

Dr Marion Read for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 2 May 2016
Hearing Stream 2 (Chapters 21, 22, 23 and 34)

1. The method used to determine the location of the landscape classification boundaries entailed fieldwork; reference to the Operative District Plan (ODP) landscape classification definitions; the matching of unclassified areas with already classified areas; the application of the Amended Pigeon Bay Factors when entirely new areas were under consideration; reference to previous reports and assessments; and the use of aerial photographs for the final mapping. The report I produced was peer reviewed and amended.
2. With regard to my report of June 2014, I have read the evidence of Patrick Baxter¹, and Yvonne Pfluger² and remain of the opinion that I have provided a thorough and appropriate character assessment of the Wakatipu Basin. On the basis of this report three new Rural Lifestyle zones have been proposed.
3. I consider the proposed limits on the hues and reflectivity values included in the PDP Permitted Activity standards for buildings in all rural zones are appropriate to ensure that development is recessive in appearance within the landscape of the District. I consider that the proposed restriction of building footprint to 500m² is too permissive to adequately manage the potential bulk of buildings which might be built as a permitted activity. The restriction of the permitted footprint to 300m² is an alternative. Another would be to limit the volume of built form to 2,500m³. Arcadian Triangle³ makes further suggestions at paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12 of their evidence and I consider these options would adequately manage the bulk and form of buildings in the Rural Lifestyle zone but not within the Rural zone.
4. I consider that the permitted activity standards for farm buildings are appropriate but that containers should not be exempt from the standards.
5. The proposed controls on glare in the Rural Residential, Rural Lifestyle and Rural zones, as amended in the revised chapters, are in my view appropriate.
6. With regard to the landscape assessment matters, I note that 21.7.1 has been amended and 21.7.1.1 and 21.7.2.1 have been deleted in the revised chapter attached to Mr Barr's s42A report. I agree with the evidence of Julian Haworth⁴ who opposes these amendments and deletions. Individually and in combination they

¹ #430 Ayrburn.

² #680 Darby.

³ #497 Arcadian Triangle Limited.

⁴ #145 UCES.

represent a reduction in the level of protection provided for the landscape of the Rural zone from that of the ODP and I am opposed to this. They also mean that my statement at 6.6 of my evidence is no longer accurate. I disagree with the UCESI evidence⁵ with regard to the detail of the remaining PDP assessment matters, however, considering them to be much clearer and more easily applied than those of the ODP. I consider that the assessment matters for the Gibbston Character Zone are similar to those of the ODP and are adequate and appropriate to manage the landscape of that zone.

7. I consider that the Building Restriction Area located on the northern side of State Highway 1 adjacent to Anderson Heights in Wanaka could be reduced in area.
8. I consider the proposed amendments to the Bobs Cove Rural Residential zone rules specifically relating to landscaping requirements should be rejected as these provisions are crucial to the development of the anticipated character of the zone.
9. With regard to the minimum lot size in the Rural Lifestyle Zone, I note that Arcadian Triangle's⁶ analysis is economic in nature and that landscape impacts are not considered. I note that Stephen Skelton⁷ makes unsubstantiated claims regarding the land area necessary to carry stock, and, in my view, fails to justify the appropriateness of his suggested 65m minimum spacing between dwellings within the RL zone. I continue to be of the opinion that a minimum lot size of 1ha with an average of 2ha is necessary to maintain rural character and to avoid adverse impacts on the wider landscape.
10. The proposed status of Restricted Discretionary for exterior alterations to a building outside of a building platform in the Rural Lifestyle zone should, in my opinion, remain. Building platforms within this zone are assessed for the possible effects of built form on them, both within the zone and outside of it. Extensions could make a building which is not visible from within an adjacent zone visible and so should be managed.
11. Wilding conifers and other species of wilding trees are a serious threat to the landscape of the District, obscuring landforms and homogenising the landscape. I support the inclusion of a list of prohibited trees, but consider that Silver Birch (*Betula pendula*) should be included (although I acknowledge that there have been no submissions received seeking this).

⁵ #145 UCES – Julian Haworth and Di Lucas.

⁶ #497 Arcadian Triangle Limited.

⁷ #430 Ayrburn.