

Yvonne Pflüger – Hearing Stream 14 – Wakatipu Basin Chapter

1. My name is Yvonne Pflüger. I am a Senior Principal Landscape Planner for Boffa Miskell Limited. I have prepared two statements of evidence on behalf of:
 - (a) Trojan Helmet Limited (THL) (Submitter 2387 and Further Submitter 1157) in relation to the proposed Hills Resort Zone (HRZ), dated 19 June 2018; and
 - (b) Boxer Hill Trust (BHT) in relation to the proposed WBLP zoning of its McDonnell Road land (Submitter 2386), dated 15 June 2018.
2. I have the qualifications and experience as set out at paragraphs 2 to 7 of my statements of evidence. In this summary statement I will provide a summary of my evidence and respond to any rebuttal evidence as necessary.

Hills Resort Zone (Submission 2387) for THL

3. In my evidence I have assessed the landscape and visual effects of the development that will be enabled by the proposed HRZ and provided an analysis of the proposed residential/visitor accommodation Activity Areas (A1-9) and Home Sites (HS1-6), as well as the Clubhouse and Resort Services Areas. The areas enabled for development under the HRZ are located within internal parts of the Site, where landscape character and visual effects will, in my opinion, be minor when viewed from surrounding roads as well as from the elevated residential areas of Arrowtown. The comprehensive development proposal has been tailored specifically for the Site, with its current recreational/golf uses and exceptionally high-quality design and maintenance standards. Specified standards relating to building design, height and landscaping and the proposed design guidelines will ensure that buildings and development within the HRZ is in character with the surrounding local and the wider landscape, without being visually prominent or dominant. The proposed rules for the Zone will ensure that the significant majority of the Site will be maintained as open space (over 96% of the HRZ) which I consider is appropriate given its current recreational uses and location in proximity to Arrowtown.

Council's Rebuttal Evidence in respect of the HRZ

4. While Ms Gilbert states in her rebuttal evidence that the proposal is to be 'applauded' and has 'laudable aspirations', she seeks restricted discretionary status for buildings instead of controlled. I have considered this and concluded that controlled activity status would provide sufficient certainty in terms of outcomes, if a further matter of control was to be added to the proposed provisions that allows an assessment of the building design and appearance (or similar) to be required at the time resource consent is sought.
5. In her rebuttal evidence Ms Gilbert expresses concerns about Home Sites 4 and 5 (paragraphs 16.10-16.13) and considers it necessary to reconfigure the sites to ensure that they are not visible from Hogans Gully Road. I note a LAMA is proposed adjacent to HS5 which will reduce the visibility of this HS, which is in the location of a previously consented building. HS 4 would be visible from Hogans Gully Road but against a backdrop of an existing residential dwelling and the proposed WBLP extension. I do not consider that a perception of development creep is to be expected from a single dwelling in this relatively distant location from the road. In my view, it is important to maintain the undeveloped nature of the prominent escarpment as boundary of development (which the HRZ does), but the low-lying flats are able to absorb the very low density of development that is proposed by the HRZ.
6. In both her EiC and rebuttal evidence Ms Gilbert expresses concerns about the change to landscape character, primarily due to the fact that the Site will become public (which I understand in fact may or may not be the case). She holds the view that the HRZ will reinforce the identity of resort development in this quadrant of the Basin, and will tip the balance to a landscape that is dominated by urban parklike (or resort) type development. I do not concur with this view and consider development under the HRZ will exhibit a 'resort-style parkland character'. I do not agree that it will have an 'urban parkland character', given 96% of the site

will be retained as open space. In my view, potential adverse cumulative effects will be avoided, as the majority of the HRZ will be retained as open space. In addition, the topography separates this proposal and other resort developments in the Basin and there are very few elevated viewpoints where the existing and proposed resort zones will be “cumulatively” visible. In this part of the Basin the sense of place, particularly with regard to the Site, is a manicured, highly modified golf course which will be retained by this proposal. Despite its operative Rural zoning, given it is used as a Golf Course, the Site does not currently provide rural landscape values relating to productive land uses.

7. The proposed trail that will provide access for the public through the Site is, in my view, a positive effect and provides an opportunity to connect with and extend the wider network of the Basin’s trails, while making the otherwise private golf course land available for access and enjoyment by the community. Ms Gilbert seeks that the walkway be implemented at the outset, instead of upon the establishment of 40 dwellings, as proposed by THL. Mr Tyler addresses this issue in his evidence summary and I concur with the opinions he expresses.
8. To conclude Ms Gilbert states in her rebuttal evidence (paragraphs 16.26-16.27) that “...*should the Panel be minded to consider it appropriate to enable additional resort land use in the Basin, from a landscape perspective (and assuming the above concerns in relation to the Structure Plan are adequately addressed), I consider that the Hills site is a reasonable candidate, given its existing highly modified golf course use, visual containment and variable landform patterning. I also share Ms Pfluger’s view that were the land to the south of Arrowtown urbanised, Hills Resort Zone may form an appropriate transition between the urban development and more rural/rural living land uses*”. I concur with Ms Gilbert on these points and consider that the existing landscape character lends itself to the proposed development. Due to the low visibility of the proposed Activity Areas, in combination with the proposed restrictions on building design, heights, colours and materials etc, and landscaping requirements, adverse effects on landscape character and values can, in my view, be avoided.

WBLP Zoning of BHT’s site at McDonnell Road (Submission 2386)

9. I note that Ms Gilbert has no objection to my evidence regarding the McDonnell land (refer to Gilbert rebuttal evidence para 20.1 – 20.2). My evidence is that the proposed average lot size of 1ha and a minimum lot size of 2,500m² on BHT’s land, which is located on the western side of McDonnell Road and adjacent to the consented Arrowtown Lifestyle Retirement Village, would provide for an appropriate density on this Site. The proposed zoning would in my view, lead to outcomes with low visual effects. While there will be a change in the landscape character of the Site if it is enabled for WBLP development, overall this type of landscape change is in character with the surrounding environment.
10. I consider that for BHT’s Site, the proposed building setback and potential future landscaping that may be required when consent is sought to develop the Site will ensure that the importance of the landscape character and visual amenity from public places (notably roads) is recognised and respected. I note that with the proposed building setback, the development under the WBLP zoning would be located away from the more sensitive edges of the Site.
11. In my view, the proposed WBLP zoning of the Site is appropriate in this location, as the landscape can accommodate change without adversely affecting the existing landscape characteristics and levels of amenity. However, I agree with Ms Gilbert that the Site would also be suitable for future urban development associated with an expansion of Arrowtown into LCU 24. I note however that the landscape character and amenity effects would differ between a WBLP and an urban zoning of the Site, with the latter potentially resulting in a highly modified urban outlook for Arrowtown residents located along the escarpment. Urban development would not allow for the provision of open space to the extent that it would be achieved under a WBLP zoning, and the openness of the Site would be reduced significantly. While development enabled under the proposed WBLP zoning would mean that the land will become more domesticated in character, the amenity provided within the Site would be more closely aligned to the existing character than what would be anticipated under a future urban zoning.