

**Marion Read for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 21 July 2017  
Queenstown Mapping – Hearing Stream 13**

1. My landscape evidence for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) relates to requests for rezoning and landscape boundary changes in the Queenstown, Glenorchy and Kingston areas of the Queenstown Lakes District.
2. As I have noted previously, the District includes some of the most spectacular landscapes in the country. These landscapes are valued in their own right as the location of residential and recreational activity. They also provide the settings for the Queenstown, Kingston and Glenorchy urban areas. Consequently this part of the District differs from the Upper Clutha Basin in that all these urban areas abut Outstanding Natural Landscapes (**ONLs**) directly with areas of lesser landscape value being limited in extent and localised in distribution.
3. The determination of landscape classification boundaries is not an exact science. Landscapes, in the main, blend into one another over areas of transition. An exception to this is where there is a clear distinction between two geological or geomorphological features. These boundaries often coincide with changes in topography and/or gradient and consequently, with changes in vegetation cover and other landscape qualities.
4. Many of the submissions which I have addressed are located on land identified as ONL in the PDP. Most of these rezoning submissions do not specifically consider the appropriate location of the ONL boundary as it is often simply contiguous with the notified zone boundaries. This is particularly the case around the margins of the Queenstown and Kingston townships. Objective 6.3.1 of the PDP requires that 'Landscapes are managed and protected from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development.' Policy 6.3.1.6 states, 'When locating urban growth boundaries or extending urban settlements through plan changes, avoid impinging on Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Outstanding Natural Features and minimise degradation of the values derived from open rural landscapes.' I have interpreted 'impinge' to mean 'make an impact, have an effect' rather than its second meaning, 'encroach.'<sup>1</sup> A consequence of this approach is that I consider the potential impact of development being allowed to impinge on the ONL surrounding Queenstown to be low or very low in some instances, and high and unacceptable in others, depending entirely on the location and context.

1 Oxford Compact English Dictionary, P498.

---

## Group 2: Rural

5. Submission **764**<sup>2</sup> relates to a pocket of RR zoning adjacent to Camp Hill. The submission requests reconfiguring and extending the zone. I consider that some reconfiguration is appropriate to reduce the adverse effects on the landscape of the zoning, but consider additional controls to be appropriate if the total zone area is to be extended.
6. Submissions **168** and **298** seek the removal of the ONL boundary, the removal of the Building Restriction Area and the extension of the Rural Residential zoning at Wilsons Bay. I am opposed to all of these changes because of the adverse effects the development so facilitated would have on the ONL.
7. Submission **848** requests the rezoning of an area of land from Rural to Large Lot Residential. I am opposed to this as the site is isolated from other urban style development and its development for residential use would have an adverse effect on the ONL.
8. Submission **826** requests the rezoning of an area of land in the Kingston Highway for residential and commercial activity. I am opposed to this rezoning as I consider it would sprawl the Kingston urban development out of the land forms which currently contain it.
9. Submission **328** seeks RL zoning for land adjacent to the Kawarau River. I consider this appropriate if the density remains at the level contained in the Right of Reply version of Chapter 22 of the PDP.
10. Submission **431** requests an area of Rural land at Wye Creek be rezoned RL. While I consider that the site could absorb some development I am opposed to the rezoning.
11. Submission **827** seeks the creation of a new subzone and its application to a site within the Gibbston Valley. The submitter has recently lodged an amended structure plan and amended plan provisions which effectively reduce the scope of development within the proposed zone to something more similar to the consented development. Consequently I consider my reservations effectively addressed, overall, and my opinion of the submission is now that, from a landscape perspective, the relief could be provided.

- 
12. Submission **447**<sup>3</sup> requests the rezoning of two areas of land between the Kawarau River and Kingston Township from RR to RVZ. While I consider both of these sites could absorb some development, I am opposed to the rezoning requested. The submission also seeks the inclusion of Farm Base Areas within the PDP to enable farm related development on large properties. I consider that this idea has merit but that the controls regarding location and area are insufficiently developed at this stage to support its establishment.
  13. Submission **478**<sup>4</sup> requests the rezoning of land within Halfway Bay to Rural Visitor zone. While I consider that the bespoke rules proposed have merit in terms of the management of potential adverse effects, I remain opposed to the full extent of the proposed zone.
  14. Submission **607**<sup>5</sup> seeks the extension of the Rural Visitor Zone at Walter Peak Station. I consider that the relief requested could be granted in part, but consider the bespoke rules proposed to be inappropriate.
  15. Submission **677** requested the rezoning of the entire Woodbine Station RVZ or RL with a visitor zone overlay. While recognising that there are areas where this zoning might be appropriate the blanket zoning of the entire property is opposed.
  16. Submission **361**<sup>6</sup> seeks the establishment of an Industrial zone adjacent to State Highway 6 (this is land between the Kawarau River and Kingston Township). I am opposed to the establishment of this zone as I consider that it would have significant adverse effects on the character of the landscape and on the visual amenity gained from views of the Remarkables.
  17. Submission **393** seeks to establish an Airport Mixed Use zone on the top of Queenstown Hill. I am opposed to the granting of this relief because of the adverse effects on the landscape character, particularly natural character, and visual amenity provided by the landscape in which it is proposed to be located.

3 Loch Linnhe Station.  
4 Lake Wakatipu Station Ltd.  
5 Te Anau Developments Ltd.  
6 Scope Resources Ltd.

---

## Group 1A

18. Submissions **344, 418, 488, and 720** relate to remnants of Rural zoned land around the fringes of the Glenda Drive Industrial Zone. These remnants, in the main, no longer serve any useful function in terms of mitigating the effects of an industrial zone within a rural area, as the area is no longer rural in character. Some land adjacent to the Airport comprises remnants of rural land which were not rezoned through Plan Change 19 Frankton Flats B. I consider that the retention of Rural zoning is important along the top and slope of the Shotover River terrace escarpment to provide a continuation of the existing buffer between development and the escarpment. This is to provide for the mitigation of views of development within the industrial zone from the north, particularly now from Shotover Country and only applies to the land referred to by Submission 448.
19. Submission **574** requests the creation of a special subzone to encompass the area occupied by the Skyline Enterprises and other activities on Bobs Peak. My assessment leads me to consider that with some small amendments to the proposed structure plan and rules, this subzone has merit, and could facilitate further development whilst providing adequate protection for the ONL in which it is imbedded.

## Geographic Overlap submissions between Groups 1A and 1B

### *Frankton, Ladies Mile and the South Face of Ferry Hill*

20. Submissions **8, 399, 408, 501(4),<sup>7</sup> 698 and 751** relate to the appropriate location of the boundary of the ONL which encompasses Ferry Hill along with Lake Johnson, Sugar Loaf and Queenstown Hill. I consider that the boundary of this ONL is appropriately located in the PDP. I do note that the portion of this boundary on the southern side of Ferry Hill which climbs from the Frankton Flats to skirt the development areas within the Quail Rise Zone is less coherent from a landscape perspective than that further west.
21. Regarding the rezoning of the land to the north of the Frankton Ladies Mile Road, as addressed by Submitters **8, 391, 399, 408, 455, 717, 751 and 847** I consider that this land has potential for rezoning for residential development. This should

<sup>7</sup> Submission 501(4) is not one of the Geographic Overlap submissions, but my evidence in chief grouped 501(4) with them from a landscape perspective.

---

remain outside of the ONL as notified, and should be designed to maintain the amenity of the existing Quail Rise zone.

### **Group 1B**

22. Submission **501** requests that the Urban Growth Boundary (**UGB**) be relocated so as to incorporate the floor of the Coneburn Valley to the east of Peninsula Hill extending from Jacks Point in the south to the vicinity of the Kawarau River in the north. I support this submission, considering that this area has the ability to absorb urban development without adverse effects on the adjacent ONLs.

### ***Ferry Hill and Lake Johnson***

23. Submissions **338** and **396** relate to land around Ferry Hill and Lake Johnson. In the main, these submissions are located outside of the area considered by the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study (**WBLUPS**). I understand submission **501(3)** has been withdrawn.
24. Submission **338** requests extensive urban development over the northern face of the landform within the ONL. I consider that this development would have a very significant adverse effect on the quality of this ONL and on the visual amenity enjoyed from a large area of the Wakatipu Basin. The submission requests that the northern fringe of this area adjacent to the Shotover River but outside of the ONL be rezoned Rural Residential. I consider that some development could be contained within this area but consider that Rural Lifestyle zoning would be more appropriate.

### ***Peninsula Hill***

25. Submissions **533** and **661**<sup>8</sup> relate to an area of land between State Highway 6 and Peninsula Road and which is adjacent to HDR zoned land to the west. I consider that HDR zoning would be appropriate on this land as the impacts of such development in this location would have only an insignificant effect on the wider ONL of its vicinity.
26. Submission **429** requests an area currently zoned LDR be rezoned HDR. I consider that this would not adversely affect the ONL.

8 Land Information New Zealand.

- 
27. Submission **48** relates to a small site upslope of the land subject to submissions **533** and **661** and it requests LDR zoning over the site. I consider that this could be appropriate if the land downslope is rezoned as it would then form part of an edge to an area of development.
  28. Submission **425** requests, among other things, the alteration of the location of the boundary of the LDR zone on Peninsula Hill. I partially support this as an opportunity to make the zone boundary more coherent from a landscape perspective.

### **Urban Fringe – Gorge Road and Arthurs Point: Group 1C**

29. Submission **790** seeks to have a site located in Kerry Drive rezoned so as to be entirely LDR. I am opposed to this as I consider that the site provides considerable amenity to the residential development in its vicinity.
30. Submissions **349** and **716** seek the rezoning of an area of land to the north of Arthurs Point Road and the west of the Moonlight Terraces subdivision. I consider that rezoning of this land for either residential or visitor accommodation purposes would be acceptable from a landscape perspective.
31. Submissions **527<sup>9</sup>** and **494** request the extension of the Low Density Residential zone onto a hillock which forms the southern end of the Arthurs Point peninsula. Following consideration of their evidence I have reduced the area of possible rezoning that I can support from than that originally indicated in my Evidence in Chief.
32. Submission **450** requests HDR zoning over an area of land currently zoned LDR and which is immediately adjacent to the ONL of Mount Dewar. I consider that this is acceptable.
33. Submissions **642** and **495** request extensions to the Rural Visitor Zone. I support this in as far as it makes the boundary of the zone more coherent from a landscape perspective than the current boundary.

9 Gertrude's Saddlery Ltd (494) and Larchmont Developments Ltd (527).

---

**Jacks Point Zone: Group 1D**

34. Submission **715** requests the alteration and extension of the Jacks Point (Homestead Bay) zone over land located between the Lake and SH6. In the main I support the alterations proposed within the existing zone area, and I support a small part of the proposed extension of the zone.