

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

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

ON BEHALF OF **HERON INVESTMENTS LIMITED**
Submitter (31014)

**SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF JESSICA MCKENZIE
(LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT)**

29th JULY 2020

- 1 The relief that is sought enables a node of development associated with rural visitor activities within the site that would consist of general farming activities, visitor's accommodation, commercial activities ancillary to the visitor's accommodation, and built form, including staff accommodation.
- 2 A landscape sensitivity map submitted with my primary evidence identified areas of high landscape sensitivity, areas of moderate-high landscape sensitivity, and areas of low landscape sensitivity. I understand that the built form will be non-complying within the high landscape sensitivity area, discretionary within the moderate-high landscape sensitivity area, and controlled within the low landscape sensitivity area. I consider that the Maungawera RVZ can absorb development associated with the RVZ without compromising the landscape character or visual amenity values of the site and its surroundings, particularly within the low landscape sensitivity area due to visual containment and existing landscape character.
- 3 Subsequent to my Statement of Evidence, the landscape sensitivity areas have been further refined. The refinement is in response to Ms Grace's and Mr Jones' rebuttal evidence. Mr Jones raised concerns about the extent of the low landscape sensitivity area in relation to the proposed controls, and the proximity of the low landscape sensitivity area to the edge of the escarpment. The landscape sensitivity map has been updated to include a 25m setback from the edge of the escarpment and the identification of seven activity areas (activity areas A-G) within the low sensitivity landscape area. An updated map of the site, including the setback and activity areas, is attached to Ms Macdonald's Legal Submission.
- 4 The activity areas have been identified to restrict built form to specific locations within the low sensitivity landscape area and give a clear idea of where development will be concentrated. The activity areas were largely informed by the location of consented rural visitor activities, future activities envisaged by the landowner and to some extent the topography of the site. To ensure development is appropriate in scale, a combined total maximum ground floor area of buildings is proposed for each area. These are summarised in Mr Vivian's summary of evidence.
- 5 I stand by my primary evidence and consider that the site has the capacity to absorb additional development as enabled by the Maungawera RVZ. The development anticipated by the revised proposal is more refined, with more controls on built form than the proposed relief assessed in my primary evidence. As such, lesser effects are anticipated than those assessed in my primary evidence. I consider that the development enabled by the currently proposed relief can comfortably be absorbed without inappropriate effects on landscape character or visual amenity.