

Stream 18 – Rural Visitor Zone (RVZ)

1. I have assessed ten submissions for the RVZ in relation to landscape matters and have prepared evidence accordingly.
2. In general, I support the RVZ provisions as recommended by Ms Grace in her rebuttal from a landscape perspective. In order to adequately protect the values of the surrounding ONL contexts, I recommend that the zone include provisions that limits site coverage and building density within the low and moderate landscape sensitivity areas and standards for the external appearance of buildings. This will provide more surety to the anticipated built outcomes in the context of the respective sites in order to protect the values of the surrounding ONLs and maintain and / or enhance the landscape character and amenity values of RCLs.
3. In relation to submitter **31022 Malaghans Investments Ltd** and **31015 Brett Mills (Kimiakau)** (combined submission), I do not oppose the RVZ relief sought subject to the refinement of the areas of high landscape sensitivity and the recommended additions to the provisions related to building height, and roading and infrastructure. I consider that the 10m setback should remain, particularly along the highly sensitive cliff escarpment along the western boundary to minimise potential effects on landscape character and visual amenity.
4. I do not support the RVZ zoning sought on the **31014 Heron Investments Ltd** site. Although in general I do not disagree with the landscape sensitivity areas identified, it is the scale of the site and the lack of site specific provisions to contain the submitter's proposed maximum building coverage or provide potential 'buildable' locations that raises most concern. A building setback should also be provided in order to be receptive to the edges of the high landscape sensitivity area. This site is also located outside of an ONL but within an RCL. In my opinion the scale of the potential future development anticipated will not serve to maintain the landscape character, or maintain or enhance visual amenity values of the landscape.
5. I do not support the RVZ zoning sought for the **31021 Corbridge Estates Ltd** site. The scale and intensity of the buildings proposed through the structure plan will not maintain the landscape character of the RCL (the site is located outside an ONL). I consider that there are areas of moderate-high landscape sensitivity on the site, which were not identified in the submitters landscape evidence. The Structure Plan generally locates the 'activity areas' into the parts of the site which

are visually contained and discrete. However, in my view future built form within AA1, AA2 and AA3 will be visible from SH6. The building coverage controls I have recommended will go some way to appease my concerns, however, I remain of the opinion that the scale, form, intensity and density of the development anticipated (as it currently stands) will not maintain the landscape character or the visual amenity values of the RCL.

6. I do not oppose the RVZ relief sought for the **31037 Gibbston Valley Station Ltd** submission, subject to the recommended provisions in relation to building height, roading and infrastructure and building materials and infrastructure that I support. The area identified for RVZ zoning and the Primary Developable Areas are located upon the visually contained upper terrace. The identified primary developable areas also do not prevent viticulture activities within the northern extent of the site (zoned Gibbston Character Zone).
7. In relation to the **31039 Cardrona Cattle Company Ltd** site I understand that the RVZ zoning has not been pursued in the planning evidence filed and rather a General Industrial Zone is promoted. Limited detailed analysis of the RVZ component is provided in landscape evidence. Irrespective of the above, the proposal and identified developable areas is largely appropriate, however I consider that developable areas 3 and 4 are assessed as being moderate-high landscape sensitivity largely due to their visual prominence.
8. In relation to submission **31033 Matakauri Lodge Ltd**, I do not oppose the RVZ relief sought subject to the refined provisions in relation to building coverage, a 10m building separation and a requirement for native vegetation to screen, soften and break up future built form. The site is remotely located, and future development will be subject to building coverage and external appearance provisions. The identified building development areas are appropriate and the site coverage enabled will, in my opinion, maximise the level of development that the site is capable of absorbing.
9. Within my evidence in chief I made a number of recommendations in relation to further detailed landscape analysis and assessment required from a number of submitters. Three submitters (**31012 Ben Hohneck**, **31016 Brett Mills** (Moonlight) and **31053 Blennerhasset** (Barn Pinch Farm)) did not provide further landscape assessment and consequently, I remain opposed to their submission due to insufficient information.