

**BRIDGET GILBERT for QLDC: Summary of Evidence**  
**Stream 18 - Topic Rural Visitor Zone, Landscape**

1. I have provided landscape evidence on RVZ rezoning submissions.
2. I do not support the refined RVZ relief sought for **Loch Linnhe (31013)** and **Lake Hāwea Holiday Park (31043)**.
3. Overall, I consider that the development of an appropriate RVZ policy regime for each of these effectively 'greenfield' RVZ areas needs to be 'landscape-led'. In my view this requires a thorough landscape assessment to give confidence that the character of landscape change associated with the RVZ will satisfy the fundamental landscape policy requirements in ONLs that development:
  - (a) protects landscape values; and
  - (b) is reasonably difficult to see.
4. In my experience, and considering a range of developments within areas that display similar landscape sensitivities to each of these sites, it is my expectation that an appropriate RVZ policy regime for the Loch Linnhe and Lake Hāwea Holiday Park sites would include:
  - (a) a location specific structure plan that responds to the landscape opportunities and constraints identified in my evidence in chief; and,
  - (b) at a minimum, a restricted discretionary activity status for buildings.
5. However, I understand from the Burdon's evidence that there is a strong desire to minimise more complex consenting requirements and therefore have turned my mind to the sort of RVZ activity that might be appropriate on the Lake Hāwea Holiday Park site as a controlled activity (from a landscape perspective). My rebuttal evidence sets out the parameters that could shape an appropriate rural visitor development outcome in that location.
6. I do not support the rezoning request sought **by Universal Developments (3248)** for land on the south side of Hāwea. In particular, I consider that:
  - (c) The proposed rezoning will not deliver defensible edges along the southern side of Hāwea and in so doing, will make the surrounding rural area vulnerable to development creep.

- 
- (d) The proposed rezoning will generate adverse visual amenity effects along its eastern side (which includes a s7(c) amenity landscape).
- (e) The proposed rezoning will adversely impact on landscape character as a consequence of the above adverse outcomes (edge treatments and visual effects), together with my view that the scale of expansion will undermine the perception of Hāwea as a relatively small-scale and 'old school' lakeside settlement, thus suggesting adverse effects in relation to settlement identity and 'sense of place'.
6. I note that the Hāwea Community Association submission (3287) seeks the retention of the notified UGB ' , to preserve the special character of the lakeside settlement. I infer from this submission that the Community Association consider that the proposed Structure Plan would detract from the identity of their settlement which speaks to an adverse effect with respect to the aspects of landscape character that take in shared and recognised values and amenity values.
7. However, it is also my opinion that the 'horse has somewhat bolted' in relation to a change in landscape character throughout the northern portion of the Universal Developments site, as a consequence of the character of development that is likely to occur at Domain Acres and throughout the consented SHA area.
8. Were the Panel minded to upzone land to the south of Hāwea, my rebuttal evidence sets out the parameters that could shape an appropriate urban expansion outcome from a landscape perspective.