

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT COUCIL

IN THE MATTER of a hearing on submissions to the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan pursuant to clause 8B of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

ON BEHALF OF **UPPER CLUTHA TRANSPORT LIMITED**
Submitter (3256)

**EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF BENJAMIN ESPIE
(LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT)**

11th AUGUST 2020

1. The submission site is zoned Rural Zone by the PDP and Rural General Zone by the ODP but it is unusual in that it sits on the fringe of Luggate Town between two sites that accommodate industrial activity. Additionally, part of the site is a closed landfill and the remainder is covered in dense, mature, unkempt pines.
2. Due to the site's characteristics and context, I consider that (subject to visual effects being appropriate), the use of the site for industrial land uses will not be at odds with the patterns of existing landscape character; existing landscape character will not be degraded. A pattern of land use commensurate with an urban fringe location and with the neighbouring sites will be enabled.
3. The provisions that are proposed to be included in the GIZ (or the Rural Industrial Sub Zone in the alternative) do not provide for unrestricted development and include specific setbacks and mitigation of potential effects by way of landscaping. As will be elaborated on by Mr Edgar, the details of final proposed provisions are the subject of ongoing discussion with the Council's reporting experts.
4. The site is plainly visible from Church Road. It currently contributes relatively little in terms of visual amenity and sits in the context that has been described; adjacent to other industrial land use on the outskirts of Luggate. By use of broad setbacks and control of landscape treatment, I consider that a result will be enabled that is not detrimental to current visual amenity as experienced by a Church Road user. Industrial use of the site, as regulated by the proposed provisions and visually screened or softened by roadside landscape treatment, will not appear unexpected, incongruous or degrading in this location.
5. The site is also visually experienced at close quarters from the public track that follows the Clutha River corridor. Again, the site currently appears unkempt and sits between other visible industrial activities. A track user's experience is dominated by the river itself in this location. Again, I consider that the use of setbacks and landscape treatment will enable activity on the site that does not significantly degrade the amenity of a trail user compared to the current situation.
6. As has been mentioned, discussions with Council experts has been ongoing, including discussions between Mr Jones and myself. Mr Jones supports an instance of industrial activity in this location but seeks some more certainty regarding the treatment of setbacks and landscaping in relation to how the site is visually experienced from Church Road and (in particular) the public track to the east of the site. I agree that these issues are important and discussions have included the concept of potential additional provisions to add clarity and certainty.
7. Overall, due to the specific characteristics of the site and its immediate context, I consider that industrial use of the site as proposed can sit comfortably in the landscape such that the character of the broader landscape is maintained.

Ben Espie

vivian+espie

11th August 2020