BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL APPOINTED BY THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Under	of the Resource Management Act 1991
In the Matter	of a request under clause 21 of the First Schedule to the Act for a Change to the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan
By	**THE HILLS RESORT LIMITED** Requestor

Closing Submissions for The Hills Resort Limited on PC1

Dated: 24 April 2026

Counsel Acting | Rebecca Wolt
Email | rebecca@rebeccawolt.co.nz
Phone | 021 244 2950

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL

1. These closing submissions are on behalf of The Hills Resort Limited (**THRL**), the requestor of Private Plan Change 1 (**PC1** or **Plan Change**) to the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan (**PDP**).

2. The opening submissions set out THRL's position on the Plan Change, the statutory framework, and the issues for determination. These closing submissions respond to the matters raised during the hearing, although THRL's position on the issues remains as set out in opening. These closing submissions address in further detail the following matters:

   (a) The Sports Courts and Gardens Activity Area (**SG**), as raised by submitters Todd and Brown.

   (b) The enlargement of Activity Area 4 (**AA 4**) as raised by submitters Todd and Brown.

   (c) The staging rule recommended by Mr Barr.

   (d) The cycle/pedestrian trail over the BHT land (Lot 6 DP 392663).

   (e) The Page viewshaft concerns regarding Activity Area 2 (**AA2**).

   (f) The matters raised by submitters Weber and Gibson.

ISSUE 1: SPORTS COURTS AND GARDENS ACTIVITY AREA (AA SG)

3. The Todd (#2) and Brown (#4) submissions seek that the SG is removed from the Structure Plan or relocated centrally within the zone, away from the zone boundary. THRL's opening submissions addressed these matters in detail. Nothing in the evidence or submissions presented by Mr Todd and Dr Galloway at the hearing displaces THRL's position. Mr Day's evidence confirms that noise from the SG activities received at the residential interface will be reasonable[1]. Ms Pfluger's and Ms Gilbert's evidence confirms the visual effects will be very low.

[1] This conclusion accounts for the nosier sport of pickleball. Mr Day's oral evidence at the hearing was that pickleball noise from the SG will be at levels that are below traffic noise. He acknowledged that problems can arise with pickleball noise where courts are located right next door to residences, for example in the middle of retirement villages. However, in the case of the HRZ, the SG/pickleball

4. While asserting that residential neighbours would experience adverse amenity effects, neither Mr Todd nor Dr Galloway presented any written or oral evidence as to the nature of these alleged amenity effects (if not noise or visual effects, then what?) nor demonstrated that such effects would in fact arise.

5. THRL maintains the SG is appropriately sited from both a master-planning and effects perspective. Mr Thomson's evidence has demonstrated that the proposed location is the most practical and functional location within the zone. His evidence is that it is desirable that the facility is separate from the golf offering and associated activities, not co-located with them. Ms Hill's evidence confirms that the proposed location it is the only suitable location available, given the constraints of the golf course, ball dispersion corridors, LAMA areas, residential and visitor accommodation areas, and roading.

6. No contrary planning, landscape, acoustic, or master-planning evidence has been tendered.

7. While Dr Galloway has opined that the proposed location is not the most appropriate from a recreation planning perspective, he has not demonstrated any adverse effects arising due to the current location, nor has he identified a more suitable location. In any case, he is not a golfer and has no experience with private golf resort design, operation or function[2]. Mr Thomson's evidence - an experienced master planner with track record of high quality, enduring resort design[3] - is that the planning principles discussed by Dr Galloway have little application to private golf courses, and that for such facilities, a location that is separate from golf is in fact preferable. Dr Galloway did not present any cogent evidence at the hearing to challenge Mr Thomson's evidence on this point.

Speculation about future activities

8. Dr Galloway suggested in questioning that uncertainty exists as to what activities might establish in the SG, raising the prospect of activities such as a hippy commune, music concerts, or a camping ground. That speculation has no proper

courts are 400m distant from the nearest residences, with a road in between, with traffic levels that creating masking noise. These factors mean that pickleball noise will be lower than traffic noise, will readily comply with the PDP noise limits, and will be reasonable.

[2] Confirmed at the hearing, in response to a question from the Panel Chair

[3] For example, Clearwater, Jacks Point, Te Arai, among others, as detailed in his EIC resume

foundation. The rules for the SG, as amended, are clear and prescriptive as to the permitted activities. The activities Dr Galloway raised are not among them. In the SG:

(a) Restaurants are not permitted (Rule 47.4.18 amendment);

(b) Retail activity is limited to one non-permanent food truck (Standard 47.5.20);

(c) The number of buildings is limited to three, each with a maximum gross floor area of 60m² (Standard 47.5.14A);

(d) Hours of retail activity, including any licensed premise, are limited to 0800-2000 (Standard 47.5.20A);

(e) Music must comply with the PDP noise limits (50dB $L_{Aeq(15min)}$ during daytime hours (8am to 8pm), and 40 dB $L_{Aeq(15min)}$ during evening hours (8pm to 8am));

(f) Residential activity, visitor accommodation and camping grounds are not provided for. These activities, and any other activity not expressly provided for, would require a non-complying resource consent under Rule 47.4.36.

Cumulative effects

9. Mr Day's summary evidence (14 April 2026) addresses Mr Todd's concern about cumulative noise effects arising from the Monk property (Merryfield Farm wedding venue). As Mr Day explains, Merryfield Farm is a professional wedding venue accommodating up to 150 guests, with two bars and outdoor marquee spaces, and permitted operating hours until midnight. That is a fundamentally different scale and intensity of use to the SG, which is not a functions facility, is limited to a single non-permanent food truck, and cannot sell food or alcohol after 8pm. In Mr Day's opinion, cumulative noise effects between the two facilities are unlikely to arise.

Mr Todd's concern about future consenting

10. Mr Todd expressed concern about the possibility that a future resource consent application might be granted for an activity not currently contemplated by the rules. That concern does not provide a proper basis for declining or relocating the

SG. Any future application for a non-contemplated activity would be assessed on its merits at the time, against the relevant rules, policies and objectives, and taking account of environmental effects. Discretionary and non-complying activities may well be publicly notified. It is unnecessary and futile to speculate on hypothetical future consenting processes for activities that the rules do not currently provide for.

11. Accordingly, THRL submits that is it appropriate for the Panel to confirm the SG, location and provisions, without further amendment.

ISSUE 2: ENLARGEMENT OF ACTIVITY AREA 4

12. The Todd and Brown submissions seek that the proposed enlargement of AA 4 is rejected on the basis of visual effects when viewed from Advance Terrace. No expert landscape evidence has been presented in support of those submissions.

13. Ms Pfluger and Ms Gilbert both conclude that the visual effects of the amended AA 4 from Advance Terrace will be low and acceptable. Ms Pfluger's summary evidence (14 April 2026) addresses Mr Todd's specific concern about the potential loss of existing vegetation. She confirms that the proposed LAMA L4 mounding (to RL 413 masl) combined with planting at 2.5 metres high at time of planting means that only the top 1.5 metre of buildings within AA 4 would potentially be visible immediately following construction. Species such as mountain beech, which are likely to be planted in the adjacent LAMA (L4) are evergreen and grow at approximately 0.8 metres per year, such that any initial low visual effects would reduce to very low within approximately three years. Her evidence is that the existing vegetation within the adjacent LAMA (L4) does not need to be retained to address the visual effects of buildings within the adjacent AA 4.

14. Ms Pfluger’s evidence further confirms that the overall visual effects of the amended AA 4 will be comparable to the currently approved location due to the screening landform and planting along the north-eastern side of the Activity Area, which provides visual separation from McDonnell Road and the Arrowtown escarpment.

15. Accordingly, THRL submits that is it appropriate for the Panel to confirm the extended AA4 and LAMA (L4), without further amendment.

ISSUE 3: THE PROPOSED STAGING RULE

16. Mr Barr recommends a new rule requiring the construction of a minimum of 14 visitor accommodation units within the HRZ before any building on Homesites 6-16 is undertaken. THRL's opposition to this rule is set out in opening and in Mr Brown's evidence. Two points are developed in closing.

No jurisdictional scope

17. As covered in opening, Mr Barr's recommended staging rule is not "on" the Plan Change.

18. The definition of "Resort"[4] in the PDP refers to an integrated and planned development "*focused on onsite visitor activities*" - not solely visitor accommodation. Onsite visitor activities are already firmly established in the zone. In particular, the 18-hole championship golf course has been established and operational since 2007. The Clubhouse is built and operational, as is the Sculpture Park. The Golf Training Facility has been consented and construction is underway. The first visitor accommodation units (Clubhouse Suites) are consented and under construction. More visitor accommodation is in the pipeline.[5] The Plan Change seeks to expand the visitor activity offering further by the addition of the Sports Courts and Gardens Activity Area (SG).

19. The "Resort" definition also requires that the resort provides principally for visitor accommodation, over residential activity. PC1 does not propose to change the maximum number of residential units (66) or the total number of units (150) and does not amend the rules that give effect to this aspect of the definition of "Resort" (Rules 47.5.15 and 47.5.16). It simply seeks to redistribute 11 units of the residential offering.[6]

20. Accordingly, the management regime and visitor activity offerings that ensure the zone meets the Resort definition are not altered by PC1.

[4] **Resort:** Means an integrated and planned development involving low average density of residential development (as a proportion of the developed area) principally providing temporary visitor accommodation and forming part of an overall development focused on onsite visitor activities.
[5] As detailed in Mr Brownn's summary evidence, dated 14 April 2026
[6] Noting, in addition, that while able to be used for residential activity, HS9-16 could also be used for visitor accommodation (RVA) 365 days per annum, under Rule 47.4.14

21. Mr Barr has also suggested that the staging rule is necessary to implement Objective 47.2.1, which seeks:

"An integrated golf resort development that principally provides for a range of visitor industry related activities, while also providing for limited residential activity, all of which are located and designed with particular regard to maintaining the landscape character and amenity values of the Zone and surrounding environment."

22. With respect to Mr Barr, that concern also does not arise from the changes promoted to the zone via PC1 and lacks jurisdictional validity for similar reasons to those given in relation to the "Resort" definition. Objective 47.2.1 requires the zone to *principally provide for a range of visitor industry related activities*. Its focus is on ensuring the primacy of *visitor industry activities* within the zone, not on mandating a particular sequencing of development. PC1 does not alter that primacy, through changes to the provisions, or otherwise. Numerous visitor industry activities are already established within the zone, as detailed above. The redistribution of some residential activity into the Hogans Gully catchment through the addition of HS9–16 does not alter this, nor does it increase the quantum of residential activity permitted (which remains capped at 66 units under Rule 47.5.15)[7]. Under PC1 residential activity remains, as Objective 47.2.1 contemplates, a secondary and limited component of an integrated golf resort that principally provides for numerous visitor industry activities, many of which are already established. A staging rule directed at ensuring the zone meets Objective 47.2.1 would need to address a deficiency in the visitor industry offering arising from the Plan Change. No such deficiency exists, and a staging rule cannot therefore be justified by reference to Objective 47.2.1.

23. Accordingly, Mr Barr's staging rule recommendation does not arise from or address any alteration to the status quo advanced by the Plan Change, nor does it respond to any submission point. Applying the *Countdown Properties* test, a decision to introduce such a rule would not be "on" the Plan Change; there is no jurisdictional scope for it.

77

24. Mr Ryan framed the Council's concerns differently. At the hearing, he justified the staging rule as a "safeguard" to ensure that "*we don't end up with just a golf course, or just residential activity"*. The prospect that the resort is developed with "just a golf course" or "just residential activity" is one that theoretically could eventuate under the operative HRZ provisions[8]. It is not a prospect arising due to the Plan Change, and the staging rule does not therefore address a change to the status quo brought about by the Plan Change and is not within its scope. In any case, the concern is overstated. The prospect that the zone is developed for "just a golf course" or "just residential activity" is highly unlikely given the range of visitor activities that are already established and consented and underway.

The rule is unnecessary on its merits

25. Even if there were scope, the staging rule is not necessary or appropriate.

26. Mr Barr's underlying concern appears to be that, without a staging rule, the Hogans Gully Home Sites could be developed as a standalone rural-residential development and present as "rural living sprawl".

27. Mr Barr's concern that the homesites could be developed as a standalone activity has no valid foundation. That is because numerous resort facilities (visitor activities) are already operational with more under construction (and in the pipeline), as detailed above (and in the summary evidence of Mr Brown). There is, therefore, no prospect that the Hogans Gully homesites will be established as a standalone rural residential subdivision, ahead of or absent these other resort/visitor activities.

28. Mr Barr's concern with the potential for "rural living sprawl", which at the hearing he described as "spilling over into a new catchment" concerns the physical outcomes of the development. That is fundamentally a landscape issue. Both Ms Gilbert and Ms Pfluger have considered the landscape effects of HS9-16 and, following amendments to building heights and Structural Planting Areas (**SPA**), agree that the landscape effects will be minor and that the development outcome will maintain landscape character and amenity values. Ms Gilbert does not recommend a staging rule as a landscape measure. In any case, Mr Barr's recommended staging rule affects only the timing of delivery of visitor

[8] A zone can only ever enable, not require, development

accommodation and residential activity; it does not alter the physical outcomes on the ground. That is, his recommend staging rule does in fact respond to his expressed concern.

29. Thus, even if there were scope for Mr Barr's staging rule (there is not), the evidence has not demonstrated that it is an appropriate or necessary method to address either a policy matter or an environmental effect arising from the Plan Change.

30. If, notwithstanding these submissions, the Panel is minded endorsing a staging rule, THRL requests that this is advised to the parties on an interim basis, with an opportunity to provide comment on the appropriate drafting of and triggers in the rule[9].

ISSUE 4: CYCLE/PEDESTRIAN TRAIL OVER BHT LAND (LOT 6)

31. THRL's opening submissions addressed at length why the QTT submission seeking a trail extension over Lot 6 DP 392663 is not "on" PC1 and is beyond the Panel's jurisdiction.

32. The matter is now resolved at a practical level. THRL's proposal to extend the cycle/pedestrian trail along the Hogans Gully Road frontage within the HRZ has been confirmed by QTT as welcomed, and as enabling a much better connection into existing and future trail networks in the Hogans Gully basin.[10] Mr Ryan and Mr Barr confirmed at the hearing that the amended position is acceptable to the Council. Accordingly, no contested issue remains on this point for the Panel to determine.

[9]This is necessary because, for example, the reference in Mr Barr's drafting to "*construction*" of 14 visitor accommodation units prior to any building in HS6-16 is both uncertain and problematic. For the purpose of the rule, at what point are the VA units "constructed" and the rule satisfied, and how is this to be demonstrated and measured? The requirements of the rule unclear, and how the rule will be objectively and consistently administered is uncertain. In addition, Mr Barr's drafting would have the rule apply to HS6-16, i.e., including HS6-8, when his evidence focusses solely on the Hogans Gully Homesites, HS9-16. There is no evidence that supports the application of the rule to HS6-8. This is relevant to both the breadth of the rule, and Mr Barr's calculation that 14 VA units should be "constructed" before building is undertaken on the homesites. If the rule and Mr Barr's 'maths' are to be applied to only H9-16, which are the sole focus of his concern and evidence, then the number of VA units that must first be established should be less than the 14 he has calculated.

[10] QTT correspondence dated 10 April 2026, attached to THRL's opening legal submissions

ISSUE 5: PAGE VIEWSHAFT CONCERNS

33. At the hearing, the Pages raised concerns about the potential loss of views to Bob's Peak arising from future development within AA 2 and referred to a 2002 agreement which they say confirmed protection of their views in perpetuity. THRL maintains the position expressed in opening and makes the following additional points.

No in-perpetuity agreement

34. THRL is not aware of any formal or informal agreement, whether with the late Sir Michael Hill, Darby Partners, or any other entity, which preserves the Pages' views across the HRZ *in perpetuity*. THRL acknowledges that discussions with the Pages regarding views did take place in 2002, and a planting plan was prepared at that time. Records have been reviewed, including the correspondence referenced by the Pages at the hearing. From this review, the 2002 and 2009 correspondence referred to by the Pages appears to relate to *specific development proposals* then under consideration. Those development proposals were never implemented. No requirement for protection of views *in perpetuity* was formally registered (on the Record of title for example), or, based on THRL's knowledge and its review of the available records, ever agreed.

The concern relates to the operative, not the proposed, part of AA 2

35. The Pages' concern appears in substance to relate to buildings that could be developed within the operative part of AA 2, not the extension proposed by PC1. The extension to AA 2 is located further to the north - that is, further away from the Pages' dwelling. PC1 also proposes to reduce the maximum RL and maximum building height within the whole of AA 2 (including the operative area) by one metre, from 416masl and 8 metres respectively[11]. The LAMA running parallel to the Pages' boundary will continue to provide visual separation. Ms Pfluger's evidence supports these amendments as ensuring that the Pages' amenity values are maintained. The net effect of PC1 on the Pages is a reduction in the potential built form to which they would otherwise be exposed to under the operative provisions.

[11] Standard 47.5.3(c)

No ability to remedy via this Plan Change

36. Subdivision and land use consent for the operative part of AA 2, including the LAMA, is already granted and cannot be altered by this Plan Change. Any alteration would require a section 127 application for variation of consent conditions, initiated by the consent holder. Ms Pfluger's advice is that the consented AA2 LAMA is designed to address views to the Activity Area from Arrowtown generally, not from the Page property specifically. That would make any section 127 variation targeted at the Page viewshaft problematic.

37. The situation of concern to the Pages does not arise from the Plan Change and cannot be remedied through this process. THRL nonetheless remains committed to ongoing discussion with the Pages and will informally engage on planting and design matters through the resource consenting process at the appropriate time.

ISSUE 6: WEBER AND GIBSON CONCERNS

38. Submitters Ms Weber and Mr Gibson (#20) raised four matters at the hearing: (a) the restricted discretionary height rule for future buildings in HS10, HS12, HS15 and HS16; (b) lighting and night-sky amenity; (c) the surface treatment of internal roading to HS9-16; and (d) future trail alignment behind their property. Matter (d) is addressed by the trail extension – which does not go as far as the Weber property – discussed above. Matters (a) to (c) are addressed below.

The restricted discretionary height rule (Rule 47.5.3A, HS 10, 12, 15 and 16)

39. Ms Weber and Mr Gibson submit that the restricted discretionary (RDA) pathway for allowing an additional one metre of height for HS10, HS12, HS15 and HS16 under proposed Rule 47.5.3A is a "loophole" that should be closed - either by fixing the height at the lower level and removing the two stepped RDA regime, or, if the two stepped regime is to be retained, requiring notification to neighbours of any application made under Rule 47.5.3A for extra height.

40. The "loophole" characterisation is inapt. Rule 47.5.3A is a carefully crafted method introduced in response to Ms Gilbert's landscape evidence and submitter concerns. Building heights and RLs for these homesites have been reduced by two metres since notification, even though the notified building heights were supported by Ms

Pfluger[12]. In conjunction with that substantial height reduction, a restricted discretionary consenting pathway is proposed that would allow up to one metre of additional height to be assessed through a focused consent process at the time detailed design of a dwelling is known[13]. Exceeding the specified height by more than one metre would require a non-complying resource consent.[14]

41. This two stepped height regime recognises that the visual modelling undertaken as part of the plan change process is a rather blunt tool, in so far as it depicts a maximum built form envelope or a rectangular bulk, i.e. – a worst case scenario - whereas in all likelihood that is not what will be built on these homesites.

42. Ms Pfluger addressed the landscape rationale for the regime comprehensively in her evidence[15]:

"It needs to be acknowledged that the visual simulations depict the maximum bulk of built form in terms of footprint and height, whereas future buildings on the HSs will have different designs, roof lines, modulation, and could be differently sited within the HS to what the visual simulations show. In addition, not all buildings will use their maximum building height envelope for the entirety of the roofline. The particular design of the building will influence how it relates to the surrounding landform and vegetation, including the adjacent LAMAs, and will influence the potential effects. Noting that the visual simulations depict a 'worst case' visual improve on) what is shown in the visual simulations, where a lowered maximum building height of 4.5m is now adopted, a two-stepped height rule is proposed whereby the establishment of a building at the lower height (4.5m) would be a Controlled Activity, while a building up to 5.5m would be a Restricted Discretionary Activity. The matters of discretion would relate to 'visual prominence from public places outside the Zone' and 'external appearance including materials and colours (Proposed Rule 47.5.3A). Buildings any higher than 5.5m would be a Non-Complying Activity. This stepped regime would allow for visual effects to be thoroughly assessed through a focussed consent process at the time the detailed design of buildings on these HSs is known."

[12] In the Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVA) lodged in conjunction with the Plan Change request
[13] Including dwelling location, size, shape, height, modulation, colours, and materials
[14] Under Rule 47.5.3B
[15] Yvonne Pfluger Evidence, 23 March 2026, at [49]

43. The proposed RDA regime is not a back-door to greater height; it provides a consenting pathway for a slightly taller building – one metre - if the effects of the height increase are demonstrated as acceptable at the time the detailed design of the building is known. A grant of consent under Rule 47.5.3A is not a fait accompli; any RDA application will be assessed on its merits, taking account of the building's visual prominence from public places outside the zone, and the external appearance the building - Rule 47.5.3A, matters of discretion. These matters of discretion are anchored by Objective 47.2.1 and Policies 47.2.1.2(c) and 47.2.1.15, which require visibility of buildings from beyond the zone to be mitigated through appropriate siting, landscaping, building height, coverage, and external appearance controls.[16] Inevitably, a further landscape assessment would be required to support any application under Rule 47.5.3A.

44. As above, Ms Pfluger supports the approach, as does Ms Gilbert. It is consistent with the existing architecture of the Zone, which applies the same two-tier height regime to AA 4 and 5 under Rules 47.5.4 and 47.5.5. There is nothing novel or exceptional about the mechanism.

45. The planning experts considered the notification question in conferencing and reached agreement. Mr Brown and Mr Barr agree that there has been sufficient rigour in the assessment of HS 9 – 16 through this plan change process, such that an RDA application for a one metre a greater height under Rule 47.5.3A need not be notified[17].

46. Accordingly, there is a cogent evidential basis for accepting the two stepped height regime for HS 10, 12, 15 and 16, whereas there is no cogent evidential or other basis for removing it, or for imposing a notification requirement for an application for increased height under Rule 47.5.3A.

47. THRL submits that the restricted discretionary two stepped height rule for HS 10, 12, 15 and 16 is appropriate, sufficiently constrained, and consistent with the Zone's existing rule architecture. No further amendment to the rule is necessary.

[16] Planning JWS, Annexure A
[17] Planning JWS, Annexure A

Internal access road noise

48. Ms Weber and Mr Gibson seek that the internal access road to the Hogans Gully Home Sites is formed with noise-reducing surface treatment. No technical acoustic evidence has been filed or presented at the hearing in support of this request. The internal access road is located some distance from the Weber/Gibson property at 63 Hogans Gully Road. Under Rule 47.5.23, use of the access is limited to HS9-16 only, so vehicle numbers will be low - the Council's own transport expert Mr Facey accepts that the access can appropriately be of rural specification given its limited function. The noise-related concerns have not been made out and are unlikely to be realised. No amendment to the provisions is necessary.

Lighting

49. Ms Weber and Mr Gibson raise concerns about light spill from the Hogans Gully Homesites and access road and the impact on night-sky amenity in the Speargrass Valley and Hogans Gully catchment. They state that these homesites and the access road will "turn this large dark area into a Christmas Tree at night"[18]. These submitters also request that the zone rules are amended to ensure that there is no street lighting at the Hogans Gully vehicle entrance.

50. The HRZ already contains rules that control lighting and ensure that the concerns raised by these submitters will not eventuate. These existing rules will apply to the new Homesites.

51. With regards to the Hogans Gully vehicle entrance, existing Rule 47.4.1 applies. Under this rule, the formation of the Hogans Gully vehicle access requires a controlled activity consent, with the Council's control reserved to matters including entrance design - including lighting[19] and edge and berm treatment, including any footpaths and lighting.[20]

52. With regards to other lighting, existing Standard 47.5.13 requires that all fixed lighting is directed away from adjacent roads and properties, and that no activity results in a greater than 3.0 lux spill (horizontal and vertical) of light onto any property located outside of the zone as measured at any point inside the boundary

[18] Weber/Gibson speaking notes
[19] Rule 47.4.1, matter of control (a)
[20] Rule 47.4.1, matter of control (c)

of the adjoining property. A discretionary resource consent is required if the Standard is not met. Standard 47.5.13 mirrors the lighting standard that applies to the surrounding WBRAZ zoned land.[21] A straightforward internet search reveals that a 3.0 lux light spill is a dim level of light compatible with a rural environment. It would not allow street lighting.

53. Accordingly, the existing controls on lighting, which will apply to the Hogans Gully Homesites, will ensure that the lighting outcomes are compatible with the rural locale and would most likely preclude street lighting. No amendment or further controls are necessary.

CONCLUSION

54. PC1 is a well-considered and appropriately scaled refinement of the HRZ Structure Plan and provisions, driven by the practical requirements of an improved golf course design and the continuing evolution of a world-class resort.

55. The landscape effects of the Plan Change are agreed by both landscape experts to be minor and appropriate. All transport matters are agreed. The planning experts are now in agreement all matters, except the staging rule.

56. On the matters that remained contested at the hearing, THRL's position is supported by the evidence and is the most appropriate outcome having regard to the statutory framework. No expert (or lay) evidence has been tendered that would displace the evidence filed for THRL on any contested issue.

57. The Plan Change meets the relevant objectives of the PDP and suitably addresses the actual and potential environmental effects of the activities enabled. It will facilitate significant improvements to the golf course and resort offering and will deliver regionally significant benefits - enhancing the reputation of the Queenstown Lakes region as an international golf destination and contributing to the local economy through high-value tourism.

58. THRL submits that it is appropriate to confirm PC1, with the amendments set out in the evidence of Mr Brown and the revised provisions tendered at the hearing.

R Wolt
Counsel for The Hills Resort

[21] See PDP Rule 24.5.17