

BEFORE THE HEARING COMMISSIONERS  
FOR THE PROPOSED THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN  
AT QUEENSTOWN

IN THE MATTER  
of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND  
IN THE MATTER  
of Hearing Stream 15

---

**Submission 2295 - Millbrook Country Club**

Summary Statement of Evidence of John Bernard Edmonds on behalf of Millbrook Country Club  
Limited  
Planning

---

18 September 2018

## Introduction

Mr O'Malley and I are attending this hearing on behalf of Millbrook Country Club Ltd Submitter 2295.

My statement of evidence is dated 6 August 2018.

I have not provided a rebuttal statement to any of the officer reports.

We are here today in respect of Millbrook's submissions to:

Earthworks	Chapter 25
Signs	Chapter 31
Open Space and Recreation	Chapter 38
Visitor Accommodation	Chapter 43

Mr O'Malley and I are both available to assist the Panel

## Earthworks

Policy 25.2.1.5	remain of the view that the policy is of minimal utility
Policy 25.2.2.1	agree to suggested alteration
policy 25.2.2.1 (B)	agree to inclusion of the 'and activities'

The proposed Chapter 25 identifies a 300 m<sup>3</sup> threshold for all earthworks within the Millbrook Resort Zone.

Millbrook sought an increase in the permitted volume within residential areas, consistent with the Jacks Point Resort Zone.

Millbrook also has sought an exemption from earthworks rules and in relation to the Golf Course and Open Space Activity Area.

The officer is agreed to increase the volume to 500 m<sup>3</sup> across all of the Millbrook Resort Zone activity areas.

I acknowledge that the increase is appropriate for the Residential Activity Areas, but remain concerned that there is still inequity. The Jacks Point Zone provides a 1000 m<sup>3</sup> limit on the Open Space Landscape areas, and no limit within for other subzones (including the Golf course).

### Signs

Millbrook has sought clarification on particular sign rules.

Rule 31.9.5 has been amended to also make reference to visitor accommodation within the Millbrook Resort Zone - which is agreed to.

Rule 31.9.5 (a) has been amended to refer to buildings rather than businesses - also agreed to.

The officer is clarified that rule 31.9.8 does not apply to the Millbrook Resort Zone.

Rule 31.6.9 relates to a districtwide rule about under Veranda signs having a minimum clearance of 2.5m. My evidence was that such rule should only apply to public roads, and not to private land such as the Millbrook Resort Zone.

### Open Space and Recreation

There are 2 parts to the submission; Millbrook Park and Coronet Forest.

The proposed active sport and recreation zoning of Millbrook Park is inappropriate and anticipates a scale of development of the park that is inconsistent with Millbrook's agreement with the Council when that land was vested. The proposed zoning is also inconsistent with the current Reserve Management Plan. Mr O'Malley was involved in that negotiation with the Council.

Millbrook Park is included within the Structure Plan of Chapter 43 (Millbrook Resort Zone) and included within the Golf Course and Open Space Activity Area (page 43 – 13).

Buildings over 40 m<sup>2</sup> are identified as requiring a discretionary activity consent (Rule 43.4.13).

You heard Mr Goldsmith submissions regarding the appropriateness of applying reserve zoning to privately-owned land yesterday. The situation is almost the reverse, in that publicly owned land (the reserve land was vested in the Council by Millbrook in 2007) is currently included in a mostly private resort zone -managed through a reserve management plan.

The preferred relief for Millbrook Park is for it to be excluded from the Open Space and Recreation Zone. The secondary relief is to include it within the proposed Informal Recreation Zone. Reference in my submission to the Passive Recreation Zone should be deleted.

The reclassification of Coronet Forest to the proposed Nature Conservation Zone is supported, as that is consistent with the Council's designation (RM 100722) and subsequent Forest Management Plan.

My reference to including the forest within a Passive Recreation Zone (page 9 of my evidence) is an error, and I confirm that the Nature Conservation Zone relief sought in the submission is the preferred relief.

### Visitor Accommodation

The visitor accommodation variation proposes that the definition of visitor accommodation be amended such that residential units within the Millbrook residential activity areas can occur a maximum of 3 times per annum for a total of 28 nights per year.

Millbrook sought that reference to 3 let's per annum be deleted and that the cumulative total be increased from 28 nights per annum to 179 nights.

Millbrook has a resource consent (RM 120485) for 150 lots to be used for visitor accommodation for up to 179 nights per annum.

Chapter 43 provides for visitor accommodation outside of the Village Activity Area is a discretionary activity

The officer report recognises the existing environment and says at paragraph 9.140 of the 42A report that "in my view the 179 night permitted threshold for RVA requested by the submitter is too high....". The officer recommends 42 nights per annum, and anything beyond that is a restricted discretionary consent.

The purpose of the zone as described at 43.1.1 as:

*The purpose of the Millbrook Resort Zone is to provide for a visitor resort of high quality. The Zone provides for recreational activities (including golf), commercial, residential and visitor accommodation together with support facilities and services.*

The objective for the Millbrook resort zone (43.2.1) is:

*Visitor, residential and recreation activities developed in an integrated manner with particular regard for landscape, heritage, ecological, and water quality values.*

This is one of only 2 resort zones in the district, and I consider that to give effect to the purpose and objective a more flexible approach to enabling visitor accommodation should occur.

John Edmonds  
18 September 2018