

## EVIDENCE SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CAREY VIVIAN

### Primary Evidence

- 1 Heron Investments Limited (HIL) have sought the approval of a Rural Visitor Zone (RVZ) at their property at Camp Hill Road, in the Maungawera Valley, Wanaka.
- 2 In my primary evidence I submitted updated zone provisions that incorporate the proposed Maungawera RVZ into the PDP format, including a number of bespoke rules relating to the density, scale and type of activities that could occur within the zone as a permitted or controlled activity. This included a limit on building coverage (6,000m<sup>2</sup>), a restriction on the number of people undertaking commercial recreation activities on the property at any one time (200 people) and a restriction on the number of overnight visitors permitted to stay within the zone (75 people).
- 3 My primary evidence also attached two letters from geotechnical engineers addressing the Cardrona fault trace issue raised in Mr Bond's report.
- 4 Ms McKenzie also provided primary evidence mapping the landscape sensitivity of the property. This included a combination of high sensitivity landscape on the terrace riser and flats adjoining the State Highway, moderate-high sensitivity along Camp Hill road and low sensitivity on the upper terrace (with the exception of a small terrace facing south).

### Rebuttal Evidence

- 5 Rebuttal evidence was submitted by Mr Bond, Mr Jones and Ms Grace.
- 6 Mr Bond reviewed the geotechnical reports attached to my primary evidence and amended his assessment to 'low'. Ms Grace concluded that while the location of the fault within the site may be uncertain, the risk is low and she therefore considers there is no need to apply a precautionary approach.
- 7 Mr Jones remained opposed to the re-zoning request. He considered the size of the lower landscape sensitivity area identified on the site requires further refinement of areas to be developed, including setbacks from the terrace edge. Ms Grace agreed with further refinement particularly given the controlled activity status of development within the lower landscape sensitivity area.
- 8 Ms Grace considered the provisions I proposed in my primary evidence in paragraph 3.5 of her rebuttal evidence. In 3.5 (a) to (b) Ms Grace addresses my recommendation that one residential unit is enable on the property. Ms Grace finds that the HIL submission does not request a relaxation of the non-complying residential rule, therefore the request is out of scope. I accept that the HIL submission did not specifically request a relaxation of the non-complying residential rule but note that other submissions did and the relief sought in those submissions may equally apply to all RVZs. Irrespective, the applicant is entitled to live on the property as staff accommodation.
- 9 In 3.5(c) Ms Grace considers my proposed standard to limit the number of overnight visitors. Ms Grace points out an inconsistency in my numbering, and I apologise for that. Ms Grace considers such a rule could be a helpful standard to manage the scale and intensity of visitor accommodation within the zone, although she notes there is no direct policy support for it.
- 10 In 3.5(d) Ms Grace considers my proposed standard requiring the zone be accessed from Camp Hill Road rather than the State Highway. Ms Grace considers that controls contained in Chapter 29 are sufficient in managing access. In hindsight, I agree.
- 11 In 3.5(e) Ms Grace considers my suggestion that the landscape sensitivity mapping should be a structure plan, as opposed to be included on the District Plan Maps. Ms Grace see's no need to complicate the implementation of the plan by including landscape sensitivity mapping in a different place. With respect to the Maungawera RVZ, I agree.

### Post Circulation of Rebuttal Evidence

- 12 Following the receipt of the rebuttal evidence, Ms Grace and I met with the view to trying to resolving the outstanding issues in relation to the proposed zoning.

- 13 That meeting, and ongoing discussions, has culminated in an agreement in principle between Mr Grace and myself as to the most appropriate zone provisions for the Maungawera RVZ. Ms Macdonald has attached the agreed provisions to her legal submissions (with Ms Grace's approval). As discussed by Ms McKenzie, this is based on a number of defined activity areas within the lower sensitivity landscape of the subject site, which direct where and the amount of development that can take place in the proposed zone. A number of bespoke provisions also direct how much visitor accommodation and commercial recreation activity can occur within the zone as of right, before requiring a discretionary or non-complying resource consents when and if the permitted activity levels are ever exceeded.
- 14 As stated in Ms Macdonald's legal submissions, there are two issues Ms Grace and I are yet to resolve. The first issue relates to proposed Rule 46.5.y.7 which relates to the building coverage in Activity Area G. This is by far the largest Activity Area within the lower sensitivity landscape area within which building coverage is restricted to 500m<sup>2</sup> total. The outstanding issue is Activity Area G includes an existing farm building (352m<sup>2</sup>) which the submitter has applied to extend to 592m<sup>2</sup>. My preference is to make the 500m<sup>2</sup> building coverage in addition to the existing or new farm buildings within the Activity Area G, noting that any such farm buildings are required to obtain a restricted discretionary activity consent pursuant to Rule 46.4.7.
- 15 The second issue is the spatial extent of the Activity Areas themselves. As stated in Ms McKenzie's summary, these Activity Area are all located within the lower sensitivity landscape areas of the property. As explained in Ms McKenzie's summary, these areas were largely informed by the location of consented rural visitor activities, future activities envisaged the landowner and to some extent topography of the site. I also note Activity Area retain the best land for farming/cropping (which is important to the visitor experience sought within the zone), provide generous setbacks from neighbouring properties and greater setbacks from the terrace edge. Mr Jones has seen an earlier (similar) version of the Activity Areas plan, but not the version attached to Ms Macdonald's submissions.

## Statistics

	Total Area (ha)	Percentage of the zone (%)	Building Coverage Enabled (ha)	Building Coverage Enabled (%)
Rural Visitor Zone	115	100	0.61	0.46
Area of Low landscape sensitivity	64	56	0.61	0.95
Area of Moderate-High landscape sensitivity	14	12	-	
Area of High landscape sensitivity	37	32	-	
Activity Area A	3.8	3	0.05	1.3
Activity Area B	2.5	2	0.18	7.2
Activity Area C	1.1	0.96	0.14	12.7
Activity Area D	2.7	2.4	0.05	1.8
Activity Area E	3.9	3.4	0.05	1.3
Activity Area F	2.6	2.3	0.03	1.2
Activity Area G	47.3	41.5	0.05 (proposed) 0.0592 (existing farm building) Total = 0.1092	0.2