

**Before Independent Commissioners appointed by
The Queenstown Lakes District Council**

In the Matter of

the Resource Management
Act 1991 (**Act**)

And

In the Matter of

Variation to the Proposed
District Plan: Priority
Landscape Schedules

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SCOTT ANTHONY FREEMAN (PLANNING) ON
BEHALF OF TREESPACE NO.1 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (SUBMITTER #96)**

17 SEPTEMBER 2023

INTRODUCTION

Qualifications and Experience

1. My qualifications and experience are detailed in my primary evidence in relation to the Variation to the PDP that deals with the Priority Area Landscape Schedules.

Key Evidence Points

2. The key evidence points addressed below relate to the Joint Witness Statement (JWS) for the Central Wakatipu Basin Priority Area ONL (dated 08/10/23). The 'points' addressed below are based off the numbering in the JWS.

Point 21

3. Mr Skelton and I are satisfied with the revised wording of point 21 in the JWS. The only difference of opinion relates to Mr Skelton's view that the word 'very' should be deleted from the first sentence within point 21. This view is consistent with the evidence prepared by Mr Skelton and I.

Point 66

4. Point 66 deals with naturalness attributes and values. Within the JWS, the words 'open, and in places' has been added to the first sentence, when dealing with the seemingly undeveloped character of the Central Wakatipu Basin Priority Area ONL. The other main amendment included within the JWS is the acknowledgement that Central Wakatipu Basin Priority Area ON is located adjacent to the Arthurs Point as opposed to 'set within'. Mr Skelton still has issues with the reworded point 66 and such will be addressed in his summary statement, in particular with the words 'seemingly undeveloped'.

Point 70

5. Mr Skelton and I are comfortable with the wording of Point 70 within the JWS.

Points 76 & 77

6. Mr Skelton and I are generally comfortable with the wording of Point 76 and 77 within the JWS, however, Mr Skelton does question the use of the word 'elsewhere' in Point 76.

Point 82(c) & (d)

Mr Skelton and I are comfortable with the wording of Point 82(c) & (d) within the JWS.

Landscape Capacity Ratings

Visitor Accommodation

7. Mr Skelton and I are comfortable with the landscape capacity rating for visitor accommodation activities within the JWS.

Earthworks

8. Mr Skelton and I are comfortable with the landscape capacity rating for earthworks activities within the JWS.

Renewable Energy Generation

9. Having reviewed the JWS in terms of renewable energy generation, Mr Skelton and I consider the capacity rating should be further amended as follows:

Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments, unless it is very discretely located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside of the site. **Very Limited** landscape capacity for discretely located, small-scale community scale renewable energy generation. A community scheme means a scheme that supplies 100 or less residential dwellings.

10. While the definition of renewable energy generation is defined in the PDP, we consider that the above amendments provide more clarity as to what small scale actually is.

Rural Living

11. In the JWS, rural living now has a capacity rating of extremely limited. Mr Skelton will explain that in his view, the capacity rating should change from extremely limited to very limited, with the provision that other factors will come into consideration if additional rural living is proposed in the PA (i.e. co-location to existing development, siting to optimise screening, small scale and integration into the landscape).

Scott Freeman