16 July 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF AMANDA JANE LEITH ON BEHALF OF SPRUCE GROVE TRUST AND BOUNDARY TRUST

Having read the rebuttal evidence and listened to the evidence presented to the Hearings Panel, I provide the following supplementary evidence:

The definition of 'resort' in the PDP[1] is as follows:

"Means an integrated and planned development involving low average density of residential development (as a proportion of the developed area) principally providing temporary visitor accommodation and forming part of an overall development focused on onsite visitor activities."

Residential activity areas and Open Space / Golf Course activity areas are proposed across the two land areas. Visitor accommodation activities are Discretionary activities in the zone and it is expected that some of the housing within the two land areas would probably be used for this.

No Village activity areas are proposed within the two land areas as I do not consider that this would be suitable due to the location of the land on the edges of the zone. This is consistent with the Dalgleish extension to the MRZ in that this area only comprises Residential and Open Space / Golf Course activity (and various landscape protection) areas.

In terms of integration, I do not consider it necessary that access to the two land areas would have to be via the Millbrook internal network, there are no objectives or policies within Chapter 43 which direct this. This would also mean that Millbrook Country Club Ltd would be able to effectively control the development of the submitter's land which I consider unnecessary as all of these properties have a legal right of access via alternative means.

Further relating to integration, the Spruce Grove Trust and Boundary Trust are not opposed to the incorporation of the Millbrook design guidelines as matters of discretion for the proposed R20 and R21 activity areas (Rule 43.4.11). However, it is not considered suitable that a neighbouring landowner control adherence to these and therefore it is sought that Council be the authority in assessing compliance. Consequently, I consider that only Sections 2 and 3 of the Millbrook Design Guidelines (dated October 2011 and found on Millbrook's website[2]) should be applicable to the subject land areas as these cover the built form and landscaping controls. Furthermore, in the event that the Panel agrees with the incorporation of the design guidelines, advice notes should also be added to Chapter 43 to state that any reference to 'Millbrook approved' or 'Design Review Board' in the design guidelines should be replaced by Council for the purposes of assessing development within the R20 and R21 activity areas.

An additional rule could also be added to Chapter 43 requiring that prior to subdivision or development of residential activity areas R20 and R21 that a Neighbourhood Design Plan has to be submitted for approval by Council. The matter of control should be the design guidelines.

Open space and density have been covered by the evidence in chief submitted to the Panel. I consider that the focus by various experts on the 5% coverage throughout the MRZ does not take into account context. I consider that to extend the form of development from Malaghans Ridge along the Spruce Grove Trust Malaghans Road site would not be out of character when viewing this area from both inside and outside the MRZ. It would not be readily apparent from any particular viewpoint within or outside the MRZ that more than 5% of open space across the entirety of the zone may have occurred. The same would apply to the Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road if the Fox's Rush development was mimicked within that land area. Furthermore, a large contiguous Open Space / Golf Course activity area is proposed on both sites.

Amanda Leith

---

1 Decision version which is subject to appeal

2 https://www.millbrook.co.nz/assets/PropertyFiles/32329-Millbrook-West-Design-Guidelines.pdf

25 July 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF AMANDA JANE LEITH ON BEHALF OF SPRUCE GROVE TRUST AND BOUNDARY TRUST

	Activities - Millbrook	**Activity Status**
43.4.11	**Buildings** a. R14, R15 ~~and~~ R16, R20a – e and R21a - b of the Residential Activity Area Discretion is restricted to the following: i. The appearance of the building ii. Associated landscaping controls iii. The effects on visual and landscape amenity values of the area including coherence with the surrounding buildings iv. For the R20a – e and R21a – b activity areas – compliance with Sections 2 and 3 of the Millbrook Design Guidelines dated October 2011 (Version 3.0). Note: For the purposes of (iv), any references to the approval of the Design Review Panel (DRP) or Millbrook within the Millbrook Design Guidelines are to be replaced with 'Council'.	RD
43.4.X	**Neighbourhood Design Plans** Prior to subdivision or development of the R20a – e or R21a – b Residential Activity Areas, a Neighbourhood Design Plan is to be submitted for approval. Discretion is restricted to the following: i. Location and size of building platforms ii. Landscaping iii. Height controls iv. Boundary fencing v. Visual and landscape amenity values vi. Visibility of development from Malaghans Road (R21 Residential Activity Area only)	RD
43.5.X	**Neighbourhood Design Plans** Development within Residential Activity Areas R20a – e and R21a – b shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Neighbourhood Design Plans	NC
43.5.15	**Visibility of Buildings within the Residential R21a Activity Area** No part of any building located within the R21a activity area is to be visible from Malaghans Road as measured from 1.5m above the centre line of any part of Malaghans Road. Note: Methods to achieve this may include restriction on building height, mounding and landscaping.	D

Amanda Leith