

**In the Environment Court
at Christchurch**

ENV-2018-CHC-137

In the Matter

of the Resource Management Act
1991

And

In the Matter

of an appeal under Clause 14(1),
Schedule 1 of the Act

Between

**REMARKABLES STATION
LIMITED, AND DICKSON
STEWART JARDINE, JILLIAN
FRANCES JARDINE, DICKSON
STEWART JARDINE AND HGW
TRUSTEES LIMITED, JILLIAN
FRANCES JARDINE AND HGW
TRUSTEES LIMITED (JARDINE
FAMILY LAND PARTNERSHIP)**

Appellant

And

**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

Respondent

**Notice of Remarkables Station Limited
and Jardine Family Land
Partnership's wish to be Party to
Proceedings**

Dated: 10 July 2018

Lane Neave
Level 1, 2 Memorial Street
PO Box 701
Queenstown
Solicitor Acting: Joshua Leckie
Email: Joshua.Leckie@laneneave.co.nz
Phone: 03 409 0321

lane neave.

To: The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch

1. Remarkables Station Limited, Dickson Stewart Jardine, Jillian Frances Jardine, Dickson Stewart Jardine and HGW Trustees Limited, Jillian Frances Jardine and HGW Trustees Limited (Jardine Family Land Partnership) (collectively referred to as **RSL and Jardine**), wish to be a party to the following appeal on Queenstown Lakes District Council's decisions on Stage 1 of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (**Proposed Plan**):

Coneburn Preserve Holdings & Others v Queenstown Lakes District Council (ENV-2018-CHC-137) (Appeal)

2. RSL and Jardine made a submission on Stream 13 Mapping and Chapter 41 seeking the rezoning of parts of Homestead Bay for residential activities which is adjacent to the land that is the subject of the Appeal. They filed their own appeal dated 19 June 2018 (ENV-2018-CHC-090) on these matters.
3. RSL and Jardine also have an interest in the Appeal that is greater than the interest that the general public has as the land addressed by the Appeal includes RSL and Jardine's land and the land immediately adjacent to RSL and Jardine's land. RSL and Jardine wish to be party to the Appeal so that it may be involved in the development of any specific amendments that may affect its interests.
4. RSL and Jardine are not trade competitors for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991 (Act) and regardless are directly affected by effects subject to the Appeal that do not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
5. RSL and Jardine are interested in all of the Appeal.
6. The parts of the Appeal RSL and Jardine are interested in are:
 - (a) Chapters 3 and 4;
 - (b) Chapter 41 provisions as they relate to RSL and Jardine's relief as outlined in their appeal; and
 - (c) the Structure Plan.

7. RSL and Jardine conditionally supports the relief sought by the Appellant in relation to the Chapters 3 and 4 for the reasons stated in RSL and Jardine's original submission, its further submission and its notice of appeal. For the parts of the appeal that RSL and Jardine conditionally supports, those parts are supported to the extent that the relief sought by the Appellant is consistent with RSL and Jardine's original submission, further submission and notice of appeal. RSL and Jardine generally consider that the parts of the appeal it conditionally supports:
- (a) achieve integrated management of the effects, use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the District;
 - (b) promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;
 - (c) are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act; and
 - (d) are otherwise in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Act, including Part 2.
8. RSL and Jardine oppose the relief sought in the Appeal in relation to the Structure Plan, to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief set out in their own notice of appeal for the following reasons:
- (a) As the owner of a significant area of land in Homestead Bay, RSL and Jardine seek that their land be rezoned for residential activities as set out in RSL and Jardine's notice of appeal;
 - (b) RSL and Jardine wish to ensure that any changes to the provisions are appropriate and consistent with the relief sought in RSL and Jardine's appeal. In particular, the version of the Structure Plan attached to the Appeal does not reflect the latest version of that plan as it relates to Homestead Bay. It does not show the OSR's that were approved in the decision on the Proposed Plan or the additional rezonings shown on the Structure Plan attached as Appendix 1 to RSL and Jardine's notice of appeal.
 - (c) The relief sought by RSL and Jardine is more consistent with the higher order provisions of the Proposed Plan, other relevant policy

and planning documents and the sustainable management purpose of the Act than the than that sought by the Appellant as it relates to Homestead Bay; and

(d) Otherwise for the reasons set out in RSL and Jardine appeal.

9. RSL and Jardine agree to participate in mediation or other dispute resolution of the proceedings.

REMARKABLES STATION LIMITED, AND DICKSON STEWART JARDINE, JILLIAN FRANCES JARDINE, DICKSON STEWART JARDINE AND HGW TRUSTEES LIMITED, JILLIAN FRANCES JARDINE AND HGW TRUSTEES LIMITED (JARDINE FAMILY LAND PARTNERSHIP)

Dated this 10th day of July 2018



Joshua Leckie

Counsel for Remarkables Station Limited and Jardine Family Land Partnership

Address for Service for the Appellant:

Lane Neave
Level 1, 2 Memorial Street
PO Box 701
Queenstown 9300
Phone: 03 409 0321
Email: joshua.leckie@laneneave.co.nz/sam.chidgey@laneneave.co.nz

Contact person: Joshua Leckie and Sam Chidgey