

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT COUCIL

IN THE MATTER of a hearing on submissions to the Proposed
Queenstown Lakes District Plan pursuant to clause 8B
of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act
1991

ON BEHALF OF **GLEN DENE LIMITED**
GLEN DENE HOLDINGS LIMITED
RICHARD AND SARAH BURDON
Submitters (31043)

EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF BENJAMIN ESPIE
(LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT)

5th AUGUST 2020

1. The relief that is sought have been amended since the time of the submission. Development enabled by the sought area of RVZ will be very considerably less dense than that of other RVZs and will be subject to a number of controls. Specifically, the relief that is now proposed includes:
 - buildings being at least a controlled activity, with matters of control including landform modification, landscaping and the compatibility of building design with landscape and visual amenity;
 - a maximum total building coverage for the proposed area of RVZ being 7% (a non-complying status would apply for coverage above this);
 - a variable allowable building height for buildings within the area of RVZ;
 - a State Highway Buffer area immediately adjacent SH6 with specific provisions relating to its vegetative management.
2. The proposed RVZ will sit close to (but distinct from) Hawea Township and will take in the existing commercial motor camp. Nonetheless, it is within the broader mountains-and-lake ONL that is characterised by vastness, openness, generally unmodified character and dramatic aesthetics. Due to the existing modification within the submission site and it being adjacent to Hawea Township, the specific location of the proposed RVZ does not particularly contribute to the important landscape character qualities that make the Lake Hawea landscape an ONL. In terms of landscape character, the site is a location with potential to absorb some change; much more so than most locations within this landscape.
3. In relation to landscape character, the existing modification/occupation and the immediate proximity to Hawea Township mean that this specific location is different to the vast majority of land adjacent to Lake Hawea (which is generally open, unoccupied and very largely unmodified). The extension of visitor accommodation activities that the proposed RVZ represents will not significantly detract from the important landscape character qualities that make the Lake Hawea landscape an ONL.
4. In relation to views and visual amenity, the State Highway Buffer area and associated provisions will mean that the visual amenity of a highway user very much continues to be dominated by the lake and mountains. While some additional development will be discernible (over and above the currently visible visitor activity), it will generally be below the important lines of sight to the broader landscape and/or will be very significantly screened by vegetation. A highway user will continue to experience the stretch of highway adjacent to the site as a stretch that is close to a town and somewhat different to the remainder of the highway as it adjoins Lake Hawea which allows completely uninterrupted views to a vast, open lake surface. Visual amenity will not be detracted from to any significant degree. In views from the east (the

lake and Hawea township/shore area), an intensification of existing visitor occupation/activity will be evident. However, this will be in an area that currently accommodates visible activity (at times of the year very apparent) and will be of a low density that involves significant open space and existing vegetation. Development that will ultimately occur will appear logical, tied to existing development and Hawea Township and not visually unattractive. The composition of views that are currently available will not fundamentally change nor be degraded.

5. Ms Gilbert raises some concerns regarding potential significant tree removal and buildings that are prominently visible adjacent to the lake edge. It must be borne in mind that the vast majority of the proposed area of RVZ is Council owned land (Section 2 Block II of 15.686ha). This Council-owned block is relatively densely treed in mixed and park-like trees and takes in most of the lake edge of the proposed RVZ (which is still separated from the lake edge itself by LINZ land). I understand that the existing designation provides for 40% building coverage of the Council-owned block and that development provided for by this designation would form part of the maximum 7% coverage that is now proposed across the entire RVZ. However, the Council (as owner) must approve of any development and, more importantly, the removal of any trees on this land and this will continue to be the case if the proposed relief is granted. I understand that the Council is very protective of the trees and open space on this land. I consider that, despite the lease that exists, the community can have faith that the Council will manage its land appropriately in accordance with community interests and that development (including any tree removal) up to the maximum provided for by the proposed relief, will be done in a responsible way that properly deals with landscape and visual effects.
6. In my understanding, the submitter requests the proposed zoning in order to future-proof their operation, rather than to undertake any significant development in the short term. Development within the existing camp operation has been incremental over many years and I understand that this is intended to continue. It may be many years or decades before a 7% site coverage is approached.
7. If we envisage the District Plan providing for visitor growth within the district for at least a decade once operative (most likely double that), I consider that, in relation to landscape planning considerations, the relief sought is appropriate. It will expand an existing operation that sits in a logical and appropriate location.

Ben Espie vivian+espie 5th AUGUST 2020