

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND
CHRISTCHURCH REGISTRY**

**I TE KOTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA
ŌTAUTAHI ROHE**

ENV-2019-CHC-000035

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

AND

IN THE MATTER of an appeal pursuant to Clause 14(1) of
Schedule 1 of the Act in relation to the proposed
Queenstown Lakes District Plan

BETWEEN

THE BOUNDARY TRUST

Appellant

AND

QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Respondent

**NOTICE OF MILLBROOK COUNTRY CLUB LIMITED'S WISH TO BE A PARTY
TO PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 274 OF THE ACT**

Dated: 31 May 2019

Counsel acting:

Ian Gordon
Barrister
Stout Street Chambers
Level 6, 1 Post Office Square
Wellington
Ph: 04-472 9026
Email: ian.gordon@stoutstreet.co.nz

TO: The Registrar
Environment Court
CHRISTCHURCH

1. Millbrook Country Club Limited (**Millbrook**) wishes to be a party pursuant to s 274 of the Act to the following proceedings:

Trustees of the Boundary Trust v QLDC (ENV-2019-CHC-000035) being an appeal against a decision of Queenstown Lakes District Council on the proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (**PDP**) in respect of its land at 459 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road together with sites at 461 Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road, 9 Orchard Hill, 29 Butel Road and 9 Butel Road (the **Land**).

2. Millbrook has an interest greater than the public generally because of the necessity to develop the Millbrook Resort Zone (**MRZ**) in an integrated and efficient manner.
3. Millbrook is not a trade competitor for the purposes of s 308C or 308CA of the Act.
4. Millbrook is interested in all aspects of this appeal and the relief sought by it. It was a submitter (#2295) and further on Planning Map 26 and Chapter 24, and a further submitter (#2773) on submissions #2444 and #541 by Boundary Trust.
5. Without derogating from the generality of the above, Millbrook is interested in the following particular issues:
 - (a) The potential amenity impacts of the proposed expansion to the Millbrook Resort Zone (MRZ) at these locations in the absence of development constraints integral to the objective and policies of the MRZ including:

- (i) The potential for the proposed extent and type of development, and ownership to undermine and detract from the amenity values of the MRZ including impacts on visual and open space amenity as experienced from both the resort facilities, dwellings, visitor accommodation and open space;

- (ii) Potential impacts on visual and open space amenity as experienced from tracks, trails, internal roads and fairways within the resort and particularly those used by

members of the Millbrook Country Club to access the resort facilities from other parts of the resort;

(iii) Potential diminution of the special qualities enabled and maintained by the MRZ and the non-statutory methods which control design, construction and behaviours on privately owned land within the MRZ;

(iv) The suitability of the Land for the development of integrated resort facilities in conjunction with the level of residential density intended by the appellant ;

(v) Potential impacts on the level of service presently provided by the tracks, trails and internal roads within the resort.

(b) A fundamental lack of integration and cohesiveness between the intensive residential development sought by the appellant and the existing amenities and facilities provided by MRZ Structure Plan;

(c) The potential for the changes sought to Chapter 43 policies and rules listed at 25 (b) to (d) of the Notice of Appeal to result in high density, poor quality residential development which detracts from and undermines the landscape, visual and golf tourism amenity values of the existing resort facilities and the purpose of the MRZ;

(d) The intention of the Appellant that the Land continue to be in separate ownership and control, unfettered by the covenants and membership rules that are imposed on dwellings (and owners) within the MRZ for the purpose of achieving and maintaining the highest integrated design, build and operational standards;

(e) The intention of the Appellant as to a contrasting type and extent of residential development with no regard for its overall integration within the MRZ for the purpose of achieving and maintaining the highest integrated design, build and operational standards;

(f) The inconsistency of the relief sought with the MRZ objective for integrated development that has particular regard for landscape, heritage, ecological, and water quality values;

- (g) The inconsistency of the relief sought with the MRZ policies of sustainable management of land resources for resort purposes;
 - (h) The potential adverse impact on the MRZ and the Millbrook brand and the contribution that both make to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the Queenstown Lakes District;
 - (i) The capacity and suitability of the Land for integrated resort facilities or activities and resort development;
 - (j) A lack of cohesive connection a with storm water and waste water which are proposed to be discharged to land in circumstances where there is insufficient available land and no overland flow path for storm water from the site; and
 - (k) The consistency of the current use of the Land with the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone(**WBRAZ**) as proposed, and the ability of the WBRAZ to provide for a sensible low-density regime to maintain rural amenity but with a discretionary, design-led regime for any development;
6. Any further, more refined, consequential, additional, other or alternative relief that might be deemed to give effect to this appeal and/or better serve the overall objectives of the district plan and the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.
7. Millbrook agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution.

DATED 31 May 2019



IM Gordon

Counsel for the section 274 party

Address for service of person wishing to be a party

Ian Gordon
Stout Street Chambers
Level 6, Huddart Parker Building
PO Box 117
Wellington 6140

Phone: 04 472 9026
Email: ian.gordon@stoutstreet.co.nz

Advice:

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