

For: Wakatipu Equities Limited (WEL) and Slopehill Properties Limited (SPL) 26 July 2018

1. I support new Rural Living being promoted as a positive land use activity in the Basin and provided for because it is an acceptable land use with environmental benefits with low adverse effects on relevant environmental values. In my opinion rural living opportunities are only inappropriate where there is a clear mandate from the experts and the community (including landowners and neighbours) identifying that parts of the basin should be protected for specific identified characteristics that support the amenity values, why they should be protected, and how they should be protected.
2. The "ODP regime" (being controlled activity subdivision and development rights in identified locations coupled with a fully discretionary unprescribed regime elsewhere) is appropriate. In particular **firstly**, the controlled activity status enables subdivision and development in locations demonstrated as being capable of absorbing intensification of residential activity. It is therefore an efficient method for providing new Rural Living opportunities. **Secondly** the discretionary regime (with no minimum or average densities) is very effective at promoting a "design led" approach, resulting in appropriate landscape and visual amenity effects on a case by case basis. **And thirdly** I accept the ODP regime does not enable cumulative effects on landscape to be managed well at a broad scale. In my view this shortcoming ~~can and~~ should be overcome by the introduction of more specific/precise descriptions of the highly valued landscape attributes in the district plan, supported by methods which seek to discourage or avoid development in those specific locations. To be clear, I consider the provisions in Proposed Chapter 24 too broad brush to warrant avoidance of development in the WBRAZ.
3. I support the amendments sought by WEL to enable (via rezoning to precinct) and SPL providing for (elsewhere) new rural living opportunities on their land respectively because it provides a more appropriate means of achieving sustainable management. In this regard:
 - a. The s.32 Analysis relied on the findings of the Wakatipu Basin Study, which was deficient / inaccurate because the Wakatipu Basin Study: did not satisfactorily recognise that new subdivision and development can be absorbed in the landscape unit; did not take into account the opinions of the local residents on amenity values; and did not give sufficient weight to the benefits of providing for new rural living opportunities in the landscape unit.
 - b. Sections 5, 7(b), 7(c), and 7(f) carry substantial weight in this enquiry, at least until such time that the PRPS and/or the Strategic Direction (chapters 3 and 6) are completely settled.
 - c. Enabling the land to be developed and used for rural lifestyle subdivision and development will facilitate a more efficient use of land than not rezoning the land.
 - d. Enabling the land to be developed and used for rural lifestyle development will not result in adverse effects on outstanding natural landscape values. The Outstanding Natural Landscape values will be protected.
 - e. New Rural Living development can enhance environmental quality and amenity values.
 - f. New Rural Living development can result in nature conservation benefits, especially if these are incentivised in the District Plan policy framework (and my evidence is that it is appropriate to incentivise such benefits).
 - g. New rural living subdivision and development can occur within the site whilst maintaining or enhancing the highly valued landscape attributes. Therefore, any consequential changes to landscape values (including cumulative effects) will appropriately fit with the local rural character;
 - h. There is no valid effects basis to "protect" the landscape values associated with the site, except for the parts of the site which Mr Skelton has identified specific parts of the landscape

unit where new development should be avoided.

4. I support the retention of the provision for second (ancillary) residential units/flats (up to 150m²) as a restricted discretionary activity (irrespective of their location). As set out in my earlier planning evidence this provides a particular benefit to families by allowing them to reside in close proximity to each other, which I consider should be taken into account. I support enabling buildings within approved building platforms as either permitted or controlled activities, especially previously approved platforms.