

Marion Read for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 13 February 2017

Chapter 41 Jacks Point Zone – Hearing Stream 09

1. I have been engaged by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to provide landscape evidence on Chapter 41 of the proposed District Plan.
2. In assessing the proposed changes to the zone and submissions, my focus has been ensuring that the appropriate management of the landscape of the zone is continued.
3. To do this a strong policy framework is important. References to having 'appropriate regard for landscape and visual amenity values' have been removed from the primary objective for the zone and a number of policies have similarly been altered or deleted. I consider it important that these references be reinstated.
4. The proposed management of Activity Area R(HD)-G is disputed. There is a disparity between the evidence of Mr Te Paa and Ms Pfluger¹ with regard to the area encompassed, and I consider Mr Te Paa's estimate of 4.65ha to be the more accurate. He proposes 8 to 10 homesites be established in this area. I consider that this area should be absorbed into the broader OSG and that this number of further homesites could be identified and located in its vicinity.
5. The proposed management of Activity Area R(HD)-F is also disputed. It is topographically and botanically complex and is bisected by the ONL boundary. Ms Pfluger agrees that the portion of the area within the ONL should be removed from the activity area, but Mr Te Paa's plan does not show this. Part of R(HD)-F is immediately adjacent to R(HD)-D, which enables medium density residential development. Jacks Point propose development at this density (17 – 26 lots per ha) in this lowest area of R(HD)-F (Fa). I consider an area of transitional density more appropriate. I also consider that controls are necessary to protect the rock outcrops and indigenous vegetation within R(HD)-Fa. The portion of R(HD)-Fb is outside the ONL should be merged into the broader OSG and a further 5 or 6 homesites identified in its vicinity.
6. The proposed Farm Preserve (**FP**) activity area encompasses the area between the golf course and the northern zone boundary and is immediately upslope of R(HD)-F and R(HD)-G. At notification 34 lots were to be allowed within FP-1.

¹ For the "Jacks Point" submitters 762, 856, 1275, 765 and 1277.

Jacks Point has now made an alternative proposal consisting of 22 further homesites in this area and these are identified in Mr Te Paa's evidence. I am satisfied that all but homesites 51, 52, and 53 could be appropriately absorbed into the landscape. These three should be eliminated as they lack topographical containment. I also consider that an overarching revegetation plan for the area encompassing proposed FP-1, R(HD)-F and R(HD)-G should be prepared by the developer. Schrantz (195) request that the ODP be reinstated for the Tablelands area, which would eliminate FP-1. I consider the proposed homesite development in the context of regenerating indigenous vegetation an acceptable alternative.

7. The ONL portion of the notified FP-2 allows for up to 8 dwellings or visitor accommodation facilities. I consider that the priority on Peninsula Hill should be the protection of the landscape quality allowing for indigenous revegetation, recreation, and farming. An alternative proposal to establish 2 'super' homesites has been made by Jacks Point and these are discussed in the evidence of Ms Pfluger and Mr Te Paa. I remain opposed to the establishment of these areas because of issues of visibility, particularly the effects of lighting at night, and the difficulties of establishing access, which I do not consider could be achieved without adverse effects on the landscape.
8. I consider the proposed Education Precinct adjacent to the Jacks Point village to be acceptable. Jacks Point now wish to incorporate this area into the Village Activity Area. I consider this less acceptable because it would allow for higher density development and taller buildings in an area visible from the State Highway. I disagree with Ms Pfluger regarding the extent of this effect, but consider it only slightly more significant than she.
9. Jacks Point hill is an important landscape feature. I am concerned that the Open Space Landscape Activity Area would allow for the construction of fencing, farm buildings, tracks and the undertaking of mining. I consider the activities outside of the Lodge Activity Areas should be restricted to trail formation, recreational activities and indigenous revegetation outside of the Lodge activity areas as is currently the case. Wild Grass (567) wishes to have three new areas established as Lodge Activity Areas. One of these, to be used for vehicle parking, is appropriate, the other two are not appropriate for identification in the structure plan. I understand from Mr Freeman's evidence that this is acceptable to Wild Grass. I consider earthworks should have additional controls imposed in this area also.

-
10. In all of the Activity Areas the activity status of development has been relaxed so that residential development in particular would generally be permitted subject only to control by the Jacks Point Design Review Board. I am opposed to this in areas of the zone that are parts of sensitive landscapes. Including the 'Controls/methods to achieve objectives' (appropriately modified) from the relevant Design Guidelines as performance standards would satisfy my concerns in most instances.
 11. Landscape Protection Areas are included as overlays on the Structure Plan, retaining the role of vegetation management but also now having implications for possible development. The Tablelands overlay is missing from the notified Structure Plan but has been reinstated into the plan attached to Ms Jones's S42a report in a slightly modified form. The Peninsula Hill Landscape Protection Area is diminished in area and, given that the whole area is within the ONL I consider that it should be reinstated to its ODP limits.
 12. Planting controls have been included to support the indigenous character of the development and its surrounding landscape context and I have recommended new wording which clarifies the intention and application of these rules.
 13. RCL (632) request that an Open Space Community and Recreation Activity Area be added to the Structure Plan. I understand from Mr Espie's evidence they have amended this request to allow for educational facilities. The maximum building height is reduced to 7m; coverage to 5000m² in total; and buildings must integrate with the character of Jack's Point. I consider these to be positive amendments.
 14. Vivo Capital (789) wishes to extend development to the north of Hanley Downs including residential development and a further village centre. In my opinion such development must remain outside of the ONL, and a spatial plan would be necessary before this was included in the PDP.
 15. The Jardine Family Trust & Remarkables Station Ltd (715) request the removal of references to over domestication caused by farming in Policy 41.2.1.10. I am opposed to this amendment as the wild character of the higher reaches of the zone which are farmed are an important aspect of the landscape character.