

Hannah Ayres for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 13 February 2017

Chapter 43 Millbrook Resort Zone – Hearing Stream 09

1. I have been engaged by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to provide landscape evidence on Chapter 43 – Millbrook Resort Zone of the proposed District Plan (**PDP**).
2. In general, I agree with the proposed re-zoning of the Dalglish Farm site to become part of the Millbrook Resort Zone (**MRZ**) subject to some minor amendments to the PDP provisions.
3. In my evidence, I provide a comprehensive review of the documentation that was available in relation to landscape matters regarding the MRZ and in particular the Dalglish Farm extension. Aside from a few discrepancies, my opinions were generally consistent with those outlined in that documentation, including in particular the previous landscape assessment and addendum provided by Baxter Design Group (**BDG**).
4. I have subsequently reviewed the evidence of Andrew Craig filed on behalf of Millbrook Country Club Ltd (**MCCL**). I find this evidence to be a more detailed and well-justified assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the proposed rezoning, compared to BDG's landscape assessment and addendum. Appended to Mr Craig's evidence are several new visual simulations from key public viewpoints. These are useful in satisfying my apprehensions with regard to the potential level of cumulative and visual effects relating to the Dalglish Farm extension.
5. Overall, Mr Craig's evidence has in most cases reiterated and in some cases altered the opinions set out in my evidence, which I highlight below:
 - a. **Roadside Planting Overlay** – I would like to clarify that it was never the intention of this suggested overlay to encourage a linear shelterbelt type tree layout. The shape I have drawn encompasses existing road side tree planting and just happens to be linear in its form. I am open to Mr Craig's suggestion that a rule or notation on the Structure Plan may be sufficient instead of an additional overlay, so long as the rule is worded in a way that ensures the original intentions of the overlay.
 - b. **Building design on the upper slopes** – I acknowledge Mr Craig's argument against altering the roof lines to better reflect the landform. Based on Mr Craig's visual simulation provided from the Malaghans Road viewpoint, I now

consider that those houses visible in that view shaft will have a negligible adverse visual effect once proposed vegetation matures. I am now more comfortable that if MCCL agrees to form a rule around retaining and/or replacing the existing trees along the road side, this will provide sufficient visual softening of the Dalgleish Farm site to render any visibility of steeply pitched roofs on the upper slopes, acceptable. That said, I remain of the opinion that the architectural form of buildings and associated landscaping could better suit the landscape character of the upper slopes than what is anticipated under the current Millbrook Design Guidelines (which do not specifically address the Dalgleish Farm component), which suits the landscape character of the flat pastoral land.

- c. **Plant species list for planting overlays** – I maintain the opinion (and Mr Craig agrees) that the plant species list should form part of the Millbrook Design Guidelines rather than listed in the rules.
6. I believe the MCCL revised 'package', attached to Mr John Edmonds (MCCL Planner), (with some further modification) is effective in addressing the landscape-related concerns of most submitters. The only exceptions being submitter Skipp Williamson (449) who raises concerns about the activity status of utility and farm buildings in the Landscape Protection (LP) Activity Areas, and Louise Taylor (X-Ray Trust's (335) planner) who has provided evidence on the location of performance standards for buildings and the enforceability of the Millbrook Design Guidelines.
7. In my statement of evidence, I agree in part with Skipp Williamson that greater controls should be maintained over buildings in LP Activity Areas. In his evidence, Mr Edmonds discusses the provision of utility buildings in the LP Activity Area as permitted activities. While I acknowledge the requirement of utility buildings for the operation of the golf course, I am still not convinced that utility buildings up to 25m² should be a permitted activity in the LP. I suggest a stricter activity status or more specific controls on utility buildings.
8. I agree with Ms Taylor's evidence for X-Ray Trust, where she recommends the performance standards for buildings (regarding height and recession planes) remain in the rules rather than be shifted to the design guidelines. At this stage I do not agree with Mr Edmonds who has suggested removing reference to the Millbrook Design Guideline in his amended set of plan provisions. These guidelines, which need to be amended to take account of the Dalgleish Farm component of the zone, will contain a layer of detail that would not be suitable to

be written as rules, and this detail will play a critical role in ensuring buildings and associated landscaping maintains a high level of visual amenity. I would like to hear further clarification from MCCL's experts on their reasoning before forming an opinion with regard to this matter.