

**BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL  
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of submissions to the Stage 1 Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Council Plan by Lake Hayes Investments Limited (Submitter 2291); Stoneridge Estate Limited (2314); D Duncan (2319); R Dayman (2315); Crosby Developments (2526); Crosby Developments (2527); L McFadgen (2296); Slopehill Joint Venture (2475); R & M Donaldson (2229); United States Ranch Limited (2126); M McGuinness (2292); Robertson (2321), Trojan Helmet Limited (2387), Hogans Gully Farm Limited (2313), Burden & Wills (2320), Boxer Hills Trust (2387), P Chittock (2787)

---

**Statement of evidence of JEFFREY ANDREW BROWN on behalf of:**

Lake Hayes Investments Limited (Submitter 2291); Stoneridge Estate Limited (2314); D Duncan (2319); R Dayman (2315); Crosby Developments (2526); Crosby Developments (2527); L McFadgen (2296); Slopehill Joint Venture (2475); R & M Donaldson (2229); United Estates Ranch Limited (2126); M McGuinness (2292); Robertson (2321), Trojan Helmet Limited (2387), Hogans Gully Farm Limited (2313), Burden & Wills (2320), Boxer Hills Trust (2387) P Chittock (2787)

**TOPIC 14: WAKATIPU BASIN LAND USE VARIATION**

**13 June 2018**

---

## 9 The Donaldson land (submitter 2229);

- 9.1 This circa 22ha block of land is within the WBLP as notified. The submission and further submissions sought some site-specific development controls that reflect an agreement between the owners and Millbrook. I understand that these are now encapsulated in a covenant(s).
- 9.2 I consider that the existing WBLP provisions, subject to my modifications as set out in this evidence, are appropriate for the land and that the covenant is an additional tool for managing the subdivision of the land.
- 9.3 However, the owners are happy to volunteer them also in a site-specific rule, which would be as follows:

	Zone and Location Specific Rules	Activity Status
<u>27.7.X</u>	<p><u>Lot 3 DP20693 (south of Ishii Lane, Millbrook):</u></p> <p>Minimum lot area 2500m<sup>2</sup> provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>no more than 15 lots in total are created;</u></li> <li>- <u>no more than 5 lots shall be located west of the existing water race on the property;</u></li> <li>- <u>any building platform shall be no less than 15m from the external boundary of Lot 3 DP20693;</u></li> <li>- <u>the 15m open space margin adjoining the periphery of Lot 3 DP20693 shall be landscaped where necessary to further soften the appearance of buildings when viewed from the Golf Activity Areas of the Millbrook Resort Zone Structure Plan.</u></li> </ul>	<u>NC</u>

## 10 The allotment size at the north end of Lake Hayes (Submitter 2126)

- 10.1 This analysis relates to the proposed WBLP area at the northern end of Lake Hayes bounded by Rutherford, Speargrass, and Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Roads. This area was initially subdivided into 4ha blocks in around 1972. Since that time, it has been zoned in various rural residential type zonings and most lots have been progressively subdivided and developed. The land is zoned "Rural Residential – North of Lake Hayes" (RRNLH) in the operative plan. This allows subdivision to an average of 8000m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size (Site standard 15.2.6.2(iv)(a)) and a minimum of 4000m<sup>2</sup> (Zone standard 15.2.6.3(i)(a)).
- 10.2 Only four 4ha blocks<sup>5</sup> remain un-subdivided in the RRNLH land, and of those, three already contain one dwelling and one contains 3 dwellings. These properties are shown outlined below.

<sup>5</sup> Lot 9 DP 12678, Lot 1 DP 15096, Lot 2 DP 15096, and Lot 3 DP 24898

## Ben O'Malley for Millbrook – Hearing Stream 14 – Summary of Evidence, 11 July 2018

Matters to be 'spoken' to from my evidence dated 13 June 2018, evidence references in brackets

1. Millbrook's 30 year controlled development history (para's 6, 12 and 14). The Ishii family, who are pioneers in tourism in NZ have dedicated themselves to creating a world-class golf resort under the trade marked name of Millbrook Resort. Unique in that only one entity controls the land within the zone that shares the name Millbrook Resort. Fearful now that Council may enable inappropriate and minimally controlled development on its boundary that could undo the hard won environment they have created.
2. Millbrook's key stakeholders are its resident members, who Millbrook also represents in this process (para's 8.3 and 40). Millbrook and its home owners are united in their objective to protect the integrity of the zone
3. Controlled Environment with proven track record in self-policing through a suite of controls Para 11.3). Millbrook's internal controls are far tighter than the MRZ rules. District Plan rules cannot be relied upon to create and maintain high amenity value. Internal controls go beyond initial design approval to require on-going standards of maintenance and behaviour to ensure a high amenity environment
4. Access (para 11.5) – MCC's a semi-gated community with limited access points with a well-designed internal road network of private ROW's. The majority of the 'me too' submitters are not accessed from the network and do not meet the zone purpose as to integration.
5. Master Planning and Zone Purpose: long term consistent approach to design with each enclave making positive contribution to visual coherence and overall amenity(Para13)
6. Millbrook's Position on MRZ Expansion (Para 22): this is a bottom line to ensure design coherence. The various layers of constraint are proven. The MRZ by itself will fall short and cannot be relied on to achieve the necessary outcomes.
7. Spruce Grove Malaghan #2513 and #2723 (para's 25-26): The location, anticipated bulk and yield is neither well located, appropriate or integrated with Millbrook resort; completely at odds with master planning strategy. Could only be supported if all para 22 elements present. Otherwise no possibility of achieving the MRZ objective.
8. Butel Road/ LakeHayes-Arrowtown Submitters #2512, 2727, 2444 and 2720 (para's 27-28): the same or similar issues arise. No relationship with or to the MRZ purpose or Objective.
9. Donaldson #2229 and 2797 (para's 29-32): WBLP could be appropriate if site specific rules or structure plan to achieve appropriate mitigate at interface with the MRZ
10. Griffin & Archibald #2580 and 2501 (para's 33 – 39): Master planning has contemplated potential for two small enclaves. Unique cases which justify exception if constraints listed at para 39 are able to be imposed. These provisions may yet be simplified by agreement.

