
EVIDENCE SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CAREY VIVIAN

1. Ms Grace states in paragraph 4.2 of her rebuttal evidence that she relies on the advice of Ms Gilbert in relation to landscape matters in her assessment of the appropriateness of the re-zoning request. Mr Espie, in his summary, has addressed Ms Gilbert's rebuttal evidence. Mr Espie states, and I agree, that the two proposed RVZ locations represent particularly small areas of a vast farming station that are easily understood when on site in terms of their land cover, topography and exposure to views. I also agree that the proposed zoning provisions are relatively simple and I support Mr Espie's opinion that the additional digital contour information or landscape character analysis sought by Ms Gilbert would unlikely lead to any further enlightenment regarding the effects of the requested relief. I agree with Mr Espie that such effects are easily understood and for that reason I prefer the evidence of Mr Espie.
2. I also note that Ms Gilbert raises, in relation to both proposed RVZ's, a *potential underestimation of the scale of adverse visual effects* in relation to views from Lake Wakatipu due to the fact that boating activity throughout the southern arm of the lake is likely to increased due to the possibility of a marina being constructed at Homestead Bay.
3. A marina is proposed at Homestead Bay. This is some 6km to the north of the proposed Wye Creek RVZ and 18km to the north of the proposed Loch Linnhe RVZ.¹ Between Homestead Bay and the proposed Wye Creek RVZ are several developments, including Lakeside Estate and the Wye Creek subdivision. From the proposed Wye Creek RVZ to the proposed Loch Linnhe RVZ there is no built form visible (except one skyline shed opposite Halfway Bay) for twelve or so kilometres of lakeside. Like the lake itself, that entire mountain range is also identified in the PDP as being part of a ONL.
4. I have boated on Lake Wakatipu for close to twenty years. The southern arm of the lake is not a popular choice for boating due to the potential for the lake to get very rough, very quickly, from the north-west and the south and little opportunity for shelter (or boat retrieval) when it does. It is also very cold recreationally. While boating may increase through the establishment of a marina at Homestead Bay, in my view, the use of those boats stored at such marina are likely to be intermittent at best.
5. LL submission seeks two small RVZs for the clustering of homesteads, farm buildings and tourism activities in recognition of the property's contribution to retaining the openness of the ONL. From a resource management point of view, I consider there is much more value in this, than weighting decisions on intermittent visual values of lake users as suggested by Ms Gilbert.
6. At paragraph 4.3 Ms Grace considers that because there is a greater area of moderate-high landscape sensitivity across the sites than lower landscape sensitivity then the proposed RVZs are not "*largely comprised of areas of lower landscape sensitivity*" which she considers to be an important factor in considering re-zoning of the sites to RVZ. With respect, Mr Espie's mapping of the proposed Wye Creek RVZ contains approximately 13% of lower landscape sensitivity area and the proposed Loch Linnhe RVZ contains approximately 47% of lower landscape sensitivity area. By comparison, the notified Arcadia RVZ contains 15% of lower landscape sensitivity and Walter Peak 14% of lower landscape sensitivity. In my opinion, the proposed Wye Creek and Loch Linnhe RVZs contain comparatively similar amount of lower landscape sensitivity areas to the notified Arcadia and Walter Peak RVZs. The amount of lower landscape sensitivity area is therefore not a reason to reject the zones.
7. At paragraph 4.5 Ms Grace concedes that an exception for one residential unit within the proposed Wye Creek RVZ may be appropriate should the site be rezoned. Ms Grace also states that the proposed Wye Creek RVZ is a relatively small area and there is not sufficient room for an extensive rural visitor development. I agree the proposed Wye Creek RVZ is relatively small, but disagree that this hinders rural visitor activities given the extent of the property (and wider conservation estate). While it is the intention of LL to have visitor accommodation at Wye Creek, in conjunction with or as part of a homestead, the Rural Visitor Zone importantly, in my opinion, enables a base to undertake visitor activities from.

¹ I note that Cecil Peak RVZ is only 5 kilometres from the proposed marina yet the entire 2.6-hectare zone has been assigned a low landscape sensitivity rating right to the water's edge.

8. At paragraph 4.7 Ms Grace suggests a specific policy that enables residential use at the proposed Wye Creek RVZ subject to demonstrating the use of the unit is integral to the operation of rural visitor activities on the site. I have no issue with respect to such a policy. It is my understanding that is exactly what LL seek to achieve through their Stage 1 submission, Stage 1 appeal and Stage 3 submission.
9. However, I disagree with Ms Grace that the status of the residential unit at Wye Creek, as an activity, should be a discretionary activity² when located in an area of lower landscape sensitivity. This area is 1750m² in area which provides ample space for a homestead dwelling and visitor activity units/activities to be designed to complement one another (or even be part of the same building).
10. In paragraph 5.5(b) Ms Grace refers to the building coverage standards I recommended in my primary evidence. Ms Gilbert is not satisfied these standards are appropriate from a landscape point of view, however Ms Grace considers they are an important method to manage landscape effects within the RVZ. Ms Gilbert alternatively advocates for a structure plan approach that responds to landscape opportunities and constraints. Ms Grace has in respect of other RVZ's sought resisted structure plans being inserted into Chapter 46 of the PDP.
11. In my opinion, the building coverage standards I recommended in my primary evidence, in combination with other notified and proposed standards (including the landscape sensitivity classifications) will adequately manage the visual effects of development in these two proposed RVZs. Rule 46.4.6 has a wide range of control, including the *"compatibility of the building density, design and location within the landscape, cultural and heritage, and visual amenity values"* and *"landform modification, landscaping and planting"* in the less sensitive parts of the proposed zones. Rule 46.4.10 requires a discretionary activity consent in the more sensitive parts of the zones.
12. In paragraph 5.5(c) Ms Grace refers to my recommendation to limit the maximum number of overnight visitors at each of the proposed RVZs. Ms Grace states this is parallel to the standard I proposed for the Maungawera RVZ, and her comments are the same. In paragraph 3.5(c), in relation to the Heron Investments submission, Ms Grace considers such a rule could be a helpful standard to manage the scale and intensity of visitor accommodation activities within the RVZ, although she notes there is no direct policy support for it. As part of our discussions on the Heron Investments submission we have agreed in principle to the inclusion of specific policy applicable to the Maungawera RVZ.³ I fail to see why a similar policy cannot be inserted for the Loch Linnhe zones if considered necessary.

² I note Ms Gilbert recommends a minimum of Restricted Discretionary activity status in paragraph 3.7 of her rebuttal evidence.

³ Attached to Ms McDonald's submissions for Heron Investments Limited.