

EVIDENCE SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CAREY VIVIAN

- 1 My primary evidence outlines the planning history of the Arcadia RVZ, including the approval process of a Structure Plan and Design Guidelines in 2011 and a twelve-lot residential subdivision in 2014. Mr Veint's submission seeks the development rights approved by the Structure Plan, Design Guidelines and subdivision consent be retained for the property. This, in my opinion, is a very unique position that cannot be replicated anywhere else in the district.
- 2 In part 3 of my primary evidence I discuss how the approved Structure Plan and Design Guidelines can be incorporated into the notified Rural Visitor provisions by recommending the adoption of new provisions specific to the Arcadia RVZ. These provisions are outlined in Blue in Attachment G annexed to my primary evidence.
- 3 Ms Grace addresses my suggestions in Part 7 of her rebuttal evidence. At paragraph 7.2 Ms Grace states the premise of my evidence appears to be that historic resource consent processes demonstrate that the effects of landscape of the structure plan and the activities it provides are no more than minor, and so there is no impediment to incorporating the structure plan and design guidelines into the RVZ. Ms Grace considers this is not a helpful focus because the regional and district planning framework has been updated since these historic assessments were undertaken. In my view, Ms Grace overstates the "historic" nature of these consents.
- 4 At paragraph 7.4 Ms Grace states that she relies on Ms Mellsop's evidence on landscape matters in forming her opinion on the structure plan and provisions I proposed. Ms Grace states that Ms Mellsop's position remains the same as expressed in her primary evidence that development enabled by the structure plan and proposed bespoke plan provisions would exceed the capacity of the area to absorb development without compromising its landscape values. This is despite the fact that the zone provisions I suggest are lesser than what the Structure Plan approved. I professionally have real difficulty with Ms Mellsop's findings given her involvement in the approval of the Structure Plan resource consent as I detail in my primary evidence.
- 5 In paragraph 7.5 Ms Grace states that if the Panel were of come to an alternative view then she has undertaken a high-level assessment of the new provisions that I propose and comments on them. I address those planning matters in dispute (using the same lettering):
 - (a) With respect to my paragraph 3.2 Ms Grace considers my change is not necessary. As I stated in my primary evidence the third paragraph includes a statement that residential activity is not anticipated within the RVZ with the exception of onsite staff accommodation. I recommended amendment to this to acknowledge many RVZs contain existing, or in Arcadia's case, consented residential activity. That is factually correct.
 - (d) In paragraph 3.6 of my primary evidence I recommend the adoption of a new policy to adopt a structure plan. Ms Grace opines that a structure plan is a method used to achieve the objectives of the RVZ, rather than an outcome itself. Ms Grace considers a policy to adopt a structure plan would be more appropriate. In hindsight, I agree.
 - (e) In paragraph 3.6 of my primary evidence I propose a suite of policies specific to the adoption of a structure plan in the Arcadia RVZ. In principle, Ms Grace agrees it is appropriate to include a

suite of policies specific to a structure plan to show how the objectives are achieved through the implementation of the structure plan.

- (f) In relation to the above policies, Ms Grace finds there is a degree of repetition that could be reduced to improve plan usability. In hindsight, I agree.
- (g) Ms Grace states there is a lack of connection between the policies and the rules, so it is not clear that the proposed rules will implement the policies. She gives an example of proposed policy 46.2.3.8 which is to provide for the establishment of structures for the purpose of storage of recreational craft, such as kayaks, and for communal facilities. Ms Grace states that no specific rules achieve this. I disagree. Built form in the LR Activity Area is controlled by Rule 46.4.6 (which requires a controlled activity resource consent), Rule 46.2.1.3(g) which limited building height to 4.5m, and the size of the Activity Area LR (which is very small).
- (h) Ms Grace refers to the reasons Ms Mellsop considers my rules are not adequate enough to protect landscape values. With respect, in my opinion, all of the matters raised in Ms Mellsop's paragraph 3.5 are resolvable through amendment to the provisions that I propose.
- (i) Rule 46.4.1.3. This is the same issue raised in questioning earlier this week by Commissioner Dawson. I acknowledge that a permitted activity rule, specific to the Arcadia RVZ, would need to be included to give effect to the intent of my rule to avoid non-compliance.
- (k) Ms Grace considers the exception to my proposed rule 46.5.1.3(e) is unclear and considers it could be improved. In hindsight, I agree.
- (l) Ms Grace recommends amendment to my Rule 46.5.8A for building materials and colours. Ms Grace considers a specific colour range should be included in the standard, in a similar way to Rule 46.5.8, to ease plan implementation. In hindsight, I agree.
- (m) I am happy to agree to the removal of my proposed roading standard.
- (n) Rule 46.5.1.3. Ms Grace opposes this rule for the reason it is an activity rule and so should be located in the activity table. I have no issue with doing that. With respect to (d), the same issue arises as discussed in (i) above, and I acknowledge a corresponding rule is required to prevent the exception from retaining non-complying status.

7 In my opinion, should the Panel come to the view that the Arcadia Structure Plan should be provided for in the PDP, then it appears to me that all of the issues raised by Ms Grace and Ms Mellsop with respect to the provisions I recommend in my primary evidence can be resolved through caucusing.