

**BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL HEARINGS PANEL**

**UNDER** the Resource Management Act 1991

**IN THE MATTER** of the review of parts of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's District Plan under the First Schedule of the Act

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of submissions and further submissions by **REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED AND QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED**

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF REBECCA ANNE SKIDMORE ON BEHALF OF REMARKABLES PARK LIMITED AND QUEENSTOWN PARK LIMITED**

**(URBAN DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE)**

**STREAM 13 REZONING HEARINGS**

**28 August 2017**

---

---

**BROOKFIELDS  
LAWYERS**

J D Young / M Goudie  
Telephone No. 09 379 2155  
Fax No. 09 379 3224  
P O Box 240  
DX CP24134  
**AUCKLAND**

## 1. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

1.1 My name is Rebecca Anne Skidmore. I am an Urban Designer and Landscape Architect. I prepared evidence in chief (**EiC**) dated 9<sup>th</sup> June 2017. I confirm my qualifications and experience as set out in that statement. I also confirm my compliance with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (2014).

1.2 Since writing my EiC I have read the rebuttal evidence of Ms Mellsop (Landscape Architect) on behalf of the Council. I also attended an expert witness caucusing meeting<sup>1</sup> on the 22 August 2017. Matters discussed at that meeting have informed this supplementary statement. In this evidence I will respond to a number of matters raised in the evidence of Ms Mellsop. This evidence should be read in conjunction with the supplementary evidence of Stephen Brown and Dave Serjeant.

## 2. RURAL SETTLEMENT PATTERN

2.1 At paragraph 4.6 of her rebuttal evidence Ms Mellsop agrees that through the CDP process there is the potential to ensure that RV3 could appear as a 'large rural visitor village'. She then goes on to calculate the development area enabled in the two terrace areas (based on the site coverage control). As noted in the joint witness statement,<sup>2</sup> these calculations are based on slightly incorrect land areas (estimated by Ms Mellsop). Based on the correct areas of 15.1 ha for the lower terrace and 12.4 ha for the upper terrace, the coverage enabled would be 41,000m<sup>2</sup> for the lower terrace and 23,000m<sup>2</sup> for the upper terrace. I remain of the opinion that, in the context of the expansive and dramatic rural setting, the built environment will be subservient to, and its character strongly influenced by, its setting. Together with the requirements for the CDP<sup>3</sup> and matters for control for new buildings<sup>4</sup>, in my opinion, the village will have a rural rather than an urban character.

2.2 To better ensure that planting both within and around the village contributes to the creation of a character that responds to and integrates with its setting, I recommend that the last bullet point of the matters of discretion could be amended as follows:<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In attendance: Ms H Mellsop, Mr R Buxton, Mr S Brown and Ms R Skidmore.  
<sup>2</sup> Which is to be submitted as part of legal submissions of Counsel for QPL and RPL.  
<sup>3</sup> Revised Rule 44.4.8 (previously 44.4.9.2).  
<sup>4</sup> Revised Rule 44.4.9.1.  
<sup>5</sup> Revised Rule 44.4.8 (previously 44.4.9.2).

Landscape and planting strategies both within and around the Activity Area to integrate the village with its wider setting, reinforce the natural landscape patterns, and create structure and visual breaks to development using both plants that are indigenous to the area and exotic species.

- 2.3 The analysis of development potential set out in paragraph 4.8 of Ms Mellsop's rebuttal evidence addressing the residential pods is based on slightly incorrect estimates of the areas of the development pods. In my opinion, the two critical factors to consider in combination are, first, that the overall total number of residential sites across the zone is limited to 90<sup>6</sup> and secondly, that the minimum lot size is 4,000m<sup>2</sup>.<sup>7</sup> In my opinion, these controls will ensure that the intensity of residential activity is suitable to ensure a rural character is achieved. I note that the 4,000m<sup>2</sup> minimum lot size is compatible with the operative District Plan Rural Living zone, which enables one dwelling per 4,000m<sup>2</sup> on sites equal to or greater than 8,000m<sup>2</sup> and for Bobs Cove a minimum lot size of 4,000m<sup>2</sup>.
- 2.4 Further comment about matters for discretion to ensure an appropriate subdivision pattern that responds to the landscape values of the area and maintains a rural character is set out in Section 4 below.
- 2.5 An issue that was raised in our caucusing meeting was the scenario where development is not associated with or precedes subdivision and would therefore not be subject to the minimum lot size or matters of discretion for subdivision. In my opinion, there would be benefit in providing a link to these provisions for development not associated with subdivision as set out below (at paragraph 3.3).

### **3. REQUIREMENTS FOR CDP'S**

- 3.1 In her rebuttal evidence, Ms Mellsop discusses the benefits of requiring a CDP for all activity areas. The provisions attached to Mr Serjeant's evidence (Annexure A) require a CDP for RV3, RV4 and RR3. It was considered that the complexity of these areas, in terms of topography and, in the case of RV3 and RV4, the activity mix and resulting development pattern enabled would benefit from a CDP to ensure an integrated approach to the broad planning and structuring of these areas. The other activity areas are either much smaller or more straight forward in terms of their topography and anticipated activity mix. I remain of the opinion that the effects of development for these activity areas can be appropriately managed through the

---

<sup>6</sup> Revised Rule 44.5.3.

<sup>7</sup> Revised Rule 27.6.1.

subdivision process. To require a CDP first would result in a duplication of process that would be of little benefit. However, after considering the points raised in Ms Mellsop's rebuttal evidence and following discussions in our caucusing meeting, I do consider the matters for discretion for subdivision<sup>8</sup> within the QPSZ could be expanded to include:

- (a) Response of development pattern to landscape values both within the Activity Area and in the surrounding context;
- (b) Planting and other landscape treatment that responds to the landscape values and rural character of the area; and
- (c) Maintenance of rural character.

3.2 I note that no assessment criteria are provided. However, in administering the matters for discretion regard would be had to the zone objectives and policies to provide guidance. These are clear in terms of the outcomes sought to integrate development with its landscape setting and to achieve a rural character. A specific note could be added directing the plan user to the zone objectives and policies.

3.3 It is recommended that the provisions are further amended to ensure that for development within RR 2, 4, 5 and 6 areas that is not associated with, or precedes subdivision, a link is made to the subdivision matters of discretion.

3.4 Having considered the points raised in Ms Mellsop's rebuttal evidence and the caucusing meeting discussion, I consider the matters for discretion for CDP's for RR3<sup>9</sup> are appropriate. However, to provide greater emphasis on the importance of ensuring a rural character is created and the pattern of development responds to the landscape values of the activity area and wider context, the list of matters for discretion could be expanded to include:

- (a) Response to the landscape values of the activity area and wider context; and
- (b) Mechanisms to reinforce the rural character of the activity area and its setting.

3.5 I also suggest that the last bullet point could be amended as follows:

---

<sup>8</sup> Revised Rule 27.5.7.  
<sup>9</sup> Previously 44.10.3.

Landscape and planting strategies both within and around the Activity Area to integrate the rural residential environment with its wider setting and reinforce the natural landscape patterns using predominantly native planting.

#### 4. OTHER MATTERS

4.1 At paragraph 4.31 of her rebuttal evidence Ms Mellsop sets out a number of matters that she considers have not been fully addressed by either myself or Mr Brown.

4.2 In terms of road widening and the effects of increased traffic movement and parking areas, I note that the QPSZ will utilise the existing farm road to access the various activity areas. I understand that only minor widening and amendments will be necessary to accommodate vehicular access to the intended uses. As the gondola will provide a primary transport connection to the zone, traffic generation and requirements for parking will be limited. In my opinion, these features will be subservient to the wider landscape setting and will not serve to diminish the rural character or landscape values of the zone. I note that the location and design of parking is a matter for control for buildings in RV areas;<sup>10</sup> and the layout of the street pattern and car parking is included as a matter for discretion for a CDP in RV activity areas.<sup>11</sup> The location and design of car parking is also listed as a matter over which control is reserved for Gondola base stations or terminal buildings. For a CDP for RR3, the matters for discretion include roading alignments and access.

4.3 The provision for 'glamping' (Rule 44.4.15) was discussed at our caucusing meeting. My understanding is that it is intended that this relates to remote, non-permanent tent-style accommodation. Having considered the matters raised in the caucusing discussion, in my opinion, the matters over which control is reserved should be expanded to include:

- (a) Scale of structures;
- (b) Access;
- (c) Provision of services; and
- (d) Land modification.

4.4 In relation to bridges and jetties, I note that these are structures that will contribute positively to the connectivity and access to the zone and its recreation opportunities. In my opinion, such structures will provide a considerable public benefit in

---

<sup>10</sup> Revised Rule 44.4.9.

<sup>11</sup> Revised Rule 44.4.8 (previously 44.4.9.2).

association with the various activities the zone enables. A number of possible locations are identified on the structure plan (not that all are envisaged to be implemented) to demonstrate a commitment to delivering these amenities. However, the detail of any proposal would need to be carefully considered through the RD consent process. In my opinion, the matters for discretion listed for Jetties or Wharves in rule 44.4.17 are appropriate. In my opinion, it would be suitable to include 'pedestrian/cycle bridges' in the same category in the activity table.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

- 5.1 Having considered the rebuttal evidence of Ms Mellsop and participated in expert caucusing I remain of the opinion that the characteristics of Queenstown Park make it particularly well suited to accommodate the rural based tourism and recreation hub that is enabled by the QPSZ.
- 5.2 In my opinion, the proposed QPSZ is a rural zone that will sit comfortably and be subservient to its spectacular landscape setting. In response to an issues raised by Ms Mellsop, I recommend a number of amendments to further refine the package of provisions proposed to ensure the landscape values of the land and its setting and its rural character are respected and reinforced.

Rebecca Anne Skidmore

**28 August 2017**