

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 6

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmnt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

| SID: | Submitter | RID | S/O | Request | Reason |
|------|------------|-----|-----|--|---|
| 1 | Rob Allan | 1 | O | Create a new zone to accommodate a limited number of exclusive Hotel and Motels. The zoning should be low density accommodation and designed with the high country landscape as the first consideration. | <p>The town will not be balanced with all accommodation concentrated in and around the main shops and to the west of the town.</p> <p>Concentrating the accommodation in this area will add congestion to the township.</p> <p>The lake view around Cowans Hill is spectacular and must be used for the full potential of the town.</p> <p>Council explanation for these changes is inadequate.</p> |
| | | 2 | | No decision should be made without consultation with the land owners. | |
| 2 | Rob Allan | 1 | O | Remove section iii(a) and (b) as inappropriate district plan rules in relation to land east of Hamilton Drive to top of Cowans Hill. | <p>The 20 metre setback is unnecessary as our land is on average 5-8 metre above road level and provides a natural buffer.</p> <p>The 10 metre setback is unnecessary as over 90% of the land is not seen from the Main Highway.</p> |
| 3 | A.W Design | 1 | S | Accept the Plan Change 6 as proposed | Support in principal what is being done around the base of Cowans Hill and it would only add to th residential harmony in this are of town especially excluded visitors accommodation other than as already |

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 6

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmnt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | | permitted. |
| 4 | Canterbury Regional Council | 1 | S | That Plan Change 6 be incorporated into the Mackenzie District Plan. | These amendments are broadly consistent with the Lake Tekapo Development Plan, a non-statutory document that is the product of extensive community consultation. |
| 5 | Lake Tekapo Community Board/ | 1 | S | Supports the principle of the proposed change | |
| 6 | Jim and Anne Murray | 1 | S | That the rezoning of Cowans Hill from TA to Res 1 be accepted. | Tourist accommodation should be centralised within walking distance of the town. |
| 7 | Walter and Zita Speck | 2 | | Reinstate the Travellers Accommodation zone on Cowans Hill or at least Residential 2. | Develop a more flexible approach. |
| 8 | Transit New Zealand | 1 | S | That the area of the proposed Residential 1 Zone at Cowans Hill be approved by the Council. | It reflects the resource consent which was granted last year for a three stage subdivision of Cowans Hill which Transit gave written approval. All access to the above subdivision is internal. Residential zoning will reduce the demand for any new access onto the state highway which would have been more sought after in the TA zone. |
| | | 2 | | Amend Rule 3.1.1d(iii)(a) as follows <i>where a site adjoins the State Highway within the Residential</i> | The rule should be amended so that it is more explicit that the 20m setback is from the State Highway boundary. |

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 6

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | <i>1 zone in Lake Tekapo, east of Hamilton Drive, all buildings shall be set back a minimum of 20m from the road State Highway boundary.</i> | |
| | | 3 | | <p>Insert the following new issue</p> <p>Issue 3 Maintaining the through route function of arterial roads adjoining residential areas</p> <p><i>In new areas of residential development adjoining an arterial road (state highway), there can be a desire for direct access to the highway. This results in land use development being undertaken in a way that adversely affects the supporting transportation network. It is important that any new areas of residential development incorporate an internal roading network in order to protect the strategic importance of the Districts arterial roads.</i></p> | <p>There is no provision in the residential areas to protect the strategic importance of the state highway network.</p> <p>The new issue, objective, policy and assessment matter promote integrated development planning, including traffic management and access provisions for areas of high degree of land use change.</p> |
| | | 4 | | <p>Insert the following new objective</p> <p>Objective Land use and transportation</p> <p><i>To integrate land use and transportation planning, including traffic and access management, for areas within the District where development and land use change is occurring.</i></p> | |
| | | 5 | | <p>Insert the following new Policy</p> <p>Policy Roading networks</p> <p><i>To require the provision of internal roading networks and</i></p> | |

Mackenzie District Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – PLAN CHANGE 6

Note: S – Support
 S (with amdmt) – Support with amendment
 O – Oppose

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | <i>avoid access onto the state highway network (arterial roads) for development or redevelopment within the Residential Zone</i> | |
| | | 6 | | Insert the following new assessment matter Assessment Matter <i>In Lake Tekapo, whether there is a practical alternative internal roading network so that access directly onto the State Highway (arterial roads) is avoided.</i> | |