

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of Stage 3 of the
Queenstown Lakes
Proposed District Plan

MINUTE 33 – WRITTEN QUESTIONS FOR MR FARRELL

Introduction

1. Mr Ben Farrell was scheduled to appear by zoom on 12 August, to present his evidence on Stream 17 and 18 matters on behalf of Wayfare Limited (#31022) and (in relation to Stream 18 only) Cardrona Alpine Resort Limited (#31018). As a result of the previous submitter significantly overrunning its scheduled hearing time, the slot allocated to Mr Farrell was entirely occupied by that further submitter and, understandably, he was unable to accommodate the delay. It was not practical to reschedule his appearance with the hearing concluding the following day and so I arranged via the Hearing Administrator that the Panel would put any questions it had of Mr Farrell in writing, in order that he might provide a written response. Our questions follow:

Stream 17 Evidence

2. We have the following questions:
 - (a) As regards paragraph 5(b), has Mr Farrell considered the implications of Policy 3.3.8?
 - (b) As regards paragraph 7, if commercial recreational activities are transient, is there potential that they might be already addressed under the provisions of Chapter 25?
 - (c) As regards paragraph 8, how many industrial buildings within the General Industrial Zone in fact provide the kind of “*large utilitarian designed buildings*” described?
 - (d) Is the BMUZ or the Remarkables Park Special Zone a better fit for the kind of commercial recreation and community activities described?

Stream 18 Evidence

3. Our questions are:

- (a) As regards provision for workers accommodation in Settlement Zones, how does Mr Farrell propose that provision for “*workers’ accommodation*” be defined given that a substantial proportion of the community are undertaking either paid or unpaid ‘work’?
- (b) As regards the reasoning in paragraph 14 of Mr Farrell’s evidence, is there an issue by reason of the fact that measures to protect against natural hazards have potential for a wide variety of on and off site effects?
- (c) As regards potential provision for navigational safety, which of the zones proposed to be amended by the ‘Glare’ variations are sufficiently close to navigable waters that glare or light spill beyond the property boundary could adversely affect navigational safety?
- (d) If the Panel agreed with Mr Farrell’s reasoning, is there a need to be more specific that it is navigation of boats that is an issue?
- (e) As regards the section of Mr Farrell’s evidence on the variation to the Open Space and Recreation Zone in Queenstown Bay:
 - (i) What land does the Wayfare submission relate to within Queenstown Bay, as several different areas are proposed to have the QTWSZ removed?
 - (ii) It appears that the rule provisions within the QTWSZ relate to activities on the surface of the water or on wharves, jetties and boardwalks that extend over the water. The rules of the Zones the variation removes the QTWSZ from manage activities on the land. Why is it appropriate for the QTWSZ to be applied over land, when that does not appear to be how the sub-zone is implemented through its rules?
 - (iii) More generally, why is it appropriate for the QTWSZ to be applied over land zoned as one of the Open Space and Recreation Zones?
 - (iv) As regards paragraph 22, more appropriate than what?

Timetabling

4. Mr Farrell is requested to have his written answers to the above questions to the

Hearing Administrator by 1pm on 21 August.

Dated 17 August 2020

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'T' followed by a horizontal line that ends in a wavy flourish.

**Trevor Robinson
Chair
Stage 3 Hearing Panel**