

**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** **LOCH LINNHE STATION**  
Submitter (31013)

---

**SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF BENJAMIN ESPIE**  
**(LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT)**  
**28<sup>th</sup> JULY 2020**

---

- 1 The amended relief that is sought would enable two nodes of development that would consist of farm activities and farm-associated tourism activity, much of which would require discretionary activity resource consent. The station is held by pastoral lease and no tenure review process is in motion, nor is one intended.
- 2 For clarity, the provision that requires that no built form is visible from SH6 applies to all development within the proposed Wye Creek RVZ area (i.e. the northern area). The proposed maximum built footprint of 1800m<sup>2</sup> is a maximum for the entire Wye Creek RVZ (i.e. both sensitivity categories combined). I understand that a breach of this maximum would comprise a non-complying activity. Similarly, the proposed maximum built footprint of 4,700m<sup>2</sup> is a maximum for the entire Loch Linnhe RVZ area (i.e. the southern area) and includes existing buildings.
- 3 A significant part of each of the two proposed RVZ areas is mapped as being of Moderate-High Landscape Sensitivity, such that development within these areas is fully discretionary. The exceptions are a 1,750m<sup>2</sup> area of flatter terrace landform within the Wye Creek RVZ area, and the part of the Loch Linnhe RVZ area that accommodates the numerous buildings and associated activity of the existing farm base area.
- 4 The clusters of activity enabled by the proposed zone would be discrete and would be located on small watercourse fans that accommodate improved pasture. Such fans are traditional locations for homestead farm base activities for stations that abut Lake Wakatipu's edge (indeed the southern of the two locations already accommodates a farm base). As such, I consider that there is considerable logic in relation to the requested situation in terms of landscape character. I consider that the attributes that contribute to the ONL status of the landscape within which the proposed areas of zoning sit, will not be materially compromised.
- 5 In relation to visual effects, the northern requested RVZ area will only have any significant effects on users of a certain part of the lake surface. Lake users will visually experience more human modification of the landscape than currently but this modification will appear in a logical location adjacent to other development on the same small fan (the Drift Bay rural living area) and will be dwarfed by the surrounding mountain slopes and lake surface.
- 6 The southern requested RVZ area will be visible from the lake and also some terrestrial view-points. In visual terms, enabled development will take the form of the expansion of an existing farm base area. A lake viewer must be reasonably distant in order to get a view of the relevant area. Again, the expanded cluster will have visual logic in that it will be on a modified and improved fan landform which is distinct from the rugged mountain slopes. A SH6 user can gain some views to the southern requested RVZ area as they travel between the Devil's Staircase and Kingston. Views from this stretch of highway are overwhelmingly dominated by the lake surface and the surrounding mountains and development that

would result from the requested RVZ would be inconspicuous and would only slightly detract from the quality of current views.

7 As mentioned, much of the proposed zoning areas would provide for development (up to a specified maximum) by way of a discretionary activity. The smaller areas that are not mapped as being of Moderate-High Landscape Sensitivity would provide for development as a controlled activity but the matters of control are wide-ranging and relevantly include:

- *The compatibility of the building design with landscape, cultural and heritage, and visual amenity values;*
- *Landform modification, landscaping and planting;*
- *Lighting;*
- ...
- *Design and location of related carparking<sup>1</sup>.*

8 I consider that these matters (coupled with the various other applicable provisions) give full confidence that development that will be enabled by the proposed relief will be appropriate in terms of effects on landscape character and visual amenity.

9 The two proposed RVZ locations represent particularly small areas of a vast farming station. The two areas are easily understood when on site in terms of their land cover, topography and exposure to views. The proposed zoning provisions are also relatively simple. I do not consider that additional digital contour information or landscape character analysis would lead to any further enlightenment regarding the effects of the requested relief; I consider that those effects are easily understood.

10 Similarly, I do not consider that a Structure Plan approach is justified for these two small areas. In my opinion, the landscape sensitivity categories coupled with the maximum total footprint provisions (as well as other provisions), provide sufficient certainty that effects will be appropriate and the important characteristics of the ONL will be maintained.

**Ben Espie**

**vivian+espie**

**28<sup>th</sup> July 2020**

---

<sup>1</sup> PDP, Stage 3, notified version.

