

**BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED DISTRICT
PLAN HEARINGS PANEL**

UNDER **the Resource Management Act 1991**
IN THE MATTER OF **the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District
Plan**

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF FIONA BLACK ON PROPOSED CHAPTERS 30, 35,
and 36**

FOR

Real Journeys Limited (621/1341)

and

Te Anau Developments Limited (607/1342)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Katherine FIONA Black. I work for Real Journeys Limited managing Real Journeys and its subsidiary companies' Department of Conservation Concessions, Resource Consents and other regulatory authorisations, along with other operational related duties. I am authorised by these companies to give this evidence on their behalf.
- 1.2 I have worked in the New Zealand Tourism industry for 29 years, the last 13 years for Real Journeys; in the first instance as the Milford Sound Branch Manager and for the last 9 years in my current role.
- 1.3 I qualified as a commercial Launch Master in 1988 and worked as a skipper on a tourism vessel on Otago Harbour until 2002.
- 1.4 Consequently I have gained a considerable knowledge of the tourism industry, including passenger transport vessels and the evolving challenges faced by this industry. Also since 2011, I have been a member of the Southland Conservation Board.
- 1.5 In preparing this evidence I have reviewed the following documents:
 - a) Section 42A Report prepared by Mr Barr in relation to Proposed Chapter 30 Energy and Utilities; inclusive of the attached s32 reports and various background reports referred to in these documents.
 - b) Section 42A Report prepared by Ms Banks in relation to Proposed Chapter 35 Temporary Activities & Relocated Buildings; inclusive of the attached s32 reports and various background reports referred to in these documents;
 - c) Section 42A Report prepared by Ms Evans in relation to Proposed Chapter 36 Noise; inclusive of the attached s32 reports and various background reports referred to in these documents;
 - d) Maritime New Zealand Rules Part 22: Collision Prevention¹ and Part 91; Navigation Safety Rules².

2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 For simplicity sake I will only refer to Real Journeys Limited, not Te Anau Developments Limited. Nevertheless the points made are relevant to either or both entities.

¹ <https://www.maritimenz.govt.nz/rules/part-22/Part22-maritime-rule.pdf>

² <https://www.maritimenz.govt.nz/rules/part-91/Part91-maritime-rule.pdf>

3. CHAPTER 30 ENERGY AND UTILITIES

3.1 Mr Barr's statement "*In addition, Policy 30.2.1.2 is problematic because I am not aware of the District containing any non-renewable electricity generation facilities, nor do I consider the policy appropriately reflects the non-complying activity status provided in Rule 30.4.7*" ignores the multitude of mainly diesel generators, used to generate electricity in mostly remote locations across the district. For example:

- a. Walter Peak;
- b. Most of the High Country Stations in the District such as Carrick, Mount Nicolas, and Halfway Bay;
- c. I understand some of the District's ski fields require diesel generators to provide for periods of peak demand; and
- d. The Aurora Energy Limited Asset Management Plan (2016-2026) includes proposals to install diesel generation at Remarkables and Glenorchy.³

3.2 These non-renewable sources of electricity generation are essential to our commercial operations in remote locations. Hence we request the Council be mindful of the essential need to generate power, usually using generators in remote locations, when finalising the provisions of the PDP.

3.3 In many remote locations across the District the use of diesel generators is the only viable and economic option to generate electricity. In my opinion policy 30.2.3.7 (below) should acknowledge this locational and practical constraint, not just "consider" it.

Policy 30.2.3.7 Consider non-renewable energy resources including standby power generation and stand alone power systems where adverse effects can be mitigated.

3.4 Similarly, in these remote locations water supply and telecommunication infrastructure need to be developed, maintained and upgraded. Accordingly, we wish to ensure that the development and use of utilities associated with tourism activities in remote areas (where connection to a network is not a viable option) are not Non-Complying Activities in the PDP, including when located within outstanding natural landscapes where the plan provisions appear to have a strong direction to "avoid/prevent" environmental effects.

3.5 In my experience, telecommunication devices such as satellite dishes, radio repeaters, radio aerials and even water tanks, need to be installed

³ <http://www.auroraenergy.co.nz/assets/Disclosures/AMP-2016/Aurora-Asset-Management-Plan-2016-26-FINAL.pdf>

on hill tops. In particular, telecommunication transmission and reception devices need to be in a location where signals can be effectively bounced from one place to another. Consequently they often need to be located on the skyline, which creates visual effects, especially in outstanding natural landscapes. For this reason we consider it is appropriate that these activities be managed via the resource consent process (for example as a discretionary activity to ensure effects can be appropriately avoided, remedied, or mitigated). However, these activities should not be discouraged.

- 3.6 Further, in locations such as Cardrona Alpine Resort, larger (1.8 to 2 metre diameter) circular satellite dishes are required to ensure uninterrupted internet connectivity in adverse weather events, such as snow storms. I do not understand why the permitted activity standard for circular antennas cannot be increased from 1.2m to 2m. In my opinion, the difference in effects would be indiscernible.
- 3.7 Much of this telecommunication equipment we are installing now is to support modern technology to provide Wi-Fi access and better internet connectivity, including the provision of voice over the internet across the company rather than using the likes of the Spark network to make phone calls.
- 3.8 We contend that the PDP provisions are overly focused on “old school” wire/lines based technology and needs to provide more fully for wireless technology such as satellite dishes, cell phones and Wi-Fi. For instance the minor upgrading and support structure definitions do not provide for minor upgrading of our support structures associated with wireless communication technology.
- 3.9 We contend rule 30.4.23 (recorded below) should be broader and not restricted to river protection works only. Real Journeys maintains other types of flood protection works such as culverts and rock armouring used to deflect usually dry water courses away from buildings and infrastructure.
- 3.10 There are also the likes of rock or retaining walls and gabion baskets around the edges of the District’s lakes which prevent land (including central Queenstown) being flooded. These structures/assets cannot be described as existing river protection works, nevertheless they must be maintained and repaired. It is important and appropriate to ensure that repairs and maintenance on these other types of existing flood protection works are also enabled.

Rule 30.4.23 Flood Protection Works for the maintenance, reinstatement, repair or replacement of existing flood protection works

for the purpose of:

- *maintaining the flood carrying capacity of water courses and/or maintaining the integrity of existing river protection works*
- *fill works undertaken within Activity Area if of the Shotover Country Special Zone.*

3.11 In addition to the above, we believe the minor upgrading definition should also encompass evolving health and safety compliance requirements, mainly with respect to working at heights. For example: the installation of fixed ladders, elevated work platforms, additional or stronger safety harness anchorage points, and guarding systems or man cages.

4. CHAPTER 35 TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES & RELOCATED BUILDINGS

4.1 We support the proposed change to “35.2.5 Objective – Temporary Storage is provided for.”

4.2 With respect to Rule 35.4.6 we contend the duration of not exceeding 3 consecutive Calendar days (excluding set up and pack down) is inadequate. On occasion, Real Journeys or its subsidiary companies hosts or facilitates events that exceed this limit, for example activities operated during Easter and associated with the Queenstown Winter Festival or the Winter Games.

4.3 The organisation of events is time consuming, multifaceted and often one off events in particular, are developed as they are being organised. That is, at the front end, the event organiser really does not have enough detail regarding how the event will work to seek resource consent. In these instances, obtaining resource consent can become a last minute scramble creating unnecessary pressure on those involved in the consent administration.

5. CHAPTER 36 NOISE

5.1 Real Journeys believe the main issue with vessel noise in the District is due to the activities of high speed vessels powered by petrol or LPG engines, such as jet boats. In my experience (as a qualified skipper and working for a vessel-based business in the Queenstown Lakes and Southland Districts for the past 13 years), I am not aware of large passenger vessels such as the “TSS Earnslaw” creating noise nuisance effects. To ensure passengers have the best experience, it is in our company’s best interests to ensure these vessels operate as quietly as possible. Consequently, as technology has improved over time, we have reduced our vessel (particularly Fiordlander Class) sound emissions by upgrading vessel engines, improving sound insulation and latterly installing “soft” engine mounts.

- 5.2 Hence, in respect of vessel noise, we want an exemption or distinction to be made in the PDP. A potential solution could be to exempt vessels which are known to be low noise emitters, such as passenger vessels powered by steam or diesel engines.
- 5.3 Vis-à-vis proposed rule 36.4.2. Real Journeys contends this rule should also ensure that vessel warning signals (as detailed in Part 22: Collision Prevention Maritime New Zealand Rules) can be made without risk or concern that they might breach the permitted noise standards.
- 5.4 We support the proposed removal of rule 36.8 from the PDP. Nevertheless, we are concerned that amended rule 36.5.15 is still not workable because our vessels operating during the day have the same noise emissions when cruising between 2000 and 0800 hours. In particular, our Fiordlander Class vessel (which we mainly use to transport staff and contractors to and from Walter Peak) has noise emissions of Lmax 74.3 dBA at cruising speed (approx. 19 knots). Due to the nature of activities carried out at Walter Peak, this vessel often departs at 0700 hours and returns late at night well beyond 2000 hrs.
- 5.5 We do not believe the noise emissions from our Fiordlander Class vessels during night time hours in Queenstown Bay create any significant nuisance effects. This is because these vessels depart the bay at lower speeds and therefore operate at lower revs. Moreover when our Fiordlander Class vessels return at night to Queenstown Bay, the vessel is cruising at no wake speed (approximately 5 knots as required under Maritime New Zealand Rules Part 91 – Navigation Safety Rules and the District’s Navigation Safety Bylaws) which is much quieter than cruising speed.
- 5.6 Proposed amended rule 36.5.15 is not enabling of water based public transport, which is likely to be operating from at a minimum 0700 hours to 2100 hours to transport workers and visitors to and from Queenstown Bay.
- 5.7 Therefore, we seek the permitted activity status for vessel noise emissions in relation to our existing steam and diesel powered passenger transport vessel services.
- 5.8 We also think it is appropriate that noise from new water based public transport, which breaches the permitted activity standards, should be provided for as a discretionary activity (not non-complying).



Signed: 1 September 2016