

Agricultural Machinery Sales Servicing and Training Facility

Landpower Group

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Peer Review

7 April 2021



Contact Details

Jeremy Head

WSP
12 Moorhouse Avenue
Christchurch 8011
+64 3 363 5400
+64 27 481 3172
jeremy.head@wsp.com

Document Details:

Date: 7 April 2021
Reference: 3-C2278.00
Status: **FINAL**

Prepared by



Jeremy Head, Senior Landscape Architect
NZILA (Registered)



Reviewed by
David McKenzie, Technical Principal:
Landscape Architecture
FNZILA (Registered)



Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Disclaimers and Limitations..... | 3 |
| 1 Introduction | 4 |
| 1.1 Background | 4 |
| 1.2 Summary Conclusions..... | 4 |
| 2 Review of LVA | 7 |
| 2.1 Points of agreement..... | 7 |
| 2.2 General Observations | 8 |
| 2.3 Applicant’s assessment of effects - response | 9 |
| 2.4 Location of proposal..... | 10 |
| 2.5 Character of the Rural Urban Fringe Zone (RuUF) - discussion..... | 11 |
| 2.6 Cumulative effects..... | 12 |
| 3 Conclusion..... | 12 |
| Appendix 1..... | 13 |

Cover View westwards from SH73 to part of the site (*Photograph by J. Head 30 March 2021*).

Disclaimers and Limitations

This report (**'Report'**) has been prepared by WSP exclusively for Christchurch City Council (**'Client'**) in relation to the preparation of a peer review of a 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' supporting an application for an agricultural machinery sales, servicing and training facility at 33 and 69 School Road, Yaldhurst, Christchurch (**'Purpose'**) and in accordance with the umbrella agreement between WSP and Christchurch City Council. The findings in this Report are based on and are subject to the assumptions specified in the Assessment of Environmental Effects report for the applicant (also the Christchurch City Council). WSP accepts no liability whatsoever for any reliance on or use of this Report, in whole or in part, for any use or purpose other than the Purpose or any use or reliance on the Report by any third party.

In preparing the Report, WSP has relied upon data, surveys, analyses, designs, plans and other information (**'Client Data'**) provided by or on behalf of the Client. Except as otherwise stated in the Report, WSP has not verified the accuracy or completeness of the Client Data. To the extent that the statements, opinions, facts, information, conclusions and/or recommendations in this Report are based in whole or part on the Client Data, those conclusions are contingent upon the accuracy and completeness of the Client Data. WSP will not be liable in relation to incorrect conclusions or findings in the Report should any Client Data be incorrect or have been concealed, withheld, misrepresented or otherwise not fully disclosed to WSP.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

This report provides a peer review of the landscape aspects covered in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVA), 12 March 2021 prepared by David Compton-Moen (DCM Urban) for the Applicant. David is an experienced, NZILA registered landscape architect.

The LVA accompanies a Resource Consent Application and AEE by Planz Consultants for the construction of a rural machinery sales and service facility at 33 and part of 69 School Road, Yaldhurst, Christchurch.

The proposal is located on a wedge-shaped site that currently includes open horse paddocks, shelterbelts and other vegetation and various small buildings (33 School Road). A dwelling is located on the site's northwest corner (69 School Road) but is excluded from the proposal. Some of the existing planting and buildings are proposed to be removed in the application. The site is fenced with a mixture of 1.2 m tall rural post and wire and 2 m tall wire mesh deer fencing. For this reason, the site is open visually - particularly from West Coast Road / State Highway 73 (SH73).

The LVA is supported with a separate set of A3 graphic attachments including artist's impressions of the proposal which is helpful.

The purpose of this peer review is to raise points where there is disagreement with comments and findings made in the LVA or where aspects need to be fleshed out or clarified further by the applicant. Areas of agreement which are many, are also noted.

This peer review has been informed by a site visit and on-site discussion with Ryan Brosnahan (Planner, Christchurch City Council).

The site visit was carried out by the reviewer (and CCC Planner) on 30 March 2021. It is understood that the proposal's activity status is Non-Complying as the proposed activity (sale and servicing of rural farm machinery) is not provided for in the District Plan in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone (RuUF) where the site is located. Permitted activities in the RuUF are generally small scale, listed under 17.5.1.1 and do not include the type of activities proposed.

The peer reviewer has experience in the assessment of developments on other similar sites within both Christchurch and Selwyn Districts, including within zones located at the interface between rural and urban areas.

1.2 Summary Conclusions

There is agreement with parts of the LVA. However, this report comes to an alternative conclusion as to the proposal's fit with the site and site context in terms of its landscape effects. The specifics of the proposal are strongly weighted towards adopting and extending the characteristics of similar scale commercial activity to the south of SH73 into the site, with less emphasis placed on maintaining rural characteristics and values. It is acknowledged that a large area of open space is included in the proposal.

The primary contributing elements to rural character and amenity values includes landscapes dominated by openness and vegetation and if buildings are appropriate, they are integrated into the natural setting. A large building such as what is proposed, placed on an open site will dominate rather than be integral to its otherwise natural setting. Large rural buildings such as wool sheds are seen on open paddocks, however these buildings clearly 'read' as rural and are therefore expected and acceptable¹. Integration of a large building into a rural landscape as proposed can

¹ Large woolsheds would be unlikely to occur in the RuUF Zone in any case as the zone does not generally support large-scale sheep farming.

only occur with generous large-scale vegetation cover that will be proportional with the scale of the building. Non-rural buildings need to be well buffered from view. The vegetation and to a lesser extent open space, needs to form the predominant characteristics of the site in order for the effects of the proposal to be compatible with the wider RuUF Zone.

The Applicant's LVA concludes that the proposal will have acceptable levels of compatibility with its setting and 'less than minor effects' – understood to be roughly equivalent to a 'Very Low'² adverse effect on the seven-point scale. This peer review concludes that the proposal as it is currently presented will clearly change the key rural characteristics and values at the site³ and within this part of the wider setting⁴.

Topics including potential proliferation of non-rural activity in the area and cumulative effects – both of which are particularly pertinent to the activity have not been explicitly discussed in the LVA. In this regard, the reviewer has provided comment.

The seven-point⁵ scale of effects recently set out in the Aotearoa NZ Landscape Assessment Guidelines⁶ has not been used in the LVA. The use of this effects scale is not compulsory; however, the intent is that landscape architects use the seven-point scale from the guidelines⁷. This follows a direction from the Environment Court that all landscape architects use the same effects scale which makes comparing reports and opinions between different landscape architects easier for decision makers.

As mentioned above, any potentially adverse landscape and visual effects have been described in the LVA using the 'less than' to 'more than' minor effects continuum. It is generally understood that these terms should not be used by technical experts (such as landscape architects) and that this continuum should only be used by the decision maker when forming a balanced determination of all potential adverse effects - of which landscape / visual effects is one.

There is no conclusion reached in the LVA as to the potential landscape (character) effects⁸. The reviewer considers that changes to landscape character will be more important in this case than purely visual effects. Landscape character effects are concerned with how well a proposal fits with the environment. Visual effects form a sub-set of landscape effects helping to determine the level of landscape effects or changes to landscape character and its values.

In the peer reviewer's opinion, any potentially adverse landscape effects arising from the proposal will primarily fall on the public passing by the site on SH73, and to a lesser degree on Hasketts Road and School Road. There will potentially be adverse landscape effects on the various occupants residing nearby, although it is noted that most properties include generous levels of vegetation around the dwellings and associated outbuildings which will lessen the effects of the proposal (**Figure 1**).

² **Very Low:** Very low or no modification to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline or available views, i.e. approximating a 'no-change' situation.

³ Contributed to by abundant levels of open space, vegetation and few or small built forms.

⁴ Including the RuUF Zone beyond the area identified in the DCM LVA 'Context Analysis' plan, page 6 of the graphic attachments.

⁵ Effects range from 'very low' - 'low' - 'moderate to low' - 'moderate' - 'moderate to high' - 'high' - 'very high'.

⁶ Prepared by New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA) 8 December 2020 (currently in draft form). Effects range from 'very low' - 'low' - 'moderate to low' - 'moderate' - 'moderate to high' - 'high' - 'very high'.

⁷ The draft guidelines document is the summation of input from multiple landscape architects following a nationwide workshop process in which the reviewer contributed to.

⁸ Visual effects form a sub-set of landscape effects and help to determine the level of landscape effects or change to landscape character and its values. Landscape character effects are concerned with how well a proposal 'fits' with the environment and includes effects that may not be seen but are otherwise understood to exist.



Figure 1. Property at 363 Hasketts Road opposite site. Private properties around the site typically include generous levels of vegetation which screens or buffers views to the site and proposal from internal views. Photograph by J. Head, 30 March 2021.

It is the opinion of the peer reviewer that any adverse landscape effects falling on the public will be 'Moderate',⁹ attributed to the following:

- A large building which will have a non-rural appearance will be positioned centrally on the site.
- There is minimal buffer or screening vegetation to road views.
- The site is currently visually open, and the proposed changes will largely retain this, adding a large building which will be obvious (particularly from SH73).
- The proposal will extend the pattern of mixed commercial and industrial activities across SH73 which will create a proliferation of 'like' activities in a zone which does not provide for such activities.
- The proposal will generate cumulative effects.¹⁰
- Patterns and elements currently intrinsic to rural character and amenity values are not included in the proposal to an effective degree.
- Extensive development to the south of SH73 including similar activities to what is proposed departs from typical rural characteristics and has lowered the landscape values of the receiving environment.
- There will be an increase in heavy vehicle movements attributed to the proposed activities.

Any potentially adverse landscape effects falling on most occupants of private properties located nearby on School and Hasketts Roads will be 'Moderate-Low',¹¹ decreasing over time to a point where any adverse effects will be 'Low' attributed to the following:

- Generous planted areas combined with a bund and solid fence are proposed along School Road.

⁹ **Moderate:** A moderate level of effect on the character or key attributes of the receiving environment and/or the visual context within which it is seen; and/or have a moderate level of effect on the perceived amenity derived from it. (*Oxford English Dictionary Definition: Moderate: adjective-average in amount, intensity or degree*). 'Moderate' effects on the seven-point scale are generally understood to be similar to 'more than minor' and 'Moderate-Low' to 'Low' effects are similar to 'minor'. However, the two scales cannot be aligned in absolute terms.

¹⁰ Generally, cumulative effects come into play where a proposal - added to the landscape, triggers a 'tipping point' where the landscape's capacity to absorb further change has been surpassed and where the landscape's character and values derived from that character have been permanently compromised. Cumulative effects are also linked with the District Plan's expectations for the RuUF Zone (permitted activities).

¹¹ **Moderate-Low:** A moderate to low level of effect on the character or key attributes of the receiving environment and/or the visual context within which it is seen; and/or have a moderate to low level of effect on the perceived amenity derived from it.

- The proposal will be visible to varying degrees when travelling along Hasketts and School Roads when approaching or leaving the area. However, when viewed from the north, the proposal will appear similar to a rural development.
- There will be a change from rural landuse activities to commercial activities that may or may not be visible (landscape effects).
- Substantial vegetation on the road boundaries of private properties precludes most views from within the properties (assumed).
- Residences' primary living areas are on the north and west sides of the dwellings (assumed) where they are orientated away from the proposal.
- The receiving environment includes commercial development similar to what is proposed which will also be passed by at times when on SH73.

There will potentially be 'Moderate' adverse landscape effects falling on the occupants of 26 and 42 School Road due to the removal of the existing planting and small buildings on 30 School Road opposite. This will enable clear views across the site to SH73 and the commercial/industrial development beyond, which will adversely affect these occupants outlook as they come and go to their properties.

In absence of the commercial/industrial development to the south of SH73, the adverse landscape effects of the proposal would be greater at 'High' due to the proposal's high level of departure from expected RuUF development patterns.

The LVA and this peer review is effects-based which is within the landscape architects' expertise. Matters of District Plan integrity are within the planner's remit and are not discussed.

This review has considered the information that has been made available to date. It is possible that any reasons and conclusions may be altered in response to new information arising that becomes available prior to or at any hearing of the application.

2 Review of LVA

2.1 Points of agreement

With regards to the LVA, there is agreement:

- (a) That 0.8 m - 1 m high mounding will soften views of the carpark / hardstand areas (Section 1, 'MM1').
- (b) The native shelter belt (plant species, size and spacings), bunding and fence (Section 1, 'MM2') proposed along School Road will provide an adequate visual screen / buffer to the proposal and maintain or provide rural amenity to views from the School Road corridor, church and property at 45 School Road in the medium to long term¹².
- (c) That generally speaking, darker, recessive colours used on buildings reduce reflectivity and visual bulk.
- (d) With the methodology described generally in (2.1, 2.2 and 2.3).
- (e) With the definition of amenity values (2.4).
- (f) With the identification, location and rationale behind the photographic viewpoints included and verification following site survey. However, it is acknowledged by the reviewer that there are no photographic viewpoints included from SH73 where most of the viewing audience will be located.
- (g) With the determination methodology of how the extent of the receiving environment was reached.

¹² Conservatively, from 5-7 years onwards.

- (h) That ZTV mapping is conservative and does not take vegetation and buildings/structures into account (a general point).
- (i) That the degree of the visual effects depends on the types of receptor, their sensitivity to change, where they are located and for how long and the degree of change to the existing view attributed to a proposal (2.4, page 6).
- (j) With the effects and photographic methodology generally (2.5 and 2.6).
- (k) With the description of the site and contextual character (3.1), except where points of difference are raised later in the peer review.
- (l) That the site context (RuUF Zone) has a modified character, [partly] reflected in the vegetation character and size and setbacks of buildings; and that 'Yaldhurst Village' includes a mix of variable landuse activities and because of this, has become a node with a local character that is neither rural nor urban (3.2).
- (m) That the *"...proposal introduces a large building into the receiving environment where currently the site is an open field."* And that: *"Signage and the placement of tractors along the state highway frontage will change the existing [rural] character to one which is more commercial..."* (3.2).
- (n) That the LIDAR/Google Earth Pro viewshed is realistic although the various buildings and vegetation at 33 School Road is proposed to be removed in which case more of the proposal will be visible from and across School Road (3.4, 'Context - Visual Catchment' – page 6 of graphic attachments).
- (o) That views from individual private properties are not included (nor practically possible) and that viewpoints from nearby public places can demonstrate similar visual effects of the proposal (3.4).
- (p) That adverse effects on visual amenity generated by the proposal on nearby residential properties can be successfully mitigated through the proposed planting and building setbacks (4).

Some of the following points identified in this peer review highlight inconsistencies found in the LVA's text and supporting graphics and from observations made during the site visit. Some aspects expand on other matters further, rather than wholly criticise or disagree with what is included. These points are discussed below.

2.2 General Observations

At Part 2.3 'Landscape Values' ONF/Ls are discussed. At Section 2.7.1 'RMA 1991' Section 6 matters are discussed. At Section 2.7.2 Christchurch District Plan' ONLs and VALs are mentioned. These matters have no relevance to the site. It would assist if this section provided more discussion around the District Plan's anticipated outcomes and expectations for the landscape character of the RuUF in which the site is located.

As discussed earlier in this peer review the recent NZILA landscape assessment guidelines have been published in draft form (8 December 2020). It would help if the LVA addressed these guidelines to see if the conclusions reached regarding the landscape effects of the proposal would differ in any way.

On page 9 of the LVA, paragraph four, a statement is made that the receiving environment has a *"...low to moderate sensitivity to change..."*. It is not stated what the change would be 'to'. This needs to be clarified.

The LVA does not assess the effects of the changes to the site following the removal of the buildings and vegetation at 33 School Road. Following this removal there will be clear views from School Road and residences at 26 and 42 School Road southwards to SH73, passing traffic and the industrial development beyond which will affect these parties' rural amenity.

The 'Development Plan' (page 3, graphic attachments) does not have a scale or north point. The scale at least needs to be added, as this helps with scaling off the drawings.

2.3 Applicant's assessment of effects - response

The fundamental concern by the reviewer is that a large non-rural building and associated outdoor activity will be located centrally on a site with scant existing or proposed buffer or screen planting to mitigate the effects. In addition, various implements and advertising flags will be seen lined up along the SH73 boundary. The high levels of visibility of the proposal from SH73 in particular is assumed to be a requirement of the Applicant for advertising reasons. The landscape treatment supports this intent with low or no planting along SH73 and trees at very wide spacings (total eleven deciduous trees in three groups along a 420 m SH73 road frontage).

Under 3.6 Built Form in the AEE, it states that: *"The Architects have designed the building to be similar to a large farm shed in recessive neutral colours with good eave overhangs along part of the edge facing the main road, helping mitigate the sense of scale. The building is set well off the road (30m) with a generous landscape strip in front. Overall, it is designed to be transitional between urban and rural densities, with the overall site setting not as dense as a typical industrial zone layout. It is a simple building sitting within a rural style setting like a large agricultural shed."*

It is in the reviewer's opinion the proposed building will bear little resemblance to a large farm shed regarding its most viewed south elevation for the following reasons:

- Large areas of glazing / translucent backlit cladding
- Sign-written / mural – possibly illuminated at night
- Multi-coloured cladding
- Angled walls / complex form
- The showroom will appear to be flat-roofed
- Surrounding outdoor activity and elements (new machinery, flags)

In the LVA (3.2) it states that: *"The development proposes a similar bulk and location to existing warehousing and commercial facilities nearby, locating a showroom in the centre of the site."*

This is a more accurate description of the proposal compared to the AEE's and architect's reference to the building resembling a 'large farm shed' (Figure 2).



Figure 2 Yaldhurst Wools Ltd at 30 School Road, viewed from School Road. This building has a footprint of approximately 1,300 m². Note the simple built form with pitched roof, minimal glazed area, set amongst / buffered by vegetation, supporting rural landuse activity. Photograph by J. Head, 30 March 2021.

The landscape strip in front of the building is not considered by the reviewer to be as generous as stated in the AEE. The reviewer considers the landscape strip to be spartan as it is devoid of any planting other than mown grass. The building setback is 'generous', if this is what is meant. The 6,586 m² building, its outward appearance, associated car parking areas and its highly austere landscape setting will appear more closely aligned with any service and distribution centre perhaps found in an industrial business park.

On the architect's elevations, the roof colour and east, west and north wall cladding is specified as 'Sandstone Grey' or similar. Colorsteel 'Sandstone Grey' has a light reflectance value (LRV) of 27% which is low and recessive, however the proposed colour should be confirmed as colour and LRV is important when assessing a building's visual effects.

Along with Sandstone Grey 'or similar', the south elevation to SH73 includes a combination of white and bright green coloured cladding, backlit translucent cladding with a mural overlay and an unnamed colour that appears to be pale blue (see architect's artists impressions). The combination of wall colour, advertising signage / flags and minimal planting between the building and SH73 will make the building visually obvious. As such, the maintenance or enhancement of rural character and amenity will be difficult to achieve.

The separate storage shed located along the site's western boundary will have the appearance of a typical rural building - assuming it is painted in recessive colours¹³ and would be compatible with generic rural character.

2.4 Location of proposal

The LVA refers to Hasketts and Pound Roads providing a landscape 'edge' of sorts between the rural area to the west and the 'Yaldhurst Village' character to the east. In this way, the LVA rests on the proposal having an acceptable level of consistency with the existing Yaldhurst Village landscape character. Hasketts Road also extends to the north of SH73 where it is considered in the LVA to provide a 'bookend' to the proposal and in some respects strengthen Norwood's location opposite. This is not considered by the reviewer as a valid reason for the proposed activities.

However, it is acknowledged that roads are helpful landscape elements where development patterns might optimally change - where a distinct contrast can often be highlighted at either side of a road. Generally, a distinct contrast between different landuse activity patterns is preferred, to best maintain landscape character - highlighting the positive attributes of each landuse.

It is the reviewer's opinion that SH73 currently provides and should continue to provide the change point between the less typical RuUF / 'Yaldhurst Village' industrial and commercial development characteristics to its south and the preferred RuUF characteristics to its north. The highway provides a strong change point. The RuUF character, north of SH73, including the site comprises a consistent rural landscape pattern from SH73 northwards to Ryans Road where the vast and open Rural Waimakariri Zone is reached. The proposal as it is presented will dilute this contrast, not strengthen it and it will not be able to maintain or enhance rural character and amenity at the site. From a landscape character perspective, it is preferable for visually obvious, large scale commercial/industrial activity to not 'step over' SH73 into the smaller scale / mosaic rural fringe character area.

Yaldhurst Wools (30 School Road) (**Figure 3**) and Oderings Nursery (20 School Road) include buildings and activities which are relatively small in scale and more compatible with the RuUF compared to what is proposed - a large building out in the open. These existing activities are also clustered at the thin / eastern end of the 'cadastral wedge'¹⁴ buffered with vegetation and well-separated from rural landuse patterns further westwards, including the site. It is not considered

¹³ This building is not shown in the architect's drawings or mentioned in the LVA.

¹⁴ Formed by SH73, Hasketts Road and School Road.

that these well-established operations provide much similarity or precedent for the proposal. The larger-scale industrial and commercial patterns to the south of SH73 depart significantly from the patterns of these two commercial operations north of SH73.



Figure 3. Yaldhurst Wools Ltd. at 30 School Road located at eastern end of site viewed from SH73. Photograph by J. Head, 30 March 2021.

2.5 Character of the Rural Urban Fringe Zone (RuUF) - discussion

The landscape characteristics of the RuUF vary subtly, but generally include small rural sites supporting a mosaic landscape pattern including built forms, vegetation and open spaces. When looking at the RuUF at a broad level, it is evident that the industrial and commercial activities opposite the site at 33, 39, 51 and 57 SH73 and 352 Hasketts Road (Norwood) appear anomalous. The proposal as it is currently proposed will exacerbate this effect of large non-rural looking buildings appearing centrally like 'islands' within large, visually open sites.

Presently the landscape character and amenity values along School Road are pleasant. To an extent the proposal will improve this further. As discussed above, the proposal includes additional planting which will screen views into the site (currently horse paddocks), but at the same time will screen views across the site where SH73 and the industrial/commercial development (LVA graphic attachments, page 10) is visible. This part of the outlook currently detracts from amenity values. It is concluded that this will provide a net benefit to those travelling along School Road and visiting or residing in properties along School Road opposite the site. However, to the east of the church (43 School Road) a gap is proposed where the existing buildings and planting is proposed to be removed at 33 School Road. In this regard the opposite effect will be generated. The positive physical containment currently experienced along School Road will open up here with direct views southwards to SH73 and beyond. It is acknowledged that there is no statutory requirement to retain these buildings and planting, however it is noted as an observation that has not been raised in the LVA as a potential adverse effect.

The LVA states at 3.2, page 9 that: *"The existing [rural] character will be maintained through the [proposal's] management of fencing and mitigating the impacts of built infrastructure through planting and bunding."* This will be possible regarding views into the proposal from areas north of the site. Otherwise planting and bunding will have almost nil effect at mitigating the building and activities on site to views from SH73. Hedging is proposed along SH73 in discrete sections, however a wide gap is left in front of the main building. These hedges are proposed to be maintained at 1.5m tall – to preserve views into the site presumably. View heights from a standard car are generally 1.2m above ground and so a 1.5 m tall hedge will provide little screening benefit from the highway.

Further in 3.2, it states: *"The development responds to the semi-rural character around the site by preserving the open character along State Highway 73. Open style fencing and low hedging*

retains an open character associated with rural areas while presenting a maintained planted frontage that is reflective of a domesticated landscape.” It is unclear what is meant by ‘domesticated landscape’ as it appears to be used to describe a less lived-in rural area. It may possibly mean ‘urban’ landscape - which fits the proposal. In any case the reviewer disagrees that the open character argument is particularly relevant to the proposal. The size, type, appearance and location of the main building and its surrounding activity (hardstand / carparking, advertising, implements on display) will dominate any semblance of ‘rural’ open space. Rural open space is typically associated with pasture grass or other productive crops and trees with buildings as subservient elements.

2.6 Cumulative effects

It is considered that the proposal will generate cumulative effects. Currently, development within the receiving environment exhibiting characteristics departing from expected RuUF characteristics is limited to the south side of SH73. The proposal expands similar activity across the highway creating a commercial highway ‘threshold’ of sorts to ‘Yaldhurst Village’. Currently the site provides a pleasant rural counterpoint and alternative outlook when travelling along SH73 through the area. In this regard there is a continuity in landscape character and its values between Sir John McKenzie Avenue to the east and the western city limit. The proposal would extinguish this continuity for a 430 m stretch which includes the site’s SH73 frontage, possibly further - the actual visibility of the proposal is mapped in the graphic attachments to the LVA at sheet 4 ‘Visual Catchment’ and suggests the effects extend beyond the site boundary.

3 Conclusion

The Applicant’s LVA concludes that the proposal will result in an acceptable level of change – from an open and semi-rural character to one that is more developed with stewardship and amenity consistent with other developments nearby, presumably across SH73 from the site.

The reviewer disagrees with the above finding and concludes that the proposal will have potentially ‘Moderate’ and ‘Moderate-Low’ adverse landscape effects depending on the party concerned. Adverse landscape effects experienced by most local residents on Hasketts Road and School Road will decrease over time as the proposed planting along the north edge of the proposal establishes.

The reviewer disagrees with the assertion in the LVA that the site is ‘semi-rural’. The site is considered by the reviewer following a site visit as rural. It is not appropriate to diminish, or at worst extinguish the site’s rural character and qualities by adopting the development patterns of non RuUF development to the south of SH73. The site needs to be considered on its own merits and any proposal should make genuine attempts to preserve that existing rural character. Such rural characteristics included in a proposal for the site may differ to the site’s existing rural characteristics. The point is, a non-rural development does not need to include predominantly open space to be ‘rural’. A combination of non-rural built forms set amongst planting and open space may have an acceptable level of consistency with the effects generated by permitted activities in the RuUF Zone.

The proposal as it is currently presented cannot maintain or enhance rural character to a level that will be compatible with the anticipated outcomes for the RuUF Zone.

Appendix 1

SEVEN POINT SCALE OF EFFECTS

Scale of Effects (7 Point)

From Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Guidelines; Prepared by New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA) 8 December 2020 (currently in draft form). The definitions come from NZILA national workshop discussions prior to the publication of the guidelines and are based on the Boffa Miskell effects descriptions.

The below seven-point scale is used to describe effects:

- Very High: Total loss to the key attributes of the receiving environment and/or visual context amounting to a complete change of landscape character
- High: Major change to the characteristics or key attributes of the receiving environment and/or visual context within which it is seen; and/or a major effect on the perceived amenity derived from it.
- Moderate-High: A moderate to high level of effect on the character or key attributes of the receiving environment and/or the visual context within which it is seen; and/or have a moderate-high level of effect on the perceived amenity derived from it.
- Moderate: A moderate level of effect on the character or key attributes of the receiving environment and/or the visual context within which it is seen; and/or have a moderate level of effect on the perceived amenity derived from it. (*Oxford English Dictionary Definition: Moderate: adjective-average in amount, intensity or degree*).
- Moderate-Low: A moderate to low level of effect on the character or key attributes of the receiving environment and/or the visual context within which it is seen; and/or have a moderate to low level of effect on the perceived amenity derived from it.
- Low: A low level of effect on the character or key attributes of the receiving environment and/or the visual context within which it is seen; and/or have a low level of effect on the perceived amenity derived from it. (*Oxford English Dictionary Definition: Low: adjective-below average in amount, extent, or intensity*).
- Very Low: Very low or no modification to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline or available views, i.e. approximating a 'no-change' situation.

wsp

wsp.com/nz