

**BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT COUCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of a hearing on submissions to the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan pursuant to clause 8B of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

**ON BEHALF OF** BARNHILL CORPORATE TRUSTEE LIMITED, D.E  
AND M.E BUNN AND L.A GREEN  
Submitter (31035)

---

**SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF BENJAMIN ESPIE  
(LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT)**

**28<sup>th</sup> JULY 2020**

---

- 1.1 In relation to the site of the proposed relief, I prepared a Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment Report dated 16/10/15 regarding the proposed Stage 1 relief (submission 626), evidence dated 13/6/18 regarding the proposed Stage 2 relief (submission 2509) and evidence dated 02/06/20 regarding the currently proposed Stage 3 relief (submission 31035).
- 1.2 The currently sought relief represents a significant reduction in relation to previously sought relief. It seeks a 2.8ha RVZ including a 0.7ha High Landscape Sensitivity Area. A maximum total built footprint of 1500m<sup>2</sup> is sought within the proposed RVZ, the intention being to develop a node of visitor activity close to a junction in the Wakatipu's network of cycle/pedestrian trails. Buildings up to the proposed maximum total footprint would be a controlled activity within the part of the RVZ that is not mapped as a High Landscape Sensitivity Area, with control being reserved in relation to:
- a. *The compatibility of the building design with landscape, cultural and heritage, and visual amenity values;*
  - b. *Landform modification, landscaping and planting;*
  - c. *Lighting;*
  - d. *Servicing including water supply, fire-fighting, stormwater and wastewater;*
  - e. *Natural Hazards; and*
  - f. *Design and location of related carparking<sup>1</sup>.*
- 1.3 I consider that the relief that is now sought appropriately maintains the landscape character of LCU 18 of the Wakatipu Basin and that the controls listed above (coupled with the other applicable provisions) will bring about a relatively compact and visually appropriate instance of visitor activity sitting in a rural setting. The controls cover all necessary aspects of detailed design.
- 1.4 I have examined and support the mapping of the High Landscape Sensitivity Area that is attached to Ms Cleaver's evidence. Given that the landscape character of the proposed 2.8ha RVZ land is relatively uniform (i.e. gently rolling improved pasture), it is logical that sensitivity is driven by prominent visibility. The mapped High Landscape Sensitivity Area follows landform such that proud landform and visually prominent land is included within the mapped area.

---

<sup>1</sup> PDP, Stage 3, notified version.

1.5 I stand by my evidence given at Stage 2 of the PDP process (Section 5 of Appendix 1 of my Stage 3 brief of evidence) that LCU 18 has a “moderate-low” capacity to absorb additional development, rather than a “low” capacity as per the Stage 3 notified version of the PDP. In any event, I consider that development enabled by the currently proposed relief can comfortably be absorbed into the landscape without inappropriate adverse effects on landscape character or visual amenity.

**Ben Espie**

**vivian+espie**

**28<sup>th</sup> July 2020**

}

}

8

8