

256 FITZGERALD AVE MULTI UNIT DEVELOPMENT

HAYWOOD / MOUNTFORT

Urban Design and Visual Impact Assessment

Project No. 2021_063 | B

4 May 2021

256 FITZGERALD AVE – MULTI UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Project no: 2021_063
 Document title: Urban Design and Visual Impact Assessment

Revision: B
 Revision Date: 4 May 2021
 Client name: Haywood / Mountfort

Author: Dave Compton-Moen
 File name: 2021_063 Haywood_256 Fitzgerald Ave_UDVIA_B

DOCUMENT HISTORY AND STATUS

REVISION	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	REVIEW	APPROVED
A	1/04/2021	UDVIA Report for Comment	DCM		
B	4/05/2021	Client review update	DCM		
	6/06/2021	Client review update	DCM		

DCM URBAN DESIGN LIMITED

Level 3, 329 Durham Street North
 Christchurch 8013

COPYRIGHT: The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of DCM Urban Design Limited. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of DCM Urban Design Limited constitutes an infringement of copyright.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

The following report is an Urban Design and Visual Impact Assessment for a proposal to include the land at 5-8/254 Fitzgerald Avenue and 9-20/5 Harvey Terrace within the table in Appendix 13.14.6.2 of the Christchurch district plan. This land is within the Specific Purpose (Ōtākaro-Avon River Corridor) Zone. This will enable the redevelopment of this former residential land for residential purposes.

Prior to the Canterbury earthquakes in 2010/11, the site contained several blocks of flats (a total of 20 including the current 4 units) and a carport building with development extending out to Harvey Terrace.

The property is located in the Specific Purpose (Ōtākaro-Avon River Corridor) Zone of the Christchurch District Plan where it is highlighted in the Ōtākaro-Avon River Development Plan as being part of the Green Spine along with the block immediately to the south of Harvey Terrace.

2. METHODOLOGY

The urban design and visual impact assessment consider the likely effects of the proposal in a holistic sense. There are three components to the assessment:

1. Identification of the receiving environment and a description of the existing urban and landscape character.
2. The urban design and landscape assessment is an assessment of the proposal against the policies, objectives, and rules of the relevant District Plan regarding building style, land use activity, setbacks and active frontages, height, shading and signage (if relevant);
3. The visual impact assessment is primarily concerned with the effects of the proposal on visual amenity and people, evaluated against the character and quality of the existing visual catchment.

2.1 URBAN DESCRIPTION

To describe the character of the receiving urban environment a site visit is undertaken noting the character of existing buildings, their height, setbacks from street frontages and where there are any active frontages. The style and character of individual buildings are noted and grouped where possible, with particular emphasis placed on buildings with any heritage value. An analysis is also undertaken of the open space network, movement connections and the quality of the receiving streetscape. A combination of desktop and site analysis is used to determine the overall character of an urban area and what its 'Sensitivity to Change' may be. For example, an urban area which exhibits a high level of cohesion and uniformity may have a higher sensitivity to a proposal than an area which is more irregular and mixed.

2.2 URBAN DESIGN ASSESSMENT

The urban design assessment component reviews the proposal against the policies, objectives and rules of the District Plan which relate to Signage matters. When assessing the proposal, the

receiving environment is considered and whether the proposal will have an adverse effect on the existing urban character and amenity of a place, which is described above.

2.3 VISUAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

In response to section 7(c) of the RMA, an evaluation is undertaken to define and describe visual amenity values. As with aesthetic values, with which amenity values share considerable overlap, this evaluation was professionally based using current and accepted good practice rather than community-consultation methods. Amenity values are defined in the Act as *“those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people’s appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes.”* The visual assessment looks at the sensitivity of receptors to changes in their visual amenity through the analysis of selected representative viewpoints and wider visibility analysis. It identifies the potential sources for visual effects resulting from the project and describes the existing character of the area in terms of openness, prominence, compatibility of the project with the existing visual context, viewing distances and the potential for obstruction of views.

The visual assessment involves the following procedures:

- Identification of key viewpoints: A selection of key viewpoints are identified and verified for selection during the site visit. The viewpoints are considered representative of the various viewing audiences within the receiving catchment, being taken from public locations where views of the proposal were possible, some of which would be very similar to views from nearby residential properties/apartments. The identification of the visual catchment is prepared as a desktop study in the first instance using Council GIS for aerials and contours. This information is then ground-truthed on site to determine the key viewpoints and potential audience. Depending on the complexity of the project a ‘viewshed’ may be prepared which highlights the ‘Theoretical Zone of Visual Influence’ (TZVI) from where a proposal will theoretically be visible from.
- Assessment of the degree of sensitivity of receptors to changes in visual amenity resulting from the proposal: Factors affecting the sensitivity of receptors for evaluation of visual effects include the value and quality of existing views, the type of receiver, duration or frequency of view, distance from the proposal and the degree of visibility. For example, those who view the change from their homes may be considered to be highly sensitive. The attractiveness or otherwise of the outlook from their home will have a significant effect on their perception of the quality and acceptability of their home environment and their general quality of life.
- Those who view the change from their workplace are considered to be only moderately sensitive as the attractiveness or otherwise of the outlook will have a less important, although still material, effect on their perception of their quality of life. The degree to which this applies depends on whether the workplace is industrial, retail or commercial. Those who view the change whilst taking part in an outdoor leisure activity may display varying sensitivity depending on the type of leisure activity. For example, walkers in open country on a long-distance tramp are considered to be highly sensitive to change while other walkers may not be so focused on the surrounding landscape. Those who view the change whilst travelling on a public thoroughfare will also display varying

sensitivity depending on the speed and direction of travel and whether the view is continuous or occasionally glimpsed.

- Identification of potential mitigation measures: These may take the form of revisions/refinements to the engineering and architectural design to minimise potential effects, and/or the implementation of landscape design measures (e.g., screen tree planting, colour design of hard landscape features etc.) to alleviate adverse urban design or visual effects and generate potentially beneficial long-term effects.
- Prediction and identification of the pre-mitigation and residual effects after the implementation of the mitigation measures.

2.4 EFFECTS ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Analysis of the existing urban and visual environment is focused upon understanding the functioning of how an environment is likely to respond to external change (the proposal). The assessment considers the resilience of the existing character, values or views and determines their capacity to absorb change, or sensitivity to change. The proposal is assessed in its 'unmitigated' form and then following proposed mitigation to determine the likely residual effects. The analysis identifies opportunities, risks, threats, costs, and benefits arising from the potential change.

Assessing the magnitude of change (from the proposal) is based on the NZILA Best Practice Guide –Landscape Assessment and Sustainable Management (02.11.10) with a seven-point scale, being:

EXTREME / VERY HIGH / HIGH / MODERATE / LOW / VERY LOW / NEGLIGIBLE

In determining the extent of adverse effects, taking into account the sensitivity (low, medium, high) of the visual receptor, combined with the Magnitude of Change proposed, the level of effects is along a continuum to ensure that each effect has been considered consistently and in turn cumulatively. This continuum may include the following effects (based on the descriptions provided on the Quality Planning website (ref: <http://www.qualityplanning.org.nz/index.php/node/837> - Determining the Extent of Adverse Effects):

- **Indiscernible Effects** No effects at all or are too small to register.
- **Less than Minor Adverse Effects** Adverse effects that are discernible day-to-day effects, but too small to adversely affect other persons.
- **Minor Adverse Effects** Adverse effects that are noticeable but will not cause any significant adverse impacts.
- **More than Minor Adverse Effects** Adverse effects that are noticeable that may cause an adverse impact but could be potentially mitigated or remedied.
- **Significant Adverse Effects that could be remedied or mitigated** an effect that is noticeable and will have a serious adverse impact on the environment but could potentially be mitigated or remedied.
- **Unacceptable Adverse Effects** Extensive adverse effects that cannot be

avoided, remedied, or mitigated.

Identification of potential mitigation or offsetting measures: These may take the form of revisions/refinements to the engineering and architectural design to minimise potential effects, and/or the implementation of landscape design measures (e.g., screen tree planting, colour design of hard landscape features etc.) to alleviate adverse urban design or visual effects and/or generate potentially beneficial long-term effects. The following table assists with providing consistency between NZILA and RMA terms to determine where effects lie.

NZILA Rating	Extreme	Very High	High	Moderate			Low	Very Low	Negligible
				Moderate-High	Moderate	Moderate-Low			
RMA Effects Equivalent	Unacceptable	Significant		More than Minor		Minor	Less than Minor		Indiscernible

The NZILA rating of 'Moderate' has been divided into 3-levels as a 'Moderate' magnitude of change to always result in either 'More than Minor' or 'Minor' effects but may be one or the other depending on site conditions, context, sensitivity or receiving character and its degree of change.

Prediction and assessment identification of the residual adverse effects after the implementation of the mitigation measures. Residual effects are considered to be five years after the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, allowing for planting to get established but not to a mature level.

3. ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS

3.1 EXISTING URBAN CHARACTER

For this proposal the receiving environment is considered to be an 800m wide catchment as shown on figure 4 in the attached figures. This is due to the relatively flat character of the receiving environment and the relatively minor nature of the proposal. The site is on the edge of existing urban development consisting of a mix of low and medium density housing in close proximity to the city centre. The style and type of housing in the area varies greatly but could be described as transitioning from 'low density with infill development' to 'medium density'. Multi-unit developments are common, often running at right angles to the street due to the long, deep nature of the lots which were designed as ¼ acre allotments (approximately 50 deep x 20m wide). Buildings are predominately 1 or 2 storeys although there is the occasional 3 storey building.

The entire area was residential prior to the establishment of the 'Red-zone' following the Canterbury Earthquakes in 2010/11. The earthquakes caused widespread damage in the area with housing removed along a wide corridor starting at the Avon Loop and extending east towards Bexley and New Brighton. In the immediate area housing was removed between the river and Harvey Terrace as well as a small portion north of Harvey up to Heywood Terrace. The proposal is located within this portion fronting onto both Fitzgerald Ave and Harvey Terrace. Housing

remains on the southern side of the Ōtākaro-Avon River immediately adjacent to Avonside Drive. On the northern side of the river, River Road has now been reduced to a cycle/walkway, forming part of the City to Sea Path. The pathway crosses the river at the Kilmore Street intersection before following an old section of Oxford Terrace, on the opposite side of the river from the proposal site.

The proposal site itself is separated from the Ōtākaro-Avon by Fitzgerald Ave to the west. Fitzgerald Avenue is a 30m wide road corridor with 2 traffic lanes and on-street cycle lanes travelling in each direction. Footpaths are present on both side of the road with a raised central median approximately 2m wide in the centre. The footpath on the west side of the street is a boardwalk, partially grade separated from the roadway. At Kilmore Street the river bends sharply to the east running perpendicular to Fitzgerald Ave, being approximately 200m from the site to the south. In this space there are two remaining houses, being 238 Fitzgerald Ave, which is a single-storey residential dwelling being used as a second-hand car sales yard and 20 Templar Road – Bill Sutton’s house, which is being used as ‘an artist in residence’ house. Multi-unit housing exists immediately to the east of the proposal site, extending up to Stanmore Road almost 400m away. The site is bordered by residential development on the eastern and part of the northern boundary with the boundary fenced. A 1.8m high close board timber fence runs along this edge. The two storey 4unit block at the front of the site is existing, surrounded by a mix of typical residential landscape plantings. Overall, the receiving environment is considered to have a medium level of sensitivity to change due to the proximity of residential development and the Otakaro- Avon River corridor. The quality and amenity of the environment is reduced though by the presence of Fitzgerald Avenue and the large number of vehicle movements that pass through the corridor.

3.2 URBAN DESIGN ASSESSMENT

3.2.1 SPECIFIC PURPOSE (OTAKARO-AVON RIVER CORRIDOR) ZONE

Located in a Specific Purpose (Otakaro-Avon River Corridor) Zone of the Christchurch District Plan and labeled as Green Spine in Appendix 13.14.6.1, the proposal has been assessed against the objectives, policies and rules of this chapter in regard to urban design matters:

As described in Clause 13.14.1 this chapter relates to the area of land that falls within the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration Plan. These are predominantly areas of land that run alongside the Ōtākaro Avon River which were ‘red zoned’ as a result of the Canterbury Earthquakes in 2010 and 2011 and which were previously part of the Specific Purpose (Flat Land Recovery) Zone, with some adjoining public open spaces. The Specific Purpose (Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor) Zone provides for a range of activities and outcomes that have been identified in the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration Plan. The objectives, policies, rules, standards and assessment criteria in this chapter seek to manage activities in the Zone through identifying sub-areas in the Development Plan in Appendix 13.14.6.1 (copied in the supporting figures).

13.14.2.1 Objective - Regeneration

- a. The regeneration of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor achieves the following priority outcomes:**
 - i. Significant areas of restored natural environment containing a predominance of indigenous planting, wetlands and restored habitat for indigenous fauna, birdlife and indigenous species, improved surface water quality and provision for the practice of mahinga kai;**
 - ii. Flood hazard and stormwater management infrastructure that mitigates natural hazard risks for the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor and surrounding areas and is integrated with the natural landscape;**
 - iii. Accessibility and connectivity across and along the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor, and with existing communities; and**
 - iv. A predominance of natural and open spaces, with limited areas of built development concentrated in specific Reaches, residential areas, Activity Area Overlays and Landing Overlays.**
- b. The Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor supports opportunities for other uses and activities that are compatible with the priority outcomes in a. above, including:**
 - i. Increased opportunities for recreation, cultural activities and community-based activities;**
 - ii. A range of visitor attractions and limited small-scale retail activities;**
 - iii. Limited residential development on the outer edge of the Zone to improve integration between the edge of existing neighbourhoods and the activities within the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor;**
 - iv. Varied learning, experimenting and research opportunities, including testing and demonstrating adaptation to natural hazards and climate change; and**
 - v. Transitional activities and structures where these do not compromise the priority outcomes in a. above.**
- c. The continuation of pre-earthquake activities on privately-owned properties that still exist within the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor.**

Response

The proposal is located on the edge of the corridor and would improve integration between the edge of existing neighbourhoods and the activities within the Otakaro Avon River corridor. The section of land between Harvey and Heywood Terraces, zoned as Specific Purpose, is a relatively small parcel of land, separated from the rest of the corridor by Harvey Terrace and Fitzgerald Avenue. Fitzgerald Ave is a 40m wide road corridor creating a significant break between the proposal site and the river while to the south the river is 180m away. The proposal area is perceived separate, both visually and physically, from the river but with the ability for the site to form a strong built edge to the open space across Harvey Terrace to the south.

13.14.2.1.1 Policy - Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Areas

- a. Recognise that areas within the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor have different priorities, characteristics and expected levels of built form, by spatially defining different areas within the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor and managing these areas to:**
 - i. Provide for the activities identified as 'Intended Activities' in Table 1 below, and ensure other activities are compatible with the 'Character Outcomes' and 'Intended Activities' in Table 1 below.**

- ii. ***Avoid other activities that are not compatible with the 'Character Outcomes' or 'Intended Activities' in Table 1 below.***

13.14.2.1.2 Policy - Supporting Regeneration Activities

- a. ***Recognise that the process of regeneration is ongoing and adaptive, and provide for this through:***
 - i. ***enabling transitional activities and structures where these do not compromise the priority outcomes in Objective 13.14.2.1a. or the Character outcomes and Intended Activities indicated in Policy 13.14.2.1.1;***
 - ii. ***focusing the management of amenity effects on neighbouring properties and activities,***
 - iii. ***predominantly at adjacent zone boundaries and boundaries of private properties that still exist within the Zone;***
 - iv. ***utilising a global consent process where appropriate for particular categories of large scale and ongoing activities;***
 - v. ***updating the Development Plan in Appendix 13.14.6.1 to reflect the locations of facilities as they are developed;and***
 - vi. ***acknowledging that there will be some loss of indigenous biodiversity associated with the development of Landings and new infrastructure, except within inanga spawning sites which will be protected, and recognising that over time there will be a significant net gain in indigenous biodiversity across the Corridor as a whole.***

Response

The proposal is located in the "green spine" which allows for some residential development in Table 1 (not copied). The implementation of the proposal will not have an effect on the ability to implement Regeneration activities shown on the Development Plan, Appendix 13.14.6.1. It will not have an adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties, albeit there will be a change, the effects are considered to be less than minor or indiscernible. The proposal is consistent with residential development which occurred on the site prior to the earthquakes and is of a scale and type which is consistent with current types of residential development in the immediate area.

13.14.2.1.3 Policy - Continuation of Pre-Earthquake Activities

- a. ***Provide for residential activities and other existing activities on existing properties in private ownership in the Ōtākaro AvonRiver Corridor.***
- b. ***Manage activities in the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor to ensure effects on existing privately-owned residential properties within the Zone are generally consistent with those anticipated in the Alternative Zone specified in Appendix 13.14.6.2.***

Response

Prior to the earthquakes there were 20 residential units on the site. As it is a privately-owned site, providing dwellings on the site would be consistent with subclause a of this policy. Providing additional dwellings on the site would not prevent the implementation of the purpose of the zone or any of the activities proposed to improve the amenity of the corridor.

13.14.2.1.4 Policy - Residential Activities

- a. ***Provide for limited new clustered, tiny or small footprint housing and temporary and permanent residential activities in identified Trial Housing Areas to enable opportunities for testing and demonstrating adaptation to natural hazards and***

climate change, where these:

- i. are comprehensively designed in one plan for the whole Trial Housing location to:*
 - A. complement and integrate with the surrounding natural and cultural environment, including the intended indigenous natural environment of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor;*
 - B. provide safe and social communal spaces; and*
 - C. provide visually attractive buildings and structures.*
- ii. avoid unacceptable risk to life and property from natural hazards.*
- b. Provide for limited new residential development in identified Edge Housing Area Overlays where these are designed to front on to the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor and improve integration between the edge of existing neighbourhoods and the activities within the Zone.*
- c. Other than in Trial Housing and Edge Housing Overlays, provide for one new residential unit on a site only where it is ancillary to, and required for, the primary activity on the site.*

Response

While the site is not in an identified Edge Housing Area Overlay, the site and adjoining properties between Harvey and Heywood Terraces would lend themselves to this purpose. This is due to the relatively small scale of the area between Harvey and Heywood Terraces and the ability to redevelop these sites without affecting the amenity of adjoining properties. The area's development into residential would improve the integration between the edge of existing neighbourhoods and the activities within the zone. The current zone boundary is mid-block and defined by a close board timber fence.

13.14.2.5 Policy - Design

- a. Provide for built development where it is of a design, scale and character that is consistent and integrated with the intended character of the area within which it is located, and which:*
 - i. incorporates ecological enhancement planting to provide a high level of onsite amenity and mitigate effects on adjacent activities, and support an improved natural environment with increased native habitat and improved surface water quality;*
 - ii. complements the surrounding natural and cultural environment, including the intended indigenous natural environment of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor;*
 - iii. incorporates onsite treatment of stormwater and/or integrates with wider stormwater management systems where practicable;*
 - iv. achieves a high quality, visually attractive development when viewed from the street and other public spaces;*
 - v. provides accessible, safe, and efficient movement options for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles;*
 - i. maintains and enhances the natural character, indigenous biodiversity, health and life supporting capacity of water bodies and their margins;*

- ii. is designed to deter crime and encourage a sense of safety, reflecting the principles of CPTED;*
- iii. manages the interface with adjacent residential and open space-zoned areas;*
- iv. promotes active engagement with any adjacent streets or public spaces, and contributes to the vibrancy and attractiveness of those spaces;*
- v. provides an adequate firefighting water supply; and*
- vi. is designed and located so that it does not obstruct existing or potential customary access to areas of ecological enhancement planting.*

Response

While the level of detail outlined above has not been developed yet, it is possible for several of the above criteria to be included in any future building and landscape design.

3.2.2 Residential Zone

If the proposal site were to be rezoned Residential, the following Objectives and Policies of the Residential zone are considered appropriate to assess:

14.2.1 Objective - Housing supply

- a. An increased supply of housing that will:

 - i. enable a wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities, in a manner consistent with Objectives 3.3.4(a) and 3.3.7;*
 - ii. meet the diverse needs of the community in the immediate recovery period and longer term, including social housing options; and*
 - iii. assist in improving housing affordability.**

14.2.1.1 Policy - Housing distribution and density

a. Provide for the following distribution of different areas for residential development, in accordance with the residential zones identified and characterised in Table 14.2.1.1a, in a manner that ensures:

- iii. medium density residential development in and near identified commercial centres in existing urban areas where there is ready access to a wide range of facilities, services, public transport, parks and open spaces, that achieves an average net density of at least 30 households per hectare for intensification development;***

Response

The proposal site is close to a wide range of facilities and services, public transport and open spaces (Avon-Otakaro River). There are two bus stops (28191 and 36046) for the Halswell/Queenspark (7) bus route in close proximity to the site providing links into the city and further afield. The Stanmore Road shops (containing several takeaway outlets, a petrol station and Dan's Fresh Produce) are within a 500m radius of the site or a 10m walk.

Towards the city centre, Little Poms and Pomeroy's are within 300m of the site. Being on the edge of the Central City, the site is appropriate for higher density development.

3.3 VISUAL EFFECTS

3.3.1 VISUAL CATCHMENT AND AMENITY

The following table outlines the potential visual effects likely to be experienced by Visually Sensitive Receivers in the receiving environment. To assist with determining effects, a series of public viewpoints were visited, considered representative of views that may be experienced from surrounding businesses, residences, and public spaces (including footpaths). These were as follows:

- VP1 – View southeast from 358 Cambridge Terrace
- VP2 – View northeast from 250 Fitzgerald Avenue
- VP3 – View north from 6 Harvey Terrace
- VP4 – View south from 272 Fitzgerald Avenue
- VP5 – View southeast from 11 Heywood Terrace

3.3.2 TABLE OF VISUAL EFFECTS

The following table outlines the potential visual effects each Visually Sensitive Receptor might receive:

Table 1: Assessment of Effects on Visually Sensitive Receptors

Viewpoint	Visually Sensitive Receptors (VSR)	Distance from Proposal (m)	Type of View (open, partial, screened)	Description of existing view	Sensitivity of VSR	Magnitude of Change	Effects	Description of Effects
1. View southeast from 358 Cambridge Terrace	Residents on Cambridge Terrace and Fitzgerald Ave	150m	Open	Existing views to the south are possible of the existing building, the road corridor and associated infrastructure. Existing trees on adjacent sites and within the road corridor are visible along with the Port Hills in the distance.	High	Negligible	Indiscernible	The existing building is already visible with any site improvements including fencing unlikely to be discernible. The building is viewed in the context of the existing urban environment and is not viewed as part of the Ōtākaro-Avon River corridor from this perspective.
	Low							
2. View northeast from 250 Fitzgerald Ave	Travellers using Fitzgerald Ave	110m	Partial/Open	From the middle of the road, the existing dwelling is partially visible behind well-established vegetation. The Ōtākaro-Avon River corridor is visible on the left of the image, separated from the proposal site by Fitzgerald Ave. The old residential lots (now part of the river park) are visible on the right of the image.	Low	Negligible	Indiscernible	While the proposal is visible, any proposed changes are considered to be negligible with no discernible effects on visual amenity. The river corridor is visible in the view, but Fitzgerald Ave creates a clear demarcation visually between the river and residential development.
3. View north from 6 Harvey Terrace	Users of the future Ōtākaro – Avon River Park	20m	Open	Open views are possible of the site and the existing dwelling. The rear of the site is visible from the street due to the openness of the adjacent dwellings. The boundary fences and adjoining residential dwellings are also visible from this location. The river is visible to the left of the photo, at the end of Harvey Terrace, across Fitzgerald Avenue.	Medium	Very Low	Less than Minor	The proposed new dwellings will be visible from this view but will be viewed in context with the existing dwelling on site and existing residential dwellings on adjoining properties. The proposal will be viewed as an extension of this type of development.
4. View south from 272 Fitzgerald Ave	Pedestrians using Fitzgerald Ave	25m	Open	Open views of the site and existing dwellings are visible from this viewpoint. Existing plantings and close board timber fences highlight old and current boundaries. The river corridor is visible to the right of the photo, across Fitzgerald Avenue	Medium	Negligible	Indiscernible	Only partial views of the proposal will be visible from this location with most views screened by existing vegetation or the existing residential block on site.
5. View southeast from 11 Heywood Terrace	Residents on Heywood Terrace	60m	Partial	Partial views of the site and existing dwellings are visible from this viewpoint. Existing plantings and close board timber fences highlight old and current boundaries. The river corridor is visible to the right of the photo, across Fitzgerald Avenue	High	Negligible	Indiscernible	The proposal will not be visible from this location as it is 'tucked' behind existing residential development on the adjoining site and the existing building on site.

3.3.3 SUMMARY OF VISUAL EFFECTS

In terms of visual effects, the proposal is considered to have less than minor effects when viewed from Harvey Terrace but Indiscernible from all other viewpoints.

Occupants of the residential dwellings will not notice any discernible change from the proposal given the character and quality of existing views.

For pedestrians and vehicles travelling west along Fitzgerald Avenue, any changes to views are anticipated to be partial and intermittent while travelling with any effects anticipated to be Indiscernible.

4. MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures are suggested to either avoid, remedy, or mitigate any potential effects on visual amenity:

MM1 LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN

It is recommended that a landscape plan be developed for the site, prior to development commencing, showing:

- Ground floor building(s) outline
- Ground surface materials such as paving, including type, location and parking areas.
- Location and width of kerbs.
- Fencing type (materials), height, location and a drawn elevation, any gates or access to the site.
- Plant/tree schedule, including species, quantity and height or grade at time of planting and at maturity.
- The location, species and height of existing planting to be retained.
- The location of new planting, and the area available for planting (including the total landscape area as a site coverage percentage, where zoning requires this).
- Identification of any protected trees or other landscape features.
- Ground contours where appropriate.
- Practical and accessible location of bins, service areas, garages, sheds, washing lines and the location of external features such as heat pumps and satellite dishes.

MM2 SUGGESTED ZONE CHANGE

The site should adopt the Residential Medium Density (RMD) zoning to be consistent with land adjacent to the site.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, I consider that the proposed development is an appropriate activity for the site with Fitzgerald Ave creating a significant barrier between the site and the Otakaro-Avon River corridor. While the site benefits from amenity afforded to it from the waterway and the Otakaro Loop Reach, the site is not considered to be part of the corridor from an urban design or a landscape perspective but is, along with the remainder of the vacant land between Heywood and Harvey Terraces being more suited to residential, in particular medium density, development.

The current 'mid-block' zoning change results in an 'awkward' edge where most of the adjoining residential developments have turned their back on the open space and the built edge to Fitzgerald Ave is somewhat diluted. The sides of buildings, service areas and close board fencing typify the edge treatment to the space, as opposed to being a high amenity built interface. It is recommended that the underlying zoning is modified to RMD to reflect the block form and current severance from the Otakaro-Avon River corridor.

The proposal will not affect any of the infrastructure proposed as part of the Otakaro-Avon River corridor.

In terms of visual amenity, the proposal will have less than minor to indiscernible effects on the receiving environment.