

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT  
AT CHRISTCHURCH**

ENV-2024-CHC-37

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

**UNDER** the Resource Management Act 1991

**IN THE MATTER** Of an appeal under clause 14(1) of the  
First Schedule of the Act

**AND IN THE MATTER** Of decisions by Otago Regional Council  
in respect of the Proposed Otago  
Regional Policy Statement 2021

**Between** **Queenstown Lakes District Council**  
**Respondent**  
Appellant

**And** **Otago Regional Council**  
Respondent

---

**NOTICE OF WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED WISH TO BE  
PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS**

7<sup>th</sup> June 2024

---

**TODD & WALKER** law  
LAWYERS | NOTARY PUBLIC

**Solicitor acting**  
R E Hill  
PO Box 124 Queenstown 9348  
P: 03 441 2743  
Rosie.hill@toddandwalker.com

**To:** The Registrar  
Environment Court  
Christchurch

- [1] Waterfall Park Developments Limited (**WPDL**) wishes to be a party to an appeal by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**Appellant**) against the decisions of the Otago Regional Council on the Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021 (non-freshwater parts) (**PORPS**).
- [2] WPDL made a submission (number S0023) and further submission (number FS00023) on the PORPS. WPDL's submission and further submission sought relief in relation to the following highly valued natural features and landscapes ('HVNFL') provisions:
- (a) UFD-P8 (1)
  - (b) UFD-(P8) (2)
  - (c) Further Submission in respect of Infinity Investment Group Holdings (414).
- [3] WPDL is otherwise a person who has an interest in the proceedings that is greater than that interest the general public has because it has development interests in land which is identified as within HVNLS within the region.
- [4] Generally, the WPDL submission sought amendments to the PORPS to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to consider the needs for, and merits of, residential, rural residential and rural lifestyle development, and non-primary production commercial activities that require a rural location, when determining the future use of rural land.
- [5] WPDL is not a trade competitor for the purposes of sections 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- [6] WPDL is interested in part of the proceedings, being those aspects of the appeal that are set out within **Appendix A** of this notice.
- [7] WPDL opposes the relief sought by the Appellant insofar as it is contrary to the relief sought in WPDL's original and further submissions to the

PORPS. WPDL's position is further set out in relation to the above provisions, in **Appendix A** to this notice.

[8] WPDL agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated 7<sup>th</sup> June 2024



.....  
**Signed** for Waterfall Park Developments Limited  
by its solicitor and duly authorised agent  
R E Hill

**Address for Service:**

C/- Todd & Walker Law  
PO Box 124, Queenstown 9348  
P: 03 441 2743  
E: rosie.hill@toddandwalker.com

**Contact persons:** R E Hill

**Appendix A – table of PORPS provisions of interest**

Provisions	Position	Reason
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation: reinstate the definition of HVNFL,</li> <li>• NFL-O1</li> <li>• NFL-P3</li> <li>• UFD-P7</li> <li>• UFD-P8</li> <li>• LF-LS-E4</li> <li>• Any other amendment to provisions that addresses SMRM-I10 – Impact Snapshot – Social – “Damage to or loss of natural features and landscapes compromises amenity values.</li> </ul>	<p>WPDL opposes any relief seeking to reverse the decision of the Regional Council to delete of provisions that provide for the ability to manage HVNFL for their amenity values and the quality of the environment associated with these landscapes.</p>	<p>WPDL does not consider that HVNL are a matter of regional significance required to be included in the policy statement. It considers that the relief sought by the Appellant would otherwise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not be consistent with Part 2 of the RMA;</li> <li>• not implement the Council’s functions under s 31 of the RMA;</li> <li>• not include the most appropriate policies in terms of s 32 of the RMA; and</li> <li>• not represent best resource management practice.</li> </ul>