

**QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN HEARING – STREAM 12**

**IN THE MATTER**

of a hearing on submissions to the Proposed District Plan (Stream 12 Upper Clutha Mapping) pursuant to clause 8B of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

**JEREMY BELL INVESTMENTS LIMITED**

Submitter

---

**EVIDENCE OF CAREY VIVIAN  
(PLANNER)  
4 April 2017**

---

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1** My name is Carey Vivian. I hold the qualification of Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning (Hons) from Massey University. I have been a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute since 2000. I am a director of Vivian and Espie Limited, a resource management, urban design and landscape planning consultancy based in Queenstown. I have been practicing as a resource management planner for twenty-two years, having held previous positions with Davie Lovell-Smith in Christchurch; and the Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC or the Council), Civic Corporation Limited, Clark Fortune McDonald and Associates and Woodlot Properties Limited in Queenstown.
- 1.2** I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained within the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on information I have been given by another person. I confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed herein.

## 2. Executive Summary

- 2.1** The purpose of this evidence is to assist the Hearings Panel on making a decision on the submission by Jeremy Bell Investments Limited (JBIL) to rezone 71.2 hectares of Criffel Station from Rural to Rural Lifestyle Zone (or Rural Lifestyle Zoning – RLZ) under the Queenstown-Lakes Proposed District Plan (PDP).
- 2.2** This evidence has been structured in accordance with the amended mandatory legal criteria the Hearings Panel must consider as set out in Colonial Vineyard v Marlborough District Council [2014] NZEnvC 55 as well, as section 32 of the Resource Management Act (RMA).
- 2.3** In my opinion the primary resource management issue raised by JBILs submission is how the requested RLZ provisions can avoid, remedy or mitigate landscape and visual amenity effects of future land-use and subdivision activities that would be enabled (by the requested RLZ). To this extent, I rely on Mr Espie's expert opinion. Secondary resource management issues include Natural Hazards, Servicing, Ecology and Traffic. In respect of those matters I rely on the Hadley Consultants report attached to the submission and the reports attached to the section 42A report.
- 2.4** In my opinion there is no impediment to zoning of the subject site is RLZ as requested by JBILs

submission. In my opinion the RLZ, with the additional provisions I recommend in Part 10 of my evidence, is the most appropriate zoning for the subject site.

### 3. Purpose and Scope of this Evidence

- 3.1** The purpose of this evidence is to assist the Hearings Panel on matters within my expertise of resource management planning in relation to the submission by JBIL on the PDP.
- 3.2** This evidence is restricted to the parts of the submissions which relate to the PDP maps. I have previously presented evidence on Chapter 3 Strategic Direction, Chapter 6 Landscapes and Chapter 21 Rural Areas and Chapter 22 Rural Living areas for other submitters.
- 3.3** This report evaluates zoning options for a terrace riser and terrace to the south of Mount Barker Road in Wanaka. The subject property is a large high country farm station of several thousand hectares in area. Within this property, a smaller area of 71.2 hectares (herein referred to as the “subject site”) has been identified as suitable for alternative uses to farming. The subject site is depicted on the plans attached to the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (attached to the submission as **Attachment 1**), contains several dwellings and farm buildings. The majority of the area is used for grazing of livestock (deer). The subject site is currently vegetated (native and exotic) as can be seen on the attached aerial photographs.
- 3.4** A number of PDP zone options were assessed as part of the pre-notification consultation with the Council and then in the drafting the relevant submission. These options included Township, Rural Visitor, Residential, Rural-Residential and Rural Lifestyle development. Given the sensitivity of this landscape, all of those options, with the exception of the RLZ, were dismissed on our recommendation for landscape and visual amenity reasons. The remainder of this evidence therefore concentrates on the appropriateness of the alternative RLZ as sought in JBILs submission.
- 3.5** When proposing to undertake any change or review to the District Plan, the Council is required to carry out an evaluation of alternative methods to establish the best and most appropriate course of action. This requirement is prescribed by section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act) and is commonly referred to as a section 32 report, evaluation or analysis. It is effectively an analysis of the costs and benefits of different options.
- 3.6** In preparing this evidence I am mindful of the amended mandatory legal criteria the Hearings Panel must consider as set out in *Colonial Vineyard v Marlborough District Council* [2014] NZEnvC 55. This includes:

- (a) Accords with section 75(1) and assists the Council to carry out its functions (s 31) so as to achieve the purpose of the Act (s 72).
- (b) Gives effect to National Policy Statements that are relevant (section 73(3)(a));
- (c) Gives effect to the Otago Regional Policy Statement (section 75(3)(c));
- (d) Has had regard to any relevant management plans and strategies under other Acts, and to any relevant entry in the Historic Places Register (section 74(2)(b));
- (e) Takes into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority;
- (f) Does not have regard to trade competition (section 74(3)).

**3.7** My evidence is structured in accordance with above criteria, as well as a section 32 evaluation against the relevant objectives and policies of the PDP.

**3.8** As referred to above, prior to the notification of the PDP the applicant had some discussion with the Council about the landscape classification of their property, including the idea of a RLZ over the subject site. The landscape classification was a result of Dr Read's report entitled "*Report to the Queenstown Lakes District Council on appropriate landscape classification boundaries within the district, with particular reference of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features*". It is understood that this report, for the Upper Clutha, was peer reviewed by Ms Steven before incorporation into the PDP. Ms Steven also had the benefit of the Vivian Espie Report entitled "*Landscape and Visual Assessment*" which was later also attached to the JBIL submission as Appendix 1. I am unsure as to what Ms Steven recommended in this regard, however I presume she recommended that the landscape line be changed to the Vivian+Espie line as that is what was publicly notified in the PDP. As a result JBIL have no concerns with respect to the proposed boundary of the Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) boundary as it affects their property, and more specifically, as it affects the RLZ requested by their submission.

**3.9** As a result of this pre-notification consultation JBIL's submission was very detailed, as follows:

- i. The subject site is owned by Jeremy Bell Investments Ltd. This site is zoned as Rural as identified on Planning Map 18 and 11 of the Proposed District Plan and has majority landscape categorization as ONL.*
- ii. We **oppose** the proposed zoning of our properties as entirely Rural zone identified on Planning Map 18 – Wanaka Rural, Hawea Flat and Proposed District Plan Map 11 - Mt Pisa.*
- iii. We seek that the land identified within the outlined area of the attached map be re-zoned in part as Rural Lifestyle zone (71.2ha) with a dedicated no build area (22ha) where these areas are more sensitive to landscape matters. This is supported by Mr Ben Espie - Landscape Planner, to*

- which his Landscape Assessment Report is attached to this submission and has influenced the parameters of the proposed zone and no build areas identified in the attached map.*
- iv. *We consider that this area would make rural living opportunities with high amenity values. The subject area can be appropriately developed to a minimum lot area of one hectare, providing the average lot size is not less than 2 hectares and for the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than 4 hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be 4 hectares. The viability of this is additionally supported in terms of Natural Hazards and Servicing review in the attached report by John McCartney, Senior Engineer of Hadley Consultants Ltd.*
  - v. *We consider that the proposed change in zoning, (in addition to the no build area as identified on the attached map), will have no more than minor effect on the wider environment. As such, we also propose that adverse effects on the environment may be managed through the use of Controlled Activity consent processes.*
  - vi. *We submit that the proposed zoning achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act – the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.”*

**3.10** JBIL submission requests the following decision from Council:

- “i. Adopt the Rural Lifestyle proposed provisions within Chapter 22 and Chapter 27 as they relate to the area identified in the attached map “Proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone Location Map”.*
- ii. Amend proposed Planning Maps 18 and 11 to change the zoning of the specific area identified within ‘Appendix 1: Proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone Location Map’ to that of Rural Lifestyle and corresponding ‘No Build Area’.*
- iii. That the land identified in the attached graphic be re-zoned to Rural Lifestyle zone with a minimum lot area of one hectare providing the average lot size is not less than 2 hectares and for the purpose of calculating any average, any allotment greater than 4 hectares, including the balance, is deemed to be 4 hectares.*
- iv. That the land identified as ‘no build’ within Appendix 1 – Proposed Rural Lifestyle Plan, Criffel Station Wanaka, be adopted within Planning Map 18 and 11 where relevant for the purposes of landscape protection.*
- v. Amend rule 22.4.3.3 to change the activity status for a building platform for a residential unit from Discretionary to Controlled Activity status.*
- vi. Delete Rule 22.5.3 (maximum building size 500m2).*
- vii. Amend Rule 27.4.1 so that subdivisions within the Rural Lifestyle zone that comply with all of the relevant standards are a controlled activity.”*

**3.11** It is noted that the submission included the following supporting documents:

- (i) A Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (LVEA) dated 5 June 2015 prepared by Mr Paul Smith of Vivian and Espie Limited. The report concluded in relation to landscape character, the proposal will change the character of the two terraces from a pastoral and agricultural landscape character to a rural living character. Mr Smith considered the rural living character of the zone will continue to allow for some agricultural activities to occur, however these may differ from the current agricultural activities. Mr Smith considers the proposed zone area is well contained by topographical boundaries and is less sensitive and less valued in terms of landscape character than the adjacent steep mountain slopes. Overall, he considered the requested RLZ would have a moderate effect on the character of the landscape.

In respect to visual effects Mr Smith concluded:

- Future development within the proposed zone will be potentially visible from short stretches of both Mt Barker Road and SH6.
  - Relatively brief glimpses of future development will be potentially gained through vegetation and over rolling hills from Ballantyne Road and Morris/Boundary Roads.
  - In the short term, initial construction and some dwellings on the upper terrace will potentially be visible from the abovementioned stretches of road.
  - In the long term, it is likely that amenity tree planting and vegetation will screen the majority of future built form. Amenity planting will bring about a slight increase in the domesticity of the site. Overall future development when visually experienced from these surrounding public places and adjacent private land will have a slight to moderate degree of adverse effects.
- (ii) Appendix 2 to the LEVA included a plan entitled RLZ Plan dated 5 June 2015 by Vivian Espie Limited. That zone plan included approximately 22 hectares of building restriction area. This plan forms the basis of the submission relief points (i) to (iv).
- (iii) Appendix 3 to the LEVA included a plan entitled Landscape Classification of the North Slopes of Criffel Range dated 5 June 2015 by Vivian Espie Limited. It is noted that this Plan is superfluous given the PDP was publicly notified with the landscape classification line as recommended by Appendix 3.
- (iv) Appendix 3 to the LEVA included a number of marked up photographs viewing the site various public places.
- (v) An engineering report from Hadley Consulting assessing natural hazard risk and feasibility of

servicing the requested RLZ. That report concludes, based on their preliminary assessment work that:

- The risk of natural hazard impacting the development site is very low (subject to detailed investigation of some areas of loess and specific foundation design);
- That feasible options exist for servicing the proposed zone areas.

**3.12** This evidence is limited to submission reliefs (i) to (iv).

**3.13** I note one further submission was received on JBILs submission by the Upper Clutha Environmental Society.

**3.14** In my opinion the primary resource management issue raised by JBILs submission is how the requested RLZ provisions can avoid, remedy or mitigate landscape and visual amenity effects of future land-use and subdivision activities that would be enabled (by the requested RLZ).

**3.15** Secondary resource management issues include Natural Hazards, Servicing, Ecology and Traffic. All of these issues are resolvable as acknowledged in the section 42A report. Tangata Whenua issues are also a secondary resource management issue.

**3.16** This evidence concentrates on these primary and secondary issues and is structured as follows:

4. Whether the proposal gives effects to any relevant National Policy Statements.
5. Whether the proposal gives effect to any relevant Regional Policy Statements and Plans.
6. Whether the proposal has had regard to any relevant management plans or strategies under other acts.
7. Takes into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority.
8. Does not have regard to trade competition.
9. Section 32 evaluation.
10. The Section 42A report.
11. Part II of the RMA.
12. Conclusion.

4. Whether the proposal gives effects to any relevant National Policy Statements.

- 4.1 At the time of writing this evidence the following national policy statements (NPSs) were in place:
- National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity
  - National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management
  - National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation
  - National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission
  - New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement
- 4.2 I understand that work has been undertaken on a proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity but this is not yet complete.
- 4.3 None of the NPSs are, in my opinion, relevant to the consideration of JBILs submission.
- 4.4 I note that the National Environmental Standard (NES) for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health is relevant should the subject site be developed for rural living in the future. This standard requires consideration to the extent that land is actually or potentially contaminated if an activity or industry on the Hazardous Activities or Industries List (HAIL) has been, or is more likely than not to have been undertaken on that land. The land use history is the trigger in determining whether land requires further assessment under the NES. From our initial investigations there is no-land use history that would adversely impact on the submission to rezone this land for rural living purposes. A Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) would likely be required at the time of land-use or subdivision consent in the future.

## 5. Whether the proposal gives effect to any relevant Regional Policy Statements and Plans.

- 5.1 The relevant Regional Policy Statements are the Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement (OORPS) (dated 1 October 1998) and the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement (PORPS) as amended by Council's decisions on submissions (dated 1 October 2016). I note the PORPS is subject to appeals and is due to be heard by the Environment Court this year.

### Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement (OORPS)

- 5.2 The OORPS provides an overview of the resource management issues of the Otago Region and the ways of achieving integrated management of its natural and physical resources. The relevant chapters of the OORPS to the consideration of JBILs submission are:
- Chapter 4 Manawhenua Perspective



- Chapter 5 Land
- Chapter 6 Water
- Chapter 7 Air
- Chapter 11 Natural hazards

- 5.3** I discuss each of the relevant objectives and policies from these chapters in relation to JBILs submission below. I have attached a list of the relevant objectives and policies to my evidence as **Attachment CV2** to assist the panel.
- 5.4** The relevant Chapter 4 Manawhenua objectives and policies are Objective 4, and policies 4.4.3 Wai and 4.5.5 Kaitiakitanga. The requested RLZ is unlikely to adversely affect any waterbodies. The requested RLZ does not affect the concept of guardianship of the land.
- 5.5** The relevant Chapter 5 Land objectives include Objective 5.4.1, 5.4.2 and 5.4.3.
- 5.6** With respect to Objectives 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 the requested RLZ promotes sustainable management by maintaining and enhancing the primary productive capacity and life-supporting capacity of the property by retaining the majority of the station in rural activities and diversifying a small part of it. I understand, as happens in the Wakatipu basin, that there is potential for the wider farm to lease land back land owned by lifestyle dwellers which in turn maintains productive potential. In my opinion the relief sought by the submission achieves these objectives.
- 5.7** With respect to Objective 5.4.3 no development is proposed within the ONL, and the sensitive terrace risers within the requested RLZ are proposed to have no build restrictions placed on them. In my opinion the proposal is consistent with this objective.
- 5.8** The relevant Chapter 5 Land policies include policies 5.5.4, 5.5.5 and 5.5.6.
- 5.9** With respect to Policy 5.5.4 the requested RLZ, in my opinion, promotes diversification by enabling rural living development opportunities within a rural setting. The requested RLZ is therefore consistent with this policy.
- 5.10** With respect to policy 5.5.5 the requested RLZ minimising the adverse effects on the quality and quantity of Otago's water resource by ensuring control is retained in terms of servicing the development in the future (through subdivision and/or land use consents).
- 5.11** With respect to 5.5.6 the ONL values of the property will be maintained through the Rural zoning which is unaffected by JBILs submission. The requested RLZ is therefore consistent with this policy.

- 5.12** The relevant Chapter 6 Water objectives and policies include Objective 6.4.2 and Policy 6.5.1. As noted in the Hadley Consulting report attached to the application there is no issue with obtaining a potable water supply to service the development. This report concludes that the requested RLZ can therefore be serviced with water without impacting on Otago's water resources consistent with this objective and policy.
- 5.13** The relevant Chapter 10 Biota objectives and policies include Objective 10.4.3 and Policy 10.5.2. The requested RLZ contains no areas of vegetation identified as being a significant habitat of indigenous vegetation. To that extent, the vegetative values on site are no impediment to the proposed zoning of rural living activities on this property.
- 5.14** The relevant Chapter 11 Natural Hazards objectives and policies are Objectives 11.4.1 and 11.4.2 and Policies 11.5.2 and 11.5.3. Natural Hazards have been addressed in the report by Hadley Consulting attached to the submission. That report concludes risk of natural hazard impacting the development site is very low.
- 5.15** In summary, the proposed plan change is consistent with, and gives effect to, the relevant provisions of the OORPS.

**Proposed Regional Policy Statement (PRPS)**

- 5.16** The Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement (PORPS) has advanced to the stage of the issue of a decision (which is now subject to appeals to the Environment Court). I have attached a list of the most relevant objectives and policies from PORPS (decisions version) to my evidence as **Attachment CV3**. The relevant section of the PORPS to the consideration of JBILs submission are:
- Chapter 2 Kai Tahu Values and Interests
  - Chapter 3 Otago has high quality natural resources and ecosystems
  - Chapter 4 Communities in Otago are resilient, safe and healthy
  - Chapter 5 People are able to use and enjoy Otago's natural and built environment
- 5.17** The relevant Chapter 2 objectives and policies are 2.1 to 2.2 (Kai Tahu values and interests). The RPS requires that Kai Tahu values and interests are recognised and kaitiakitaka is expressed. The requested RLZ, in my opinion, does not affect this from occurring.
- 5.18** The relevant Chapter 3 objectives and policies are Objective 3.1 and Policy 3.1.1 Fresh Water, 3.1.3 Water and 3.1.10 Natural Features, Landscapes and Seascapes and Objective 3.2 Identifying highly values natural features, landscape and seascapes, Policies 3.2.5 and 3.2.6.

- 5.19** The requested RLZ is, in my opinion, consistent with Objective 3.1 to the extent the requested RLZ maintains a low level of development, retains that area of the property identified as being within the ONL in Rural zoning and requests a no building restriction over the more sensitive terrace riser .
- 5.20** With respect to Policies 3.1.1 and 3.1.3 the Hadley Consulting report attached to the submission confirms that the requested RLZ can feasibly be serviced (relying on the Hadley Consulting report attached to the submission). In my opinion the requested RLZ is consistent with these policies.
- 5.21** With respect to Policy 3.1.10, Objective 2 and Policies 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 the values of natural features and landscapes are recognised and provided for in the PDP. To that extent this policy is achieved through the PDP and as discussed above, the proposed ONL/ RLC classification boundary is not opposed in respect of this property. The requested RLZ is outside the ONL and therefore accords with the policies of the PORPS.
- 5.22** Overall I consider the relief sought in the JBILs submission, and therefore the request to zone the subject site RLZ, is consistent with Objective 3.1 and 3.2 and associated relevant policies.
- 5.23** The relevant Chapter 4 objectives and policies include Objective 4.1 and Policies 4.1.1 to 4.1.6 in respect of natural hazards; Objective 4.3 and Policy 4.3.1 in respect of infrastructure; and Objective 4.4 in respect of energy supply. These issues have all been addressed in the Hadley Consulting report attached to the submission with no major concerns raised.
- 5.24** The relevant Chapter 5 objectives and policies include Objective 5.3 and Policy 5.3.1. The requested RLZ is a small proportion of the overall area of Criffel Station. It is my understanding that the primary production values of the property will likely be maintained, if not enhanced, by the requested zoning. Reverse sensitivity issues can be remedied or mitigated at the time of subdivision (through the location of building platforms in combination with no complaints covenants if necessary). Overall I consider the requested zoning is consistent with these provisions.
- 5.25** The requested RLZ is, in my opinion, consistent with, and gives effect to, the relevant objectives and policies of the PORPS.

**Regional Plan : Air and Water**

- 5.26** The Regional Plans: Air and Water will be of relevance if the RLZ is approved. Consents are likely to be required for water take and discharge (if a communal wastewater system is proposed).

## 6. Whether the proposal has had regard to any relevant management plans or strategies under other acts.

- 6.1 In my opinion there are no other management plans or strategies prepared under other acts relevant to the consideration of JBILs submission.

## 7. Takes into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority.

### **Kai Tahu ki Otago Iwi Management Plan**

- 7.1 The Kai Tahu ki Otago Resource Management Plan (the Plan) was prepared in 2005 and is the principal planning document for Kāi Tahu ki Otago. It was developed over a 2-year period through extensive consultation with the four Papatipu Rūnaka of Otago as well as consultation with, and input from, the Otago whānau and rōpū groups and Southland and South Canterbury Rūnaka.

- 7.2 At Section 2.5.6 the Plan states that *'Kāi Tahu ki Otago values have been incorporated, to varying extents, in the following Regional and District Plans and Policy Statements'*. Key issues identified in the Plan relate to wai maori, wahi tapu, mahika kai and biodiversity, cultural landscapes, air and atmosphere, coastal environment.

- 7.3 The Upper Clutha is located within the Clutha-Mata-au Catchment, and this is described at Section 10.1 as:

*"The Clutha/Mata-au Catchment centres on the Clutha/Mata-au River and includes all sub-catchments within this main Catchment.*

#### **10.2.2 Wai Maori Issues in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment:**

...

##### **Land Use:**

- *Lack of reticulated community sewerage schemes.*
- *Existing sewage schemes are not effectively treating the waste and do not have the capacity to cope with the expanding population.*
- *Land use intensification, for example dairying in the Poumahaka Catchment.*
- *Increase in the lifestyle farm units is increasing the demand for water.*
- *Sedimentation of waterways from urban development.*

...

#### **10.2.3 Wai Maori Policies in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment:**

...

##### **Land use:**

9. *To encourage the adoption of sound environmental practices, adopted where land use*

*intensification occurs.*

*10. To promote sustainable land use in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment.*

*11. To encourage all consents related to subdivision and lifestyle blocks are applied for at the same time including, land use consents, water consents, and discharge consents.*

*12. To require reticulated community sewerage schemes that have the capacity to accommodate future population growth*

...

### **10.3 WÄHI TAPU**

#### **10.3.1 Wähi Tapu in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchments**

*There are a range of wähi tapu of particular significance within the Clutha/Mata-au Catchments. Urupä are the best modern day example of wähi tapu, but physical resources such as mountaintops, springs and vegetation remnants are other examples. Urupä and some significant sites of conflict are located all along the Clutha/Mata-au River.*

...

#### **10.3.3 Wähi Tapu Policies in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment**

*1. To require that wähi tapu sites are protected from further loss or destruction.*

*2. To require accidental discovery protocols for any earth disturbance activities.”*

**7.4** With respect to 10.2 development under the RLZ provisions is likely to be in accordance with sound environmental management and promote sustainable land use practices. There is no possibility of connecting to a reticulated community sewerage scheme, but there is the possibility of communal wastewater disposal scheme servicing the lots.

**7.5** With respect to 10.3 there is no known waahi tapu associated with the site. The Accidental Discovery Protocol can be imposed by consent conditions on any future resource consents if deemed necessary.

## **8. Does not have regard to trade competition.**

**8.1** There are no trade competition issues relevant to the consideration of this submission.

## **9. Section 32(1) evaluation.**

**9.1** Section 32(1) states that an evaluation report must examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. The key Objectives and Policies are contained in the following parts of the PDP:

- Chapter 5 – Strategic Directions
- Chapter 6 - Landscapes
- Chapter 22 – Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle.

**9.2** Each of these will be assessed in turn.

9.3 The purpose of the strategic directions chapter of the PDP is to set out the over-arching strategic direction for the management of growth, land use and development in a manner that ensures sustainable management of the Queenstown Lakes District’s special qualities:

- Dramatic alpine landscapes free of inappropriate development
- Clean air and pristine water
- Vibrant and compact town centres
- Compact and connected settlements that encourage public transport, biking and walking
- Diverse, resilient, inclusive and connected communities
- A district providing a variety of lifestyle choices
- An innovative and diversifying economy based around a strong visitor industry
- A unique and distinctive heritage
- Distinctive Ngai Tahu values, rights and interests

9.4 This direction is provided through a set of Strategic Goals, Objectives and Policies which provide the direction for the more detailed provisions related to zones and specific topics contained elsewhere in the District Plan. The following Objectives and Policies are relevant to JBILs submission and are addressed in the following table:

3.2.1.4 Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character, healthy ecosystems, and Ngai Tahu values, rights and interests.				
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</i> <sup>(a)</sup>	<i>Benefits</i> <sup>(b)</sup>	<i>Costs</i> <sup>(b)</sup>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting</i> <sup>(c)</sup>	
JBILs submission recognises the potential for this site to diversify in accordance with this objective. Importantly the requested RLZ ensures a sensitive approach is taken with respect to amenity and landscape values and ecosystems.	The requested RLZ ensures a sensitive approach is taken with respect to amenity and landscape values and ecosystems. The requested RLZ also provides Upper Clutha community with alternative rural living opportunities, in close proximity to the Airport	The requested RLZ over the subject site does not result in any significant cost to rural amenity values.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective.	

	and town centres.		
--	-------------------	--	--

3.2.2.2 Manage development in areas affected by natural hazards.			
3.2.2.2.1 Ensure a balanced approach between enabling higher density development within the District's scarce urban land resource and addressing the risks posed by natural hazards to life and property.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
JBILs submission includes an engineering report that concludes natural hazard impacting the subject site are very low.	The requested RLZ is unlikely to be affected by natural hazards and therefore its development does not increase risk of natural hazards to life and property.	The requested RLZ does not result in any cost to the community with respect to natural hazards.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

3.2.4.2 Protect areas with significant Nature Conservation Values.			
3.2.4.2.1 Identify areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, referred to as Significant Natural Areas on the District Plan maps and ensure their protection.			
3.2.4.2.2 Where adverse effects on nature conservation values cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consider environmental compensation as an alternative.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
The subject site does not contain or is in close proximity to any Significant Nature Conservation Values (SNCV) – refer to PDP Map 18.	Opportunity for the indigenous vegetation on the terrace riser (i.e. requested no build area) to be enhanced.	There is no cost to any SNCVs.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policies.

3.2.4.4 Avoid exotic vegetation with the potential to spread and naturalise.			
3.2.4.4.1 That the planting of exotic vegetation with the potential to spread and naturalise is banned.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
Proposed Rule 34.4.1	Rule 34.4.1 is relevant	There is no cost to the	There is no uncertainty or

prohibits the planting of trees that have wilding characteristics.	to the requested RLZ.	ONLs of the Upper Clutha basin.	insufficient information regarding Objective and policy.
--	-----------------------	---------------------------------	--

3.2.5.1 Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development.			
3.2.5.1.1 Identify the district's Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features on the District Plan maps, and protect them from the adverse effects of subdivision and development.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
The requested RLZ sought is not within an ONL.	The requested RLZ sought is not within an ONL.	There is no cost to the ONL values.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

3.2.5.2 Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes.			
3.2.5.2.1 Identify the district's Rural Landscape Classification on the district plan maps, and minimise the effects of subdivision, use and development on these landscapes.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
The requested RLZ will be exempt from the landscape classification.	Subdivision, use and development is controlled through the RLZ provisions which are appropriate because of the absorption capacity of the site.	Given that this location is appropriate there is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

3.2.5.4 Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained.			
3.2.5.4.1 Give careful consideration to cumulative effects in terms of character and environmental impact when considering residential activity in rural areas.			
3.2.5.4.2 Provide for rural living opportunities in appropriate locations.			



<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
Careful consideration has been given to the cumulative effects of the requested RLZ in the context of this rural environment.	The requested RLZ provides for rural living opportunities in an appropriate location.	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

**9.5** The purpose of Chapter 6 Tangata Whenua is to recognise and provide for Ngāi Tahu as a partner in the management of the District's natural and physical resources through the implementation of this District Plan. The Council will actively foster this partnership through meaningful collaboration, seeking formal and informal advice, providing for Ngāi Tahu's role as kaitiaki, and protecting its values, rights and interests.

**9.6** The following Objectives and Policies are relevant to the JBLs submission:

5.4.1 Objective - Promote consultation with tangata whenua through the implementation of the Queenstown Lakes District Plan.			
5.4.1.1 Ensure that Ngāi Tahu Papatipu Rūnanga are engaged in resource management decision-making and implementation on matters that affect Ngāi Tahu values, rights and interests, in accordance with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.			
5.4.1.2 Actively foster effective partnerships and relationships between the Queenstown Lakes District Council and Ngāi Tahu Papatipu Rūnanga.			
5.4.1.3 When making resource management decisions, ensure that functions and powers are exercised in a manner that takes into account iwi management plans.			
5.4.1.4 Recognise that only tangata whenua can identify their relationship and that of their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water sites, wāhi tapu, tōpuni and other taonga.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
No specific consultation has been undertaken as part of this submission. Opportunity exists for consultation as part of the resource consent	Consultation can occur as part of the subdivision process (proposed to be discretionary activity).	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

process (Discretionary activity for subdivision).			
---	--	--	--

5.4.3 Objective - Protect Ngāi Tahu taonga species and related habitats.			
5.4.3.1 Where adverse effects on taonga species and habitats of significance to Ngāi Tahu cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consider environmental compensation as an alternative.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
As far as I am aware, and based on my review of the KTKP Natural Resource Management Plan, there is no taonga species and habitats of significance to Ngāi Tahu within the area sought for RLZ.	If such values exist then they can be considered in accordance with the RLZ provisions, including a discretionary activity regime for subdivision.	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

5.4.5 Objective - Wāhi tūpuna and all their components are appropriately managed and protected.			
5.4.5.1 Identify wāhi tūpuna and all their components on the District Plan maps and protect them from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development.			
5.4.5.2 Identify threats to wāhi tūpuna and their components in this District Plan.			
5.4.5.3 Enable Ngai Tahu to provide for its contemporary uses and associations with wāhi tūpuna.			
5.4.5.4 Avoid where practicable, adverse effects on the relationship between Ngāi Tahu and the wāhi tūpuna.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
As far as I am aware, and based on my review of the KTKP Natural Resource Management Plan,, there is no wahi tapuna within the area requested for RLZ.	Development under RLZ is designed to identify such areas if they exist.	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

- 9.7 The purpose of Chapter 6 – Landscapes is to recognise the landscape as a significant resource to the district and region which requires protection from inappropriate activities that could degrade its qualities, character and values. The relevant Objectives and Policies are as follows:

6.3.1 Objective - The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.1.1 Identify the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features on the Planning Maps.

6.3.1.2 Classify the Rural Zoned landscapes in the District as:

- Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF)
- Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL)
- Rural Landscape Classification (RLC)

6.3.1.3 That subdivision and development proposals located within the Outstanding Natural Landscape, or an Outstanding Natural Feature, be assessed against the assessment matters in provisions 21.7.1 and 21.7.3 because subdivision and development is inappropriate in almost all locations, meaning successful applications will be exceptional cases.

6.3.1.4 That subdivision and development proposals located within the Rural Landscape be assessed against the assessment matters in provisions 21.7.2 and 21.7.3 because subdivision and development is inappropriate in many locations in these landscapes, meaning successful applications will be, on balance, consistent with the assessment matters.

6.3.1.5 Avoid urban subdivision and development in the Rural Zones.

6.3.1.6 Enable rural lifestyle living through applying RLZ and Rural Residential Zone plan changes in areas where the landscape can accommodate change.

6.3.1.7 When locating urban growth boundaries or extending urban settlements through plan changes, avoid impinging on Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Outstanding Natural Features and minimise disruption to the values derived from open rural landscapes.

6.3.1.8 Ensure that the location and direction of lights does not cause glare to other properties, roads, and public places or the night sky.

6.3.1.9 Ensure the District's distinctive landscapes are not degraded by forestry and timber harvesting activities.

6.3.1.10 Recognise that low-intensity pastoral farming on large landholdings contributes to the District's landscape character.

6.3.1.11 Recognise the importance of protecting the landscape character and visual amenity values, particularly as viewed from public places.

6.3.1.12 Recognise and provide for the protection of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes with particular regard to values relating to cultural and historic elements, geological features and matters of cultural and spiritual value to Tangata Whenua, including Tōpuni.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
<p>6.3.1.1 – The requested RLZ is not within an ONL or ONF.</p> <p>6.3.1.2 – The requested RLZ will be exempt from the RLC.</p> <p>6.3.1.3 – The requested RLZ is not within an ONL or ONF. This policy is therefore not relevant to the requested RL zone.</p> <p>6.3.1.4 – This policy is applicable irrespective of Rural or RLZ .</p> <p>6.3.1.5 – Urban development is not permitted under the requested RLZ provisions.</p> <p>6.3.1.6 – The requested RLZ would enable rural living opportunities in an area that can accommodate change.</p> <p>6.3.1.7 - Urban development is not permitted under the requested RLZ provisions. The</p>	<p>The requested RLZ is not within an ONL or ONF.</p> <p>The requested RLZ would enable rural living opportunities in an area that can accommodate change. The limited size of the requested RLZ retains pastoral character of the balance (and majority) of the property. The landscape and visual amenity effects of development within the requested RLZ can be mitigated in this location.</p>	<p>There is no cost to the community.</p>	<p>There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.</p>

<p>requested RLZ avoids ONL and ONF's.</p> <p>6.3.1.8 – This detail can be addressed at the time of development.</p> <p>6.3.1.10 – Forestry activities can be prohibited (through consent notice) at the time of subdivision under the RLZ provisions.</p> <p>6.3.1.11 – The proposal effectively and efficiently achieves this by defining a building restriction area over the more sensitive terrace riser part of the property. This technique has been used (in my view to good effect) in the Wyuna RLZ at Glenorchy.</p> <p>6.3.1.12 – The requested RLZ is not within an ONL or ONF.</p>			
--	--	--	--

**6.3.2 Objective - Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.**

6.3.2.1 Acknowledge that subdivision and development in the rural zones, specifically residential development, has a finite capacity if the District's landscape quality, character and amenity values are to be sustained.

6.3.2.2 Allow residential subdivision and development only in locations where the District's landscape

<p>character and visual amenity would not be degraded.</p> <p>6.3.2.3 Recognise that proposals for residential subdivision or development in the Rural Zone that seek support from existing and consented subdivision or development have potential for adverse cumulative effects. Particularly where the subdivision and development would constitute sprawl along roads.</p> <p>6.3.2.4 Have particular regard to the potential adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values from infill within areas with existing rural lifestyle development or where further subdivision and development would constitute sprawl along roads.</p> <p>6.3.2.5 Ensure incremental changes from subdivision and development do not degrade landscape quality, character or openness as a result of activities associated with mitigation of the visual effects of proposed development such as screening planting, mounding and earthworks.</p>				
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</i> <sup>(a)</sup>	<i>Benefits</i> <sup>(b)</sup>	<i>Costs</i> <sup>(b)</sup>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting</i> <sup>(c)</sup>	
<p>6.3.2.1 – The requested RLZ represents a location where rural landscape values are unlikely to be affected.</p> <p>6.3.2.2 – The requested RLZ is in a location where landscape character and visual amenity would not be degraded.</p> <p>6.3.2.3 – The requested RLZ does not represent sprawl along roads.</p> <p>6.3.2.4 – The requested RLZ has the potential to enhance the valued landscape character of the terrace riser.</p> <p>6.3.2.5 – The</p>	<p>This request represents comprehensive management of the site and the zone change is more effective and efficient method in managing cumulative effects than through resource consent process.</p> <p>The RLZ provides a zone change informed by landscape, engineering and ecological advice that has confirmed it can absorb development.</p> <p>Areas that can't absorb development are given a greater level of protection (i.e. no build areas).</p> <p>Avoids incremental changes.</p>	<p>A cost will be there will be more development in this area than what is currently permitted.</p>	<p>There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.</p>	

requested RLZ is unlikely to degrade the landscape quality, character and openness on an incremental basis.			
---	--	--	--

6.3.4 Objective - Protect, maintain or enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).			
6.3.4.1 Avoid subdivision and development that would degrade the important qualities of the landscape character and amenity, particularly where there is no or little capacity to absorb change.			
6.3.4.2 Recognise that large parts of the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes include working farms and accept that viable farming involves activities which may modify the landscape, providing the quality and character of the Outstanding Natural Landscape is not adversely affected.			
6.3.4.3 Have regard to adverse effects on landscape character, and visual amenity values as viewed from public places, with emphasis on views from formed roads.			
6.3.4.4 The landscape character and amenity values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape are a significant intrinsic, economic and recreational resource, such that large scale renewable electricity generation or new large scale mineral extraction development proposals including windfarm or hydro energy generation are not likely to be compatible with the Outstanding Natural Landscapes of the District.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</i> <sup>(a)</sup>	<i>Benefits</i> <sup>(b)</sup>	<i>Costs</i> <sup>(b)</sup>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting</i> <sup>(c)</sup>
The requested RLZ is not within an ONL or ONF. This objective and associated policies are therefore not relevant.	The requested RLZ is not within an ONL.	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

6.3.5 Objective - Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape character and diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).			
6.3.5.1 Allow subdivision and development only where it will not degrade landscape quality or character, or diminish the visual amenity values identified for any Rural Landscape.			
6.3.5.2 Avoid adverse effects from subdivision and development that are:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly visible from public places and other places which are frequented by members of the public</li> </ul>			

<p>generally (except any trail as defined in this Plan); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visible from public roads.</li> </ul> <p>6.3.5.3 Avoid planting and screening, particularly along roads and boundaries, which would degrade openness where such openness is an important part of the landscape quality or character.</p> <p>6.3.5.4 Encourage any landscaping to be sustainable and consistent with the established character of the area.</p> <p>6.3.5.5 Encourage development to utilise shared accesses and infrastructure, to locate within the parts of the site where they will be least visible, and have the least disruption to the landform and rural character.</p> <p>6.3.5.6 Have regard to the adverse effects from subdivision and development on the open landscape character where it is open at present.</p>			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</i> <sup>(a)</sup>	<i>Benefits</i> <sup>(b)</sup>	<i>Costs</i> <sup>(b)</sup>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting</i> <sup>(c)</sup>
<p>6.3.5.1 – The requested RLZ represents a location where there is capacity to absorb change. The proposal is therefore an efficient and effective method of achieving this policy.</p> <p>6.3.5.2 – Any adverse effects can be avoided through appropriate subdivision design under the RLZ provisions.</p> <p>6.3.5.3 – This detail is best achieved at the time of subdivision.</p> <p>6.3.5.4 – This detail is best achieved at the time of subdivision.</p> <p>6.3.5.6 -</p>	<p>The requested RLZ seeks to locate development where it can be absorbed and where landscape and amenity will not be degraded, and provides a rural living environment.</p> <p>The visual effects, in Mr Espies opinion, will be slight.</p>	<p>There is no significant cost to the community.</p>	<p>There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policies.</p>



- 9.8** Chapter 22 of the PDP contains the Objectives, Policies and rules relevant to the RLZ of the District. The purpose of these zones are detailed below:

*“The Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones provide residential living opportunities on the periphery of urban areas and within specific locations amidst the Rural zone. In both zones a minimum allotment size is necessary to maintain the character and quality of the zones and, where applicable, a buffer edge between urban areas, or the open space, rural and natural landscape values of the surrounding Rural Zone.*

*While development is anticipated in the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones, the district is subject to natural hazards and, where applicable, it is anticipated that development will recognise and manage the risks of natural hazards at the time of subdivision or the identification of building platforms. Some areas such as Makarora have been identified and provisions are provided to manage natural hazards at these locations.”*

- 9.9** Specifically the purpose of the RLZ is:

*“The Rural Lifestyle zone provides for rural living opportunities, having a development density of one residential unit per hectare with an overall density of one residential unit per two hectares across a subdivision. Building platforms are identified at the time of subdivision to manage the sprawl of buildings, manage adverse effects on landscape values and to manage other identified constraints such as natural hazards and servicing. The potential adverse effects of buildings are controlled by height, colour and lighting standards.*

...

*Many of the Rural Lifestyle zones are located within sensitive parts of the district’s distinctive landscapes. While residential development is anticipated within these zones, provisions are included to manage the visual prominence of buildings, control residential density and generally discourage commercial activities. Building location is controlled by the identification of building platforms, bulk and location standards and, where required, design and landscaping controls imposed at the time of subdivision.”*

- 9.10** The objectives and policies relevant to the JBIL submission are assessed as per below:

**22.2.1 Objective - Maintain and enhance the district’s landscape quality, character and visual amenity values while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from those landscapes.**

- 22.2.1.1 Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines.
- 22.2.1.2 Set minimum density and building coverage standards so the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District’s distinctive landscapes are not reduced.
- 22.2.1.3 Allow for flexibility of the density provisions, where design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision and residential development, roading and planting would enhance the character of the zone and the District’s landscapes.
- 22.2.1.4 Manage anticipated activities that are located near Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes so that they do not diminish the qualities of these landscapes and their importance as part of the District’s landscapes.
- 22.2.1.5 Maintain and enhance landscape values by controlling the colour, scale, location and height of permitted buildings and in certain locations or circumstances require landscaping and vegetation controls.
- 22.2.1.6 Have regard to the location and direction of lights so they do not cause glare to other properties, roads, public places or the night sky.
- 22.2.1.7 Have regard to fire risk from vegetation and the potential risk to people and buildings, when assessing subdivision, development and any landscaping.

<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness <sup>(a)</sup></i>	<i>Benefits <sup>(b)</sup></i>	<i>Costs <sup>(b)</sup></i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting <sup>(c)</sup></i>
<p>Policy 22.2.1.1 – The requested RLZ provisions ensure that buildings will be avoid on prominent slopes (including the no building area over the terrace riser), ridges and skylines.</p> <p>Policy 22.2.1.2 - The requested RLZ has provisions controlling the level of development.</p>	<p>Benefits to the community include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Land available for rural lifestyle opportunities.</li> <li>○ Construction work.</li> <li>○ Possibility of land for a community reticulated wastewater scheme.</li> <li>○ Other employment opportunities.</li> <li>○ Revegetation of</li> </ul>	<p>There is no cost to the community.</p>	<p>There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policies.</p>

<p>Policy 22.2.1.3 - Opportunity exists to employ innovative design techniques, especially in relation to the terrace riser and its protection as a whole.</p> <p>Policy 22.2.1.4 – The effects of development can be efficiently and effectively managed so they do not diminish the importance of the adjoining ONL.</p> <p>Policy 22.2.1.5 - Landscape values will be efficiently and effectively maintained through design controls and specific building heights.</p> <p>Policy 16.3.1.8 – Conditions can be efficiently and effectively imposed on subdivision or land use consent to ensure fire risk is had regard to.</p>	<p>the terrace riser.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Increased level of development while retaining landscape values through location of the zone and proposed provisions (i.e. controls on colour, planting, design etc)</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

22.2.2 Objective - Ensure the predominant land uses are rural, residential and where appropriate, visitor and community activities.			
22.2.2.1 Provide for residential and farming as permitted activities, and recognise that depending on the location, scale and type, community activities may be compatible with and enhance the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle Zones.			
22.2.2.2 Any development, including subdivision located on the periphery of residential and township areas, shall avoid undermining the integrity of the urban rural edge and where applicable, the urban growth boundaries.			
22.2.2.3 Discourage commercial and non-residential activities, including restaurants, visitor accommodation and industrial activities, so that the amenity, quality and character of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones are not diminished and the vitality of the District's commercial zones is not undermined.			
22.2.2.4 Encourage visitor accommodation only within the specified visitor accommodation subzone areas and control the scale and intensity of these activities.			
22.2.2.5 The bulk, scale and intensity of buildings used for visitor accommodation activities are to be commensurate with the anticipated development of the zone and surrounding residential activities.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
<p>Policy 22.2.2.1 - Residential development can be efficiently and effectively enabled through the requested RLZ .</p> <p>Policy 22.2.2.2 – The requested RLZ does not form a urban edge.</p> <p>Policy 22.2.2.3 to 5 – The RLZ provisions controls these matters through rules.</p>	Residential development can be efficiently and effectively enabled through the requested RLZ .	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policies.

<b>22.2.3.1 Parts of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones have been, and might be identified in the future as susceptible to natural hazards and some areas may not be appropriate for residential activity if the natural hazard risk cannot be adequately managed.</b>			
22.2.3.1 Parts of the Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones have been, and might be identified in the future as susceptible to natural hazards and some areas may not be appropriate for residential activity if the natural hazard risk cannot be adequately managed.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
JBILs submission includes an engineering report that concludes natural hazard impacting the subject site are very low.	Residential activities can occur unimpeded.	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policy.

<b>22.2.4 Objective - Ensure new development does not exceed available capacities for servicing and infrastructure.</b>			
22.2.4.1 Discourage new development that requires servicing and infrastructure at an adverse cost to the community.			
22.2.4.2 Ensure traffic generated by new development does not compromise road safety or efficiency.			
<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
Policy 22.2.4.1 – The costs of servicing the development will not be at the expense of the community. Policy 22.2.4.2 – The level of traffic generated by the proposal can efficiently and effectively be	The development will accommodate rural living dwellings without impacting adversely on the community by imposing servicing costs, or increasing traffic volumes beyond the carrying capacity of the surrounding roads.	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policies.

absorbed into the existing roading network.			
---	--	--	--

**22.2.5 Objective - Manage situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated rural activities.**

22.2.5.1 Recognise existing and permitted activities, including activities within the surrounding Rural Zone might result in effects such as odour, noise, dust and traffic generation that are established, or reasonably expected to occur and will be noticeable to residents and visitors in rural areas.

<i>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness (a)</i>	<i>Benefits (b)</i>	<i>Costs (b)</i>	<i>Risk Acting/Not Acting (c)</i>
Future residents live in this environment recognising that there will at times be effects from surrounding farming activities.	Farming activities continuing to occur in surroundings land. Potential for future residents buy in to the land management of the wider station (such as Closeburn Station in the Wakatipu basin).	There is no cost to the community.	There is no uncertainty or insufficient information regarding this objective and policies.

9.11 Overall, given the above analysis, it is considered the requested RLZ is an effective and efficient means to achieving the relevant objectives of the PDP.

## 10. The Section 42A Report and Recommendation

10.1 The section 42A report was received on 22 March 2017. Mr Barr addresses the JBIL submission at page 75 to 80 of the report of the report entitles “Group 3 Rural”. Mr Barr’s overall recommendation is to reject the submission for the following reason:

*“The PDP Rural Zone is more appropriate than the requested rezoning of Rural Lifestyle over the area because the Rural Zone has the most appropriate provisions to manage the wide variety of effects that are possible from rural living.”*

- 10.2** This is, in my opinion, is a very unusual statement for the reason that the purpose of the Rural Lifestyle zones is to provide residential living opportunities amidst the Rural zone. The Rural zone, on the other hand, discourages rural living activities even in the lowest level RLC. I therefore disagree that the Rural Zone has the most appropriate provisions to manage the “wide variety of effects that are possible from rural living”. In this case the effects, as concluded in Mr Barr’s report, are primarily contained to landscape and visual amenity effects. He raises little concern with indigenous vegetation, infrastructure, and traffic effects.
- 10.3** On Page 77 of the Section 42a report Mr Barr has shown a green area which he purports to represent the area sought to be rezoned. I note that the area coloured green is inaccurate and the Hearings Panel should place no weight on that map. The requested RLZ is shown on the plans attached to the submission and lies to the north (vertically) of the area coloured green.
- 10.4** At paragraph 16.1 Mr Barr states the submission seeks to rezone 71.2ha from Rural Zone to RL Zone, with an additional 22 hectares of no build zone to be rezoned from Rural Zone to RL Zone. With respect, this is not correct. The submission seeks to rezone 71.6 ha of land from Rural Zone to RL Zone. Of that 71.6 hectares, 22 hectares proposed to have a no build overlay on the requested RLZ. Such an approach is common in the RLZ including the new Wyuna RLZ in Glenorchy. The 22 hectares is not in addition to the 71.6 hectares as is implied by Mr Barr.
- 10.5** At paragraph 16.2 Mr Barr states that the “net developable” area would be 49.2 hectares and has been assessed in the submission documents as capable of yielding twenty five RL allotments. That information was taken from the Hadley Engineering report attached to the submission. I note that the “*net developable*” area as sought by the text of the submission is 71.6 hectares which would be capable of yielding, in my experience, at least twenty nine RL allotments (which I calculate as  $71.6 \text{ ha} \times 0.8 \text{ (development factor)} / 2 \text{ ha average} = 28.64$ ). To limit the net yield to 25 rural lifestyle allotments requires the inclusion of a specific rule, which I recommend below.
- 10.6** At paragraph 16.3 Mr Barr states that the “*site is within an ONL*”. That is incorrect. While parts of the station fall within the ONL, the requested RLZ is not within the ONL. Please refer to the plan attached to my evidence as **Attachment CV1**. I note Mr Barr’s confusion on this point may be compounded by the fact that he identified a green shaded area in “*the general area sought to be rezoned*” on the aerial photograph on page 77 of his report in the incorrect location. (I note his green shaded area is within the ONL).
- 10.7** At paragraphs 16.6 to 16.8 Mr Barr discusses landscape issues related to the submission, drawing on the

conclusions of Ms Mellsop. Importantly at paragraph 16.8 Mr Barr states that Ms Mellsop concludes that while there is some capacity to absorb development in this area, the development as proposed would be inappropriate from a landscape perspective. With respect, that is not exactly what Ms Mellsop concludes. At paragraph 8.72 Ms Mellsop states:

*“In my view, while the rezoning area may have some capacity to absorb sensitively designed development that is screened from the wider basin by landform, the proposed Rural Lifestyle zoning of the site would be inappropriate from a landscape perspective. I therefore oppose the rezonings sought by the submission.”*

**10.8** I consider both Mr Barr and Ms Mellsop are confusing a request to zone land as part of the District Plan Review with actual development (which at this stage is not proposed). Having accepted that the requested RLZ *“has some capacity to absorb sensitively designed development”* the question then becomes how does the District Plan ensure that occurs. Both Mr Barr and Ms Mellsop have, in my opinion, failed to complete this important step in the process, instead taking the ‘easy road’ by relying on a (in my opinion) contradictory statement that the *“... Rural Lifestyle zoning of the site would be inappropriate from a landscape perspective.”*

**10.9** RLZ is not *laissez-faire* (i.e. policy of non-interference). It is a highly regulated zone, particularly with respect to subdivision including the identification of residential building platforms, in addition to the imposition of a minimum and average allotment size for the zone. Such controls are succinctly outlined in Part 221. Zone Purpose as follows:

*“The Rural Lifestyle zone provides for rural living opportunities, having a development density of one residential unit per hectare with an overall density of one residential unit per two hectares across a subdivision. Building platforms are identified at the time of subdivision to manage the sprawl of buildings, manage adverse effects on landscape values and to manage other identified constraints such as natural hazards and servicing. The potential adverse effects of buildings are controlled by height, colour and lighting standards.*

...

*Many of the Rural Lifestyle zones are located within sensitive parts of the district’s distinctive landscapes. While residential development is anticipated within these zones, provisions are included to manage the visual prominence of buildings, control residential density and generally discourage commercial activities. Building location is controlled by the identification of building platforms, bulk and location standards and, where required, design and landscaping controls imposed at the time of subdivision.”*

**10.10** Importantly, in my view, is Part 22.3.1 of the PDP which draws attention to District Wide Chapters, including Chapter 3 Strategic Direction and Chapter 6 Landscapes. I note that Rule 6.4.1.2 states that the landscape categories apply only to the Rural Zone, but the Landscape Chapter and Strategic Direction Chapter’s objectives and policies are relevant and applicable in all zones where landscape values are at



issue. As such, I consider the following Strategic and Landscape Objectives and Policies are relevant to the consideration of development under the requested RL Zone:

- Objective 3.2.4.1 and associated policies.
- Objective 3.2.5.3 and associated policies.
- Objective 3.2.5.4 and associated policies.
- Objective 3.2.5.5 and associated policies.
- Objective 6.3.2 and associated policies.
- Objective 6.3.7 and associated policies.
- Objective 6.3.8 and associated policies.

**10.11** I also note, that in considering these Objectives and policies Rule 6.4.1.1 states that the term 'subdivision and development' includes subdivision, identification of building platforms, any buildings and associated activities such as roading, earthworks, lighting, landscaping, planting and boundary fencing and access / gateway structures. This illustrates the Council's broad control under the RLZ provisions. I acknowledge that the RLZ does enable a greater level of development than the Rural Zone, but in my opinion, this is appropriate given that it is recognised by Ms Melsop, Mr Smith and Mr Espie that the site has 'some' capacity for rural living development.

**10.12** In addition to the Chapter 3 Strategic Directions and Chapter 6 landscape Objectives and Policies, there are also landscape based objectives and policies in Chapter 22 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle of the plan. Of particular relevance to development within the RLZ is Objective 22.2.1 and associated policies which state:

***"22.2.1 Objective - Maintain and enhance the district's landscape quality, character and visual amenity values while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can avoid detracting from those landscapes.***

***Policies***

*22.2.1.1 Ensure the visual prominence of buildings is avoided, particularly development and associated earthworks on prominent slopes, ridges and skylines.*

*22.2.1.2 Set minimum density and building coverage standards so the open space, natural and rural qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are not reduced.*

*22.2.1.3 Allow for flexibility of the density provisions, where design-led and innovative patterns of subdivision and residential development, roading and planting would enhance the character of the zone and the District's landscapes.*

*22.2.1.4 Manage anticipated activities that are located near Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes so that they do not diminish the qualities of these landscapes and their importance as part of the District's landscapes.*

*22.2.1.5 Maintain and enhance landscape values by controlling the colour, scale, location and height of permitted buildings and in certain locations or circumstances require landscaping and vegetation controls.*

*22.2.1.6 Have regard to the location and direction of lights so they do not cause glare to other*

*properties, roads, public places or the night sky.*  
22.2.1.7 *Have regard to fire risk from vegetation and the potential risk to people and buildings, when assessing subdivision, development and any landscaping.”*

**10.13** In my opinion the requested RLZ provides effective control over landscape and visual amenity values that address the concerns raised by Mr Barr and Ms Mellsop. I do consider the Chapter 22 Rural Lifestyle rules and Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development objectives, policies and rules could be further strengthened in terms of landscape and ecological restoration (similar to those proposed by Council within respect to the Wyuna Rural Lifestyle Zone) as follows:

(1) Amend 22.3.210 as follows:

**“22.3.2.10** *In addition to Tables 1 and 2, the following standards apply to the areas specified:*

*Table 3: Rural Lifestyle Deferred and Buffer Zones*

*Table 4: Rural Residential Zone at Forest Hill.*

*Table 5: Rural Residential Bob’s Cove and Sub Zone.*

*Table 6: Ferry Hill Rural Residential Sub Zone.*

*Table 7: Wyuna Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.*

*Table 8: Criffel Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.”*

(2) Insert a new Table 8 as follows:

<b>Table 8</b>	<b>Criffel Station Rural Lifestyle Zone</b>	<b>Non-compliance Status</b>
<b>22.5.39</b>	<b>Building Height</b> The maximum height for any building is 6.0 metres.	NC

(3) The insertion of a new objective and policy in Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development as follows (note I have used 27.7.10 numbering which is reserved for the Stage 2 Industrial B zone):

**“27.7.10 Objective - Criffel Station Rural Lifestyle Zone – To provide for a limited (in terms of total yield) Rural Lifestyle Zone on the terraces to the south of Mt Barker Road.**

*Policies*

*27.7.10.1 Enable a maximum of 25 residential building platforms and/or Rural Lifestyle allotments within the Criffel Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.*

*27.7.10.2 Avoid exceeding the maximum specified in Policy 27.7.10.1.*

*27.7.10.3 The subdivision design, identification of building platforms and associated mitigation measures shall ensure that built form and associated activities within the zone are reasonably inconspicuous when viewed from State Highway 6 to the north. Measures to achieve this shall include:*

- Prohibiting development over the sensitive areas of the zone via building restriction areas;*
- Appropriately locating buildings within the zone, including restrictions on future building bulk;*

- *Using native vegetation to assist visual screening of development;*
- *The maximum height of buildings shall be 6m above ground level prior to any subdivision development.*

27.7.10.3 *Maintain and enhance the indigenous vegetation and ecosystems within the building restriction areas of the zone and to suitably and comprehensively maintain these areas into the future. As a minimum, this shall include:*

- *Methods to remove or kill existing wilding exotic trees and weed species from the lower banks of the zone area and to conduct this eradication annually;*
- *Methods to exclude and/or suitably manage pests within the zone in order to foster growth of indigenous vegetation within the zone, on an ongoing basis;*
- *A programme or list of maintenance work to be carried out on a year to year basis in order to bring about the goals set out above.”*

(4) The insertion of a new rule Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development as follows:

**“27.8.10 Criffel Station Rural Lifestyle Zone**

27.8.10.1 *There shall be no more than 25 residential building platforms and/or Rural Lifestyle allotments within the Criffel Station Rural Lifestyle Zone.”*

10.14 I note that under Rule 27.8.1 non-compliance with this standard would require non-complying resource consent.

## 11. Part II of the RMA.

11.1 It is my understanding that under the *King Salmon* decision a board overall judgement under Part II of the RMA is not required in the consideration of JBILs submission.

11.2 In case I am wrong on this point, I confirm for the reasons I have expressed in this evidence, that the requested RLZ does, in my opinion, achieve sustainable management in the context of the relevant planning documents and the RMA.

## 12. Conclusion.

12.1 The Chapter 6 Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle provisions anticipate that there will be development in areas where the landscape can accommodate change. The subject site is, in my opinion, one of those areas for the following reasons:

- (a) The subject site can be fully serviced (refer Hadley Consulting report);
- (b) The risk of natural hazards impacting the subject site is assessed as very low (refer Hadley Consulting report);
- (c) Traffic effects are assessed as minor (42A report);
- (d) Ecological values can be addressed at the time of subdivision (refer new policy I have recommended);
- (e) The location of the requested RLZ is not as sensitive to change as many locations within the Rural Zone; the landscape and visual effects will be well mitigated; and there is considerable logic to the proposal in terms of landscape planning (Relying on the evidence of Mr Espie).

**12.2** The requested RLZ provides for, in my opinion, a comprehensive approach to the future management of Criffel Station. Similar management (including RLZ) occurs in other high country stations in the Wakatipu Basin such as Closeburn and Wyuna. The management of those stations are seen as model examples throughout New Zealand.

**12.3** I consider the requested RLZ is the most appropriate method to manage the resource management issues for this particular site.

# Attachment CV1 – ONL boundary and requested RLZ overlay



## Attachment CV2 – Relevant RPS Objectives and Policies

### **4. Mana Whenua**

4.4.3 Wai (Water) To recognise the principle of wairua and mauri in the management of Otago's water bodies.

4.4.5 Kaitiakitanga (Guardianship) To incorporate the concept and spirit of kaitiakitanga in the management of Otago's natural and physical resources in a way consistent with the values of Kai Tahu.

### **5.4 Land – Objectives**

5.4.1 To promote the sustainable management of Otago's land resources in order: (a) To maintain and enhance the primary productive capacity and life-supporting capacity of land resources; and (b) To meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's people and communities.

5.4.2 To avoid, remedy or mitigate degradation of Otago's natural and physical resources resulting from activities utilising the land resource.

5.4.3 To protect Otago's outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

### **5.5 Land - Policies**

5.5.4 To promote the diversification and use of Otago's land resource to achieve sustainable landuse and management systems for future generations.

5.5.6 To recognise and provide for the protection of Otago's outstanding natural features and landscapes which:

- (a) Are unique to or characteristic of the region; or
- (b) Are representative of a particular landform or land cover occurring in the Otago region or of the collective characteristics which give Otago its particular character; or
- (c) Represent areas of cultural or historic significance in Otago; or
- (d) Contain visually or scientifically significant geological features; or
- (e) Have characteristics of cultural, historical and spiritual value that are regionally significant for Tangata Whenua and have been identified in accordance with Tikanga Maori.

### **6.4 Water - Objectives**

6.4.2 To maintain and enhance the quality of Otago's water resources in order to meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's communities.

### **6.5 Water - Policies**

6.5.1 To recognise and provide for the relationship Kai Tahu have with the water resource in Otago through:

- (a) Working toward eliminating human waste and other pollutants from entering all water bodies; and
- (b) Consulting with Kai Tahu over any application that would result in the mixing of waters from different water bodies and the setting of water flows and levels.

### **9. 4 Built Environment – Objectives**

9.4.1 To promote the sustainable management of Otago's built environment in order to:

- (a) Meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's people and communities; and
- (b) Provide for amenity values, and
- (c) Conserve and enhance environmental and landscape quality; and
- (d) Recognise and protect heritage values.

9.4.2 To promote the sustainable management of Otago's infrastructure to meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's communities.

9.4.3 To avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of Otago's built environment on Otago's natural and physical resources.

### **9.5 Built Environment - Policies**

9.5.2 To promote and encourage efficiency in the development and use of Otago's infrastructure through:

- (a) Encouraging development that maximises the use of existing infrastructure while recognising the need for more appropriate technology; and
- (b) Promoting co-ordination amongst network utility operators in the provision and maintenance of infrastructure; and
- (c) Encouraging a reduction in the use of nonrenewable resources while promoting the use of renewable resources in the construction, development and use of infrastructure; and
- (d) Avoiding or mitigating the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development of land on the safety and efficiency of regional infrastructure.

9.5.4 To minimise the adverse effects of urban development and settlement, including structures, on Otago's environment through avoiding, remedying or mitigating:

- (a) Discharges of contaminants to Otago's air, water or land; and
- (b) The creation of noise, vibration and dust; and
- (c) Visual intrusion and a reduction in landscape qualities; and
- (d) Significant irreversible effects on:
  - (i) Otago community values; or
  - (ii) Kai Tahu cultural and spiritual values; or
  - (iii) The natural character of water bodies and the coastal environment; or
  - (iv) Habitats of indigenous fauna; or
  - (v) Heritage values; or
  - (vi) Amenity values; or
  - (vii) Intrinsic values of ecosystems;

9.5.5 To maintain and, where practicable, enhance the quality of life for people and communities within Otago's built environment through:

- (a) Promoting the identification and provision of a level of amenity which is acceptable to the community; and
- (b) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects on community health and safety resulting from the use, development and protection of Otago's natural and physical resources; and
- (c) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of subdivision, landuse and development on landscape values.

### **10.4 Biota – Objectives**

10.4.1 To maintain and enhance the life-supporting capacity and diversity of Otago's biota.

10.4.2 To protect Otago's natural ecosystems and primary production from significant biological and natural threats.

10.4.3 To maintain and enhance the natural character of areas with significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.

### **10.5 Biota - Policies**

10.5.3 To reduce and where practicable eliminate the adverse effects of plant and animal pests on Otago's communities and natural and physical resources through:

- (a) Developing strategies to effectively manage Otago's plant and animal pests; and
- (b) Educating about the responsibilities of all parties in the management of Otago's plant and animal pests; and
- (c) Adopting the most practicable method of pest control while safeguarding the environment.

### **11.4 Natural Hazards – Objectives**

11.4.1 To recognise and understand the significant natural hazards that threaten Otago's communities and features.

11.4.2 To avoid or mitigate the adverse effects of natural hazards within Otago to acceptable levels.

### **11.5 – Natural Hazards – Policies**

11.5.2 To take action necessary to avoid or mitigate the unacceptable adverse effect of natural hazards and the responses to natural hazards on:

- (a) Human life; and
- (b) Infrastructure and property; and
- (c) Otago's natural environment; and (d) Otago's heritage sites.

11.5.3 To restrict development on sites or areas recognised as being prone to significant hazards, unless adequate mitigation can be provided.

#### **13.4 Wastes & Hazardous Substances – Objectives**

13.4.1 To protect Otago's communities, environment and natural resources from the adverse effects of the waste stream.

13.4.2 To encourage a reduction in the amount, range and type of waste generated in Otago.

13.4.4 To minimise the risks to people and the wider environment arising from existing contaminated sites, and the storage, use, transportation and disposal of hazardous substances.

13.5.1 To recognise and provide for the relationship Kai Tahu have with natural and physical resources when managing Otago's waste stream through: (a) Providing for the management and disposal of Otago's waste stream in a manner that takes into account Kai Tahu cultural values; and (b) Working towards eliminating human wastes and other pollutants from entering Otago's waterways

13.5.7 To address the adverse effects of past waste disposal practices through:

- (a) Identifying sites of old landfills, hazardous substance dumps or contamination within Otago; and
- (b) Determining any adverse effects arising from those sites and requiring the remedying or mitigation of any adverse effects..



## Attachment CV3 – Relevant RPSDV Objectives and Policies

**Objective 2.1** *The principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi are taken into account in resource management processes and*

**Policy 2.1.2** *Treaty principles Ensure that local authorities exercise their functions and powers, by:*

- a) *Recognising Kāi Tahu's status as a Treaty partner; and*
- b) *Involving Kāi Tahu in resource management processes implementation;*
- c) *Taking into account Kāi Tahu values in resource management decision-making processes and implementation;*
- d) *Recognising and providing for the relationship of Kāi Tahu's culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taoka;*
- e) *Ensuring Kāi Tahu have the ability to: i. Identify their relationship with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taoka; ii. Determine how best to express that relationship;*
- f) *Having particular regard to the exercise of kaitiakitaka; g) Ensuring that district and regional plans:*
  - i. *Give effect to the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998;*
  - ii. *Recognise and provide for statutory acknowledgement areas in Schedule 2;*
  - iii. *Provide for other areas in Otago that are recognised as significant to Kāi Tahu;*
- h) *Taking into account iwi management plans.*

**Objective 2.2** *Kāi Tahu values, interests and customary resources are recognised and provided for*

**Policy 2.2.1** *Kāi Tahu wellbeing Manage the natural environment to support Kāi Tahu wellbeing by all of the following:*

- a) *Ensuring the sustainable management of resources supports their customary uses and cultural values in Schedules 1A and B;*
- b) *Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of natural resources.*

**Objective 3.1** *The values of Otago's natural resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced decisions*

**Policy 3.1.1** *Fresh water Manage fresh water to achieve all of the following:*

- a) *Maintain or enhance ecosystem health in all Otago aquifers, and rivers, lakes, wetlands, and their margins;*
- b) *Maintain or enhance the range and extent of habitats provided by fresh water, including the habitat of trout and salmon;*
- c) *Recognise and provide for the migratory patterns of freshwater species, unless detrimental to indigenous biological diversity;*
- d) *Avoid aquifer compaction and seawater intrusion in aquifers;*
- e) *Maintain good water quality, including in the coastal marine area, or enhance it where it has been degraded;*
- f) *Maintain or enhance coastal values;*
- g) *Maintain or enhance the natural functioning of rivers, lakes, and wetlands, their riparian margins, and aquifers;*
- h) *Maintain or enhance the quality and reliability of existing drinking and stock water supplies;*
- i) *Recognise and provide for important recreation values;*
- j) *Maintain or enhance the amenity and landscape values of rivers, lakes, and wetlands;*
- k) *Control the adverse effects of pest species, prevent their introduction and reduce their spread;*
- l) *Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of natural hazards, including flooding and erosion;*
- m) *Avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on existing infrastructure that is reliant on fresh water.*

**Policy 3.1.3** *Water allocation and use* Ensure the efficient allocation and use of water by undertaking all of the following:

- a) Requiring that the volume of water allocated does not exceed what is necessary for its efficient use;
- b) Encouraging the development or upgrade of infrastructure that increases use efficiency.

**Policy 3.1.10** *Natural features, landscapes, and seascapes* Recognise the values of natural features, landscapes and seascapes are derived from the biophysical, sensory and associative attributes in Schedule 3.

**Objective 3.2** *Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced*

**Policy 3.2.5** *Identifying highly valued natural features, landscapes and seascapes* Identify natural features, landscapes and seascapes, which are highly valued for their contribution to the amenity or quality of the environment but which are not outstanding, using the attributes in Schedule 3.

**Policy 3.2.6** *Managing highly valued natural features, landscapes and seascapes* Protect or enhance highly valued natural features, landscapes and seascapes by all of the following:

- a) Avoiding significant adverse effects on those values which contribute to the high value of the natural feature, landscape or seascape;
- b) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects;
- c) Recognising and providing for positive contributions of existing introduced species to those values;
- d) Controlling the adverse effects of pest species, preventing their introduction and reducing their spread;
- e) Encouraging enhancement of those values which contribute to the high value of the natural feature, landscape or seascape.

**Objective 4.1** *Risk that natural hazards pose to Otago's communities are minimized*

**Policy 4.1.1** *Identifying natural hazards* Identify natural hazards that may adversely affect Otago's communities, including hazards of low likelihood and high consequence by considering all of the following:

- a) Hazard type and characteristics;
- b) Multiple and cascading hazards;
- c) Cumulative effects, including from multiple hazards with different risks;
- d) Effects of climate change;
- e) Using the best available information for calculating likelihood;
- f) Exacerbating factors.

**Policy 4.1.2** *Natural hazard likelihood* Using the best available information, assess the likelihood of natural hazard events occurring, over no less than 100 years. :

**Policy 4.1.3** *Natural hazard consequence* Assess the consequences of natural hazard events, by considering all of the following:

- a) The nature of activities in the area;
- b) Individual and community vulnerability;
- c) Impacts on individual and community health and safety; d) Impacts on social, cultural and economic wellbeing;
- e) Impacts on infrastructure and property, including access and services; f) Risk reduction and hazard mitigation measures;
- g) Lifeline utilities, essential and emergency services, and their co-dependence; h) Implications for civil defence agencies and emergency services;
- i) Cumulative effects;
- j) Factors that may exacerbate a hazard event.

**Policy 4.1.4** *Assessing activities for natural hazard risk* Assess activities for natural hazard risk to people and communities, by considering all of the following:

- a) The natural hazard risk identified, including residual risk;
- b) Any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate those risks, including relocation and recovery methods;
- c) The long term viability and affordability of those measures;
- d) Flow on effects of the risk to other activities, individuals and communities;

e) The availability of, and ability to provide, lifeline utilities, and essential and emergency services, during and after a natural hazard event.

**Policy 4.1.5** *Natural hazard risk Manage natural hazard risk to people and communities, with particular regard to all of the following:*

- a) *The risk posed, considering the likelihood and consequences of natural hazard events;*
- b) *The implications of residual risk, including the risk remaining after implementing or undertaking risk reduction and hazard mitigation measures;*
- c) *The community's tolerance of that risk, now and in the future, including the community's ability and willingness to prepare for and adapt to that risk, and respond to an event;*
- d) *The changing nature of tolerance to risk;*
- e) *Sensitivity of activities to risk.*

**Policy 4.1.6** *Avoiding increased natural hazard risk Manage natural hazard risk to people and communities by both:*

- a) *Avoiding activities that significantly increase risk including displacement of risk off-site; and*
- b) *Avoiding activities that increase risk in areas potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years.*

**Objective 4.3** *Infrastructure is managed and developed in a sustainable way*

**Policy 4.3.1** *Managing infrastructure activities Manage infrastructure activities, to achieve all of the following:*

- a) *Maintaining or enhancing the health and safety of the community;*
- b) *Avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects of those activities on existing land uses, including cumulative adverse effects on natural and physical resources;*
- c) *Supporting economic, social and community activities;*
- d) *Improving efficiency of use of natural resources;*
- e) *Protecting infrastructure corridors for infrastructure needs, now and for the future;*
- f) *Increasing the ability of communities to respond and adapt to emergencies, and disruptive or natural hazard events;*
- g) *Protecting the functional and operational requirements of lifeline utilities and essential or emergency services.*

**Objective 4.4** *Energy supplies to Otago's communities are secure and sustainable*

**Objective 5.3** *Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production*

**Policy 5.3.1** *Rural activities Manage activities in rural areas, to support the region's economy and communities, by all of the following:*

- a) *Enabling primary production and other rural activities that support the rural economy;*
- b) *Minimising the loss of significant soils;*
- c) *Restricting the establishment of activities in rural areas that may lead to reverse sensitivity effects;*
- d) *Minimising the subdivision of productive rural land into smaller lots that may result in rural residential activities;*
- e) *Providing for other activities that have a functional need to locate in rural areas, including tourism and recreational activities that are of a nature and scale compatible with rural activities.*