



Planning & Strategy Committee

8 June 2017

Agenda for a meeting of the Queenstown Lakes District Council Planning & Strategy Committee, to be held in Council Chambers, 10 Gorge Road, Queenstown on Thursday 8 June 2017 commencing at 10.00am.

Item	Page #	Report Title
		Apologies
		Declarations of Conflict of Interest
		Matters Lying on the Table
		Public Forum
		Confirmation of Agenda
	3	Confirmation of Minutes 21 April 2017
1	10	Proposed District Plan Review Timeline
2	24	PUBLIC EXCLUDED Appeals Subcommittee Draft Minutes 21 April 2017

**Planning & Strategy Committee
21 April 2017**

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning & Strategy Committee held on Friday 21 April 2017 in Council Chambers, 10 Gorge Road, Queenstown commencing at 10.30am.

Present

Councillor Hill (Chair), Councillors Lawton, MacDonald and McRobie.

In Attendance

Mr Tony Avery (General Manager Planning & Strategy), Mr Ian Bayliss (Planning Policy Manager), Ms Shelley Dawson (Senior Governance Advisor) and 1 member of the media and 9 members of the public.

The Chair thanked Councillor Lawton for her contributions to Planning and Development during her time as a Councillor. He noted that she had been a valuable member of Council and he had enjoyed working with her.

Apologies

An apology for lateness was received from Councillor Miller.

**On the motion of Councillors Hill and Lawton it
was resolved that the apology be accepted.**

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts were declared.

Matters Lying on the Table

There were no matters on the table.

Public Forum

Warwick Goldsmith

Mr Goldsmith commented that he spoke for and on behalf of a number of planners and their clients who had lodged submissions to the Proposed District Plan. He spoke on behalf of his clients at Anderson Lloyd, for Ben Farrell on behalf of JEA & Associates, for Chris Ferguson on behalf of Boffa Miskell, for Amy Wilson-White on behalf of Brown & Company, for Ian Gordon representing Millbrook Country Club Ltd and for Graeme Todd representing a number of submitters. He talked to *Item 1: Proposed District Plan Review Stage 2*.

Mr Goldsmith commented that they were concerned that the agenda item signalled an intention to delay releasing any decisions on the Proposed District

Plan until the review was complete in 2019. He noted that this was causing great concern amongst the planning fraternity.

Mr Goldsmith read from a report to Council dated 30 July 2015 and noted one of the recommendations was to agree that Stage 2 of the District Plan review not be further advanced until hearings for Stage 1 have been completed. He also noted a sentence in the report explaining that focus was required on Stage 1 and the desire to have it complete through to the issue of the commissioners' decision. Mr Goldsmith commented that it will take at least three years to complete all of the hearings therefore it would be 2019 or 2020 before any decisions were released. In 2015 he was told that Stage 1 would be completed through to the decisions and he had told his clients that and that was what they were expecting.

Mr Goldsmith commented that Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act required a Local Authority to give a decision on the District Plan no less than 2 years after notifying it. He noted that he was concerned about the legality and the reasons given in the report to delay the decisions.

Councillor Miller joined the meeting at 10.37am.

Mr Goldsmith commented that his clients had invested a significant amount of money, some into the millions on the hearings. He noted that all provisions in the proposed plan were dependent on the Stage 1 decisions adding that the changes Council put into the proposed plan to address housing issues would not become operative if decisions were delayed until 2019.

Maree Baker-Galloway

Ms Baker-Galloway commented that she worked for Anderson Lloyd and acted for a range of clients but was also speaking on behalf of the planning fraternity. She noted that she was speaking to the reasons given as to why the decision should be delayed. Ms Baker-Galloway commented that the reports point that releasing a decision on Stage 1 now was unfair to participants was incorrect. She commented that clients had invested a large amount of money and had entered Stage 1 on the understanding that a decision would be made this year. Ms Baker-Galloway commented on the reports view of the risk of getting the plan wrong noting that if consequential issues were discovered through Stages 2 to 5 these could only be fixed through a variation not the decision.

Ms Baker-Galloway noted that the comment in the report that the plan could not be used throughout the appeal period was incorrect. She explained that as soon as the decision on Stage 1 was issued the rules would have effect even if they were under appeal. Not issuing a decision on Stage 1 would cause confusion and could also cause a possible avalanche of appeals to the Environment Court when all decisions were finally released. This could potentially create a delay due to the lack of resources to deal with the volume of appeals

Confirmation of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed without addition or alteration.