

IN THE MATTER of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Queenstown Lakes  
District Plan Review,  
Hearing Stream 14,  
Wakatipu Basin Chapter 24  
Variation, original  
submission 2101.1 and  
further submission  
FS7772.10

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE FOR HEARING BY R HADLEY

26 JULY 2018

## **Introduction**

- 1 Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this hearing. Further to my original submission and my further submission I have listened to some of the submitters from earlier in the week and have some additional comments as follows.
- 2 I want to be clear that my submissions to you are motivated from the stand point of simply trying to help you provide sound outcomes for the Wakatipu Basin. In this regard I am no different than other landscape professionals who have already appeared before you in a personal capacity.
- 3 I am aware that Mr Goldsmith seems anxious to label me as “just a neighbour”. That is correct, however I have lived on Speargrass Flat Road for over 15 years, I know the landscape in this area very well and I have lived and worked in the Wakatipu for over 25 years as a professional Landscape Architect. I would like to help you in your deliberations and I am here today to assist you as a local and an experienced Landscape Architect. The reality is you as a Commission are free to decide what you may see as relevant in my submissions regardless of what Mr Goldsmith may say about weight or admissibility.
- 4 I support the protection, maintenance and enhancement of the Wakatipu Basin landscapes and agree that a change to the existing planning regime is necessary to avoid cumulative effects or you could say the death of the golden goose by one thousand cuts. However, the application of the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, the LCU’s and the Precinct and Rural Amenity classifications must be implemented with very strong planning policy in order to realise development that maintains and enhances the landscape.

## **LCU 8, Lifestyle Precinct and Waterfall Park Ltd**

- 5 I would like to be clear that the Wakatipu Trail between Speargrass Flat Road and Millbrook is a public place as it follows a paper road on the flats

and then zigs and zags in and out of the easement on the escarpment. Views of the proposed Precinct and the proposed Ayrburn urban development must therefore be considered on a statutory basis. In my opinion both densities of residential development will detract from the visual amenity and recreational amenity of the trail in this location. This trail is named the Countryside Trail and where it passes through the Ayrburn land it is isolated and affords users panoramic views over open farmland to the surrounding mountains. This section of the trail is very popular with pedestrians as well as cyclists and is heavily used. It is very different to other sections of the trail that pass through rural residential development such as the Triangle where users are predominantly cyclists, views are limited and adjacent lots are undeveloped giving a temporary more open character.

- 6 There has been some discussion over the urban character of Millbrook. I do not consider Millbrook to have an urban character, it has a resort character that is distinctly different as it includes open parkland space, open golf course space and strictly controlled residential areas. As a Resort zone it also has a structure plan and strict design controls. This is very different to an urban area that has predominantly residential dwellings, some smaller areas of open space, street lights, kerb and channel, through traffic, public transport, schools, shops, libraries etc.
- 7 I therefore think that it is very inappropriate to include Millbrook in the Arrowtown Urban Growth Boundary. It is also contradictory to the development of nodes of residential development surrounded by rural amenity landscape. Instead it constitutes urban sprawl and encourages further sprawl.
- 8 I oppose the Precinct zone to the north of Speargrass Flat Road and to the north of Hogan Gully road for the following reasons;
- 9 Ms Gilbert said yesterday when questioned that she prefers Precincts to align with geomorphological boundaries and a Precinct needs a strong boundary with Rural Amenity due to the scale of this landscape and urban

areas need even stronger boundaries. There are no clear geomorphological boundaries to the west or east of the proposed Precinct within LCU8 apart from Mill Stream. In my opinion Mill stream is the only geomorphological boundary of appropriate scale on the western side of the proposed Precinct. From the east, I also consider that the boundary to the Precinct within LCU 8 is the Mill Stream as this is a clear geomorphological feature that also has the benefit of planting. I note that the Ayrburn urban development proposal also uses Mill stream as a boundary. This would result in Mill Stream forming the west boundary of the Precinct and the east leaving an area within the flood plain that could possibly absorb further development.

- 10 Ms Gilbert in her rebuttal evidence reviewed her location of the western boundary of the Precinct from being the ephemeral stream to a 75m offset from the Trail. As a least favoured alternative, I have also further investigated the ephemeral stream as a boundary as I do not consider 75m as an adequate set back to retain the recreational and visual amenity values from this important walkway. The ephemeral stream runs north south parallel with the walkway, it then turns to the east at the farm road and follows the base of a terrace edge with a height of approximately 10m before joining Mill stream. The stream is incised at this point and makes more legible sense from a landscape perspective than a boundary offset.
- 11 If the ephemeral stream was used as a boundary it is my opinion that it should be planted and buildings set back to the east. Importantly, development should not encroach onto the higher paddock slopes towards the base of the escarpment face as it will become visible from surrounding roads.
- 12 I accept that the northern boundary could be the base of the escarpment, but I note that the land included in the Precinct is not actually flat but rises up to meet the base of the steeper escarpment. This means future residential development would be placed at elevation above the existing flat paddock level and would be highly visible from Speargrass Flat Road, particularly with a building height limit of 8m. The northern boundary must

be carefully located to avoid built form on this elevated land and limit it to only the flat paddock area if the ephemeral stream is used as the western boundary.

- 13 However, I still do not think that a Precinct should be located to the north of the Lake Hayes Rural Residential zone. Both Mr Skelton and Ms Gilbert have discussed the landscape continuum experienced from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. I prefer Mr Skelton's description of this continuum than Ms Gilberts as I agree with Mr Skelton that the open paddocks either side of the road at Ayrburn Farm and on the north side of Hogan Gully Road provide a "breathing space" between Arrowtown and the Lake Hayes Rural Residential zone. Without this breathing space Arrowtown is joined to Lake Hayes which is already joined to Ladies Mile. I do not think that the consented Lake Hayes Ltd development to the south of Hogan Gully Road will significantly detract from the breathing space as it is opposite existing rural and residential development to the west and the breathing space is located on the north side of Speargrass Flat Road and Hogan Gully Road. I prefer Commissioner Robinson's suggested contrary argument that the Lake Hayes Ltd development makes the paddocks to the north even more important.
- 14 Ms Gilbert noted yesterday that the Friends of Lake Hayes spoke about shared and recognized values and a sense of place that displayed a strong association beyond their own residential benefit. The breathing space on the journey to and from Arrowtown provides me with my sense of place, it is the break between Arrowtown and home. Home is not just within my cadastral boundaries, it is the views and surrounding landscape that I see, travel through and recreate in every day. I am sure that other residents and travelers be they locals or visitors once they get to know the area (including users of the walkway), feel the same way. These open paddocks are important to the landscape continuum and the sense of place, they are not just fragments of rural landscape.
- 15 The same continuum is experienced on the Trail between Millbrook and Speargrass Flat Road. The trail descends the escarpment slope offering

elevated panoramic views to the Remarkables, Crown Terrace and Lake Hayes with a foreground of open pasture to the west along the Speargrass Flat corridor and the east into Hogans Gully, only broken by willow trees next to Mill Stream and the Ayrburn Farm homestead buildings. The break into the openness by the homestead does not detract as it is the farm homestead and recognizable as such, particularly if you know the area and understand that the tree lined avenue from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road leads to the homestead. As the trail crosses the flatter paddocks it enters into the rural residential area and has arrived in a different place. The development that will occur in the Precinct with only a 75m offset will essentially join the rural residential area to Millbrook and destroy the breathing space between the two places resulting in a loss of sense of place to both. The urban density proposed by Waterfall Park Ltd on the open paddocks will reduce the sense of place even further. Planting to screen built form will not help, neither will a 75m offset from the Trail. A 75m offset in my opinion defines private lots from public road or Trail, increasing privacy for the lot owner but it does little to preserve, maintain or enhance landscape values.

- 16 I note that the necessary flood mitigation works required for development by Waterfall park Ltd were not included in Mr Skelton's visual assessment or Ms Gilbert and Ms Gilbert acknowledged yesterday that they could have an adverse landscape effect.
- 17 I also note that the Speargrass corridor is clearly visible from the formalized viewpoint at the top of the zig zags on the Crown Range and a change from open paddocks to residential development will detract from the existing landscape amenity pattern of the Basin from this viewpoint.
- 18 In summary, I consider that the Speargrass Flat/Hogan Gully valleys provides one of only two remaining green corridors with a rural landscape character in the Wakatipu Basin. The open paddocks adjacent to the Countryside Trail and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road provide a breathing space that is important to both residents, locals and visitors in creating a sense of place. I therefore disagree with the location of the Precinct in this

location. If the Precinct was to proceed I consider that Mill stream correctly forms both the west and east boundaries of the Precinct or as a least preferred option, the ephemeral stream and Mill Stream respectively should form the west and east geomorphological boundaries of the zone.

### **X Ray Trust and Avenue Trust**

- 19 I strongly disagree with the proposed cluster development on the Speargrass Flat paddocks of the X – Ray Trust and Avenue Trust land for the following reasons;
- 20 The open paddocks adjacent to Speargrass flat Road are vital to the maintenance of the Speargrass Flat green corridor discussed already.
- 21 There are currently no houses on the northern side of Speargrass Flat Road until the McGuinness property at the western edge of the rural residential area. The northern side of the road is generally wider than the south and views to the mountains are possible to the north not the south due to the landform to the south side of the road. Views through clusters of houses will be inferior to the current situation and impede the current open views to the escarpment face of the plateau above.
- 22 The proposed cluster development has no clear defendable boundaries and will be vulnerable to infill development. I note that cluster development was popular in the past, but both Stonebridge and the development at the corner of Speargrass flat Road and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road on the south side have been surrounded by rural residential development.
- 23 The scale of the Speargrass Flat paddocks is not large enough to absorb the proposed clusters and the vision of such a development is fanciful and will appear contrived. The area of the remaining pastoral land is not enough to balance the development areas.
- 24 The eastern most cluster is very close to the boundaries of existing houses in the rural residential zone. I note that Ms Gilbert said yesterday that

amenity values of existing residents should be taken into consideration. I agree that amenity values of these residents will be significantly compromised by the proposed node of likely 10 lots, but just as importantly so will the amenity values of visitors using Speargrass Flat Road and the Countryside Trail.

- 25 The existing residential development on the southern side of the road is not justification for development on the northern side
- 26 I also have concerns about the zoning of the Precinct over the plateau area of the X Ray Trust and Avenue Trust land. I agree with Mr Blakely that these ice sculpted hills should be protected. Development in an elevated location and along the top of a landform is at odds to the pattern of development proposed for other Precinct areas. I understand that Ms Gilbert believes development in this location will not be visible due to viewing angle and set backs but again I tend to agree with Mr Blakely that the development will have an adverse visual effect from some locations, such as Malaghans Road where it will add to the existing Millbrook development and be visible on a ridgeline. Development on the Plateau area will also be visible from the important viewpoint at the top of the zig zags on the Crown Range. I note that residential development at Bendemeer was not intended to be visible on ridge lines or on the skyline but several houses are visible from Lake Hayes - Arrowtown Road and all lots are not yet built on.
- 27 I therefore disagree with the proposed cluster development of X Ray and Avenue Trusts and the Precinct zoning over both the high plateau and the lower flats.

Rebecca Hadley

26 July 2018











Photograph taken from Crown Range zig zag viewpoint, 35mm lens March 2018

R. HADLEY 26.7.18

Photograph taken from Crown Range viewpoint (zoom) March 2018

R. HADLEY 26.7.18

5

CLUSTERS

PLATEAU

PRECINCT

