

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL HEARINGS PANEL

UNDER

the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER

of the review of parts of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's District Plan under the First Schedule of the Act

AND

IN THE MATTER

of submissions and further submissions by
REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED AND
QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF REBECCA ANNE SKIDMORE ON BEHALF OF
REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED AND QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED**

(URBAN DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE)

STREAM 13 REZONING HEARINGS

4 September 2017

**BROOKFIELDS
LAWYERS**

J D Young / M Goudie
Telephone No. 09 379 2155
Fax No. 09 379 3224
P O Box 240
DX CP24134
AUCKLAND

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Rebecca Anne Skidmore. I am an Urban Designer and Landscape architect and I have the qualifications and experience set out in my evidence in chief (**EiC**). I have prepared two statements of evidence in relation to this matter: my EiC dated 9 June 2017; and my supplementary evidence dated 28 August 2017. I also attended an expert witness caucusing meeting and jointly prepared a statement dated 24 August 2017.
- 1.2 The areas of agreement and disagreement between the urban design and landscape architecture witnesses are clearly set out in that statement.

2. SUITABILITY OF LAND FOR ZONE

- 2.1 There is agreement about the classification of the subject land as falling within an Outstanding Natural Landscape. Given this classification Ms Mellsop is of the opinion that it is not suitable to accommodate the activities enabled by the QPSZ.
- 2.2 I remain of the opinion that Queenstown Park is a distinctive place that exhibits a number of characteristics that make it particularly well suited to accommodate the rural based tourism and recreation hub that is enabled by the QPSZ. In particular, the land's spectacular landscape setting, its relative isolation while being proximate to the urban environment, the gentle, north-facing topography of the lower terraces, the existing and potential recreational opportunities in the area, make it well suited to enable a range of inter-related activities that are mutually supportive to enable the sustainable management of the rural land.

3. AMENDMENTS TO ZONE PROVISIONS

- 3.1 In response to a number of points raised in Ms Mellsop's rebuttal evidence and discussions in the joint witness caucusing meeting, I have recommended a number of changes to the provisions to ensure that development within the activity areas appropriately responds to the landscape values and integrates with its wider setting, and to ensure a rural character is maintained. These changes include: additional matters for discretion for CDP consents; additional matters for discretion for subdivision; additional matters over which control is reserved for 'glamping'; and including pedestrian bridges in the activity category with jetties and wharves. These recommended changes have been incorporated in the updated zone provisions included in Dave Sergeant's supplementary evidence (Appendix A).

4. REQUIREMENT FOR CDP'S

- 4.1 Ms Mellisop is of the opinion that it would be preferable for CDPs to be required for all activity areas. I do not agree. The revised provisions require a CDP for RV3, RV4 and RR3 (Rules 44.4.9.2 and 44.10.3). In my opinion, the complexity of these areas, in terms of topography and, in the case of RV3 and RV4, the activity mix and resulting development pattern enabled, mean they would benefit from a CDP to ensure an integrated approach to the broad planning and structuring of these areas. The other activity areas are either much smaller or more straightforward in terms of their topography and anticipated activity mix. I remain of the opinion that the effects of development for these activity areas can be appropriately managed through the subdivision process. To require a CDP first would result in a duplication of process that would be of little benefit. However, as noted above, I have recommended additional matters for discretion for subdivision in Rule 27.5.7 to ensure development appropriately responds to the landscape values and integrates with its wider setting and maintains a rural character.

5. RURAL CHARACTER

- 5.1 In my opinion, in the context of the expansive and dramatic rural setting, the built environment enabled by the QPSZ will be subservient to and its character strongly influenced by its setting. The configuration of discrete activity areas that have been determined in response to the characteristics of the land, together with the requirements for CDPs, the matters of discretion for subdivision and the matters for control for new buildings, in my opinion, will ensure that the village and associated rural residential pods will have a rural rather than an urban character.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Having considered the rebuttal evidence of Ms Mellisop and participated in expert caucusing I remain of the opinion that the characteristics of Queenstown Park make it particularly well suited to accommodate the rural based tourism and recreation hub that is enabled by the QPSZ. In my opinion, the proposed QPSZ is a rural zone that will sit comfortably and be subservient to its spectacular landscape setting.

Rebecca Skidmore

4 September 2017