

TONY MCQUILKIN (SUBMISSIONS 0459 AND 2273)

EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF BEN ESPIE (LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT)

- 1 In a broad sense, the landscape line that separates the ONL from the non-ONL should be a line that separates the Crown Terrace from the Crown Escarpment.
- 2 Following Ms Mellsop's rebuttal evidence, there is now only one area of difference between Ms Mellsop's preferred ONL boundary line and my preferred ONL boundary line. This difference is shown on Figure 2 of Ms Mellsop's rebuttal evidence. My preferred ONL boundary line is most clearly seen in the attachments to my evidence.
- 3 The difference between Ms Mellsop's line and mine is that Ms Mellsop includes the small lower terrace area that is described in my evidence within the ONL, while I consider this small terrace to be more logically categorised as part of the Crown Terrace itself and therefore excluded from the ONL.
- 4 Ms Mellsop's reasoning is that in views from the Wakatipu Basin floor, the crest of the Crown Escarpment in the relevant location appears to be formed by the 3 to 4 metre escarpment at the back of the small terrace (because the surface of the small terrace is not visible) and therefore the area of the small terrace is within the ONL.
- 5 I consider that the lines that separate one landscape from another should be drawn (where possible) at clear, broad scale landform edges. What is perceived from individual viewpoints (particularly distant ones) should not be of primary importance. Landscape categorisation lines should be most appropriately based on landscape character (the patterns and elements that make up the landscape, both natural and human-imposed) rather than on visibility or individual views. This is how landscape categorisation has been done across the district by the PDP, landscapes are categorised by character, not by views of them. An example is the Crown Terrace itself. It is of a distinct character to the rugged unkempt slopes above and below it, so it is given a different categorisation. It is not visible from the basin floor (such as in Ms Mellsop's Photograph 8) but nonetheless, no one is suggesting that the Crown Terrace should therefore be subsumed and categorised as part of the broader ONL. Simply because, from one viewing area, the small terrace looks like it is part of the Crown Escarpment, does not mean that it is part of the Crown Escarpment. I consider that, more logically, it is part of the Crown Terrace.
- 6 I agree with a point highlighted in Ms Mellsop's primary evidence (and reinforced by a Court of Appeal decision which she cites, as well as a number of Environment Court decisions), where she points out that a decision on where the boundary of an ONL sits should be a landscape decision, based on landscape analysis, with the planning consequences then following from that decision¹. Notwithstanding that, in this instance, we need not fear that excluding the small terrace from the ONL will lead to some undesirable result. The existing hut on the small terrace has been there for 20 years and is invisible from outside the site itself. The non-ONL land of the Crown Escarpment will be zoned as Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, with suitable and rigorous provisions regulating potential development.
- 7 For all of the reasons above and given in my evidence, I consider that landscape categorisation should be done as per the plan attached to the submission and the images attached to my evidence.

¹ Primary evidence of Ms Mellsop, 28 May 2018, paragraph 5.5.