

TO: The Hearing Administrator, Lynley Scott, [DP.Hearings@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:DP.Hearings@qldc.govt.nz)

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL  
APPOINTED BY QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**UNDER THE** Resource Management Act 1991 (“**Act**”)

**IN THE MATTER OF** a Variation to the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile) in accordance with Part 5 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991 (“**Variation**”)

**BETWEEN** **GLENPANEL DEVELOPMENT LIMITED (“GDL”)**  
Submitter

**AND** **QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL (“QLDC”)**  
Proponent of the Variation

**SIXTH MEMORANDUM ON BEHALF OF GDL:  
FURTHER EVIDENCE AND QUESTIONS**

*Before a Hearing Panel:* David Allen (Chair), & Commissioners Gillian Crowcroft, Hoani Langsbury, Judith Makinson and Ian Munro

1. In its fifth memorandum, GDL sought leave be granted to allow cross examination of Mr Skelton.
2. The Panel declined to grant leave, stating:
  - Leave to cross examine is not granted. The Panel is more than capable to asses credibility and weight to be given to witnesses related to the matters relevant to this hearing.
  - GDL is directed to file a brief, no longer than 2 pages:
    - o statement of evidence (excluding any appendices) related to its concerns with Mr Skelton's reply to the questions in issue and in writing, and
    - o a list of questions that it wishes to put to Mr Skelton.
  - Both the evidence and the questions are to be filed with the hearing Administrator by 11am tomorrow (1 December 2023).
  - Mr Skelton can provide his response to the Panel when he presents his evidence next week (if additional time is required we can discuss it then). The Panel will review the questions and may provide direction as to

whether they require an answer. Mr Skelton is reminded of Direction 9.16 of 10 August 2023 in responding to questions.

- GDL can respond further in its presentation to the Panel if it so wishes (no additional evidence will be required to be provided at that time as it is provided above but the relevant witness can address it in their summary if they wish).

3. I have raised with the hearings administrator the difficulty in responding by 11am today. This response is being filed as soon as practicable. In respect of evidence, it is noted that two short briefs are required, in terms of the best evidence rule, being:

- (a) A short brief from Mr Tylden giving direct evidence as to his discussions with Mr Skelton, including as to Mr Skelton's initial comments as to development on the "mid-slope" of the ONF. Mr Tylden also attaches the plans that Mr Skelton (and, for that matter, Mr Harland) supported as part of GDL's previous HASHA proposal.
- (b) A short brief from Mr Rossouw, to that explains and attached a composite plan that shows that the plans that Mr Skelton (and Mr Harland) supported as part of GDL's previous HASHA proposal included a significant number of buildings at the "toe" of the slope, within the current ONF line.

4. In respect of questions, in light of the above, GDL poses the following further specific questions:

- (a) With the refreshing of your memory as to your discussions with Mr Tylden, do you agree that you indicated verbally that you would be likely to be able to support 6-9 residential development lots on the "mid-slopes" of the ONF on the GDL land? [It is accepted that this was not a written, or fully formed opinion, but was just a preliminary one.]
- (b) Do you agree that:
  - (i) You previously supported, as an independent expert landscape architect, development on the toe of the slope as part of GDL's HASHA proposal?

- (ii) That development in fact included a significant number of buildings at the “toe” of the slope, within the current ONF line?
- (iii) The extent of development that GDL is currently seeking to enable on the toe of the slope through a minor adjustment to the ONF line is similar to that which you had previously supported?

**1 December 2023**  
**James Gardner-Hopkins**  
**Project Manager**