

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 8:  
Business Zones

**MINUTE DIRECTING THAT CERTAIN SUBMISSIONS BE TRANSFERRED  
TO MAPPING HEARINGS**

1. This Minute relates to submissions in respect of specific sites zoned Local Shopping Centre Zone (“LSCZ”) in the Proposed District Plan (“PDP”). During the course of hearing submissions on the provisions of the LSCZ it became apparent that certain submissions were more appropriately dealt with in the mapping hearing streams.

**Cardrona Valley Road LSCZ**

2. The Council, in its opening legal submissions, submitted that submission #622 (lodged by Stuart Ian and Melanie Kiri Agnes Pinfold and Satomi Enterprises Limited, “the Pinfolds and Satomi”) raised matters that were intrinsically related to the size of the LSCZ at Cardrona Valley Road, and that those submitters should be given the opportunity to be heard in the mapping hearing stream when the application of the zone was to be considered.
3. On 29 November 2016, the Hearing Panel received a memorandum from counsel for the Pinfolds and Satomi acknowledging that the submissions was site specific and seeking clarification as to whether it would be heard as part of the Business Hearing Stream, or the mapping stream. The submitters have lodged expert planning evidence for the Business Stream and sought 40 minutes to present their case.
4. Having heard the Council’s submissions and receiving the memorandum from the Pinfolds and Satomi, I had the Committee Secretary check with counsel for the Gordon Family Trust (FS1193.3), which had lodged a further submission in opposition to submission #622, whether that submitter also wished to have its submission deferred to the mapping hearings. Counsel advised that as the evidence for his client had been lodged and the Panel had heard contrary

economic evidence from the Council's witness, Mr Heath, his client would prefer for the Panel as constituted for the Business Hearing Stream to continue to hear FS1193.

5. As a general principle, I consider the hearing process is more efficient when all submissions relating to a particular site, whether in relation to the overall zoning, or seeking site specific rules, are dealt with together in a single hearing stream.
6. The Pinfolds and Satomi's submission is clearly site specific. The Council has also advised, in a memorandum dated 1 December 2016, the following submissions relate specifically to this site in Cardrona Valley Road: #274 (Susan Meyer), FS1101 (Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village) and FS1212 (Wanaka Lakes Health Centre). It also notes that submission #249.26 (Willowridge Development Limited), #619 (Satomi Enterprises Limited) and FS1193.3 (the Trustees of the Gordon Family Trust) have already been allocated to the mapping hearing stream.
7. Finally, I note that the evidence of Mr Heath referred to by Mr Todd is not site specific, but applies to the LSCZ as a whole.
8. Having consider all these matters I **direct** that the following submissions and further submissions be deferred to Hearing Stream 12: Upper Clutha Mapping:
  - #622 the Pinfolds and Satomi;
  - #274 Susan Meyer;
  - FS1101 Aspiring Lifestyle Retirement Village; and
  - FS1212 Wanaka Lakes Health Centre.
9. As the schedule for this Hearing Stream is being prepared at present, I also **direct** that 40 minutes be made available at that hearing for the Pinfolds and Satomi, and the expert evidence already lodged be transferred to that hearing stream. The submitter will be able to replace that evidence in accordance with the evidence timetable for Stream 12 if it so chooses.
10. If any of the submitters listed in paragraph 8 above have not sought to be heard in Hearing Stream 12 and now wish to be heard, they are to advise the Committee Secretary ([DP.Hearings@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:DP.Hearings@qldc.govt.nz)) of that by noon on Friday 9 December 2016 and specify the amount of time they require.

## 1 Hansen Road LSCZ

11. At the hearing on 29 November 2016 Ms Bowbyes, in addressing the Panel in relation to the site-specific rules applying to this land, advised the us that it was her understanding that a resource consent application was imminent for 1 Hansen Road, and that the activity proposed was more akin to residential than business. When he appeared for the New Zealand Transport Agency, Mr MacColl confirmed that he understood that to be the case also.
12. The proposed zoning of this site LSCZ raises a number of resource management issues which the PDP seeks to address through site-specific provisions. If the use of the site is as suggested by Ms Bowbyes and Mr MacColl, then those site specific LSCZ rules may well be inappropriate and any analysis of the submissions in relation to the application of the LSCZ to this land may be rendered worthless.
13. In addition to the principle expressed above, that site specific provisions are best heard in parallel with submissions relating to the zoning of a specific site, deferral of submissions in respect of this land at this stage would enable the Hearing Panel dealing with the matter in 2017 to have a better understanding of the factual situation. It appears, from the evidence that we have heard and that has been lodged for Hearing Stream 8, that no party would be prejudiced by such a deferral.
14. Consequently, I **direct** that the following submissions in relation to the LSCZ at 1 Hansen Road be deferred until Hearing Stream 13: Queenstown Area Mapping:
  - #698 Spence Farms Limited; FS1077 Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Incorporated; FS1340 Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited;
  - #719 New Zealand Transport Agency;
  - #433 Queenstown Airport Corporation Limited; FS1077 Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Incorporated; FS1097 Queenstown Park Limited; FS1117 Remarkables Park Limited.

For the Hearing Panel



Denis Nugent (Chair)

2 December 2016