

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL  
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES  
PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

**UNDER**  
the Resource Management Act 1991

**IN THE MATTER OF**  
Stage 3b of the Proposed District  
Plan

**SUBMITTERS**  
Gibbston Valley Station Limited  
(GVS)

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF TONY DOUGLAS MILNE  
ON BEHALF OF GIBBSTON VALLEY STATION LIMITED**

---

**DATED: 30 July 2020**

## INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Tony Douglas Milne. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence in Chief.
2. This Summary of Evidence sets out the key points within my Evidence in Chief. I have also read the rebuttal evidence of Mr Matthew Jones<sup>1</sup> on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council, and I have responded to his comments.

## THE PROPOSAL

3. Gibbston Valley Station is seeking rezoning of an area of land to Rural Visitor Zone under the PDP. The site currently has split zoning of Gibbston Character Zone and Rural Zone with an overlay of Outstanding Natural Landscape. The proposed zone is located south of Gibbston Highway and encompasses a site of approximately 109ha which is bound to the north by the powerlines which traverse the GVS property through the GCZ land.
4. The site has a rural character and moderate-high natural character. Landscape and amenity values are largely associated with the broad scale landforms which form a backdrop to Gibbston Valley. The site has a sense of remoteness due to the elevated and contained topography. The visual influence of the site is limited due to the complex folded landform and elevated setback from the highway corridor.
5. An assessment of the site's landscape sensitivity has been undertaken, incorporating analysis of the site's character and values. The landscape sensitivity analysis has informed the proposed Structure Plan in which the proposed Primary Developable Areas are located in areas of lower landscape sensitivity, these are considered to be appropriate locations for potential future development within the RVZ according to the policies and rules of the Section 42A report recommended Chapter 46, subject to those amendments suggested by Mr Giddens<sup>2</sup>.
6. The proposed Primary Development Areas exhibit factors including but not limited to favourable topography, ease of access, reasonable sunlight access, quality views and presence of existing modifications. As indicated on the Structure Plan, not all areas of lower sensitivity are included within one of the Primarily Developable Areas. This is not to say these areas are unsuitable in any way. They have been left out because it is preferred that the Primary Development Areas are contiguous and of an appropriate size and shape to allow for a clustered approach to development. Since lodgement on 28 May 2020, no changes have been made to the proposed Structure Plan.
7. Additional provisions have been put forward for the zone and include a 7m building height limit within Primary Developable Area 1 and 3, a rural standard for roading and infrastructure, and inclusion of the Wakatipu building materials and colours standard with the allowances for 'sympathetic design, cladding, materials and colours to enhance the landscape character of the zone'. I consider these provisions to be appropriate from a landscape perspective.
8. In the context of the assessment of landscape effects, I consider the proposed rezoning to be appropriate as the Structure Plan and proposed Primary Developable Areas have been informed by the landscape sensitivity analysis in order to select suitable areas for the application of the RVZ and exclude areas of moderate-high or high landscape sensitivity. Landscape effects on a whole are considered to be low as the changes are sensitive to the character and values of the surrounding landscape and the proposed Primary Developable Areas are generally contained within the application

---

<sup>1</sup> Rebuttal Evidence of Matthew Jones. Landscape Architecture – Rezoning – Rural Visitor Zone. 12 June 2020.

<sup>2</sup> Section 42A Report of Emily Suzanne Grace. Chapter 46 Rural Visitor Zone. 18 March 2020.

site. As a result, I consider the values of the surrounding Rural Zone ONL and character of the GCZ will be maintained.

9. In the context of the assessment of visual amenity effects, I find that overall, adverse effects on visual amenity arising from the proposed zone will be low in the context of the receiving environment. This is attributed to the limited visibility of the proposed zone and the considered approach outlined by the proposed Structure Plan which seeks to locate the proposed Primary Development Areas in areas of low visual influence. Therefore, it is considered that the effects of development resulting from the proposed zoning change, will not be at odds with existing patterns of development in the wider landscape and will represent a change that is acceptable in the context of views from Gibbston Valley and the surrounding landscape.

### **LANDSCAPE MATTERS RAISED**

10. In his rebuttal evidence<sup>3</sup>, Mr Jones refers to the proposed RVZ and provisions and indicates that the primary reasons for his initial opposition have been effectively addressed from a landscape perspective and that he has changed the assessment conclusion reached in his EIC and now does not oppose the rezoning relief sought for the site and supports the changes to the provisions regarding building height, roading and infrastructure and building materials.

### **STATUTORY FRAMEWORK**

11. The policy framework relevant to landscape effects arising from the proposed subzone are found in PDP Chapter 3 – Strategic Direction, Chapter 6 – Landscapes, Chapter 21 – Rural Zone, Chapter 23 – Gibbston Character Zone and Chapter 46 – Rural Visitor Zone.
12. I am satisfied that the proposed RVZ will meet the objectives and policies anticipated by the Chapters 3 and 6.
13. Chapter 46 contains detailed provisions relating to the proposed Rural Visitor Zone. The purpose of the zone is to provide for visitor industry activities at a limited scale and in generally remote locations, including within ONLs where the effects of development can be absorbed without compromising the landscape values of the District.
14. Objective 46.2.1 and associated policies seek to locate visitor activities within appropriate locations that maintain the values of the ONL. Objective 46.2.2 and associated policies seek to locate buildings and development where landscape character and visual amenity values are maintained. I consider that the proposed Structure Plan and provisions will protect the landscape values of the ONL as well as landscape character and visual amenity, as a result I consider the proposed zone to be consistent with these objectives and policies.

### **CONCLUSION**

15. The proposed Rural Visitor Zone provides for a holistic approach to development within the application site while providing for a certainty of protection for the landscape values of the receiving environment. Therefore, I consider that the proposed RVZ rezoning is an appropriate fit for the site.

---

<sup>3</sup> Rebuttal Evidence of Matthew Jones. Landscape Architecture – Rezoning – Rural Visitor Zone. 12 June 2020.

