

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of the Queenstown Lakes
Proposed District Plan

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING QUESTIONS FOR MR FERGUSSON

Introduction

1. At the hearing today the Mr Fergusson requested that he be excused for personal reasons prior to the Panel finishing questioning him. We agreed to this on the basis that he would answer our remaining questions in writing by 2 p.m. on Friday 27th May 2016.
2. The Schedule attached sets out the questions the Panel would like answered.

For the Hearing Panel



Denis Nugent (Chair)

25 May 2016

SCHEDULE

1. What should the minimum lot size be in the Rural Lifestyle zone?
2. Should the minimum/average lot size and maximum or average density in the Rural Lifestyle zone be different for the Wakatipu Basin as compared with the remainder of the District?
3. With reference to management plans as a way of addressing vegetation clearance, how can or should they be provided for in the PDP?
4. With reference to your proposed definition of ski area activities in paragraph 106:
 - a) Isn't (b) repetitive given your proposed definition of passenger lift systems?
 - b) Is the wording of (c), if it is required, consistent with the opening statement?
 - c) Aren't (f) and (g) circular references referring to the activity that is being defined?
 - d) Is it appropriate to delete the 'and' in (l)?
5. Referring to the discussion regarding the definition of building in paragraphs 108 and 109, is it sound resource management practice to disregard the potential effects of towers and other support structures where they may be located within Outstanding Natural Landscapes (i.e. outside of SASZs)?
6. Referring to paragraphs 112-114, would the form of accommodation sought within SASZs for a category distinct from visitor accommodation that would be worthy of its own definition and activity status? If yes, can you provide an appropriate definition?
7. With reference to informal airports, is it your evidence that informal airports be provided for as a permitted activity within SASZs with no limit on flights? If that is not your evidence, could you clarify what it is that you are suggesting appropriate in paragraphs 134 and 135?
8. Could you please clarify whether, when you reached your opinion in paragraph 141, you took account of the Council's obligations under

sections 6 and 31 in respect of indigenous flora and fauna? If you did, could you please explain how the mechanisms you propose enable the Council to fulfil its obligations?