

iP solutions

APPLICATION FOR

LAND USE
RESOURCE CONSENT

APPLICANT: ILIESA BECI

LOCATION: 7 ST JUST PLACE, WANAKA 9305

Date: 27/05/2026

Location: 7 St Just Place, Wanaka 9305

Attention: QLDC – Wanaka Planning Department

Document Quality Assurance

Project Reference: Iliesa Beci - Dwelling

Prepared for: Iliesa Beci

Prepared by: Cameron Stobie

Reviewed by: Dan Curley

Use and Reliance

This report has been prepared by IP Solutions Limited on the specific instructions of our client. It is solely for our client's use for the purpose for which it is intended in accordance with the agreed scope of work. This document is the intellectual property of IP Solutions Limited and cannot be copied or reproduced in part or full without the permission of IP Solutions Limited. IP Solutions Limited does not accept any liability or responsibility in relation to the use of this report contrary to the above, or to any person other than the Client. Any use or reliance by a third party is at that party's own risk. Where information has been supplied by the Client or obtained from other external sources, it has been assumed that it is accurate, without independent verification, unless otherwise indicated. No liability or responsibility is accepted by IP Solutions Limited for any errors or omissions to the extent that they arise from inaccurate information provided by the Client or any external source.

Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION 3

2.0 APPLICATION DETAILS 3

3.0 APPENDICES 3

4.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL 3

5.0 NES FOR ASSESSING CONTAMINANTS IN SOIL 9

6.0 SITE HISTORY 10

7.0 RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE DISTRICT PLAN 10

7.1 ACTIVITY STATUS 10

8.0 ASSESSMENT OF ADVERSE EFFECTS 10

8.1 PERMITTED BASELINE 10

8.2 EXISTING ENVIRONMENT 11

8.3 RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT 11

9.0 ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS 11

10.0 EFFECTS ON PERSONS 16

11.0 OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES OF THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN . 17

12.0 PART II OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 19

13.0 CONCLUSION 19

27th May 2026

Queenstown Lakes District Council
Wanaka Office
47 Ardmore Street
Wanaka 9305

Attention: Wanaka Planning Department

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Please find an application for Resource Consent to construct a residential unit at 7 St Just Place, Wanaka which breaches rules relating to site coverage, and retained earthworks in proximity to a boundary.

It is relevant to this application to note that the original developer received an approved resource consent under RM200817 for the road boundary setbacks to be reduced from 10m to 5m for the one-way loop road which forms St Just Place.

The application includes a site description, description of the proposed activity and an assessment of how the proposal aligns with the relevant District Plan rules and assessment criteria.

2.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

APPLICANT	ILIESA BECI
SITE LOCATION	7 ST JUST PLACE, WANAKA 9305
LEGAL DESCRIPTION	LOT 4 DP 567306
APPLICATION SITE AREA	204M^2
ZONING	LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL A

3.0 APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	RECORD OF TITLE & ENCUMBRANCES
APPENDIX B	PLAN SET
APPENDIX C	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

4.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL

4.1 SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject site is a located at 7 St Just Place, accessed via a loop road from the Roses Saddle Rise cul-de-sac the site has one road boundary and three internal boundaries.

The site has a generally flat topography which gently slopes towards the northern boundary. The site is currently void of built form, however there is an existing retaining wall along the eastern, northern, and western elevations installed by the previous owner, the proposal includes removal of this retaining wall as it was not constructed with resource consent approval, and to be reconstructed by the applicant.

The site does not currently have a formed vehicle crossing; however, access is proposed in the southeastern corner of the site. There is some existing planting around the top of the existing retaining walls along the northern and eastern boundaries, however this has mostly died and will be removed during retaining wall removal and construction.



Figure 1: Aerial view of subject sites (outlined in yellow) and surrounds. Source: GRIP Map.

The loop road which is subject to a 5m road boundary setback rather than the Proposed District Plan Large Lot Residential A Zone standard 10m road boundary setback is depicted in Figure 2 below:



Figure 2: Depiction of the one-way loop road (shown with a yellow line) subject to a 5m road boundary setback.



Figure 3: Site photo (North).



Figure 4: Site photo (South).



Figure 5: Site photo (East).



Figure 6: Site photo (West).



Figure 7: Existing eastern road boundary timber retaining to be removed.

4.2 PROPOSAL

The proposal is to construct a 325.6m^2 residential dwelling with associated retaining, which triggers rules relating to both an exceedance of the 15% site coverage as well as retaining in proximity to boundaries.

4.2.1 SITE COVERAGE BREACH

The proposal includes 325.6m^2 of built form for the residential unit. The maximum building coverage for the Large Lot Residential A zone is 15% of the site area, the proposal is for 16.24% building coverage over the site area. This results in a minor breach of 1.24%.

4.2.2 RETAINED EARTHWORKS BREACH

The proposal includes a breach for the proximity of retained earthworks to a boundary. There is existing timber retaining on site, however this retaining was completed by the previous owner and undertaken without resource consent, the applicant seeks to reconstruct the retaining to a higher standard and apply for resource consent via this application.

The schist stone retaining wall details are as follows:

Western Retaining Wall
Breach Length: 0.8m of retaining in breach butting against the southern internal boundary
Material: Schist Stone
Maximum Height: 0.8m
Drainage Method: 100mm drainage coil in a filter sock installed at the base of the retaining wall feeding into a soak pit on site.

Northern Retaining Wall
Breach Length: 1m of retaining in breach butting against the eastern road boundary
Material: Schist Stone
Maximum Height: 1m
Drainage Method: 100mm drainage coil in a filter sock installed at the base of the retaining wall feeding into a soak pit on site.

Eastern Retaining Wall
Breach Length: 39.5m of retaining in breach along the eastern road boundary
Material: Schist Stone
Maximum Height: 0.8m - 1m
Distance from eastern boundary: 0.3m
Drainage Method: 100mm drainage coil in a filter sock installed at the base of the retaining wall feeding into a soak pit on site.



Figure 8: Proposed Site Plan, full plan set attached as **Appendix B**.



Figure 9: Residential Dwelling Rendering.

5.0 NES FOR ASSESSING CONTAMINANTS IN SOIL

With respect to a preliminary site investigation (PSI) of soil contaminants, consistent with the published guidelines for assessing and managing contaminants in soil to protect human health, an investigation of known land use associated with the site was undertaken. Both the Queenstown Lakes District Council's GIS hazard register and Otago Regional Council records have been searched and there is no evidence of any activity which requires consent under the national standard. Residential occupation of the site has been approved by the underlying subdivision which created the site.

6.0 SITE HISTORY

The following consents are relevant to this application:

- **RM200470** – Approved resource consent for a ten-lot subdivision which created the subject site.

- **RM200817** – Approved resource consent application to reduce the 'U-Road' maximum road boundary setbacks from 10m to 5m.

7.0 RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE DISTRICT PLAN

7.1 ACTIVITY STATUS

Proposed District Plan

The subject site is zoned Large Lot Residential A under the Proposed District Plan, and therefore the proposed building activity requires the following consents:

- A **Restricted Discretionary Activity** pursuant to **Rule 11.5.2.1** which provides for a maximum building coverage of 15% of the net site area. The proposal is for 20.37% building coverage. Council discretion is restricted to the following:

    a) The effect on openness and spaciousness;
    b) Effects on views and outlook from neighbouring properties;
    c) Visual dominance of buildings;
    d) Landscaping.

- A **Restricted Discretionary Activity** pursuant to **Rule 25.5.18.2** which requires that earthworks supported by retaining walls are setback a distance equal to the height of the retaining wall. The proposal seeks to construct a schist retaining wall greater in height than the distance to boundaries.

Overall, under the Proposed District Plan, the proposal qualifies as a **Restricted Discretionary Activity**.

8.0 ASSESSMENT OF ADVERSE EFFECTS

8.1 PERMITTED BASELINE

Pursuant to Section 104(2) of the Act, when considering the actual and potential effects of an application for resource consent, a consent authority may disregard an adverse effect of an activity on the environment if the plan permits an activity with that effect (the permitted baseline).

In this instance, the permitted baseline on each site includes:

- Residential activities;
- Home occupation;
- Establishment of residential dwellings, including a residential flat, at a density of one per 2,000m^2 and a minimum allotment size of 1,500m^2;
- Fencing;
- Landscape planting;
- Internal setbacks of 4m;

- Road setbacks of 10m;
- Maximum building height of 8m;
- Maximum building coverage of 15% of the net site area;
- Earthworks up to 400m^3.

8.2 EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

The existing environment is of relevance to the consideration of the proposed development. The existing environment includes the existing retaining within the site which is to be removed and replaced; servicing provided to the site and the existing subdivision approval which created the site under RM200470.

8.3 RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT

In addition to the permitted baseline and the existing environment, it is important to consider the receiving environment. This includes established and consented Large Lot Residential A development on sites adjoining and in the vicinity of the application site.

Residential units are established on the adjacent properties to the south and east. The properties to the north, and northeast are currently vacant of built form, the property to the west has built form however the directly adjacent part of this property is void of built form. There are other established residential units within the St Just Place loop road subdivision. Multiple properties within the subdivision have received approved resource consent for site coverage breaches.

As previously described, the road boundary setbacks for properties fronting the St Just Place loop road, are subject to a 5m road boundary setback rather than the zone standard 10m setback, as approved under RM200817.

9.0 ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS

9.1 SITE COVERAGE BREACH

The matters over which Council has restricted its discretion are as follows:

a) The effect on openness and spaciousness;
b) Effects on views and outlook from neighbouring properties;
c) Visual dominance of buildings;
d) Landscaping

a) Effect on openness and spaciousness

The subject site has a total area of 2,004m^2, which is consistent with the intended low-density character and amenity outcomes anticipated within the Large Lot Residential A Zone. The proposal results in a minor exceedance of the permitted building coverage standard, with site coverage increasing to 16.24% where 15% is permitted. This equates to a breach of only 1.24%.

Notwithstanding this minor exceedance, approximately 84% of the site will remain as open space. The scale of the allotment ensures that the built form remains well separated, visually recessive, and clearly subordinate to the surrounding open environment. The proposal will not result in a perception of overdevelopment, crowding, or site saturation. In particular, the northern portion of the site will

remain largely open and landscaped, maintaining a level of spaciousness consistent with the surrounding residential environment and the established pattern of development within the subdivision.

Accordingly, adverse effects on openness and spaciousness are considered to be less than minor.

b) Effects on views and outlook from neighbouring properties

The proposed dwelling is consistent with the scale and form of anticipated residential development within the zone, including the established 5m road boundary setbacks along St Just Place. The minor increase in building coverage will not result in any material loss of outlook, visual amenity, or viewshafts from adjoining properties.

It is also relevant that a number of surrounding properties within the subdivision have previously obtained resource consent approval for breaches of the building coverage standard, including:

- 2 St Just Place – RM260274 – 5.37% breach;
- 3 St Just Place – RM210859 – 5% breach;
- 4 St Just Place – RM221138 – 4.05% breach; and
- 5 St Just Place – RM211001 – 7% breach.

In this context, modest exceedances of the 15% building coverage standard are an established and reasonably anticipated outcome within the subdivision. The proposed breach is comparatively minor and will not appear incongruous or out of character within the surrounding environment.

It is further noted that, as part of the original subdivision consent process, the developer sought approval for a building coverage standard of up to 25% across the subdivision. While this was ultimately not adopted, Council's preference was to assess coverage exceedances on a case-by-case basis, recognising that some flexibility may be appropriate depending on site-specific circumstances.

Accordingly, adverse effects on neighbouring views and outlook are considered to be less than minor.

c) Visual dominance of buildings

The proposed dwelling has a maximum height of 5.236m, which is significantly below the permitted 8m height standard. The low-profile nature of the building, together with compliance with recession plane controls and internal setbacks, ensures that the dwelling will not appear visually dominant when viewed from neighbouring properties or the street environment.

The building design also incorporates articulation through step-ins, material variation, and modulation of wall planes, avoiding the appearance of large unbroken façades. The use of high-quality natural materials, including stone and timber cladding, further softens the visual appearance of the dwelling and contributes positively to the overall residential character of the area.

Accordingly, adverse effects relating to visual dominance are considered to be less than minor.

d) Landscaping

No additional landscaping is proposed as part of this application. However, given the very minor nature of the site coverage exceedance, and the fact that the proposal will be largely indiscernible from the surrounding environment, additional landscaping mitigation is not considered necessary.

The proposed dwelling remains appropriately integrated within the site and surrounding residential context without reliance on additional screening or planting.

Accordingly, adverse effects relating to landscaping are considered to be less than minor.

Overall Conclusion

Overall, the proposed building coverage exceedance of 1.24% on a 2,004m² Large Lot Residential A zoned site is very minor in scale and does not give rise to any discernible adverse effects. When assessed against the relevant matters of discretion, the proposal will maintain the anticipated character, openness, and amenity values of the zone, while resulting in less than minor effects in relation to openness and spaciousness, neighbouring outlook, visual dominance, and landscaping.

9.2 RETAINED EARTHWORKS BREACH

The previous owner of the subject site constructed a timber retaining wall extending around the eastern, northern, and western portions of the site. This retaining wall was established without resource consent approval from QLDC and is now exhibiting signs of minor structural failure in certain locations. As part of the proposal, the applicant seeks to remove the existing retaining wall and replace it with a schist stone retaining wall as detailed within this application.

The proposed retaining wall will generally occupy the same alignment and function as the existing retaining structure, wrapping around the developed platform area of the site. The retaining wall breaches the relevant retaining height in relation to boundary standard in the locations identified in green on the site plan below.



Figure 10: Site Plan depicting retaining walls in green where the standard is breached.

From an amenity and visual perspective, the proposed schist retaining wall is considered appropriate within the context of the surrounding environment. The use of natural schist stone reflects the established landscape character of the area and is consistent with existing retaining treatments on adjoining properties, particularly the neighbouring property to the east, which incorporates a schist retaining wall along its northern boundary and road frontage.



Figure 11: View to the neighbouring site to the east showing their retaining wall on the northern boundary wrapping around the road frontage.

The proposed retaining wall has a maximum height of 1m and therefore does not require specific engineered design. Notwithstanding this, appropriate drainage measures will be incorporated into the retaining structure, including installation of a 100mm perforated drainage coil wrapped in filter sock material and connected to the on-site stormwater soakage system. This will ensure groundwater and surface runoff are appropriately managed and will avoid sediment-laden discharge beyond the site boundaries.

Construction and earthworks associated with the retaining wall will be undertaken in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) attached as **Appendix C**. The EMP provides a range of erosion and sediment control measures designed to avoid and mitigate adverse environmental effects during construction activities. In particular, earthworks will be undertaken as expediently as practicable, avoided during significant rainfall events, and supported by installation of a silt fence along the northern boundary during construction.

Overall, the proposed retaining wall represents a substantial improvement over the existing unconsented and partially failing timber retaining structure. Subject to implementation of the proposed drainage and EMP measures, adverse effects relating to visual amenity, land stability, and sedimentation are considered to be less than minor.

10.0 EFFECTS ON PERSONS



Figure 12: Aerial image showing adjacent neighbouring sites, indicated by green stars.

Having regard to the assessment contained within Section 9.0 of this report, the neighbouring properties identified in Figure 12 are not considered to be adversely affected persons pursuant to section 95E of the Resource Management Act 1991, as the proposal will result in adverse effects that are no more than less than minor.

The proposed site coverage exceedance of 1.24% is extremely minor in scale and will be effectively indiscernible from external views into the site. This is particularly relevant in the context of the wider subdivision, where a number of surrounding properties, including 3, 4, and 5 St Just Place, have previously obtained resource consent approval for site coverage breaches ranging from approximately 4% to 7%. In comparison, the proposed exceedance is materially smaller and correspondingly

less perceptible in the environment. Within this context, modest infringements of the building coverage standard are an established and reasonably anticipated characteristic of development within the subdivision.

In relation to the retaining wall located in proximity to the boundary, the proposal will provide an improved outcome relative to the existing unconsented timber retaining wall, which is currently failing in parts. The replacement schist retaining wall will provide a structurally sound and visually appropriate solution that is consistent with the established natural and built character of the surrounding environment.

Any temporary adverse effects associated with earthworks activities will be appropriately managed through implementation of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP), which includes measures to avoid and mitigate potential effects relating to erosion, sedimentation, and land instability.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal will not result in any adverse effects on neighbouring properties or surrounding persons that are more than minor. Accordingly, no persons are considered to be adversely affected by the proposal for the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991.

11.0 OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES OF THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed District Plan (PDP)

11.1 CHAPTER 3 - STRATEGIC DIRECTION

The relevant strategic objectives and policies in Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction) are addressed below.

Objective 3.2.2 – *Urban growth is managed in a strategic and integrated manner.*

Policy 3.2.2.1 *– Urban development occurs in a logical manner so as to:*

a. *promote a compact, well designed and integrated urban form;*
b. *build on historical urban settlement patterns;*
c. *achieve a built environment that provides desirable, healthy and safe places to live, work and play;*
d. *minimise the natural hazard risk, taking into account the predicted effects of climate change;*
e. *protect the District's rural landscapes from sporadic and sprawling urban development;*
f. *ensure a mix of housing opportunities including access to housing that is more affordable for residents to live in;*
g. *contain a high quality network of open spaces and community facilities; and*
h. *be integrated with existing, and proposed infrastructure and appropriately manage effects on that infrastructure.*

Objective 3.2.3 *– A quality built environment taking into account the character of individual communities.*

Policy 3.2.3.2 *– Built form integrates well with its surrounding urban environment.*

In regard to Objectives 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 and the associated relevant policies, the proposed development is consistent with appropriate urban growth within the urban growth boundary, and is in line with the anticipated Large Lot Residential outcomes. The proposal appropriately blends with the existing development in the immediate area to provide a well-designed residential dwelling that utilises the site effectively to create a residential living opportunity for the owners of the subject site. The proposal is consistent in regard to these objectives and policies.

Objective 3.2.4 *- The distinctive natural environments and ecosystems of the District are protected.*

Policy 3.2.4.1 *- Development and land uses that sustain or enhance the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems, and maintain indigenous biodiversity.*

The proposal is consistent with the objective and policy above. The proposal will ensure that the life supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems will be maintained. All earthworks undertaken will be completed without significant adverse effects on air, water, soil and ecosystems.

11.2 CHAPTER 11 – LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL

Objective 11.2.1 – A high quality of residential amenity values are maintained within the Large Lot Residential Zone.

Policy 11.2.1.1 - Maintain low density residential character and amenity through minimum allotment sizes that efficiently utilise the land resource and infrastructure (Area A).

Objective 11.2.2 - Predominant land uses are residential. Where appropriate, community and recreational activities also occur.

Policy 11.2.2.1 - Provide for residential and home occupation as permitted activities, and recognise that depending on the location, scale and type, community activities may be compatible with and enhance the zone's amenity values.

The proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies above. The proposed built form maintains the large lot character of the zone whilst achieving a high quality residential amenity that is appropriate in the context of the zone and surrounding sites. The land use is entirely residential and as such is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies.

11.3 CHAPTER 25 – EARTHWORKS

The relevant objectives and policies from Chapter 25 are addressed below.

Objective 25.2.1 *– Earthworks are undertaken in manner that minimises adverse effects on the environment, including through mitigation or remediation, and protect people and communities.*

Policy 25.2.1.1 *– Ensure earthworks minimise erosion, land instability, and sediment generation and off-site discharge during construction activities associated with subdivision and development.*

Policy 25.2.1.4 *– Manage the scale and extent of earthworks to maintain the amenity values and quality of rural and urban areas.*

Policy 25.2.1.6 *– Ensure that earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that does not adversely affect infrastructure, buildings and the stability of adjoining sites.*

The proposed earthworks when undertaken in compliance with the Environmental Management Plan, will result in a degree of adverse effects on the environment or people that is less than minor, mitigating and avoiding adverse effects in relation to erosion, land stability, sedimentation, and off-site discharge. The proposed earthworks and retaining will not adversely affect infrastructure and the EMP will ensure the avoidance of adverse effects on buildings and land stability of adjoining sites. The proposed earthworks are consistent with the relevant objective and policies in Chapter 25 – Earthworks.

Overall, the proposed development is consistent with the objectives and policies of the relevant chapters of the Proposed District Plan.

12.0 PART II OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

In consideration of the relevant principles outlined in Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the Act, it is considered that if approved, the proposed development will continue to achieve the purpose of the Act as presented in Section 5. The proposal will provide for the owners social well-being, which is appropriate for its residential purpose and the liveability of the site, while ensuring any adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

13.0 CONCLUSION

This application seeks Resource Consent to construct a residential unit at 7 St Just Place, Wanaka which breaches rules relating to site coverage, and retained earthworks proximity to a boundary.

When aligned against the relevant assessment criteria of the District Plan, it is considered that the proposal will promote outcomes encouraged by the relevant rules, assessment criteria, objectives, and policies of the PDP. It is also considered that the application represents sustainable development as sought within Part 2 of the Act.

It is therefore respectfully requested that Council approve this proposal subject to appropriate conditions of consent.

Kind Regards,

Cameron Stobie
IP Solutions Ltd



iP solutions®

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN PROCESS & YOUR OBJECTIVES

IP Solutions Limited
5 Chalmers St, Wanaka, NZ
info@ipsolutions.nz