

## KIWI BIRDLIFE PARK LIMITED (2569)

### EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF PAUL KAVANAGH (KIWIBIRDLIFE PARK MANAGER )

- 1 KBP operates a wildlife park from 51 Brecon Street, Queenstown and leases the land from the QLDC.
- 2 KBP is a commercial enterprise however a significant proportion of the activities it carries out fall within the categories of education, community, wildlife and nature conservation. The amendments sought to the proposed district plan provisions by KBP directly relate to protecting our existing operations, allowing for sensitive growth of our business and cost efficiencies, which in turn supports wildlife conservation and community education.
- 3 I filed evidence in relation to the amendment of rules to include an exception to the maximum height limits of aviaries and fences on the KBP site; the amendment of rules to explicitly include the KBP operations as a permitted activity; the introduction of a new policy to protect KBP existing operations from new activities and; provisions relating to height and activity status in the Lower Terminal Area of the BLSZ; and the retention of a discretionary activity status for informal airports in the BLSZ.
- 4 I have considered the views expressed by Ms Christine Edgely in respect of my evidence. Regarding a new exemption to allow KBP aviary enclosures to have a permitted maximum height of 10 metres Ms Edgely considers the notified provisions to be more efficient than including a site-specific exemption. I understand that a discretionary consent will be required rather than a restricted discretionary consent. I have recently been involved in consents for the new kiwi enclosures and appreciate the cost involved. I do not agree with Ms Edgely's comments from a practical perspective.
- 5 Although I appreciate I am not an expert in these matters, I believe that 10m aviaries (which are transparent) will create far less impact than buildings recently consented on surrounding sites (which include iFly and Skyline developments). Ms Edgely supports an increase in height for the Skyline terminal buildings to 18.5m which would be situated behind the KBP site, therefore her approach appears inconsistent to me.
- 6 In respect of my request for an exemption from the rule on height for fencing for the KBP site Ms Edgely points out that existing use rights would apply for the replacement of any existing fencing (providing that this was legally established). Fences on the site were established some 30 years ago, it will be difficult to prove that they were lawfully constructed; however they are an integral part of our operations. Also some of the existing fences are less than the optimal predator protection height of 2.2m. I fail to understand how the provisions as notified are more efficient than having a site-specific exemption as we would have to go to considerable expense to prove that the fences were lawfully established or include a further assessment in our resource consent application.
- 7 I sought an amendment to Rule 38.9.26 to identify that the species conservation work and activities that KBP undertakes is a permitted activity within the IRZ. Ms Edgely considers that the term "species protection and conservation management works" in Rule 38.9.26 as notified cover the KBP operations and that further wording is not necessary. KBP wants to be certain this is the case, to ensure the future of the park is protected and there are no costly debates with Council in the future.
- 8 It is also extremely important that KBP has protection from neighbouring activities given the purpose of the zone. Accordingly I respectfully request that the amendments sought in my evidence are included in the proposed plan provisions.