

In the Environment Court of New Zealand
Christchurch Registry

I Te Koti Taiao o Aotearoa
Ōtautahi Rohe

ENV-2018-CHC-000133

Under	the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
In the matter of	an appeal under Clause 14(1) of Schedule 1 of the RMA in relation to the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan
Between	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc Appellant
And	Queenstown Lakes District Council Respondent

Notice of Soho's wish to be party to proceedings pursuant to section 274 RMA

10 July 2018

Section 274 party's solicitors:

Maree Baker-Galloway | Rosie Hill
Anderson Lloyd
Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300
PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348
DX Box ZP95010 Queenstown
p + 64 3 450 0700 | f + 64 3 450 0799
maree.baker-galloway@al.nz | rosie.hill@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

To: The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch

- 1 Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 (**Soho**) wish to be a party pursuant to section 274 of the RMA to the following proceedings:

Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc v QLDC (ENV-2018-CHC-000078) being an appeal against decisions of Queenstown Lakes District Council on the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (**PDP**).

- 2 Soho is a person who made a submission about the subject matter of the proceedings.
- 3 Soho is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the RMA.
- 4 Soho is interested in all of the proceedings.
- 5 Without derogating from the generality of the above, Soho is interested in the following particular issue:

Chapter 33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

- (a) Policy 33.2.1.8 b iii
- (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because the criteria for determining the significant of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna in the Council's decision are considered appropriate
- (b) Policy 33.2.3.3
- (i) Soho supports the relief sought because amendments sought to this policy to encourage retention and enhancement for connectivity purposes is supported as an appropriate outcome.
- (c) Policy 33.2.3.4
- (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because when considering the proposals for the clearance of indigenous vegetation, the decision version of Policy 33.2.3.4 is considered more appropriate.
- (d) Rules 33.3.3.2, 33.3.3.3 and 33.3.3.4.

- (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because the Council's decisions to increase the vegetation coverage thresholds are considered appropriate.
- (e) Deletion of Rule 33.4.2
 - (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because the rule appropriately provides through non-regulatory means and method that is both an efficient and effective outcome having regard to the alternative of not having this rule in place.
- (f) Rule 33.4.4
 - (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because the amendments sought to this rule are too restrictive, as compared to the standards that apply to SNAs which permit a small degree of indigenous vegetation clearance.
- (g) Deletion of Rule 33.4.5
 - (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because the permitted activity rule for indigenous vegetation clearance within the SASZs, on land administered under the Conservation Act with approval from DoC is considered inappropriate. Deletion would create unnecessary duplication of process and inefficiencies.
- (h) Rules 33.5.1
 - (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because the changes sought to the standards for indigenous vegetation clearance are considered too narrow if applied to exclusively tall tussock grassland communities and not other types of indigenous vegetation.
- (i) Rules 33.5.2
 - (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because deletion and replacement of Rule 33.5.2 with the proposed more restrictive standards is considered less effective than the Council's decision
- (j) Rules 33.5.7
 - (i) Soho opposes the relief sought because elevation of the status of non-compliance with a breach of the alpine vegetation standard is considered unnecessary and too stringent and inconsistent with the policies that recognise and provide for the continued use and development within Ski Area Sub-Zones.

- 6 Soho agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated this 10th day of July 2018

Maree Baker-Galloway

Maree Baker-Galloway/Rosie Hill
Counsel for the section 274 party

Address for service of person wishing to be a party

Anderson Lloyd

Level 2, 13 Camp Street

PO Box 201

Queenstown 9300

Phone: 03 450 0700 Fax: 03 450 0799

Email: maree.baker-galloway@al.nz | rosie.hill@al.nz

Contact persons: Maree Baker-Galloway | Rosie Hill

Advice

If you have any questions about this notice, contact the Environment Court in Christchurch.