

**APPENDIX 1 - MINUTES DATED 13 JULY AND 10 AUGUST 2017**

## QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

### Private Plan Change 52 Mount Cardrona Station

#### Sixth Minute and Directions of Hearing Commissioners

1. Following the hearing on 11 July, the Commission met on 12 July to consider whether it had all information necessary to make its decision, other than the Applicant's Reply which was due to be provided by 25 July 2017.
2. The Commission has decided further information is required on a number of matters, as follows:
  - a) In light of the Request including a change to the activity status of any gondola from Discretionary to Controlled, the Commission wants to obtain a better understanding of the position of the Council and other parties on the activity status sought to be applied to gondolas generally throughout the district and the gondola now possibly proposed for Cardrona Alpine Ski Resort and Mt Cardrona Special Zone (MCSZ).

In that regard, we **direct** the Council to provide to us **by 21 July** the following information related to the District Plan Review (DPR):

- i. A copy of the section 42A report to the DPR hearing panel on the skifield sub-zones. This should include the landscape report from Dr Read;
- ii. A copy of DPR submissions lodged on the Cardrona ski field zone so far as they relate to the proposed gondola;
- iii. A copy of any evidence presented to the DPR hearing panel on the matter of the proposed gondola at the Cardrona ski field, including the gondola corridor;
- iv. All information relating to the skifield sub-zone rules;
- v. A copy of the Council's formal written replies to the DPR hearing panel regarding the Cardrona ski field zone, the proposed gondola and relevant aspects of any other zones or chapters of the Proposed District Plan that would apply to the Cardrona skifield and the proposed gondola;
- vi. A tabulated reference to the above documents, pointing us to the relevant sections of the documents that we should consider.

We note that some of the above information will be relevant to the Skifield subzone hearings held earlier this year, as referenced by witnesses at the PC52 hearing on 11 July. However, other parts of the information may also be found in other DPR hearing streams concerning Strategic Direction, Landscape and the Rural zone. We ask that Mr Bryce make thorough enquiries with Council staff involved in the DPR to ensure that we are provided with all relevant information on items (i) to (vi) above.

- b) The Commission is concerned that it has not received an independent assessment of the traffic safety aspects of PC52, in particular the intersections of the proposed PC52 access roads with the Cardrona Skifield Access Road and Cardrona Valley Road. The link road from MCSZ to the Cardrona Skifield access road is very close to Area 8C, which we expect to be a busy traffic area, particularly at peak times of the day. Likewise, we are concerned about the distances between the various access points along the stretch of Cardrona Valley Road between the Cardrona Skifield entrance and Tuohys Gully Road and associated traffic safety issues, particularly given this is a 100kph zone.

While the Commission is conscious that many detailed design matters will follow should the plan change be granted, it considers more information is necessary to assist us in assessing this aspect of the Request before us.

We **direct** the Council to:

- i. Obtain an independent assessment of the transport matters raised in a letter provided by Mr Rossiter dated 29 November 2016. This should be provided to the Commission **by 9 August 2017**.
  - ii. Obtain written comment from Council's engineering staff about roading design, particularly intersections and the proposed entrance points to MCSZ from both the Cardrona Skifield Access Road and Cardrona Valley Road. We note this report should take account of any points raised in the independent traffic assessment requested. The Council's comments should also be provided to us **by 9 August 2017**.
- c) The Request includes reference to an irrigation facility for the golf course, but little information was provided on what this might entail – for example, whether the facility would include wetlands or be more akin to a storage pond/ dam. There is the potential for this structure, in whatever form it takes, to be reasonably large. The Master Plan provided as Figure 2 to the Urban Design Report appears to show a large storage pond at the northern end of the golf course. As noted in the Urban Design Report, the Master Plan does not form part of the Request.

At page 40 of his section 42A report, Mr Bryce referred us to a submission from Mr Leslie and Ms Rasmussen (52/05/06) which sought the capture of all stormwater and grey water from all buildings and that this be utilised for irrigation of the golf course and public areas. We do not have a record of that part of the submission being responded to by the Requestor at the hearing, but appreciate that may have been intended to form part of the Requestor's reply. We are of the view that it would assist the Commission to be better understand this part of the Request if details of the storage facility were provided through this further information process, given the lack of information provided at the hearing and through the Request documents.

We **direct** the Requestor to respond to the following questions **by 28 July 2017**:

- i. Does the Requestor agree to capturing stormwater and greywater from all buildings?
- ii. Will the development include the application of greywater to the golf course and will this be stored in any irrigation storage facility?
- iii. What is the form of irrigation storage for the golf course and approximately where will it be located?

- iv. How do the zone provisions address the effects of the irrigation storage facility?
3. We further **direct** that all information referred to in paragraph 2 above is to be forwarded to all submitters at the time it is received by the Council's Hearing Secretary.
4. The hearing remains adjourned pending the receipt of this information. We will make further directions about the date for any further comments to be received from the submitters and the Council, along with an amended date for the Applicant's Reply, once all information is received.
5. Any enquiries regarding these Directions or related matters should be directed to Stephanie Prendergast at Queenstown Lakes District Council: [Stephanie.Prendergast@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:Stephanie.Prendergast@qldc.govt.nz).

Jan Caunter (Chair)

For the Hearing Commissioners

13 July 2017

## QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

### Private Plan Change 52 Mount Cardrona Station

#### Seventh Minute and Directions of Hearing Commissioners

1. The Commission has now received the further information requested in paragraphs 2(b)(i) and 2(c) of the Sixth Minute dated 13 July 2017.
2. The Stantec independent traffic report dated 8 August 2017 recommends that the Requestor provide additional information. We agree such information is necessary for our assessment.
3. We **direct** the Requestor to provide the following further information by **Friday 1 September 2017**:
  - (a) Updated traffic turning volumes at the Tuohy's Gully Road intersection with Cardrona Valley Road;
  - (b) Predicted Origin-Destination (OD) from generated traffic presented in the PC52 application;
  - (c) Confirmation of the Cardrona Valley Road 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed at the proposed link road intersection location. We note we have concerns about assumptions made by TDG on vehicle speed in the location of this proposed intersection and require information confirming that such speeds have been recently measured in this roading environment;
  - (d) Safety assessment of the proposed right-left stagger at the intersection of the link road (development access) with Cardrona Valley Road;
  - (e) A response to the matters raised by Stantec on the link road intersection with Cardrona Skifield Access Road, including the sealing surface of the link road travelling to the Cardrona Skifield Access Road;
  - (f) Proposed provisions the Requestor suggests should be provided in the PC52 Structure Plan to address the flexibility of:
    - i. the Cardrona Valley Road intersection location and design, including increased separation (with a minimum separation distance of 25m) from Tuohy's Gully Road intersection and provision of such information at design stage;
    - ii. the intersection of the Link Road with the Cardrona Skifield Access Road and provision of such information at design stage.
4. We also **direct** that Stantec provide a further written report to the Commission on the Requestor's further information outlined in paragraph 3 above by **Friday 15 September 2017**.
5. We have not yet received comment from the Council's internal engineering staff on roading design, requested in paragraph 2(b)(ii) of our Sixth Minute. Given the request for further information set out in this Seventh Minute, we suggest these be received with Council comments on the further information received from the Requestor and the Stantec reports, as part of Mr Bryce's final report to the Commission.

6. We further **direct** that all information referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4 above is to be forwarded to all submitters at the time it is received by the Council's Hearing Secretary.
7. The hearing remains adjourned pending the receipt of this information. We will make further directions about the date for any further comments to be received from the submitters and the Council, along with an amended date for the Applicant's Reply, once all information is received.
8. Any enquiries regarding these Directions or related matters should be directed to Stephanie Prendergast at Queenstown Lakes District Council: [Stephanie.Prendergast@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:Stephanie.Prendergast@qldc.govt.nz).

Jan Caunter (Chair)

For the Hearing Commissioners

10 August 2017