

**BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL APPOINTED BY THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Under of the Resource Management Act
1991

In the Matter of a request under clause 21 of the
First Schedule to the Act for a
Change to the Queenstown Lakes
Proposed District Plan

By **THE HILLS RESORT LIMITED**

**Evidence of Yvonne Pflüger (Landscape) for
The Hills Resort Limited**

Dated: 13th March 2026

INTRODUCTION

Qualifications and experience

1. My name is Yvonne Pflüger. I am employed as a Landscape Planner for Boffa Miskell Limited (**BML**), an environmental consultancy specialising in planning, design and ecology. I have been employed at BML's Christchurch office for thirteen years and have been based in our Queenstown office for seven years. I am a Partner in the company.
2. I hold a Master's degree in Landscape Planning from BOKU University, Vienna (Austria, 2001) and a Master's degree in Natural Resources Management and Ecological Engineering from Lincoln University (NZ, 2005). I am a Full Member of the Resource Management Law Association and a registered member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects, as well as a Certified Environmental Practitioner under the Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand.
3. I have practised as a landscape planner for 25 years on a wide range of projects including environmental and visual effects assessments, nature conservation and river restoration, and recreation planning. During my time at Boffa Miskell I have played a key role in preparing several landscape studies for various territorial authorities throughout New Zealand's South Island, including studies for Banks Peninsula, the Southland Coast, the Te Anau Basin, which included the assessment of the landscape's capacity to absorb future development. I was the project manager and key author of the Canterbury Regional Landscape Study Review (2010) and Ashburton, Invercargill, Hurunui and Christchurch District landscape studies (2009-2015). Over the past years I also prepared landscape studies for Mackenzie, Waimate, Kaikoura and Timaru Districts and the Southland Region. The preparation of the above-mentioned studies involved evaluating landscape character and quality for these regions and districts and advising councils on objectives and policies for the ongoing management of the landscape.
4. I have also prepared a large number of landscape and visual assessments for development projects of varying scales within sensitive environments, including preparation of landscape evidence for numerous council and Environment Court hearings.

5. Projects that I have been or am involved in within the Queenstown Lakes District include Treble Cone gondola, Parkins Bay resort and golf course, Jacks Point Zone, a number of gravel extraction operations, the Queenstown Airport runway extension and several rezoning and consent applications for private rural subdivisions.
6. My involvement with the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) commenced in 2015 and has included preparing reports and presenting evidence at the first instance Council hearings in respect of the Hills Resort Zone (**HRZ**), the Rural Zone (PDP Chapter 21), Jacks Point Zone, the Wakatipu Basin variation (PDP Chapter 24) and the Ski Area Subzones. I have participated in expert witness conferencing concerning the policy for the Wakatipu Basin (PDP Chapter 24_) and provided advice and participated at Court facilitated mediations for a number of rezonings within the Wakatipu Basin, including for Trojan Helmet Limited in respect of THRZ.
7. My involvement with THRZ commenced in 2015, when the zone was being formulated. I provided advice on landscape matters arising from the creation of the HRZ, and prepared a landscape assessment and evidence in relation to the rezoning. I also provide advice, landscape assessments and evidence for the two neighbouring landholdings owned by Boxer Hill Trust, being an entity related to Trojan Helmet Limited, one of which is located adjacent to the HRZ on the corner Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road/ Hogans Gully Road and the other adjacent to the HRZ on McDonnell Road.
8. I am very familiar with the HRZ land, as well as the wider area, having visited the area on many occasions over previous years, including when undertaking numerous site visits to THRZ land, with my most recent site visits in March 2026 when height poles were erected on the new homesites and some amended activity areas. I have viewed the THRZ land from all the surrounding roads, tracks and elevated northern viewpoints in the Wakatipu Basin, and also from the Draper property (Submitter #13) in September 2025 at their request.

CODE OF CONDUCT

9. I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

10. The Hills Resort Limited (**THRL**) requests to change parts of the Hills Resort Zone (**HRZ**) and the HRZ Structure Plan, and to make consequential changes to other provisions of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) to facilitate the rerouting of the existing 18-hole golf course and to improve the resort offering. (**Plan Change Request or Request**).
11. The particular changes requested are to amend the location and extent of existing Activity Areas, establish eleven additional homesites in the south of the HRZ, and provide for three new Activity Area associated with the Resort, including the Sports Garden Activity Area.
12. The Plan Change Request was filed with the Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) in October 2024. Further information was provided in May 2025. I prepared the Landscape and Visual Assessment dated 9 May 2025 (**LVA**) that accompanied the notified Request documents.
13. In the LVA I provided a description of the existing environment for the HRZ (also referred to as the 'Site' in this evidence) and the surrounding area, including an assessment of the existing landscape character and values. I outlined the development currently enabled within the HRZ and described the amendments sought to the zone via the Plan Change Request, which include changes to activity areas (Activity Areas A1, A2, A4, A5, A10, A11, Sports Courts/Garden and Golf Training Facility Areas), Homesite additions (HS 6-16), and related amendments to the access and planting framework. The LVA included an assessment of effects on landscape values and a detailed assessment of visual effects based on visual simulations that were provided with the assessment.

14. In the LVA I also provided an Assessment Methodology, which is based on best practice guidance. Both my LVA and this evidence follow the concepts and principles outlined in Te Tangi a te Manu: Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines¹. A full methodology is outlined in Appendix 1 of the LVA.
15. I generally maintain the views expressed in the LVA, which should be read alongside this evidence, although for some aspects of the proposal I now hold the view that the landscape effects will be lower than I assessed in the LVA. This is due to changes made to the Request since I prepared the LVA, in response to submissions and the Council's section 42A Reports. Mr Brown will cover the changes in detail. The landscape related changes are, in summary:
- (a) Lowering the maximum building heights for most of the new Homesites (**HS**) in the Hogans Gully catchment (i.e. HS 9-12 and HS 15-16).
 - (b) Minor repositioning of HS15.
 - (c) Expansion of the Structural Planting Areas (**SPA**) in the Hogans Gully catchment.
 - (d) Amendments to the provisions (rules) for the Sports Court and Garden Area (**SGAA**).
 - (e) A new mitigation planting requirement adjacent to the vehicle access for HS5-8 and cycle trail, in vicinity to the Dan property (214 McDonnell Road, Submitter #15).
16. In this evidence I provide an assessment of these changes and respond to the landscape related issues raised in submissions and in the section 42A reports.
17. Given it is proposed to lower the maximum building height for new HS 9-12 and 15-16, the visual simulations included with the LVA have been updated to reflect the new (lowered) maximum building heights. The updated visual simulations are in **Attachment 1 (bound separately)**. The updates relate to viewpoints within the Hogans Gully catchment (Viewpoint 5-10). Other viewpoints are not affected.

¹ Te Tangi a te Manu Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines, July 2022

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

18. In preparing this evidence I have reviewed the following documents:
- (i) The Plan Change Request documents.
 - (ii) The Statement of Evidence by Ms Gilbert that accompanied the s42A report (dated 13 February 2026).
 - (iii) The following submissions (as relevant to landscape matters):
 - a. Submission #2 G Todd
 - b. Submission #4 D Brown
 - c. Submission #13 J & J Draper
 - d. Submission #15 S Dan
 - e. Submission #18 Page
 - f. Submission #20 I Weber & D Gibson
 - (iv) The evidence by Mr Brett Thomson, Mr Andy Carr and Mr Jeff Brown for the Hills Resort Ltd (in draft).
 - (v) The revised HRZ Structure Plan and District Plan provisions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

19. The proposed amendments to the HRZ comprise of relatively small changes to the location and layout of approved Activity Areas. The changes are required to enable an enhanced golf course design, and also provide for an additional eleven Homesites.
20. The proposed Homesites straddle two visual catchments. HS 6-8 are located to the west of existing HS 5 within the visual catchment facing McDonnell Road, whereas HS 9-16 are located in the south-west of the HRZ facing Hogans Gully Road.
21. While new Homesites are proposed, the building coverage in some of the approved/proposed activity areas will be lowered, leading to only a small overall

increase of built form across the HRZ. The majority of the HRZ will remain as open space.

22. Specifically designed planting areas are proposed, including LAMAs for the new Homesites and amended Activity Areas that will largely screen built form, and extensive structural planting areas (SPAs) that will visually integrate the proposed Homesites into the wider development area.
23. The existing HRZ Structure Plan provides for built form within parts of the Site where effects can be largely internalised with only limited/partial visibility of Activity Areas and Homesites from outside. The same design principles have been applied to the proposed new Homesites and the amendments to the Activity Areas.
24. Overall, the amendments to the Activity Areas are of a size and nature that they are unlikely to be readily detectable from outside the site and are aimed at a better integration of buildings with the golf course environment.
25. The proposed Homesites provide for future buildings comparable in size to what could be established on the existing Homesites. The existing HRZ provisions (rules) contain design controls to ensure that all buildings are recessive in appearance. These controls will apply to future buildings on the proposed Homesites.
26. When formulating the Plan Change revisions, it was important to achieve a cohesive design which ties the already approved development areas and the proposed development areas together and achieves an overall visual coherence with a similar landscape character and visual amenity across the entirety of the Zone. Even with the addition of the proposed Homesites, the majority of the Zone will continue to be open space with clustered buildings arranged around the new golf course layout.
27. The addition of new Homesites on the south-western side of the HRZ will lead to a change in this part of the Zone as future buildings will be partially visible from some viewpoints in this visual catchment. In the LVA, I assessed the visual effects of the proposed Homesites as low or low-moderate from some private and public viewpoints along Hogans Gully Road. Since I prepared the LVA, reductions have been made to the maximum height of future buildings on most of the proposed Homesites in the Hogans Gully catchment (HS9-12 and 15-16) in response to submitters' concerns and Ms Gilbert's recommendations, and to minimise their

visual effects. The height reductions mean that now only very small parts of future buildings on these homesites will be visible from the submitters' properties and public roads. I consider that with the height reductions, the proposed Hogans Gully Homesites will give rise to very low to low visual effects.

28. In addition to the Homesites height reductions, since I prepared the LVA recommendations by Ms Gilbert in her evidence regarding the extension of the SPAs in the Hogans Gully catchment have been accepted by THRL and the SPAs have been enlarged to further improve the visual integration of HS buildings in this area.
29. Furthermore, changes are proposed to the provisions (rules) for the Sport Garden Activity Area (**SGAA**) to limit the number and reduce the scale of buildings that could establish in this Activity Area, which means that the visual effects of this Activity Area on private properties on Advance Terrace would be very low.
30. In relation to Activity Area A4² I conclude that the overall visual effects of the amended A4 will be comparable to the currently approved location due to the screening landform and planting extending along the north-eastern side of the Activity Area which will provide visual separation from McDonnell Road and the Arrowtown escarpment. Both Ms Gilbert and I consider the adverse visual effects of A4 and SGAA from these two properties to be low.
31. For A2³ the proposed extension is located to the north, further away from the submitter's residence, and visually separated by a LAMA along the property boundary. Since the tops of the activity area may be visible from the Page residence, it is proposed to reduce the building height to 7m for the entire area which means that any adverse visual effects of additional built form arising from the extension of the Activity Area would be outweighed by the height reduction of the approved development in this activity area.
32. Taking account of the opinions I expressed in the LVA and the revisions to the proposal made since, which further reduce the proposal's landscape and visual effects, I am of the view that the proposal will be in character with the existing

² Submission #2 G Todd and Submission #4 D Brown at 10 and 18 Advance Terrace

³ Submitter #18 Page at 148 McDonnell Road

environment and create very low adverse effects on the landscape and visual amenity values as experienced from outside the HRZ.

33. I consider that the proposed amendments to the HRZ will ensure that built development will be visually integrated with the existing environment, while maintaining the high amenity of open space that contributes to the surroundings and the internal quality of the resort.

EVIDENCE

Proposed Changes to THRZ PC Following Notification

34. A comprehensive assessment of landscape and visual effects of all the Activity Areas and homesites that are addressed by the Plan Change Request is provided in the LVA. I will not repeat the LVA findings.
35. In her evidence on the Plan Change Request QLDC's landscape architect, Ms Gilbert, makes a number of recommendations as to amendments required to ensure that the potential landscape effects of the Change can be minimised. Ms Gilbert states (para 1.9 of her evidence) that if amendments she recommends are incorporated, *'the landscape-related effects of the development enabled by THRZ PPC change will be minor; and 'the development outcome will maintain the landscape character and amenity values of THRZ and the surrounding environment, making it appropriate from a landscape perspective.'* The changes she recommends also address the landscape issues raised in submissions on the Change Request.
36. I concluded in the LVA (p.28) that *'the new homesites in the south-western part of the HRZ have been located in parts of the terrain where they can be absorbed with low visual effects from public viewpoints. While low-moderate visual effects may be experienced from some elevated private viewpoints on the southern side of Hogans Gully Road, the landscape character would be maintained.'* While I continue to hold this view, I agree with Ms Gilbert that the visual effects of some of the homesites can be minimised further through design amendments.
37. The following sections of my evidence outline revisions to the proposal made since I prepared the LVA, in response to QLDC's Section 42A report and evidence, and

submissions. As part of this, I provide an assessment of the landscape and visual effects implications of the proposed revisions.

Visual Simulations

38. A comprehensive package of visual simulations was prepared as part of the LVA. Initially, these visual simulations were prepared in early 2025 in response to QLDC's request for further information (dated 11 Dec 2024). Following notification a submitter requested (Submission #13 Draper) a visual simulation to be prepared to illustrate the view that could be gained from the outside deck of their property at 110 Hogans Gully Road.
39. As part of this evidence the visual simulations have been updated to reflect the changes to the HS heights and increases to the SPAs (see following sections for descriptions). Since all these amendments are located within the Hogans Gully Road visual catchment, only viewpoints 5-10 have been updated. These updated viewpoints are contained in **Attachment A**. The same best-practice methodology has been applied to the preparation of the simulations as outlined in the LVA (Section 4.1.3), and the Homesites are now labelled as requested by Ms Gilbert (para 1.10 of her evidence).
40. The photos for the visual simulations were taken from the following ten viewpoints (as shown on the viewpoint location plan Figure 1 in Attachment A):
- VP 1: View from Feehley Hill looking South
 - VP 2: View from Fox Terrace Walkway looking Southwest
 - VP 3: View from Cotter Avenue Walkway looking Southwest
 - VP 4: View from Cotter Avenue Walkway outside no.49 looking Southwest
 - VP 5: View from Arrowtown Lake-Hayes near Hogans Gully Road Intersection looking East
 - VP 6: View from outside 36 Hogans Gully Road looking Northeast
 - VP 7: View from outside 58 Hogans Gully Road looking Northeast
 - VP 8: View from outside 108 Hogans Gully Road looking Northwest
 - VP 9: View from Arrowtown Lake-Hayes opposite Ayrburn looking East
 - VP 10: View from deck of residence at 110 Hogans Gully Road looking Northwest (as requested in addition by Submitter #13)

Changes to Homesites in Hogans Gully Visual Catchment

41. Ms Gilbert has assessed the landscape effects of the proposed additional Homesites in the Hogans Gully visual catchment (referred to as Speargrass Flat valley catchment in her evidence, i.e. HSs 9-16) as more than minor, on the basis that they would *'introduce an appreciable landscape change to the landscape outcome anticipated by the PDP'* (para 1.5 -1.7 of her evidence). In her view, the partial visibility of eight new homesites would disrupt the spacious rural landscape of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (**WBRAZ**) *'read as rural living development sprawl'* (para 7.4).
42. In paras 7.5 and 7.6 of her evidence Ms Gilbert outlines that she considers it necessary to apply *'a very careful approach to the management of the visibility of built form on each HS, so that, at worst, only the upper portion of dwellings are seen in external views from Hogans Gully Road and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road in particular.'* This would in her opinion be required *'to ensure that the new development aligns with PDP THRZ Objective 47.2.1 and appropriately manages landscape-related effects.'* While she acknowledges that *'the visibility test'* that she considers should be applied in this part of the THRZ is *'more stringent than would typically be required in rural living areas in the Basin (i.e. the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (WBLP))'*, she opines that *'the landscape buffer role of this part of THRZ as 'breathing space' merits this along with the number of HSs proposed in this part of the site (which suggests the potential for cumulative adverse effects).'*
43. In response to Ms Gilbert's concerns, and taking account of the recommendations at paragraph 7.8 of her evidence, THRL proposes a number of changes to the homesites located within the Hogans Gully visual catchment.
44. Ms Bridget recommends an increase in the mounding height of the LAMAs for HS 10, 11, 12, 15 and 16. Her recommendation is to increase the LAMA mounding by 1m, apart from HS12 where an increase of 3m is recommended.
45. At paragraph 7.8(a) Ms Gilbert notes that THRL has proposed to reduce the HS9 rolling height (i.e., building height measured from ground level) and RL by 1m, to address concerns raised by Draper (Submitter #13)⁴. Ms Gilbert opines that this

⁴ Refer Brown & Co letter to QLDC dated 15/01/2026

will achieve a similar outcome in terms of managing landscape related effects as increasing the mounding per her recommendation. I agree and take this to mean that Ms Gilbert does not require any further changes to be made to HS9, given the 1m height reduction already proposed.

46. Adopting the same approach for HS10, 11, 12 and 16, in order to reduce the visual effects of the future built form on these HS, and hence reduce associated landscape and potential cumulative effects, rather than increase LAMA height (as Ms Gilbert has recommended), THRL proposes to lower the building heights and RLs for these Homesites. In particular, to lower these by 1m for HS 11, and 2m for HS 10, 12, 15 and 16. The notified maximum rolling building heights for these HSs, which I assessed in the LVA, was 6.5m with a corresponding RL. The amendments now proposed would reduce these maximum heights to 5.5m for HS 9 and 11, and to 4.5m for HS 10, 12, 15 and 16, with corresponding reductions to the RLs.
47. I consider that the reduction of the overall height of the homesite buildings will achieve similar results in terms of screening future built form through the proposed LAMAs (which remains unchanged from the notified proposal which assessed in the LVA), as could be achieved through increasing the height of the mounding within the LAMAs. As I have already noted, Ms Gilbert acknowledges in her paragraph 7.8, compared with increasing LAMA mounding height, lowering building height would lead to a similarly appropriate landscape outcome. In my view, reducing the height of buildings is preferable, as high mounding can look out of place, whereas lower building heights reduce the visual effect of the bulk of built form from a wider range of viewpoints.
48. I consider that the height reductions address the landscape concerns raised by submitters Draper (Submitter # 13) and Weber and Gibson (Submitter #20).
49. It needs to be acknowledged that the visual simulations depict the maximum bulk of built form in terms of footprint and height, whereas future buildings on the HSs will have different designs, roof lines, modulation, and could be differently sited within the HS to what the visual simulations show. In addition, not all buildings will use their maximum building height envelope for the entirety of the roofline. The particular design of the building will influence how it relates to the surrounding landform and vegetation, including the adjacent LAMAs, and will influence the potential effects. Noting that the visual simulations depict a 'worst case' visual

outcome and actual buildings may through their design 'read' differently (and improve on) what is shown in the visual simulations, where a lowered maximum building height of 4.5m is now adopted, a two-stepped height rule is proposed whereby the establishment of a building at the lower height (4.5m) would be a Controlled Activity, while a building up to 5.5m would be a Restricted Discretionary Activity. The matters of discretion would relate to 'visual prominence from public places outside the Zone' and 'external appearance including materials and colours (Proposed Rule 47.5.3A). Buildings any higher than 5.5m would be a Non-Complying Activity. This stepped regime would allow for visual effects to be thoroughly assessed through a focussed consent process at the time the detailed design of buildings on these HSs is known.

50. For clarity, the table below outlines the proposed changes to the maximum roof heights for buildings on HS 9-16 that would be provided for as a Controlled Activity. The homesites that are proposed with a 4.5m height could be increased to 5.5m as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, if they are able to demonstrate that appropriate landscape/visual effects can be achieved. The explanation in the last column of the table describes when these changes were made and if they were made in response to concerns raised by Council's landscape architect Ms Gilbert and/or by submitters.
51. I viewed these building heights staked on Site in early March 2026 to ensure that appropriate outcomes can be achieved in terms of visual integration and screening through the LAMAs. Based on these on-site findings HS 15 was lowered by 2m (instead of 1m as recommended by Ms Gilbert) to ensure visual effects from Hogans Gully Road are minimised.
52. I also reviewed the visual simulations that were updated (see **Attachment 1**) and consider that the landscape and potential cumulative effects of HS9-16 would be very low to low in light of the proposed amendments. Given the sensitivities of the Site and surrounding area, this would be an appropriate outcome in my opinion.

Table 1: Changes to Homesite heights and max building height (RL) following notification

Activity Area	Revised Max Building Height 06/03/26	Revised Max Building Height RL 06/03/26	Notified Max Building Height RL	Explanation of Proposed Changes prior to PC Hearing
HS9	5.5m	401.5	402.50	Lowered max building RL by 1m as per Brown letter to QLDC 15 Jan 2026 in response to Submission #13 (Draper). Ms Gilbert agrees that this addresses visual effects.
HS10	4.5m	403.5	405.50	Lowered max building RL by 1m as per Brown letter to QLDC 15 Jan 2026 in response to Submission #13 (Draper). Ms Gilbert recommends increasing LAMA mounding by 1m to 403m. Proposed to further lower max building RL to 4.5m
HS11	5.5m	418.50	419.50	Lowered max building RL by 1m as per Brown letter to QLDC 15 Jan 2026 in response to Submission #13 (Draper). Ms Gilbert agrees that this addresses visual effects.
HS12	4.5m	408.5	410.50	Ms Gilbert recommends increasing LAMA mounding by 1m to 403m or reducing max RL to 407.5m. Proposed to lower max building RL to 4.5m, providing 2m of mitigation due to lower building height.
HS15	4.5m	375.50	377.50	Ms Gilbert recommends increasing LAMA mounding by 1m to 376m or reducing max RL to 376.5m, as well as moving the BP approx 5m north, away from the road. The BP was moved as recommended and reduced by 2m (instead of 1m as recommended) This was based on on-site findings with poles erected. This also addresses concern raised by Submission #20 (Weber).
HS16	4.5m	414.50	416.50	Lowered max building RL by 1m as per Brown letter to QLDC 15 Jan 2026 in response to Submission #13 (Draper). LAMA has been amended following notification to increase mounding height and merge into slope landform on eastern side. Ms Gilbert recommends extending the extent of LAMA mounding to the west. Proposed to further lower max building RL to 4.5m

Sport Courts and Gardens Activity Area (SGAA)

54. Two submitters raised concerns regarding the potential effects of the SGAA (Submission #2 G Todd and Submission #4 D Brown). While I have not visited these properties, I have taken photos from the public walkway on Advance Terrace which is located in vicinity of the two residential buildings at 10 and 18 Advance Terrace and reviewed the visual simulations for this Activity Area. I note that these properties are situated in an elevated location with a relatively open outlook towards the existing entrance and proposed SGAA at a distance of around 350m, where due to the elevation of the properties, the proposed LAMA on the eastern side of the SGAA would provide less screening than from viewpoints along McDonnell Road.
55. In response to the concerns raised by the submitters, changes were made to size of structures allowed within the SGAA (max building size 60m² instead of 200m²) with a maximum number of buildings limited to three. In addition, the changes remove provision for cafes/restaurants and pavilions in this area, with only one greenhouse, pergolas and toilets provided for. Given that there is already a garden area with a greenhouse present in this area and that these lightweight structures would not present large perceivable bulk I consider that the visual effects on these two residential properties would be low at most.
56. I note that these submitters were also concerned about potential noise effects, which is addressed separately by noise expert Mr Day.

Activity Areas A4 and A2

57. Both submitters⁵ also raised concerns about the changed location and extent of Activity Area A4. I concluded in the LVA that the overall visual effects of the amended A4 will be comparable to the currently approved location due to the screening landform and planting extending along the north-eastern side of the Activity Area which will provide visual separation from McDonnell Road and the Arrowtown escarpment. I note that Ms Gilbert concludes in her evidence (para 6.4) that *“relying on my site visit to 10 and 18 Advance Terrace and the broader Advance Terrace and Cotter Avenue area (often described as the ‘Arrowtown escarpment’*

⁵ Submission #2 G Todd and Submission #4 D Brown

area), and careful review of the Clause 23 documents (including Visual Simulations from this part of Arrowtown), I concur with the Landscape Report's analysis of the relevant viewpoints (i.e. 2, 3 and 4)." She considers the adverse visual effects of A4 and SGAA from these two properties to be low. I concluded the same in my assessment and maintain this view.

58. Submitter #18⁶ (Page) requested changes to Activity Areas A2 and S2, but I note that S2 is not proposed to be changed from what is already approved, and I understand therefore, falls outside the scope of the Plan Change Request. A2 is located to the north-west of the Page property residence. It is an existing Activity Area, which is proposed to be extended to the north under the Plan Change. The landform that contains the existing Activity Area will be extended to ensure that the extended Activity Area is screened from this property. The LAMA that accompanies this Area mostly consists of planting to the east and mounding and planting to the north. The planting and landform separating this Activity Area from the neighbouring property will help to block most of the views, but the tops of the proposed buildings may be visible from the Page property. In order to ensure that glimpsed views can be minimised, the height limit for buildings in A2 has been reduced from 8m to 7m for the entire area (in the notified Plan Change documents). This means that the built form in vicinity of the submitter's residence would be less visible under the Change than under the existing Structure Plan. The proposed extension of the Activity Area is towards the north, extending the Area further away from the submitter's residence. The extended Area is visually separated by a LAMA along the property boundary. While glimpses of the proposed extension may be gained from the Page residence, the effects of additional built form would, in my view, be outweighed by the 1m height reduction that is proposed for this Activity Area.

Structural Planting Area (SPA) Strategy

59. In para 7.5 of her evidence Ms Gilbert outlines the following in relation to the proposed planting areas: *"I accept that the proposed LAMA and SPA strategy has the potential to accord with the zone purpose of achieving a predominance of open space in this part of THRZ. However, I consider that very close scrutiny of the collective planting strategy is necessary along with a very careful approach to the*

⁶ neighbouring property at 148 McDonnell Road

management of the visibility of built form on each HS, so that, at worst, only the upper portion of dwellings are seen in external views from Hogans Gully Road and Arrowsmith Lake Hayes Road in particular.”

60. In response to recommendations from Ms Gilbert in relation to the SPA, several updates to the SPA strategy amendments have been made. She recommends that *“the SPA strategy is reconfigured to include the three open, elevated, flatter parts of the southern portion of THRZ to achieve a coordinated and cohesive landscape strategy.”* Therefore, the three gaps shown in her Fig 2, are now proposed to be included in the SPA outlines. In addition, the SPA is proposed to be extended in the western corner of the HRZ, in vicinity of the BHT land, in response to recommendations made by Ms Gilbert in her para 2.21-2.22. Extension of the structural planting onto the lower escarpment in this area will assist in avoiding the creation of unnatural lines in planting that may draw attention to the boundary between the adjacent properties, while still allowing for grazing stock to move between paddocks in this area.

Walking/Cycling Trail

61. While the submitter Mr Dan (submission #15) is generally supportive of the Plan Change Request, in particular the deletion of Activity Area A7 which is located in vicinity of his property at 214 McDonnell Road and the addition of HS 6-8, he has raised concerns in relation to the screening of headlights from vehicles using the relocated access road to HS5-8 and privacy concerns regarding the routing of the cycle trail. Ms Gilbert has recommended additional planting is implemented in the vicinity of the Dan property to address these concerns.
62. In response to the Dan submission and Ms Gilbert’s recommendation, it is proposed to retain an existing dense hedge within the HRZ along the western boundary of the Dan property (see Figure 1 below). This will be shown on the Structure Plan. In addition, I am aware that the adjacent land to the north, owned by BHT (an entity related to THRL) has resource consent to establish earth mounding along the boundary including where it adjoins the Dan property. Mr Brown covers this in more detail in his evidence. The mounding, in conjunction with the existing vegetation, will assist with mitigating headlights from vehicles using the relocated HS 5-8 access road. Retention of the existing hedge will also serve to maintain the privacy of the Dan property when the cycle trail is formed.

63. Formation of the cycle trail is a Controlled Activity (Rule 47.4.1). In addition to retaining the existing vegetation (hedge) it is proposed to include in Rule 47.4.1 a new matter of control which requires planting to ensure that the maintenance of the Dans is maintained. Given the location of the trail on the HRZ Structure Plan is indicative and the final routing may change, I consider this will better ensure that the Dan's privacy is achieved, as compared with Ms Gilbert's recommendation.



Figure 1 shows the existing hedge located on the Hills property that will be maintained on the western side of the Dan property to provide visual separation from the track and the relocated access road to HS 5-9.

Hogans Gully Access Road

64. I understand that QLDC's traffic expert (Mr A Facey, section 3 of his evidence) raised concerns regarding the location of the turn-off of the access road to eight lots (HS 9-16), which did not allow for sufficient sight distance (para 3.6 ff). The applicant, therefore, proposes to re-locate the access road turn off by 30m to the east as shown on Sheet 03 of the revised LAMA plans. Given that the SPAs are not located in immediate vicinity of the entrance, there will be no implications on the planting areas contained within the SPAs.
65. In addition, submitters have raised concerns that this road could be used as an access to the wider THRZ, including activity areas and homesites located within the McDonnell Road catchment. I understand that this will be discouraged through the

new rule 47.5.23, as described by Mr Brown in his evidence. There are no landscape implications associated with this approach.

Conclusions

66. The proposed amendments to the HRZ comprise of relatively small changes to the location and layout of approved Activity Areas. The changes are required to enable an enhanced golf course design, and also provide for an additional eleven Homesites. While new Homesites are proposed, the building coverage in some of the approved/proposed activity areas will be lowered, leading to only a small overall increase of built form across the HRZ. The majority of the HRZ will remain as open space.
67. Specifically designed planting areas are proposed, including LAMAs for the new Homesites and amended Activity Areas that will largely screen built form, and extensive structural planting areas (**SPAs**) that will visually integrate the proposed Homesites into the wider development area.
68. Overall, the visual effects can be largely internalised with only limited/partial visibility of Activity Areas and Homesites from outside. Amendments to the Activity Areas are of a size and nature that they are unlikely to be readily detectable from outside the site and the Plan Change revisions will achieve a cohesive design which achieves an overall visual coherence with a similar landscape character and visual amenity across the entirety of the Zone.
69. The addition of new Homesites on the south-western side of the HRZ will lead to a change in this part of the Zone as future buildings will be partially visible from some viewpoints in this visual catchment. In the LVA, I assessed the visual effects of the proposed Homesites as low or low-moderate from some private and public viewpoints along Hogans Gully Road. Since I prepared the LVA, reductions have been made to the maximum height of future buildings on most of the proposed Homesites in the Hogans Gully catchment (HS9-12 and 15-16) in response to submitters' concerns and Ms Gilbert's recommendations, and to minimise their visual effects. The height reductions mean that now only very small parts of future buildings on these homesites will be visible from the submitters' properties and public roads. I consider that with the height reductions, the proposed Hogans Gully Homesites will give rise to very low to low visual effects.

70. In addition to the Homesites height reductions, since I prepared the LVA recommendations by Ms Gilbert in her evidence regarding the extension of the SPAs in the Hogans Gully catchment have been accepted by THRL and the SPAs have been enlarged to further improve the visual integration of HS buildings in this area.
71. Furthermore, changes are proposed to the provisions for the SGAA to limit the number and reduce the scale of buildings that could establish in this Activity Area, which means that the visual effects of this Activity Area on private properties on Advance Terrace would be very low. The reduction in building height for A2 to 7m for the entire area means that any adverse visual effects of additional built form enabled through the Plan Change would be outweighed by the height reduction of the approved development in this Activity Area.
72. Taking account of the opinions I expressed in the LVA and the revisions to the proposal made since, which further reduce the proposal's landscape and visual effects, I am of the view that the proposal will be in character with the existing environment and create very low adverse effects on the landscape and visual amenity values as experienced from outside the HRZ.
73. I consider that the proposed amendments to the HRZ will ensure that built development will be visually integrated with the existing environment, while maintaining the high amenity of open space that contributes to the surroundings and the internal quality of the resort.

Yvonne Pflüger

13th March 2026

ATTACHMENT 1 – UPDATED VISUAL SIMULATIONS (bound separately)