

## **Emily Suzanne Grace for QLDC: Summary of Evidence, Stream 18 – Rural Visitor Zone**

1. The Rural Visitor Zone (RVZ) was notified in four locations, with 14 requests received through submissions to apply the zone to new locations. The RVZ implements Strategic Objectives and Policies in Chapter 3 that seek to realise the socioeconomic benefits of visitor industry, and to retain the District's distinctive landscapes. The enabling of visitor industry-related activities is provided for through a combination of permitted and controlled activity status for visitor industry-related activities and buildings. Effects on landscape are managed through the extent of the RVZ itself, being limited in size, then within the boundaries of the RVZ, through landscape sensitivity mapping. The rule framework is directly tied to the landscape sensitivity mapping, with buildings in moderate-high landscape sensitivity areas requiring consent as a discretionary activity, and buildings in high landscape sensitivity areas requiring consent as a non-complying activity.
2. The notified RVZs are all located within ONLs. The RVZ provisions were drafted to reflect the ONL status and the known developments and activities on those sites. They were also drafted prior to the release of the 'Topic 2 Interim Decision' of the Environment Court on landscape matters. I have recommended changes to the provisions of the Chapter to strengthen the management of landscape matters in light of the Topic 2 Interim Decision, with scope created through a submission (Christine Byrch, 31030) seeking clarification of the purpose and extent of the Zone.
3. The requests for new RVZs are on land within ONLs, Rural Character Landscapes (RCL) and the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (WBRAZ). Should the Panel decide to accept any of the re-zoning requests within Section 7 landscapes (RCLs and WBRAZ), I have recommended changes to the provisions to ensure that the management directions for Section 7 landscapes are carried through to the RVZ.
4. I recommend that one of the 14 re-zoning requests be accepted, at Gibbston Valley Station, subject to some site specific provisions. The other re-zoning requests, and the submission in relation to the notified Arcadia RVZ, raise issues related to **landscape management, proposed structure plans, residential activities, management of risk from natural hazards, and/or 'fit' with the RVZ**. I summarise each of these issues below, and note where the issue remains for certain rezoning submissions.
5. In relation to **landscape management**, I have recommended that no re-zoning to RVZ occurs unless there is adequate landscape sensitivity mapping undertaken, as otherwise the RVZ rule framework could not be applied. I have

- 
- also stated my opinion that there is no need to include landscape sensitivity mapping as a structure plan within the RVZ, because of the way the rules are linked to the mapping. Appropriate site coverage standards for each of the re-zoning sites is another important means of managing effects on landscape. In most cases, there is not agreement between the landscape architects on what appropriate coverage standards are.
6. This is an outstanding issue for the following re-zoning requests for which evidence on landscape matters was provided: **Heron Investments Limited (Maungawera RVZ), Loch Linnhe Station, Lake Hāwea Holiday Park (Glen Dene & Burdon) and Barnhill (Morven Ferry RVZ)**. Landscape matters are no longer an issue for Malaghans (Skippers RVZ), Gibston Valley Station and Matakauri Lodge, subject to recommended site specific provisions.
7. Landscape management is also an issue for the sites that seek a **structure plan framework** as an alternative to the notified provisions, particularly the **Corbridge** re-zoning request and the **Arcadia RVZ**. I consider that these structure plans must meet the relevant test for landscape management set out in Chapter 3 (section 6(b) ONL or Section 7 landscape), and the advice of Ms Mellsop and Mr Jones is that they do not.
8. The status of **residential activity** within the RVZ is an outstanding issue for the **Corbridge** re-zoning submission and the **Arcadia RVZ** submission. The RVZ provisions specifically seek to avoid residential activities, as a means of enabling visitor industry activities and managing the nature, scale and intensity of development within the Zone. I recommend no change to this approach, including in response to submissions on the text of the RVZ. Issues of scope are raised by new requests for residential activity in statements of evidence.
9. Management of **risk from natural hazards** is an outstanding issue for the **Malaghans (Skippers RVZ)** re-zoning. I have stated that the nature of the natural hazards present and the risk posed to future visitor industry-related activities should be understood prior to re-zoning occurring.
10. The RVZ has a specific role to play in implementing the Strategic Objectives and Policies of the PDP. This specific role means RVZ sites have specific characteristics, and I have recommended a new policy to capture this. The sites proposed for re-zoning, and the specific structure plans proposed for the Arcadia RVZ site, **need to ‘fit’ into this specific role and purpose**. Where they do not, I have recommended that the RVZ is not an appropriate zone for the site. This is a particular issue for the **Corbridge** and **Arcadia** submissions.