

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL  
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES  
PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

**UNDER**  
the Resource Management Act 1991

**IN THE MATTER OF**  
Stage 3b of the Proposed District  
Plan

**SUBMITTERS**  
Cardrona Cattle Company Limited  
(CCC Ltd)

---

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF TONY DOUGLAS MILNE  
ON BEHALF OF CARDRONA CATTLE COMPANY LIMITED

---

**DATED:** 5 June 2020

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. My full name is Tony Douglas Milne.
2. I am a Landscape Architect and Director of Rough & Milne Landscape Architects Limited, which is a Christchurch based consultancy established in 2010.
3. I hold a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Canterbury and a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree from Lincoln University. I am a Registered Member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects Inc.
4. I have been practising as a landscape architect since 1995. Our consultancy is involved in a wide range of landscape design and land planning projects throughout New Zealand. Many projects have involved preparing reports and evidence, which address matters of visual impact and landscape effects concerning proposed developments.
5. I am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note (2014). I confirm that I have complied with that practice note in preparing this evidence. In particular I confirm that my evidence is within my area of expertise and the opinions I have expressed are my own except where I have stated that I have relied on the evidence of other people. I have not omitted any facts known to me that may be material in influencing my evidence.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

6. My evidence is presented on behalf of Cardrona Cattle Company Limited (CCCL) who own 91.4 ha at Victoria Flats, legally described as Lot 2 DP 420346 and Lot 9 DP 402448. CCCL is seeking part of the application site be rezoned General Industrial Zone (GIZ) as part of Stage 3b of the PDP.
7. My evidence is focused on the appropriateness of the proposed GIZ for the application site, in response to the landscape evidence provided by Mr Jones<sup>1</sup> where he is critical of the lack of assessment undertaken for the proposed rezoning of the site and opposes the rezoning.
8. In the course of preparing my evidence I have considered the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> Second Statement of Evidence of Matthew Jones. Landscape Architecture – Rezoning – General Industrial Zone. 18 March 2020.

- The Proposed District Plan (PDP), specifically Chapter 3 – Strategic Direction, 6 – Landscapes, Rural Character, 21 – Rural Zone and 23 – Gibbston Character Zone.
- The notified Chapter 18A – General Industrial Zone of the PDP.
- Section 42A Report on Chapter 18A – General Industrial Zone, prepared by Mr Luke Place, dated 18 March 2020.
- Evidence of Mr Matthew Jones on Landscape Architecture – Rezoning – General Industrial Zone, dated 18 March 2020.

9. The structure of my evidence is set out below as follows:

- A description of the landscape values of the site and surrounds
- A description of methodology
- A description of the proposal
- Matters raised in the section 42A landscape evidence
- Commentary on a second submission for part of the application site as Rural Visitor Zone
- Conclusion

10. An A3 Graphic Attachment (GA), dated 2 June 2020, is provided in support of my evidence and includes maps, aerials and photographs illustrating the application site and the Structure Plan, which sets out the developable areas anticipated by the GIZ. A second Structure Plan has been prepared for the Rural Visitor Zone (RVZ) proposal which relates to the submission 31039 made by Cardrona Cattle Company Limited.

## **LANDSCAPE VALUES OF THE SITE AND RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT**

11. In general, I agree with the brief description of the application site's characteristics and attributes set out in Mr Jones' report<sup>2</sup>, however, I consider further discussion of the character and values of the site and receiving environment is important to inform the analysis of landscape sensitivity and capacity, as well as discussion of landscape and visual effects.

---

<sup>2</sup> Second Statement of Evidence of Matthew Jones. Landscape Architecture – Rezoning – General Industrial Zone. 18 March 2020.

## **Attributes & Values of the Receiving Environment**

12. Sheets 4 – 8 of the GA indicates features of note and existing zoning within the wider context of Gibbston Valley and the localised receiving environment of Victoria Flats. The following list of elements and features contribute to the existing landscape character and values of the receiving environment:

- Victoria Flats is surrounded by mountains which contribute to a high level of natural character. Landscape values are associated with the legibility of the landform and amenity values include the scenic quality of the setting and sense of enclosure.
- On the flats, land cover is primarily pasture and low hardy thickets of sweet briar rose. Although exotic, the naturalised patterns of vegetation contribute to a perceived sense of naturalness.
- The river terrace itself has a rural character with a dominance of open space and very low density of built form.
- A variety of land uses including productive (stock grazing), semi-industrial (QLD landfill and quarry) and recreation activities (Wakatipu Gun Club, Oxbow Adventures and Off Road Adventures 4WD tracks) exist across Victoria Flats. In proximity to the QLD landfill, amenity values are reduced by odour and dust.
- Exotic shelterbelts, bunds and mitigation planting are typical elements of development across the flats. These are a human intervention which detracts from the openness and naturalness of the river terrace.
- The influence of the Kawarau River ONF on the river terrace is limited as it has an incised path well below the river terrace. It is a notable feature from Victoria Bridge and the highway corridor along the curve of the oxbow.
- The GCZ land within Victoria Flats anticipates viticulture use, although this is yet to eventuate. As such, the existing character of Victoria Flats is distinct from the character of Gibbston Valley to the west.

## **Attributes & Values of the Application Site**

13. As indicated in Mr Jones<sup>3</sup> report, the site has a unique shape and is essentially divided into northern and southern areas of the site. The proposed GIZ area has been refined since the

---

<sup>3</sup> Second Statement of Evidence of Matthew Jones. Landscape Architecture – Rezoning – General Industrial Zone. 18 March 2020.

original submission<sup>4</sup>; the revised area of the zone encompasses 16.2 ha within the north site and 41.2 ha within the south site. Annotated maps of the site's features are included on Sheets 14 – 15 of the GA in relation to the 'north' and 'south' site areas. Detailed inventory and analysis of the site features has been undertaken on Sheets 16 – 19 of the GA and includes slope, existing land use and modifications, vegetation and hydrology.

14. The following list of elements and features contribute to the existing landscape character and values of the application site:

- The site itself is relatively flat and open, exhibiting a working rural character, attributes contributing to this include modified vegetation cover, dominance of open space over built form and productive land use.
- Significant human modifications are prevalent as a result of farming practices and associated infrastructure. This contributes to the rural character of the site and reduced natural character.
- Ecological integrity of the application site is generally poor, due to lack of native vegetation and prevalence of exotic species.
- Amenity values afforded by the application site are broadly derived from the qualities of the mountainous landscape which surrounds Victoria Flats, which contribute a sense of ruggedness and scenic quality.
- Amenity is also influenced by the adjacent land uses, including the landfill and rock excavation operation. Amenity values are reduced by the proximity of the landfill. From the southern part of the site, dust and the tops of refuse piles are partly visible. From the north site, shelterbelts adjacent to Victoria Flats Road reduce the sense of openness otherwise experienced across Victoria Flats.
- Within the south site there is a sense of 'remoteness', although it is not actually physically remote as it is accessed to State Highway 6, a key transportation corridor for the region. A sense of 'remoteness' is attributed to the localised basin landscape which encloses the south site. As a result, visual influence of the south site, especially the west half, is highly limited.

### **Opportunities & Constraints**

15. Key opportunities associated with the site's location, values and physical qualities include:

---

<sup>4</sup> I understand that a formal amendment to the submission has not been made to ensure that the scope remains as per the submission.

- The visual influence of the site is limited to a short corridor of State Highway 6 with intermittent views.
- The topography of the south site allows for contained areas of potential developable sites which are visually discrete.
- The site is not a pristine natural landscape and has evidence of human modification due to farming and other activities.
- The site is located in close proximity to the landfill and other semi-industrial operations which would coexist well with industrial activities.
- Proximity to State Highway 6 which is a key arterial between Queenstown and Cromwell.

16. Key constraints include:

- The site is located partly within an ONL and the importance of retaining the quality of views towards these landscapes and features.
- The site is located partly within the GCZ which seeks to provide for viticulture and associated commercial activities.
- The site has and surrounds has a rural character which is inconsistent with the form of development anticipated by the standard GIZ provisions. However, existing rural character is likely to change with the implementation of recently approved resource consents.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Site Visits**

17. I have visited the application site on one occasion in March 2020 prior to the Level 4 lockdown. Given my experience on other projects in the vicinity, I have good working knowledge of the area. Given the situation with Covid-19 over the past months, desktop studies with GIS and Google Streetview have been utilised to undertake additional analysis and testing as well as round out the visual presentation of the assessment.

### **ZTV Study**

18. A Zone of theoretical visibility study have been undertaken utilising GIS to determine the extent of visibility of the site within the receiving environment. This has informed the proposed Structure Plan for the site including the location of proposed developable areas and provisions regarding height and building coverage. This approach has been utilised to ensure that the proposed future development areas are not highly visible from within the receiving environment and ensure an appropriate response to the site and its surrounds. The ZTV studies have also been utilised for undertaking a high-level assessment of visual effects resulting from the proposal.

### **Landscape Sensitivity**

19. Large-scale changes which introduce new or uncharacteristic features into the landscape or view are likely to have a more significant effect than small changes involving features already present within the landscape or view. Therefore, an appraisal of other existing modifications and patterns of development within the existing environment, as described previously, is necessary to determine appropriateness, along with consideration for the local planning context and activities expected within the zone.
20. It is generally considered that modification or development will have lesser effects on ONL and other non-ONL landscapes where there is obvious modification to the land (e.g. roads and their cuttings) and/or evidence of man's cultural processes already existing (e.g. buildings, fencelines, transmission lines). As a result, I consider the landscape sensitivity of the river terrace to range from moderate to low in closer proximity to the landfill and more obvious modifications. The sensitivity of the surrounding mountains is considered to be moderate-high due largely to the important landscape values associated with the landforms.
21. Assessment of the application site's landscape sensitivity has been undertaken and has been informed by the analysis of the site's character and values. *Refer to Sheet 21 of the GA.* Four sensitivity zones have been described: high, moderate-high, moderate and low landscape sensitivity.

### **THE GIZ PROPOSAL**

22. The proposed GIZ for the CCCL application site is supported by a Structure Plan. *Refer Sheet 22 of the GA.* The development of the Structure Plan has been an iterative process, informed

by the visibility assessment undertaken from the State Highway 6 corridor, analysis of site attributes and existing modifications and the landscape sensitivity analysis. The proposed GIZ Developable Areas are located in areas of lower landscape sensitivity and exhibit factors including limited visibility from State Highway 6, favourable topography, ease of access, reasonable sunlight access and presence of existing modifications. As a result, it is considered that these areas have a higher capacity to absorb development. A description of each area type follows.

#### **General Industrial Area 1 – 7.5 ha**

23. Located on the periphery of the development, these areas are intermittently visible from SH6 and transition the edge of the zone into the rural surrounds. The proposed zone is for small scale industrial uses which prioritise open space over built form. Height of built form is limited to 6m with proposed controls relating to form and colour, adapted from the Rural zone.

#### **General Industrial Area 2 – 19.9 ha**

24. These areas are less visible and are generally internal to the Zone. If visible, they are seen at a greater distance and can be largely screened from views along State Highway 6 with amenity setbacks or mitigation planting. Built form is limited to a height of 7m, with an exception for towers up to 12m. General Industrial Area 3 – 10.3 ha

25. Located internal to the development, these areas are not visible as they are setback a significant distance from State Highway 6 and contained by localised topography. The proposed height limit for built form is 10m, with exception for up to 12m for towers.

#### **Green Corridors**

26. Green corridors are proposed between industrial zones which allow for ecological improvements through revegetation of waterways and stormwater retention. They will also provide visual amenity for those visiting and working in the zone.

#### **Planted Amenity Setbacks & Mitigation Planting Zones**

27. Amenity planting setbacks provide separation and screening between different industrial zone types and uses. This will increase amenity within the development for the site's users. This will also provide a degree of screening and mitigation from viewpoints along State Highway 6 in order to minimise visual amenity effects of the proposal for viewers within the receiving environment.



## MATTERS RAISED IN THE SECTION 42A LANDSCAPE REPORT

28. The landscape report prepared by Mr Jones<sup>5</sup> concludes that the site does not have capacity to accommodate the type of development anticipated by the GIZ. Mr Jones provides a list of site attributes and characteristics which he considers will render the GIZ inappropriate for the site. The following paragraphs respond to those points.

**(a) The site is of a remote character and location and contained by topographical features.**

29. It is my opinion that the site displays a sense of remoteness while not actually being physically remote. The site is located in close proximity to State Highway 6 which is a major transport corridor between Queenstown and Cromwell. While the site is located outside an urban centre, there is often need for activities to be located close to a resource or away from population centres, as demonstrated by the adjacent landfill and quarry. Further, I consider that the contained nature of the site provides an opportunity as this allows a greater capacity to absorb the type of development sought while at the same time limiting the impact on visual amenity from the surrounding landscape.

**(b) Although contained by localised topography, the site is visible for long stretches along State Highway 6. Development anticipated by the GIZ will be incongruous with the surrounding landscape character.**

30. I do not consider the site to be visible for long stretches along State Highway 6. Having driven this stretch of State Highway 6 many times and having undertaken a ZTV analysis, I consider that views of the site are intermittent due to the localised topography and views of the site vary considerably as one travels through Victoria Flats and around the Kawarau River oxbow. *Refer to Sheet 20 of the GA which sets out the main view corridors from State Highway 6.*

31. I agree with Mr Jones view that visual effects on the view corridor from State Highway 6 are of critical importance. This corridor is a key transportation route between Queenstown and Cromwell and is travelled by locals and tourists. The landscape entering and leaving Victoria Flats is dynamic due to the Kawarau River oxbow, mountainous setting and Nevis Bluff. Therefore, regarding visual outcomes from State Highway 6, the key consideration is that future development will not compromise the underlying landscape values of the ONL nor the visual amenity and landscape character of the rural landscape as experienced from State Highway 6.

---

<sup>5</sup> Second Statement of Evidence of Matthew Jones. Landscape Architecture – Rezoning – General Industrial Zone. 18 March 2020.

32. Assessment of the site's visibility has been a critical component of the revised application and has informed the revision to the proposed zone boundary and development of the proposed Structure Plan, which seeks to locate future development in the less visible areas of the application site. In my opinion, this approach, paired with setbacks and mitigation planting as shown on the Structure Plan and bespoke provisions regarding height and building coverage, will reduce the visibility of the future development within the proposed zone.
33. Given the location of the proposed development on the river terrace, which does not extend onto the slopes of the surrounding landforms, I consider the visual amenity associated with values of the ONL will remain. While some degree of development on the river terrace itself will be visible, adverse effects will lessen in time as mitigation planting establishes. This will ensure that adverse effects on visual amenity values of the State Highway 6 corridor will be within an acceptable range.
- (c) The site is in part located within the GCZ which seeks to provide for viticulture and associated commercial activities.**
34. It is commonly regarded that the rural character of the Gibbston Valley is distinct from typical rural settings within the District. The GCZ is relatively permissive of certain kinds of development, including viticulture and tourism activities, to a greater degree than the Rural Zone and, as an exception zone, not subject to the ONL classification of Victoria Flats. The unique landscape character of the GCZ comprises a mix of viticulture, arcadian pastoral, natural features, rural living at varying scales, visitor attractions, historical elements and infrastructure. The amenity of the Gibbston Valley landscape is largely associated with the juxtaposition of viticulture and intensive pastoral uses on the valley floor in the context of the surrounding more natural hills and mountain slopes.
35. Within Victoria Flats the character of the Gibbston landscape has yet to eventuate. I consider this can largely be attributed to the physical separation of Victoria Flats from Gibbston Valley and further, the evolving patterns of land use which have occurred across Victoria Flats since implementation of the QLD landfill, which would not coexist with the landscape character of the GCZ as described above.
36. In my opinion, the location of the Gibbston Character Zone within Victoria Flats and, in particular, the southern extent of the application site, seems to be an anomaly given the localised topography of Victoria Flats and even more so, the south site, which separates this land from the rest of Gibbston Valley.

**(d) The northern part of the site is located within an ONL. The activities and scale of development anticipated by the notified GIZ are inappropriate in this setting.**

37. Earlier in this report I have provided a description of the landscape values of the receiving environment. The landscape values associated with the District Wide ONL within Victoria Flats and which overlays the northern part of the site in the PDP are primarily associated with the mountainous setting which encloses Victoria Flats, the landform has high legibility and naturalness and provides a sense of enclosure and scenic quality.
38. Across the Rural flats, there is an open character and degree of naturalness attributed to the dominance of naturalised vegetation patterns, although exotic. However, a significant level of human modification has occurred across the river terrace. Previous consented development has been implemented with mitigation strategies utilising bunding, native planting and exotic shelterbelts, allowing the landscape to somewhat absorb these activities with some impacts on the openness and naturalness of Victoria Flats.
39. On the land in proximity the landfill, both the ODP and PDP, Designation 76 'Landfill Buffer' provides for the operation and expansion of the landfill activities with a buffer from the adverse effects of the landfill. The purpose of the buffer is to provide visual screening and separation from the landfill as well as minimise effects of odours, dust and wind-blown litter. Much of the buffer zone has been significantly modified, including mounding and exotic tree planting for screening along Victoria Flats Road, which forms a backdrop to the application site. These modifications as well as the landfill activity itself and associated adverse effects do not align with the classification of an ONL.
40. The application site itself is neither particularly outstanding nor natural in an aesthetic or ecological sense. It is primarily appreciated for its setting within the context of the mountainous landforms enclosing the narrow river terrace.
41. The proposal seeks to retain the values of the ONL associated with the broader landscape while acknowledging that some areas of the site within the ONL overlay may be suitable for development due to the degree of modification and values of the site which clearly differ from the values associated with the surrounding landforms. To ensure development is proposed within appropriate locations, we have undertaken a landscape sensitivity analysis and assessed the visual influence of the site. As a result, the proposal has excluded areas with high and moderate-high landscape sensitivity, while enabling low density development within areas of moderate landscape sensitivity and locating the majority of the proposed

development in areas of low landscape sensitivity which are visually contained. With this approach, I consider effects on the ONL values identified above will be in the range of moderate to low.

**(e) The southern part of the site is of a remote character and location which will not be able to successfully absorb the scale and form of development anticipated by the GIZ.**

42. As described previously in response to (a), I am of the opinion that the southern part of the site is not remote due to its proximity to State Highway 6. However, I do agree that the localised topography contributes to a sense of remoteness and containment. As a result, I consider this presents an opportunity as the site has capacity to successfully absorb the scale and form of development proposed in the Structure Plan. The proposed zone and provisions have been refined since the original submission and informed by a Structure Plan which takes into account the site's landscape sensitivity and visual influence. This will ensure development within the southern part of the site is contained and effects on the surrounding landscape will be limited.

43. Within the site itself, the proposal will constitute a significant change. However, I consider in proximity to the landfill and other semi-industrial land uses within Victoria Flats, these activities will be able to coexist and are not entirely unexpected. Further, the layout of the proposed Structure Plan areas provides for a gradual increase in density from the edges of the site to the contained interior. Paired with mitigation planting and green corridors, this will help to integrate future development into the site and surrounds while also providing a level of amenity internal to the site for daily users.

**(f) There is a lack of existing buildings (including above ground activities and built form) within the localised context of the site. The introduction of development anticipated by the notified GIZ will be inconsistent with the surrounding character and appearing 'out of place'.**

44. Buildings viewed throughout Victoria Flats are not common although there is considerable modification across the river terrace which has been absorbed through bunding and shelterbelt planting. These methods of mitigation are in and of themselves, human modifications which are readily apparent across an otherwise open landscape. Further, I consider that an absence of built form does not necessarily preclude built form from occurring in the future and that rural character landscapes often include low densities of built form including large sheds and farm buildings.

45. It is important to consider that a General Industrial Zone does not necessarily equate to an urban form and density of development. While the proposal will introduce new elements into

the landscape, the proposed Structure Plan and provisions display a considered response to the site. Essentially this will introduce a new typology of general industrial built form with design standards to ensure development can be appropriately integrated into a rural setting. As shown on the structure plan, this will be achieved by introduction of three types of areas with different rule provisions relating to height. Areas located within parts of the site with a greater degree of visibility are subject to more design controls regarding building height, site coverage, form and colour, whereas those in areas with less visibility allow for more permissive controls. Further, the location of built form setbacks within the zone, paired with amenity and mitigation planting will also ensure the scale of future development does not appear 'out of place' and will avoid significant adverse effects on the open and rural landscape character of the surrounds.

**(g) From a landscape perspective, the GIZ zoning is inappropriate for this site. The development potential associated with the notified GIZ and also the recommended amended provisions (included within the submission) in my opinion is inconsistent and would not protect the landscape character and landscape values of the site and surrounding context.**

46. As described in relation to Mr Jones' comments above, I consider the proposed Structure Plan provides a bespoke response to the site that would allow a new typology of general industrial development to be well integrated into the site and the surrounding setting. While it is inevitable that the character of the application site will change through a change in land use and introduction of built form, the considered approach of the Structure Plan ensures the landscape character and values of the surrounding context will not be affected to an unacceptable degree.

## **RURAL VISITOR ZONE SUBMISSION**

47. In relation to a second submission for a smaller area of the CCCL site. I have prepared a second structure plan for the RVZ proposal based on the landscape sensitivity analysis and visual influence studies described previously, refer to Sheet 23 of the GA. The proposed RVZ incorporates an area of 36 ha which is mostly located within the GCZ. Four zones have been identified. I consider that Area 1, which has low landscape sensitivity and is not highly visible, has a high capacity to absorb development. Areas 2-4, being located within areas that have moderate landscape sensitivity and are more visible from the State Highway 6 corridor have capacity to absorb a small amount of development. I consider that a low density of built form in these areas will not detract from the values of the ONL nor visual amenity from State

Highway 6, as development of an appropriate scale, colour and form has potential to complement the rural character and visual amenity of the site and surrounds, much like small scale rural settlements or farm buildings currently do within the rural landscape.

48. I consider that there is capacity for the site to absorb this type of development and concur with the reasons outlined in paragraph 14.12 of the Jones report<sup>6</sup>.

## CONCLUSION

49. Through my assessment of the proposed rezoning, I consider that there is capacity, from a landscape perspective, for the application site to accommodate the type of development anticipated by the GIZ through implementation of the proposed Structure Plan and provisions. This will ensure adverse effects on the landscape values associated with the ONL and visual amenity as experienced from State Highway 6 will be to an acceptable degree.



Dated this 5 June 2020

---

Tony Milne

---

<sup>6</sup> Second Statement of Evidence of Matthew Jones. Landscape Architecture – Rezoning – Rural Visitor Zone. 18 March 2020.

## APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS & TABLES

### Natural Character

Table 1: Natural Character Assessment Rating<sup>7</sup>

Natural character rating	Very High	High	Moderate - High	Moderate	Moderate-Low	Low	Very Low
Ecological naturalness state	Natural	Near-natural	Semi-natural	Agricultural	Agricultural	Near cultural	Cultural
Measure of human influence	Non-disturbed	Very weakly influenced	Weakly influenced	Moderately disturbed	Strongly influenced	Very strongly influenced	Extremely disturbed
Typical habitats	<b>Self-regulating</b> Habitats approaching pristine state – no human modifications to ecosystems	Forest vegetation communities with species and structure typical of the site, limited harvesting or clearing of biomass, light fertiliser, pastoralism	Managed exotic forests, extensive pastoral farmland, slight improvements	Intensive grazing, developed pasture. Selection of species in terms of grazing potential (ie clover ryegrass pasture) Extensive arable land, irrigation, fertilised, limed, use of pesticides, drainage	Regular cultivation, intensively cropped arable land, horticultural cropping, drainage, heavy use of fertiliser and pesticides	Parkland, greenways, green open space	<b>Non-self-regulating</b> Urban-suburban
Vegetation structure	No change	No change	Maybe naturally occurring, layers beneath exotic canopy	Improved pasture, annual crops	Perennial or annual crops dominant	Amenity plants, turf, ephemeral weeds	Amenity plants, turf, ephemeral weeds
Floristic composition	No change	Most species spontaneous	Some species spontaneous, e.g. understory in exotic forestry	Few species spontaneous, other than weeds. Weed growth controlled	Few species spontaneous, other than weeds. Weed growth controlled	Few to no species spontaneous, other than weeds. Weed growth generally controlled	No species spontaneous, other than weeds.
Substrate change	No change	Few changes	Small, superficial	Moderate	Drastic	Drastic - artificial	Drastic, compaction, artificial, impervious surfaces

<sup>7</sup> Ecosystem Factors in the assessment of naturalness (After Sukopp 1971 and van der Maarel (1975).

## Landscape Effects

Table 2: Landscape Effects Rating Scale<sup>8</sup>

Magnitude/Degrees	Use and Definition
Very Low	Negligible loss of or modification of key elements, features, characteristics, and/or values of the baseline. Influence of new elements on landscape character and/or landscape value is barely discernible.
Low	Very little material loss of or modification to key elements, features, characteristics and/or values. New elements integrate seamlessly into the pre-development landscape character and/or landscape values.
Moderate-Low	Minor loss of or modification of one or more key elements, features, characteristics and/or values. New elements are not uncharacteristic within the receiving landscape and do not disturb the pre-development landscape character and/or landscape values.
Moderate	Partial loss of or modification of key elements, features, characteristics and/or values. The pre-development landscape character and/or landscape value remains evident but is changed.
Moderate-High	Modifications of several key elements, features, characteristics and/or values. The pre-development landscape character and/or landscape values remain evident but materially changed.
High	Major modification or loss of most key elements, features, characteristics and/or values. Little of the pre-development landscape character remains and amounts to a significant change in the landscape character and/or landscape values.
Very High	Total loss of key elements, features, characteristics and/or values. Amounts to a very significant change in landscape character and/or landscape values.

## Visual Effects

Table 3: Visual Amenity Effects Rating Scale<sup>9</sup>

Magnitude/Degrees	Use and Definition
Very Low	Negligible loss of or modification to key elements, features and/or characteristics of the baseline. Visual influence of new elements is barely discernible.
Low	Very little material loss of or modification to key elements, features and/or characteristics. New elements integrate seamlessly into the pre-development visual environment.
Moderate-Low	Minor loss of or modification to one or more key elements, features, and/or characteristics. New elements are not uncharacteristic within the visual environment and do not disturb the pre-development visual amenity.
Moderate	Partial loss of or modification to key elements, features, and/or characteristics. The pre-development visual amenity remains evident but is changed.

<sup>8</sup> Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Bridget Mary Gilbert for Queenstown Lakes District Council, Topic 2-Rural Landscapes, Annexure 2: Guidelines for the Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects, 29 April 2019

<sup>9</sup> Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Bridget Mary Gilbert for Queenstown Lakes District Council, Topic 2-Rural Landscapes, Annexure 2: Guidelines for the Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects, 29 April 2019



Moderate-High	Modifications of several key elements, features and/or characteristics. The pre-development visual amenity remains evident but materially changed.
High	Major modification or loss of most key elements, features and/or characteristics. Little of the pre-development visual amenity remains and amounts to a significant change in visual amenity values.
Very High	Total loss of key elements, features and/or characteristics, which amounts to a very significant change in visual amenity.

## Adverse Effects

Table 4: Determining the Nature of Effects<sup>10</sup>

Nature of Effect	Use and Definition
Adverse (negative)	The proposed development would be out of scale with the landscape or at odds with the local pattern and landform which results in a reduction in landscape and / or visual amenity values.
Neutral (benign)	The Proposed development would complement (or blend in with) the scale, landform and pattern of the landscape maintaining existing landscape and / or visual amenity values.
Beneficial (positive)	The proposed development would enhance the landscape and / or visual amenity through removal or restoration of existing degraded landscape uses and / or addition of positive elements or features.

Table 5: Minor Effects for Notification Determination and Non-complying Activities

Very Low	Low	Moderate-Low	Moderate	Moderate-High	High	Very High
Less than minor	Minor		More than minor		Significant	

<sup>10</sup> Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment Methodology, Appendix A, Boffa Miskell, 5 April 2018