

**Richard Malcolm Tyler – Hearing Stream 14 – Wakatipu Basin Chapter**

1. My name is Richard Malcolm Tyler. I have prepared a statement of evidence for Trojan Helmet Limited (THL) (Submitter 2387 and Further Submitter 1157) dated 19 June 2018 which addresses the masterplanning work undertaken in respect of the Hills Resort Zone (HRZ).
2. I have the qualifications and experience set out at paragraphs 2 to 5 of my evidence.
3. In this summary statement I will briefly summarise my evidence and respond to any rebuttal evidence as necessary:

**Hills Resort Zone (Submission 2387) for Trojan Helmet**

4. The Hills site has been developed over time from an operational deer farm to the golf resort it is today. The existing course and its features have been designed to integrate with and enhance many of the features of the original farm. Existing buildings are well designed and exhibit a sense of connection with the land and heritage of the Region.
5. The design principles for the HRZ are based and build upon those for the 17 Lot Consent (granted in 2009). They can be summarised as being 'to create a place of golf, art, architecture and landscape where one can escape from daily life and be a part of the outdoor environment.'
6. The HRZ, including the Structure Plan, has been developed and refined over a three year period through a collaborative process involving a range of consultants.
7. The Structure Plan includes Activity Areas and Homesites located to ensure built form will be subservient to the landscape. It also takes account of and seeks to provide for changes to the site brought about by recent developments including the 9 hole Short Course and recently established buildings and residential building developments within the site, while continuing to provide a world class championship golfing experience.
8. The maximum number of residential units proposed in the HRZ is 150 which allows for a range of building typologies and resort accommodation. If the site is to be developed to its maximum yield and with larger dwellings (350m<sup>2</sup> average size) 96.4% of the site will be retained as open space.
9. A walking / cycle trail is included in the Structure Plan to allow the general public to enjoy the landscape and take a safe and scenic route through the site to Lake Hayes.
10. A set of Building Design Guidelines have been developed to provide a framework to assess future builds against.

**Council Rebuttal Evidence**

11. In her rebuttal evidence Ms Gilbert expresses concerns about Home Sites 4 and 5 (her paragraphs 16.10-16.13) where she considers it necessary to reconfigure the home sites to ensure that they are not visible from Hogans Gully Road. I understand Ms Pfluger has discussed landscape and visual effects. I consider it not necessary to relocate the homesites as they are located in recessive locations within the base of Hogans Gully catchment, which is an area capable of absorbing some degree of change (as stated by Ms Pfluger). The intention of these homesites is to offer two discrete building sites with a semi-rural outlook, which have direct access to the resort facilities by way of golf cart or by foot. On this basis my preference is to retain the homesites in their current location. If the Panel remains concerned about the potential landscape effects of dwellings within these homesites, one option could be for an alternative activity status to apply to buildings within these sites, with landscape focussed assessment criteria, (although I maintain this unnecessary).

12. The walkway will provide a significant public benefit. Ms Gilbert seeks that the walkway be implemented at the outset, instead of upon the establishment of 40 dwellings as proposed by THL. I consider design issues may arise if the walkway were to be required at the outset including the requirement for fencing and screen planting, because the property / golf course is currently exclusive with private access. Under future development the course may become more publicly accessible, at which point in time potential walkway interface issues will be simpler to resolve. I therefore support a planning mechanism that requires the walkway to be constructed at a point in time when it might be expected that the property / golf course could operate under a public management model, rather than a lower yield exclusive access model as currently exists.
13. Mr Langman in his Appendix C queries proposed HRZ standard 44.5.4 which sets maximum building heights for each Activity Area. He states "*a datum or use of existing ground level may be more appropriate. In addition, these heights are not specified on the structure plan so the RL could be difficult for future administration*". To alleviate his concerns I have included a datum height and a maximum height above that datum for clarity in the **attached** table. I understand Mr Brown will suggest an amendment to Standard 44.5.4 which incorporates this information.
14. Mr Langman also in his Appendix C has a query around the maximum number of residential units proposed for each Activity Area by HRZ Standard 44.5.12,. I have reviewed the spreadsheet used to calculate these maximums and have identified an error in rounding, which has led to the error in the Standard that Mr Langman has identified. I have provided the corrected numbers in the **attached** table, and understand that Mr Brown will update the HRZ standard accordingly, when he presents his evidence.

The Hills Structure Plan - Yield Schedule  
17.07.18 (updated prior to hearing)

Activity Area	Size	Density (unit/Ha)		Units		Height Limit		
		Low	High	Low	High	Datum (masl)	Height	Max. Height (masl)
A1	0.9 Ha	1	13.5	1	12	410.5	8m	418.5
A2	0.9 Ha	1	13.5	1	13	408	8m	416
A3	0.4 Ha	1	13.5	1	6	413	8m	421
A4	2.2 Ha	1	13.5	1	29	410	8m	418
A5	1.2 Ha	1	13.5	1	16	411.5	8m	419.5
A6	0.9 Ha	1	13.5	1	12	411.5	8m	419.5
A7	0.5 Ha	1	13.5	1	7	406	8m	414
A8	0.6 Ha	1	4	1	2	395.8	6.7m	402.5
A9	2.7 Ha	1	13.5	1	36	409.5	8m	417.5
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>9</b>	<b>133</b>			

S	0.8 Ha	1	13.5	1	11	400.5	8m	408.5
C	1.0 Ha	<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	417	8m	425

H1	0.3 Ha	1		1	1	411	8m	419
H2	0.3 Ha	1		1	1	413.5	8m	421.5
H3	0.3 Ha	1		1	1	400	8m	408
H4	0.3 Ha	1		1	1	366.5	8m	374.5
H5	0.3 Ha	1		1	1	362	8m	370
H6	0.3 Ha	1		1	1	432	5.5m	437.5
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>			

<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>150</b>
--------------	-----------	------------

Total Structure Plan Area	162 Ha
Ave. Lot (per land area)	10.1 Ha
	1.1 Ha