

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT CHRISTCHURCH**

ENV-2025-CHC-080

**I TE I TE KŌTI TAIAO
KI ĪTAUATAHI**

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

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

BETWEEN **TEKAPO LANDCO LTD AND GODWIT
LEISURE LTD**

Appellant

AND **MACKENZIE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Respondent

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

Dated: 18 September 2025

TODD & WALKER law
LAWYERS | NOTARY PUBLIC

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

TO: The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch

AND TO: The Appellant

AND TO: The Respondent

[1] **Queenstown Commercial Parapenters Limited (QCP)** wishes to be a party to the following proceedings:

(a) ENV-2025-CHC-080, an appeal by **Tekapo Landco Ltd and Godwit Leisure Ltd (Appellant)** against decisions by the Mackenzie District Council (**Council**) on its Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) (**Appeal**).

[2] QCP made a submission on the subject matter of the Appeal, and is an appellant to the same issues, in respect of the PDP.

[3] QCP is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**Act**).

[4] QCP is interested in all of the proceedings.

[5] QCP is interested in the following particular issues:

(a) OSZ-P2 (Compatible Activities); and
(b) OSZ-R6 (Commercial Recreation Activities).

[6] QCP opposes the relief sought by the Appellant in its entirety because the decisions version of the Open Spaces Zone (**OSZ**) chapter in the PDP appropriately recognises the enabled use of the OSZ (save for as appealed by QCP separately):

(a) Provisions of the OSZ provide for passive and active recreation activities, with commercial recreation activities provided for as a restricted discretionary activity. However, the notified OSZ-P2 created a strong direction that any other proposed activities could not detract from the passive use of the zone, conflicting with the proposed use of the zone for both passive and active recreation activities.

- (b) Similarly, the notified text of OSZ-R6 referred to a commercial recreation activity's compatibility with only 'passive' recreation. This was remedied with the removal of 'passive' in the decisions version.
 - (c) The matters of discretion in the notified text of OSZ-R6 were focused on the maintenance of a static and unchanging environment, rather than consistency of the use of the zone with the zone's anticipated character and visual amenity values.
 - (d) The matters of discretion in the notified text of OSZ-R6 also inferred that proposed developments in the OSZ will be required to upgrade / enhance degraded public areas. The decisions version is clearer in its intention to allow for consideration of broader benefits to users of the OSZ.
 - (e) The relief sought by the Appellant would otherwise be inconsistent with the National Planning Standards, which provides for a description of Open Space Zones as being: '*Areas used predominantly for a range of passive and active recreational activities, along with limited associated facilities and structures.*'
 - (f) QCP otherwise considers the relief sought by the Appellant would be inconsistent with, and not achieve, higher order policy and objectives of the PDP and other policy instruments, Part 2 and s 32 of the Act.
- [7] QCP agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated: 18 September 2025



.....
Signed for Queenstown Commercial Parapenters Limited
by its solicitor and duly authorised agent
R E M Hill

Address for Service:

C/- Todd & Walker Law
PO Box 124, Queenstown 9348
P: 03 441 2743

E: rosie.hill@toddandwalker.com

E: lucy.king@toddandwalker.com

Contact persons: R E M Hill / L C King

Advice

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