853	The intent of PC21 was to give effect to the Spatial Plan. This is not being achieved	
		Oppose	<p>Lot 1 DP 455053, Lot 400 DP 560853, Lots 49 and 50 DP 560853 and Lot 1 DP 560853 are zoned Mixed Use Zone with a new precinct 'Tekapo Mixed Use Precinct' which allows for campground activities and a greater level of built form</p> <p>Additionally, that the Lake Tekapo Precinct is removed from the areas where the "Tekapo Mixed Use Precinct" is requested</p> <p>Alternatively, that these lots are zoned MRZ with the Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct</p>	<p>The notified zoning does not reflect the Spatial Plan. A Mixed Use Zone with a Tekapo Mixed Use Precinct better gives effect to the Spatial Plan</p> <p>The alternative, the Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct, provides for Spatial Plan a Visitor Accommodation area in the National Planning Standards format</p>	
		Oppose	That Lot 301, 304, and 303 DP 560853 are not zoned a residential zone and instead zoned open space	It is understood that the open space zones are in the next stage of the district plan review. Therefore, it is better for the reserve land within the Station Bay Development to not be zoned a residential zone and instead be zoned an open space zone when this is available in later stages of the district plan review	
		Oppose	That Specific Control Area 7 is extended over Lot 400 DP 560853	Specific Control Area 7 allows for greater height limits which is also appropriate for this site	
		Oppose	Remove the paper road (parcel ID 3568134) from being located within the boundaries of the Takapō / Lake Tekapo West Future Development Area	The paper road (parcel ID 3568134) should not be included within the boundaries of the Takapō / Lake Tekapo West Future	

			Development Area to align with the adopted Tekapo Spatial Plan
	Oppose	Revise the Statutory context Legal Effect of Provisions section of the plan to write out RMA parts in full and/or include references to the RMA where this is used	Parts are copied from the RMA, though not in their entirety. The parts should either be complete, just include a reference to the RMA, or removed
	Not Specified	That the definitions link between each other	Looks as though the intention is to link definitions, however, some are not linked
	Support	Support inclusion of National Planning Standards definitions	National Direction
	Oppose	Include subcategories for clarity when using National Planning Standards definitions	Use of subcategories would provide for further explanation of definitions and provide additional clarity to the effect of a provision
	Oppose	Amend definition of 'Boundary' to be a nested rule included in the first table with each defined separately in the definitions or subcategories	Will improve plan clarity
	Oppose	<p>Include a new 'Building' sub-category in the definitions to exclude smaller constructions such as pergolas, dog houses, woodsheds, outdoor storage bins, and playhouses as follows:</p> <p><i><u>Sheds and Shelters/Small scale buildings - means structures less than 10m² in area and in addition less than 2m in height above ground level. Note: these types of buildings are excluded from the rules associated with 'buildings'</u></i></p>	<p>The National Planning Standards definition of building is very broad and could capture things such as pergolas, dog houses, woodsheds, outdoor storage bins, and playhouses which seems unanticipated. The RMA/National PS definition of structure does not result in these smaller constructions being excluded. Therefore, a subcategory of building/structure should be included to improve clarity</p>
	Oppose	<p>Remove self-contained units and bedsits from being commercial visitor accommodation and amend the definition of 'Commercial Visitor Accommodation' as follows:</p> <p><i>means land and buildings used for any form of visitor accommodation that is not defined as residential visitor accommodation, including:</i></p> <p><i>a. backpackers;</i></p> <p><i>b. camping grounds;</i></p>	<p>Campgrounds are a different form of commercial visitor accommodation better provided for as a subset activity definition as below</p> <p>Holiday homes or minor residential units could be captured under the definition. The definitions/rules relating to Residential Visitor Accommodation should allow for use of a residential holiday home without requiring</p>

			<p>c. hostels; d. hotels; e. motels; f. motor inns; g. tourist lodges; and h. self-contained units and bedsits.</p> <p>In addition, define the bullet points as subset definitions of commercial visitor accommodation e.g., ‘campground and holiday park activities’, and ‘hostels, hotels, motels, and motor inns.’</p>	resource consent for “Commercial Visitor Accommodation”	
		Oppose	<p>Insert a new subset activity definition of commercial visitor accommodation - ‘Campground and Holiday Park Activities’ as follows:</p> <p><u>Means land and building used for visitor accommodation that is not defined as residential visitor accommodation or commercial visitor accommodation. This includes a range of short-term accommodation provided as campgrounds, cabins, backpackers, and associated facilities where they operate together either on one site or as one operation.</u></p>	A separate subset activity definition is suitable as campground and holiday park activities are quite different from other commercial visitor accommodation activities	
		Oppose	<p>Amend the definition of ‘Ground Level’ to exclude the ability to undertake earthworks to alter the ground level. For example, could include:</p> <p><u>“Means.... The surface of the ground prior to any earthworks on the site...”</u></p>	Will improve plan clarity	
		Oppose	<p>Amend the definition and/or rules applicable to Residential Visitor Accommodation to allow for use of a residential holiday home without requiring consent for ‘Commercial Visitor Accommodation’</p>	Some residential units may be rented as visitor accommodation/holiday homes for the entire year and never used for residential activity, although being a residential unit. The current inclusion in the definition of “residential unit” within Residential Visitor Accommodation may	

				not apply in these circumstances as the use of the building for the entire year as short-term accommodation would not meet the definition of “residential unit”	
		Oppose	Amend the definition and/or rules applicable to Residential Units to allow for use of a residential holiday home without requiring consent for ‘Commercial Visitor Accommodation’	Same reason as above	
		Oppose	Seek that MRZ provisions are amended	Will improve plan clarity and result in better environmental, social and economic outcomes	
		Support	Support inclusion of paragraph 4 of the Introduction to the Medium Density Residential Zone as notified	Acknowledges the role non-residential activities have in creating a well-functioning residential area	
		Support	Retain MRZ-O1 as notified	Addresses other compatible activities	
		Oppose	Amend MRZ-O2 as follows: <i>The Medium Density Residential Zone is a desirable, higher density, residential living environment, which:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>contains a range of housing typologies including <u>detached</u>, semi-detached, terraced housing and low rise apartments;</i> 2. <i>is well designed with good design outcomes;</i> and 3. <i>provides on-site amenity and maintains the amenity values of adjacent sites</i> 	Residential units within the zone may also be smaller detached housing	
		Support	Retain MRZ-P1 as notified	No reason/comment provided	
		Support	Retain MRZ-P2 as notified	Addresses other compatible activities	
		Oppose	No specific relief sought: MRZ-P4	Policy repeats part of P2 and achieves the same function. Amendment of P2 or expansion could achieve the intention of P4. Use of ‘avoid’ does not align with the Discretionary status of R-13	
		Oppose	Amend MRZ-P5 to include reference to the Tekapo Character Design Guide for non-residential activities in the zone	No reason/comment provided	

			Clarify how the design guides will be used in the assessment of resource consents								
		New Policy	<p>Insert a new MRZ policy as follows:</p> <p><i>Provide for residential visitor accommodation at a scale and character that is compatible with the surrounding residential character</i></p>		Specifically provides for residential visitor accommodation to allow for more flexible use of properties						
		Oppose	<p>Amend the format of rules as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the 'where' criteria for permitted rules and only link to standards. Where appropriate add 'where' criteria as standards. Remove 'Medium Density Residential Zone' from first column of the rules table. Instead of using titles and box below just have rule reference, rule and activity status, and non-compliance notes. <table border="1" data-bbox="869 847 1400 948"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rule Ref</th> <th>Rule and Activity status</th> <th>Non-compliance notes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rule Ref	Rule and Activity status	Non-compliance notes					<p>'Where' creates standards within the rule</p> <p>It is not necessary to have 'Medium Density Residential Zone' written out below every rule as it is clear which provisions are being addressed. The code MRZ is sufficient</p>
Rule Ref	Rule and Activity status	Non-compliance notes									
		Support	Support a range of activities having a permitted activity status		No reason/comment provided						
		Oppose	<p>Amend MRZ-R1 to remove the 'where' criteria and convert to rules and to remove the 400m² minimum site area as follows:</p> <p><i>Residential Units</i> <i>Activity Status: PER</i> <i>Where:</i> <i>There is a maximum of one residential unit per site;</i> <i>and</i> <i>The site has a minimum site area of 400m². 200m²</i></p>		'Where' criteria are density standards. The 400m ² minimum site area does not align with the density standard MRZ-S1 which enables a minimum site area per residential unit of 200m ² . The 400m ² within this rule appears to be a subdivision/lot size standard and if so, should be removed from this rule and instead included in the future subdivision chapter						
		Not Specified	Combine MRZ-R1 and R2 together just as 'Buildings and Structures'		They are both permitted, with R2 being a catch all rule so there is no benefit in						

			having them as separate rules. Particularly as R3 allows for residential activity as a permitted activity
Support in Part	Amend MRZ-R4 as follows: <i>1. No more than one residential unit on a site is used for residential visitor accommodation; and 2. The maximum occupancy of a site residential unit used for residential visitor accommodation does not exceed six guests per night</i>		Using 'site' in the rule does not allow for unit title development due to how the definition of 'site' applies to unit title developments
Support	Retain MRZ-R11 as notified		Support inclusion of Commercial Visitor Accommodation as a Discretionary Activity within the zone
Support	Retain MRZ-R12 as notified		Support inclusion of other Commercial Activities as a Discretionary Activity within the zone
Support	Retain MRZ-S1 as notified		The minimum site area per residential unit should remain as notified as 200m ²
Oppose	Amend MRZ-S2 as follows: <i>1. The maximum height of any building or structure shall not exceed 10m above ground level except a gable roof may exceed the maximum height by no more than 1m. 2. All floors shall have a minimum ceiling height of 2.7m</i>		Clause 2 is not a planning or urban design matter and is not relevant
Oppose	Amend MRZ-S3 to include the height to boundary requirements within the standard. Exclude adjoining boundary walls (e.g., duplex) from needing to comply with this rule		Improve useability and clarity by including the height to boundary requirements
Oppose	Amend MRZ-S4 as follows: <i>1. Any building or structure shall be setback a minimum of 2m from any road, shared accessway or reserve. Except any site with road frontage to Lakeside Drive, Takapō / Lake Tekapo shall have any building or structure setback a minimum of 4.5m.</i>		Ensures duplex designs and smaller residential structures do not trigger setback breaches Setback for garage doors allows space for a carpark in front of the garage providing for increased onsite parking

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>Any building or structure shall be setback a minimum of 2m from any internal boundary.</i> 3. <i>Any building or structure on the true right bank of the Tekapo River shall be setback a minimum of 6m from the edge of the upper terrace.</i> 4. <i>Garage doors facing the road shall be set back a minimum of 4.5m.</i> 5. <i>Setbacks shall not apply to buildings adjoining a common boundary or to sheds and shelters/Small scale buildings</i> 	Smaller structures often have little effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties due to their size and should be exempt from the setback rules. Use new defined term as above	
	Oppose	Amend MRZ-S8 to include: <i>'Outlook spaces may be within the site, over a public street or other public space'</i>		Allows outlook space to be over public places where relevant	
	Oppose	Amend MRZ-S9 as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>All fencing along the road boundary shall be:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>No higher than 1.8m 1.2m above ground level and</i> b. <i>Any part of the fence higher than 1.2m above ground level shall be visually permeable, excluding support structures</i> 		The notified rule is not consistent with the Medium Density Residential Design Guide and does not support good urban design outcomes	
	Oppose	The Mixed Use Zone is revised to be a more intensive high density/mixed use zone and the current areas and provisions are recategorized as 'Settlement Zone'		Mixed Use Zones are commonly used as a transitional zone between a town/metropolitan centre and a residential area. Settlement Zone as per the National Planning Standards would be a better fit for the notified locations and provisions	
	Not Specified	Amend the Introduction to the Mixed Use Zone to include Tekapo		Consequential amendment to zoning relief	
	Support	Retain MUZ-O1 as notified		No reason/comment provided	
	Oppose	No specific relief sought in relation to MUZ-O2		The Mixed Use Zone should not necessarily have built form of a scale that reflects the surrounding zoning as it is its own zone with its own provisions in relation to built form	
	Support	Retain MUZ-P1 as notified		No reason/comment provided	

		Oppose	Amend MUZ-P2 as follows: <i>Provide for activities that are not enabled by MUZ-P1 to establish and operate within the Mixed Use Zone where they:</i> <i>1. are not of a scale or nature which detracts from the character, amenity values or purpose of the Town Centre Zone; and</i> <i>2. are compatible with the scale and nature of activities permitted within the zone. and the amenity values of the surrounding residential area.</i>	The relevance of the character and amenity values of the Town Centre Zone to the Mixed Use Zone is unclear. Activities within the Mixed Use Zone should not necessarily reflect compatibility with the surrounding zoning as it is its own zone with its own provisions
		Oppose	Amend MUZ-P3 as follows: <i>1. provides a high-quality pedestrian environment.</i> <i>2. is well-integrated with roads and public areas and positively contributes to their vibrancy;</i> <i>3. provides a good level of amenity for residents, workers and visitors; and</i> <i>4. is compatible with its residential setting and maintains the anticipated amenity values of any adjoining residential zone.</i>	Activities in the Mixed Use Zone should not necessarily reflect the compatibility with surrounding zoning, as it is its own zone with its own provisions in relation to built form. An activity might be in the middle of the zone rather than adjoining a residential zone
		New Rule	Include Campground and Holiday Park Activities as a Permitted Activity within the proposed Tekapo Mixed Use Precinct	No reason/comment provided
		New Rule	Include Backpackers Accommodation as a Permitted Activity within the proposed Tekapo Mixed Use Precinct	No reason/comment provided
		Support	Retain MUZ-R1 as notified	No reason/comment provided
		Support	Retain MUZ-R2 as notified	No reason/comment provided
		Not Specified	Combine MUZ-R2 and R3 together just as 'Buildings and Structures'	There is no benefit to having separate rules. Particularly, as R4 allows for residential activity as a permitted activity
		Support in Part	Amend MUZ-R5 as follows: <i>3. No more than one residential unit on a site is used for residential visitor accommodation; and</i>	Using 'site' in the rule does not allow for unit title development due to how the definition of 'site' applies to unit title developments

			<i>The maximum occupancy of a site-residential unit used for residential visitor accommodation does not exceed six guests per night</i>	
		Support	Retain MUZ-R6 as notified	No reason/comment provided
		Support	Retain MUZ-R7 as notified	No reason/comment provided
		Oppose	Amend MUZ Standards to allow for development similar to MRZ standards	Allowing development similar to the MRZ provides for more comprehensive mixed use development
		Support in Part	Amend MUZ-S4 to allow for commercial activities to front the street with no minimum setback	Some activities facing the street are better suited, as if there is a setback it may be used for carparking, and the street presence would be reduced
		Oppose	Remove MUZ-S7 and instead use a matter of discretion for setbacks and boundary standards	Better dealt with by a matter of discretion. Not all activities in MUZ would need to be mitigated with landscaping
		Oppose	Amend relevant zone chapters to include provisions for the Lake Tekapo Precinct, instead of having a separate chapter	Improve plan useability
		Oppose	Specify the “special character” and “distinctive built form” that is sought in the Lake Tekapo Precinct	No reason/comment provided
		Oppose	Specify the “special character” and “distinctive built form” which is to be maintained in PREC1-O1	No reason/comment provided
		Oppose	Specify the “built form character” that is to be maintained and enhanced in PREC-P1	No reason/comment provided
		Oppose	Amend PREC1-S3 as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The wall of any building shall not be greater than:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>20m in total length; and</i> b. 14m, without a recess in the façade and roofline of at least 1m in depth and 2m in length. 2. <i>There shall be a minimum separation distance between any buildings on a site of no less than 2m</i> 	Remove requirements for stepped facades as these may increase building costs on already challenging sites. The orientation of lots is typically that the long façade is to the internal boundary and does not impact the streetscape Exclude minor buildings and structures from the setback requirements for ‘buildings’

		Oppose	Amend PREC1-S4 as follows: 2. <i>The maximum height of any building or structure shall be 7.5m 8m above ground level except a gable roof may exceed the maximum height by no more than 1m.</i> 3. <i>All floors shall have a minimum ceiling height of 2.7m.</i>	8m is consistent with the operative standards and is appropriate for a range of roof forms Minimum floor height is not a planning or urban design concern	
		Support	Retain Specific Control Area 7 as notified	No reason/comment provided	
		Oppose	The Takapō Lake Tekapo West Future Development Area is not included within the District Plan	The specified objectives and policies are limited in scope and do not cover all matters relating to the future suitability of this land for development. As such, a future master plan would be limited in the analysis/investigation required to be undertaken. Currently unable to determine what would be provided for or what the intention of these areas is in the District Plan context	
		Support	The inclusion of a design guideline in APP2	Design Guidelines contribute to achieving good urban design for developments	
		Oppose	The design guideline needs to have a clearer relationship with the provisions and the process for using the design guideline for resource consenting needs to clearly laid out	Without a clear implementation method, the design guideline could be inconsistently applied by Council and confusing for plan users	
		Support	Amend the roofing guide to make it clearer that hip style roofing is not an acceptable roof type for Tekapo	Hip style roofing does not fit with the current aesthetic or character of Tekapo, and the design guideline should be clearer that this is an unacceptable roof type	
122.	Matt Smith	Oppose	The Large Lot Residential Zone is retained at a minimum density of one residential unit per 4,000m ²	The 2,000m ² will ruin the visual appeal of these areas and create too much traffic in an area that wasn't designed for it	Y
123.	Lisa Cotterrell	Oppose	All existing recreation areas are maintained and not rezoned Town Centre in Twizel	We purchased our property having green areas/reserves beside us and across the road for our use and visual outlook. The green areas are what Twizel is well known for. Use land where buildings currently exist, avoid the grass areas	Y

124.	Anita Middleton-Buchan	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	This course is a great asset to Twizel and brings many visitors	N
125.	Robin McCarthy	Support in Part	The Medium Density Residential Zone and Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct on Wairepo Road, Twizel be re-designated "Visitor Accommodation and Activities Retail"	Accommodation businesses already have retail "activities" of different kinds. A standalone Activities Operator (such as bike or skydive operator) has no designated zoning permitting such an activity	Y
126.	Helen Johnson and Phil McCabe	Oppose	The proposed walking track around the western side of Fairlie and the Fairlie Cemetery displayed on the Spatial Plans is removed	The walking track is close to our deer farm boundary. Being a deer farm there is a high risk to the safety of the public, any animals walking past and our farm animals if a track in this location was developed	N
127.	Tessa Smith	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	We will lose three holes of the Frisby golf course which is a major drawcard for Twizel. As well it will negatively impact the visual entrance to Twizel	N
128.	Craig Latta	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	I own a retail shop in Dunedin, and we stock disc golf. This is a major growing sport. Having a course in Twizel is incredibly important as it will become a major drawcard to the area. The local tournament draws lots of people. A down grade of the course will not make people see Twizel as a disc golf destination and they will instead look to other centres. Reducing the Twizel course will take away opportunities for future events. Disc golf course is incredibly important for our physical and mental health	N
129.	Matt Smith	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	We will lose three holes of the Frisbee golf course which is a major drawcard for Twizel. As well it will negatively impact the visual entrance to Twizel	N

130.	Maree Cummings	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	The disc golf course in Twizel is a great draw card to Twizel. Disc golf is a fast growing sport with more and more participants. It brings tourism to Twizel with money being spent by participants on food, fuel and accommodation	N
131.	Ian McDonald	Oppose	The proposed Town Centre Zone east of Gray Street is rezoned residential	No reason/comment provided	N
132.	Liz Angelo	Oppose	<p>The name of the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area be changed back to The Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct to accurately reflect its intended nature.</p> <p>A Heritage Precinct consultant be engaged to develop design guidelines (as per the Tekapo Precinct).</p> <p>The Heritage Precinct be included in Plan Change 21.</p> <p>The Residential Zone, outside the heritage precinct, truly reflect the rural character of Burkes Pass.</p> <p>Mixed use zone be considered inappropriate for Burkes Pass.</p>	<p>The planning process and notification were flawed and did not follow proper procedure.</p> <p>The “Burkes Pass Rural Character Area” has been overlaid on the original Burkes Pass Heritage Precinct but is not defined in any way. Area is considered to have special heritage character and provides the township with a distinctive identity.</p> <p>The low or large lot density residential zones are not suitable for the Burkes Pass Rural Character Area / Heritage Precinct.</p> <p>The Mixed-Use Zone and the potential range of activities that it could allow is not consistent with the heritage values of the Burkes Pass Rural Character area/Heritage Precinct. Specific worker accommodation (for workers out of the area and in greater numbers than normal residential accommodation) is not appropriate for Burkes Pass rural character</p>	Y
133.	Hannah Josli	Support	The Medium Density Residential Zone is applied to both sides of Maryburn Road in Twizel	Seems a struggle to find other areas to change. This seems an easy win and hopefully helps towards saving some of our green areas.	N
134.	Sarah Thompson	Oppose	All Recreation P land is to be retained and not rezoned under Plan Change 21	Our green spaces/reserves in Twizel need to be protected	N

135.	Jessica Maaka	Oppose	The minimum density within the Drive Twizel (4,000m ²) is maintained via a Specific Control Area, similar to Boundary Terrace, Glen Lyon Estate, Merino Downs and parts of Northwest Arch	<p>The Large Lot Residential Zone will allow further subdivision within The Drive down to 2,000m² which will increase the traffic in the area, impede the rights of the residents and severely impact the safety of children</p> <p>Covenants that currently apply for the benefit of residents will not be applied to new titles</p> <p>Intensification could drastically impact the landscape for those who walk or cycle the existing town belt walkway</p> <p>New houses will be able to build to 8m and would be highly visible as the houses will be closer together, impacting the natural landscape</p>	N
136.	Kerryn Archer	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Dobson Place, Twizel is currently a quiet cul de sac with little to no traffic. We have owned this property for many years and enjoy the unobstructed views and peaceful lifestyle. We enjoy playing frisbee golf and see how popular it is with the course often being busy. This space should remain	N
137.	Eugene Archer	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	I live at 1 Dobson Place directly opposite the proposed plan change and would need to understand the long term effects on my property's value and resale potential. Also, the impact of traffic flow and congestion as it is currently a quite cul de sac with park and mountain views. Choosing green space near the Doc office on Wairepo Rd which has no housing around it would have far less impact on surrounding neighbours	N

138.	Walter Speck and Zita Speck	Oppose in Part	<p>The zoning plan should be revisited</p> <p>Clarification sought regarding Low Density Residential Zone S1. Does this allow a 800m² section to be subdivided into two sections of 400m² or can every 800m² section be treated as 2 x 400m² sections (same ownership)</p> <p>Road access to Residential 2 or Tourism Zones should be direct off SH8 and should not go via/past Residential 1 Zones.</p> <p>In the Cairns Subdivision there are properties which are split into two zones. These property owners should be able to decide what zone they want to be. The separation along altitude lines within one title/property should be avoided.</p> <p>Amendments to LRZ-R2 to allow minor units to be two storeys</p> <p>Amendments to LRZ-R5 to allow residential visitor accommodation for up to 10 people as a permitted activity</p>	<p>Does not make sense to have one side of a road low density and the other side of the road high density</p> <p>Minor units should be allowed to be two storey to allow for garaging/storage and additional space on the ground floor</p> <p>More economically viable</p>	Y
139.	Rob Young	Oppose	<p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct</p>	<p>The green spaces of Twizel is its soul, and are an integral piece of the towns original design. The plan change will likely mean the closure of the existing Disc golf course by removing three holes from our international standard course</p>	Y
140.	Ian Thomson	Oppose	<p>Northwest Arch should be maintained at a density of 4,000m²</p>	<p>Brought their section for views and quietness. Height and building restrictions to remain</p>	N
141.	Brian Carpenter	Oppose	<p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified</p>	<p>No reason/comment provided</p>	N

			as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct.		
142.	Kathleen Carpenter	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Concerns over the Frisby golf course	N
143.	Erica Wills	Oppose	<p>Building heights of 10-11m are not provided for in the Medium Density Residential Zone</p> <p>The carparking requirements in the Medium Density Residential Zone are reviewed</p> <p>The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive is zoned Town Centre Zone instead of or in addition to the Ruataniwha Road Town Centre Zone</p> <p>The 10.5m height for buildings in the Town Centre Zone is considered in relation to the existing Market Place and further consideration is given for carparking</p> <p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct</p>	<p>Will reduce sunlight and views. Further research and review is required</p> <p>Allowing multiple units up to three stories will likely result in residents parking within unformed footpath areas. This is already a problem in the holiday period and creates a hazard for walkers</p> <p>The area on Ruataniwha road does not integrate well with Market Place and is limited by the existing service station and motel under construction. The area between Tasman Road and Mackenzie Drive integrates better with Market Place</p> <p>Impacts of shading and views. We have insufficient carparks during holiday periods</p> <p>Will lose the Frisby golf course</p>	Y
144.	Jane Nicholls	Oppose	<p>Intensive and multistorey buildings should not be provided for</p> <p>The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not</p>	<p>No reason/comment provided</p> <p>The frisbee golf course should be retained</p>	N

			zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct		
145.	Christopher Johnson	Oppose	Low Density Residential Zone-Specific Control Area 4 should be maintained at 4,000m ² in perpetuity No height increases should be allowed	Northwest Arch should be retained at its current size with the current height restrictions. We brought our property for the views and open space	N
146.	Eleanor Harris-Brouwer	Oppose	Intensive and multistorey buildings should not be provided for The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	No reason/comment provided The frisbee golf course should be retained	N
147.	Frances Bower	Oppose	The Recreation P land between Ruataniwha Road and Dobson Place is retained and not zoned Medium Density Residential or identified as a Commercial Visitor Accommodation Precinct	Concerns regarding the loss of the frisbee golf course	N
148	Malcolm Lousley* (Submission failed to load through website portal. Mr Lousely bought a dated hard copy to the Twizel MDC offices 9/12/22)	Oppose	That height restrictions and the number of housing units be reduced within the Medium Density Residential zone in Twizel.	Will retain the “village like” concept and stop developers from polluting our views of a unique and tranquil landscape.	N