

1. My name is Michelle Kay Snodgrass. I filed a statement of evidence for the applicant dated 4th April 2017. The following is a summary of the proposed re-zoning from Rural General to Wanaka Airport Mixed Use Zone and is my response to Ms. Mellsops rebuttal evidence dated 5th May 2017.
2. Overall the landscape of which the site is a small part is rural with wide, open views across the plains to the mountain ranges to the north, east and south east, and is confined by steep topography on the south and west, with the exception of the Wanaka Airport, and Rural Visitor Zone which is a small node of visitor activities centred on the airport located within and dominated by large scale rural and natural landscapes. The site is well tucked into the toe of the escarpment and visually dominated by the airport development and the escarpment landform which partially encloses the site and is at a larger scale.
3. The rural character of the immediate area is already significantly influenced by the airport development and the 'Have a Shot' business. This presents an opportunity to locate additional development in a well confined area that is already characterised by non-pastoral buildings.
4. The landscape effect of the proposed WAZ will be substantial in that it will form a significant and immediately apparent part of the scene that changes the site's character. However, I am of the opinion that the change in character will be to the site only. It will not affect landscape character beyond the node of tourist activities centred on the airport, nor will it change the pastoral and rural character the surrounding landscape outside of that node. The proposed zone will not become the dominant feature of the surrounding landscape, nor will the elements of escarpment or rural character become subordinate to the new zone. Rather it will fit into and consolidate an existing node of development, and be contained by the escarpment landform.
5. The degree of visibility of the proposed zone change would be no greater than that of the existing site in terms of the locations that it is visible from. At all viewing locations the buildings of the proposed zone would be viewed with, and as part of, the node of development at the intersection of SH6 and Mt Barker.
6. The visual effect of the proposed zone will be
 - moderate from SH6 and Mt Barker Road in that the zone will form a visible and recognisable new element within the overall scene and may be readily noticed by the observer or receptor. It will change the character of the site but not the overall character of the wider landscape;
 - slight to moderate from Stevenson Road, in that the new zone will constitute a minor component of the wider views, and awareness of the new zone would not have a marked effect on the overall quality of the scene;
 - Negligible from Kane Road in that only a very small part of the proposal is discernible and/or is at such a distance that it is scarcely appreciated. Consequently it will have very little effect on the scene;
 - Nil from Ballantyne Road.
7. Visually the SH6 part of the site is within the same viewing corridor as that of Wanaka Airport and is enclosed by the airport on one side and the escarpment on the other side. The site, and the airport are experienced as foreground on both sides of the road with the same ground plane. Development on the site will not appear visually incongruous with the airport development.
8. I disagree with Ms Mellsops opinion that the proposed zoning would degrade the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Rural Landscape.
9. A2 which is proposed to have maximum building height of 12m is approximately the same in area as A3. It is not the dominant maximum height in terms of area. I disagree that large scale buildings within this activity area would obscure the escarpment. Buildings within the proposed zone will screen approximately the lower third of the escarpment. The middle and upper third of the escarpment, the part of the landform that has the most natural character, will be visible and not obscured.
10. Large scale buildings within the proposed zone will be of a similar character as those of the Wanaka airport, and they are, with the exception of Area 2, determined by the same height restrictions and site coverage.

11. I agree that the proposed development would extend domestication beyond that enabled on the northern side of SH6 under the airport designation. The eastern zone boundary does not extend as far as that of the airport designation. The setbacks specified in the designation would mean that the potential building area within the Wanaka Airport designation would stop approximately half way along Area A3 on the proposed zone. The built area within the proposed zone would extend approximately a further 100m east. This is a small increase beyond the current limit of development.
12. I disagree the zone would adversely affect the open pastoral character. The landscape on the southern side of the road is not entirely open due to the escarpment. The effect on openness is limited already by topography. Development will not significantly impede character.
13. I disagree that buildings on the eastern side of Mt Barker Road would be viewed without the context of visible airport buildings. When travelling along Mt Barker Road towards SH6, airport buildings are visible from the entry to Criffel Station. From this point the buildings of the proposed zone would be viewed with the context of the airport buildings.
14. From Stevenson Road and at the intersection with SH6, buildings within the toy museum site are visible between existing trees. Future buildings within the proposed zone will be visible on Mt Barker Road from approximately the last 190m of Stevenson Road before the intersection with SH6. Trees within the amenity planting strip will soften those views. I disagree that visible buildings would significantly detract from natural and pastoral views. The visible buildings would be in the midground against the escarpment in views from SH6. The foreground views would still be pastoral, and views of the mid third and upper third of the escarpment would be retained as would views to the surrounding mountains beyond. Buildings within the proposed zone would form a low, linear part of the view. They would not dominate the view as they would be a minor component of that view.
15. I disagree that built development at the eastern end of the proposed development, (Area 3) would detract significantly from the openness, pastoral character and pleasantness of views from SH6. Views to the south of pastoral character when travelling past the site on SH6 are limited to the site and the escarpment. The escarpment itself limits views considerably. The greater openness, pastoral character and pleasantness of views is to the north across the airport land to the mountains beyond. Buildings within the proposed zone will not obscure those open views to the north. They will partially obscure views of the lower third of the escarpment face and will obscure views of pastoral land beyond Mt Barker Road for the road frontage of the site when travelling west. This is for a small distance, and currently these views are partially obscured by the existing 'Have a Shot' building.
16. I agree that the proposed zone will result in buildings 5 metres from the SH6 boundary. The distance of those buildings from the edge of the carriageway would be between 23m and 46m, as the carriageway does not sit in the middle of the legal road corridor, and the existing deer fence on the SH6 boundary of the site is also within the legal road corridor. The buildings within the proposed zone will be set back further from a viewer in a vehicle than the existing airport buildings, and the viewing corridor will be more open than Ms Mellsop possibly perceives it to be.
17. I disagree that effects on visual amenity and views as experienced from SH6 would potentially be greater than that of built development on the northern side of the Wanaka Airport runway. The landscape of the northern side of the runway is characterised by its expansiveness and does not offer any enclosing topography or vegetation which could absorb buildings. The potential prominence of buildings on the northern side of the runway would significantly detract from the pastoral character of the wider landscape. The site of the proposed zone does have partially enclosing topography, and in the case of the SH6 portion of the site, is also partially enclosed by the airport development which limits views across pastoral landscapes.