

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 4:
Subdivision

MINUTE CONCERNING HEARING OF SUBDIVISION PROVISIONS
APPLYING TO JACKS POINT RESORT ZONE

1. On 26 July 2016 the Hearing Panel received a memorandum from counsel representing Darby Planning LP (#608), Soho Ski Area Ltd (#610), Treble Cone Investments Ltd (#613), Lake Hayes Ltd (#763), Jacks Point Residential No.2 Ltd, Jacks Point Village Holdings Ltd, Jacks Point Developments Ltd, Jacks Point Land Ltd, Jacks Point Land No. 2 Ltd, Jacks Point Management Ltd (#762) and Glendhu bay Trustees Ltd (#583).
2. The memorandum referred to discussions between the Panel and counsel for the District Council during the course of the Council opening on Monday 25 July 2016. These discussions were around whether hearing submissions on the subdivision provisions relating to the Jacks Point Resort Zone should be deferred to be heard in conjunction with the submissions on the zone provisions (Chapter 41). Counsel for the submitters support the deferral of consideration of the subdivision matters specific to Jacks Point Resort Zone until the hearing of Chapter 41 and set out reasons in support.
3. At the commencement of the hearing on Tuesday 26 July 2016 counsel for the District Council advised that the Council's position was that it would prefer to have the submissions relating to subdivision provisions applying to Jacks Point heard as part of this hearing stream as the evidence of all parties had been prepared and circulated.
4. Further, during the course of the Panel's questioning Mr Bryce, the reporting planner, on Tuesday 26 July, the provisions of Chapter 27 specific to Jacks Point were traversed. Thus, the Hearing Panel, as presently constituted, and the Council's reporting planner are already engaged in consideration of these provisions. It is, therefore, more efficient for this to be concluded in this Hearing

Stream than defer them for consideration by a differently constituted Panel with a different reporting planner.

5. Finally, the Hearing Panel notes that PC44 is a change to the Operative District Plan. The outcome of any appeals on that matter cannot affect the provisions of the PDP. If amendments to the PDP are necessary to bring the provisions of PC44, as finally settled, into the Plan, our ability to make such amendments is limited to the reliefs sought in submissions on the PDP.
6. For these reasons we will not defer consideration of the submissions on Chapter 27 specific to Jacks Point Resort Zone.

For the Hearing Panel

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Nugent", written in a cursive style.

Denis Nugent (Chair)

27 July 2016