

Helen Mellsop for QLDC: Summary of Evidence, Stream 17/18 - Landscape

1. I have prepared landscape evidence in relation to submissions on notified provisions and mapping for RVZs, the Arthurs Point North area, and the Cardrona Settlement Zone. I have also provided evidence in relation to the new RVZ sought at Morven Ferry and changes sought to the utilities rules in Stream 17 and 18 zones.

General Industrial Zone, Three Parks Commercial Zone, Cardrona Settlement Zone

2. In my opinion, more refined site specific landscape assessment would be required to support the increased utility pole height standard sought for these zones (3032). The landscape evidence provided does not adequately address the influence of the zone area and the landscape context on the ability of industrial or commercial zones to absorb telecommunications infrastructure. Nor does it recognise the varying levels of amenity and landscape value in different industrial and commercial zones.

RVZ

3. In general terms I support the amended rebuttal RVZ provisions from a landscape perspective. In particular, I support the changes to the zone standards recommended by Ms Grace, which introduce external appearance standards and total building coverage standards for any new RVZs. In my view these provisions should also apply to the notified RVZs.

Morven Ferry RVZ

4. No expert analysis of the landscape sensitivity of the site and surrounding area has been provided to support the currently proposed RVZ at the corner of Morven Ferry Road and the Twin Rivers Trail (31035). My view is that there is potential for a small area of RVZ to be absorbed in this location. The proposed building setback from Morven Ferry Road is beneficial in this regard. However I consider that careful design of buildings, access, parking and landscaping would be required to allow a 1500m² total floor area to be absorbed without adverse visual amenity effects. In my view controlled activity development status would not ensure this level of design. A total building coverage standard of 500m² would be more appropriate, in my view.

Arcadia RVZ

5. I do not support the relief sought by L Veint for the Arcadia RVZ (31006). Despite the reductions in proposed total building coverage and the introduction of restricted discretionary status for buildings in some areas, the proposed structure plan and bespoke planning provisions would not appropriately protect the landscape values of

the zone or ONL in which it is set. Development enabled on the lower zone slopes which lead down to Diamond Lake would, in my view, inappropriately reduce the naturalness and the coherence of scenic views within the landscape. It could also have significant adverse effects on the perceived quality and aesthetic coherence of the surrounding ONL. Aspects of the proposed bespoke zone rules and standards (for example the maximum building heights), would enable development likely to be inappropriate in this highly valued landscape setting.

Arthurs Point North

6. I support the retention of BRAs 3 and 4 in Arthurs Point North. In my view development in accordance with the underlying MDR zoning would not maintain the naturalness of the knoll at the eastern end of Arthurs Point (BRA 3). It also has the potential to adversely affect the landscape and visual amenity values of the eastern Arthurs Point Basin ONL (BRA 3 and 4). I have recommended changes to the extent of BRA 2 to respond more closely to the existing topography.
7. I do not support the extension of BRAs into the Rural Zone ONL (31041), as I consider the landscape-related provisions of the PDP are sufficient to protect the values of this land, without a BRA.
8. I do not support the retention of the ODP RVZ extent and provisions at 164 Arthurs Point Road (31028). In my opinion the steep unmodified parts of the Shotover escarpment within this site are clearly part of the Shotover River ONF and have no capacity to absorb development.
9. In my view an increase in permitted building height (31031 and 31032) for the steep MDR-zoned slopes on the lower part of Mount Dewar would result in inappropriate adverse landscape and visual effects. The bulk and dominance of buildings of up to three stories on a prominent and visible slope would exacerbate adverse effects on the natural character and visual coherence of Mount Dewar.
10. I agree that the additional area of MDRZ sought by R Stewart (31038) would result in a more logical, coherent and landform-related pattern of urban development within Arthurs Point North. However I recommend that the boundaries of the proposed zoning be refined.

Cardrona Settlement Zone

11. I oppose the rezoning of the upper part of Mr Butson's (31036) property from Rural to Settlement Zone. In my assessment, development on these toe slopes of the mountain could result in an anomalous extension of prominent built form beyond the natural topographical boundaries of the village.