

**Marion Read for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 15 May 2017
Upper Clutha Mapping – Hearing Stream 12**

1. I have been engaged by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to provide evidence in relation to landscape matter regarding rezoning requests in the Upper Clutha area of the Queenstown Lakes District and to related landscape classification issues.
2. My evidence addresses the landscape classification of the Matukituki Valley and of the Fern Burn Valley, and the location of the ONL/ONF boundary adjacent to the Albert Town Bridge. It also addresses rezoning requests in the Makarora Valley and in the Glendhu Bay / Parkins Bay areas.

Submissions 339, 585 and 706 and Further Submission 1106¹

3. Submissions 339, 585 and 706 request the uplifting of the Rural Lifestyle (**RL**) zoning over the Makarora Valley floor and its replacement with Rural zoning. Submission FS1106 opposes this relief.
4. Without considering the existing zoning of the valley I have undertaken a landscape classification assessment from first principles and consider the Makarora Valley to be part of a wider ONL.
5. Approximately 1292ha of the valley floor has been notified RL in the PDP, and of this approximately 880ha could potentially be developed in accordance with the rules of the RL zone. This level of development would transform the landscape of the valley, fragmenting the open pastoral areas through the inclusion of many dwellings (potentially around 300) and associated planting and other domestic modifications. This would have the effect of degrading the ONL of the wider Valley. The existence of this extensive RL zoning limits the ability of Council to protect the landscape of the valley from inappropriate development, and will result in significant impacts on the qualities and characteristics that make this landscape, outstanding.
6. I have identified two areas in which RL zoning could be retained with little adverse effect on the landscape of the valley. In my opinion the Rural zoning over the rest of the valley would be more appropriate than RL. I note that Mr Barr has

1 Evan Alty (339), Heather Pennycook (585) and Forest & Bird (706), and Cooper (FS1106).

recommended that more land than I consider appropriate, should remain RL. This is in two further discrete areas where I understand subdivision has occurred

Submission 325²

7. Submission 325 requests that the ONL status of the floor of the Matukituki Valley be uplifted and the flats and downs of the submitter's land, the Matukituki Station, be identified as Rural Landscape Classification.
8. I have completed an analysis of the valley landscape from first principles as detailed in my evidence, and in my view, despite modifications brought about by farming, the entire valley is appropriately identified as ONL. I note that the ONL status of the balance of the flats and downs within the valley within the Aspiring and West Wanaka Stations has not been challenged. I consider that the relief sought by the submitter should not be granted.

Submission 1038³

9. Submission 1038 challenges the appropriate location of the ONL boundary adjacent to and upstream of the Albert Town bridge. Although principally addressed by Ms Mellsop in her evidence I simply wish to confirm that I consider the correct location of the boundary to be at the edge of the terrace escarpment and that I understand that this is where Ms Mellsop has located it in her rebuttal evidence.

Submission 583⁴

10. Submission 583 wishes to have the ONL status of the Fern Burn Valley floor uplifted, and replaced with Rural Landscape Classification (**RLC**). They argue that this reflects the Environment Court's decision in C73/2002 and that this classification, as it was included in the Council's map at Appendix 8b of the ODP, should be reinstated.
11. The Environment Court, in its C79/2012 decision, clearly states that they consider that the Council was in error to identify this area as Visual Amenity Landscape on its ODP Appendix 8b map on the basis of its earlier discussion of the area. The

2 Solobio Ltd (325).

3 Seven Albert Town Property Owners (1038).

4 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd (583).

Court continued to explain why the Fern Burn Flats should be considered part of the surrounding ONL. I accept that position and agree that the Fern Burn Flats are too small on their own to be a landscape and are perceived to be a part of the surrounding mountain landscape. Consequently I consider that the relief requested should not be granted.

12. Submission 583 also requests the creation of a new Glendhu Station Zone (**GSZ**) to encompass the entirety of the Glendhu Bay Station, which incorporates the area subject to the consented Parkins Bay golf resort (RM070044, C79/2012). The proposed GSZ is intended to facilitate the consented development (as well as additional activities). In my evidence in chief, which was based on the GSZ as proposed in the submission, I concluded that the relief requested should not be granted.
13. The proposed GSZ has been amended through the evidence of Ms Pfluger and Mr Fergusson on behalf of the Submitter, and my rebuttal evidence addresses this amended version. I consider that most of the modifications to the proposed GSZ are positive. I remain opposed to the relief requested, however, for the following reasons:
 - (a) Eight home sites are sought in addition to the 42 consented. Only one of these home sites seems to differ in any way from the 8 which were declined consent in the original Council hearing.
 - (b) The consented development includes specific footprints for buildings on the 42 home sites, with a requirement for vegetated roofs and a height limit of 3.5m above the defined RLs for each site. Building on the home sites in the GSZ are proposed to be a controlled activity. The RLs are retained, but the future building designs are not specified (beyond basic design controls) and the maximum building height, while lowered from the original submission, remains at 4m above RL. This could allow for much less subtle development and consequently effects that are significantly more extensive than those allowed for by the consent.
 - (c) Controls on the planting of exotic vegetation have not been carried over from the consent into the proposed zone.
 - (d) Controls from the extensive covenants required by the original consent have not been carried over to the proposed zone.
 - (e) The proposed zone encompasses 2,483ha, all of which is ONL. The development area constitutes approximately 180ha. It remains my opinion that the landscape is best managed in accordance with the

consent conditions and with the Covenants required by the Environment Court in addition to the requirements of Chapters 21 and 6 of the PDP.

Marion Read
15 May 2017