

In the Environment Court of New
Zealand
Christchurch Registry

I Mua I Te Kōti Taiao o Aotearoa
Ōtautahi Rohe

ENV-2021-CHC-022

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

In the matter of an appeal under clause 14(1) of Schedule 1 of the RMA
in relation to Stage 3 of the Queenstown-Lakes Proposed
District Plan

Between **Marc Scaife**
Appellant

And **Queenstown Lakes District Council**
Respondent

NOTICE OF PERSON'S WISH TO BE A PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS

10 June 2021

To: The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch

1 Name of party giving notice:

Heron Investments Limited
C/o Vivian and Espie Limited
Box 2514
Whakatipu Mail Centre
Queenstown 9349
Attn: Carey Vivian

2 The relevant proceedings are:

ENV-2021-CHC-022

3 The party giving notice is:

Heron Investments Limited (HIL) is a person who made a submission on Stage 3 of the Proposed District Plan (PDP) successfully seeking a new Rural Visitor Zone (called the Maungawera Rural Visitor Zone) located at Camp Hill Road in the Upper Clutha basin.

HIL is not a trade competitor for the propose of section 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991.

4 HIL are only interested in that part of the proceedings that affect the adoption of the Maungawera Rural Visitor Zone.

5 The relief sought is opposed because:

The appellant made a further submission (#31062) in opposition to Matakauri Lodge Limited's (MLL) original submission (#31033) which sought the adoption of a new Rural Visitor Zone at Queenstown-Glenorchy Road, Queenstown.

Copies of these submissions #31033 and #31062 are not attached to the appeal. HIL have attached copies of these submissions to this notice.

The appellants further submission is limited to opposing MLL original submission which was specific to its property at Queenstown-Glenorchy Road, Queenstown.

HIL made a submission on Stage 3 of the PDP requesting the adoption of the Maungawera Rural Visitor Zone located at Camp Hill Road in the Upper Clutha basin. No further submitter opposed HIL's submission. The Council granted HIL's submission by adopting the Maungawera Rural Visitor Zone with some site-specific objectives, policies and rules. This decision,

including those site-specific objectives, policies and rules, has not been appealed.

The appellant's notice opposes *“the expansion in the number of RVZs and expansion of the scope of RVZs beyond the notified scope of Rural Zoned land with ONL classification in the District Plan Review, and, in particular, the proposed RVZ for Matakauri Lodge Ltd.”* For the reasons outlined above, HIL considers there is no jurisdiction for the appellant to oppose the Maungawera Rural Visitor Zone (or any other Rural Visitor Zone, except the Matakauri Lodge Rural Visitor Zone).

HIL therefore seeks the appellants relief sought that *“no new RVZ sites being established except those that existed in the ODP, as originally notified in the PDP”* be amended or struck-out as it relates to the adoption of the Maungawera Rural Visitor Zone (and any other Rural Visitor Zone with the exception of the Matakauri Lodge Rural Visitor Zone) on jurisdictional grounds.

- 6 HIL agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Attachments

- 7 The following documents are **attached** to this notice:

APPENDIX [1] TO THE SECTION 274 NOTICE BY HERON INVESTMENTS LIMITED JOINING MARC SCAIFE;

APPENDIX [2] TO THE SECTION 274 NOTICE BY HERON INVESTMENTS LIMITED JOINING MARC SCAIFE.

Dated this 10th day of June 2021



Carey Vivian
Planning Consultant for the Appellant