

IN THE MATTER                      of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER                      of the Queenstown Lakes  
Proposed District Plan

AND

IN THE MATTER                      of Hearing Stream 13:  
Queenstown Mapping

**MINUTE TRANSFERRING SUBMISSIONS TO**  
**WAKATIPU BASIN HEARING STREAM**

1. In a Memorandum dated 5 May 2017, counsel for David Broomfield (Submission 500), Scott Conway (Submission 467) and Richard Hanson (Submission 473) requested that the submitters' submission points set down to be heard in Stream 13 be deferred to be heard as part of the Wakatipu Basin Hearing Stream.
2. In a Minute dated 5 May 2017 I sought the views of the Council on such a transfer. Counsel for the Council responded in a memorandum dated 11 May 2017 advising:
  - a) the Council did not oppose the request;
  - b) at this stage, the Council cannot definitely state whether the submitters' land would be within the area affected by any variation to give effect to the Wakatipu Basin Landscape Study, nor whether there would be such a variation; and
  - c) it appeared that two other submissions (#310.3 and #476.2) fell within the same category as these submissions.
3. By way of a Minute dated 12 May 2017 I provided the submitters mentioned in paragraph 2(c) above the opportunity to advise whether or not they wished to have their submission points transferred as well.
4. The representative of K Hindle and D Wright (Submission 476) responded by email on 15 May 2017 advising that those submitters' preference was to remain in Stream 13, but that they would not be calling any evidence in support of their submission.

5. The representative of J Waterson (Submission 310) responded by email on 16 May 2017 advising that the submitter's preference was to have his submission transferred to the Wakatipu Basin Hearing Stream.
6. The request lodged by Messrs Broomfield, Conway and Hanson is reasonable given that the Wakatipu Basin Landscape Study suggests a planning regime for land along Tucker Beach Road. Although the Council cannot confirm whether any variation, if one were to be promulgated, would affect this land, there remains a risk that submitters and the Hearing Panel could have to duplicate their respective considerations of the appropriate zoning of the land in question. The same situation applies to Mr Waterson.
7. For those reasons, and noting the Council's lack of opposition, I transfer the relevant submission points of Submissions 500, 467, 473 and 310 to the Hearing Stream dealing with the zoning of the Wakatipu Basin, and will vacate the hearing slots provided to those submitters in Hearing Stream 13.
8. K Hindle and D Wright are in a different situation. As they do not propose to call evidence in Stream 13, if any variation altered the zoning of the land their submission relates to, they would not need to duplicate appearance costs if they wished to be heard in respect of any such change. Thus, as they requested, Submission 476 will remain in Hearing Stream 13.

For the Hearing Panel



Denis Nugent

17 May 2017