

**Technical memorandum for an application for subdivision consent under the Resource Management Act 1991 in respect of 25 Punawaitai Road, Porerere Beach**

To: Ryan O'Leary, Planning Manager, The Property Group

From: Rebecca Keren Ryder, Landscape Architect / Partner, Boffa Miskell

---

## 1. Application details

**Applicant's name:** Paonui Point Limited (**Applicant**)

**Application number:** RM220003

**Activity type:** 55 lot subdivision (described in more detail below)

**Site address:** 25 Punawaitai Road, Porerere Beach, legally described as Lot 1 DP 571994 & Lot 7 DP 571994; Lot 22 DP 571994 & Lot 2 DP 564721 (**Property**)

## 2. Introduction

### Qualifications and relevant experience

- 2.1. My name is Rebecca Keren Ryder, and I am a Landscape Architect and Partner at Boffa Miskell Limited.
- 2.2. I hold a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (Honours) from Lincoln University and am affiliated to the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects as a Registered Landscape Architect, and am a Fellow of this Institute. I am an executive member of the Executive Committee for the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects.
- 2.3. I joined Boffa Miskell in 2001 and place a strong focus on designing proposals into an environment, responding to the natural environment and needs of a community. With a strong background in landscape planning and design I advise a wide range of clients, in particular council policy planners, parks teams and numerous private developers. My strengths lie in the field of landscape assessment and analysis along with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) assessment.
- 2.4. Of relevance to this hearing, I am experienced in the areas of Landscape and Visual Effects Assessments associated with urban form and urban character, rural landscape including rural character. I also provide peer reviews for numerous local and regional authorities on urban

and rural applications where they address urban and rural character, visual amenity and landscape effects.

- 2.5. By way of background, I have also prepared technical landscape and natural character studies for numerous regional and district authorities including; Tauranga City, Western Bay of Plenty District, Whakatane, Opotiki, Bay of Plenty Region, Waikato District, Hastings District and currently Taupo District.
- 2.6. I was engaged to undertake a peer review of the applicant's landscape assessment, prepared by Hudson Associates Landscape Architects in 2022. In order to undertake the peer review I visited the site on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March 2022 during which the applicant provided a site tour and I also observed the site from its surrounding visual catchment's public viewing points. I have read all the applicant's material, including the Landscape Assessment report prepared in 2021 by Hudson Associates.

### 3. Overview and scope of technical memorandum

- 3.1. The Applicant has applied for a resource consent to subdivide the Property into:
  - a. 48 allotments suitable for residential development plus balance lot;
  - b. 3 lots for shared open space;
  - c. 1 lot for stormwater detention and treatment; and
  - d. 2 lots for shared access.
- 3.2. My technical memorandum addresses the landscape effects of the Application to assist the preparation of the Central Hawkes Bay District Council's (**Council**) reporting planner's report under s 42A of the RMA and will cover the following matters:
  - a. Natural character effects, and;
  - b. Landscape character effects, inclusive of rural character and visual amenity effects.
- 3.3. In preparing this technical memorandum, I have reviewed the following documents relevant to the Application:
  - a. Applicant's resource consent application (**Application**), and in particular:
    - i. Pourerere Subdivision Landscape Assessment, Hudson Associates Landscape Architects, September 2021;
    - ii. Assessment of Effects on the Environment, Application for Subdivision Consent, Punawaitaitai Road, Pourerere, Stage 3.
    - iii. District Plan Assessment table;
    - iv. Drawings dated 20211223;
    - v. Written approval signed plan 20211123, and;
    - vi. Site Plan 20211223.

- b. Relevant supporting information with reference to the requirements of Chapters 4, 9, 14 the Central Hawke's Bay District Plan (**Operative Plan**) and the requirements of Chapters RLR (Rural Land Resource), TW (Tangata Whenua), SUB (Subdivision), NFL (Natural Features and Landscapes) and GRUZ (General Rural Zone) the Central Hawke's Bay Proposed District Plan (**Proposed Plan**).
- c. The Central Hawkes Bay Landscape Assessment, prepared by Hudson Associates, May 2019<sup>1</sup>, has also informed the background understanding of the District's landscape and those identified areas. Similarly the Natural Character Assessment of The Central Hawke's Bay Coastal Environment, January 2019<sup>2</sup> was also prepared by Hudson Associates and is also relevant to the wider receiving environment.
- d. Higher order policy documentation including the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 has also been taken into consideration, as the site is identified within the Coastal Environment within the Proposed Central Hawkes Bay District Plan.

#### 4. Executive summary

- 4.1. The proposed subdivision will introduce 48 residential lots into the rural landscape, which have been assessed in the Hudson Associates Landscape Assessment report (2021). Overall, in my opinion the landscape assessment does not comprehensively evaluate the landscape character, including visual amenity, effects and in turn provide reasoning for the appropriateness of the development in a rural zone, particularly related to the sprawl and dominance of the subdivision within the pastoral rural landscape.
- 4.2. Reliance on the remaining open rural landscape and spatial layout of the subdivision, without a landscape mitigation plan, does not provide suitable certainty of the management of potential adverse landscape effects. In my view the unique characteristics of the site and design responses to appropriately integrate a land use change are not apparent in the assessment.
- 4.3. It is my opinion that there remains potential for moderate adverse landscape effects to be generated on the rural character. Further detail is required to evaluate the reasoning for the site's ability to integrate the loss of the open rural landscape. The mitigation measures recommended by the Applicant do not suitably respond to the rural character and require, in my view, a more robust response. I have provided further recommendations on what these could comprise further within this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Central Hawke's Bay District Outstanding Natural Landscape Assessment, May 2019, Hudson Associates.](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Natural Character Assessment of the Central Hawke's Bay Coastal Environment, January 2019, Hudson Associates.](#)

## 5. Overview of Application

The Application describes the subdivision proposal in detail, however by way of summary, the proposed subdivision is proposed to be completed over three stages (Stages 3A and 3B). An excerpt of the proposed scheme plan is included in **Figure 1** below.



**Figure 1**

5.1. The Application describes the proposed subdivision as follows:

- a. 47 allotments (Lots 1 to 14, 16, 17, 19 to 21 and 23 to 50 having areas between 1790m<sup>2</sup> and 4700m<sup>2</sup> suitable for residential development);
- b. Lot 22 – 1.74 ha, part of which contains a house site and part of which is intended to be divided into paddocks to be available for lease by owners of the 47 other residential lots for the grazing of horses;
- c. Lot 15 – 2711m<sup>2</sup> (which will contain the stormwater detention and treatment area serving Stage 3);
- d. Lot 18 – 5354m<sup>2</sup> (shared open space);
- e. Lot 51 - 1.27 ha (shared open space);
- f. Lot 52 - 1.6 ha (shared open space);
- g. Lots 53 and 54 (shared access); and
- h. Lot 60 – approximately 358 ha (balance area).

- 5.2. It is anticipated that Lots 15 (stormwater detention and treatment); lots 53 and 54 (shared access); and, Lots 18, 51 and 52 (shared open space) will be held in separate titles, to be owned by an Incorporated Society (to be established). Each owner of the new lots will be required to be a member of the incorporated society which will control and manage the communal facilities, including the open space areas and rights of way.
- 5.3. Communal open space areas are also proposed to be developed by the incorporated society for recreational activities in future, but these do not form part of this Application.
- 5.4. The Application is for subdivision consent only, and no land use consent has been applied for in relation to development of the proposed lots (e.g. for potential non-compliance of development with the Operative Central Hawke's Bay District Plan's Rural Zone's permitted activity rules, such as minimum setbacks of residential dwellings from internal boundaries).
- 5.5. I understand that the subdivision proposal requires consent as a discretionary activity pursuant to rule 9.9.4 of the Operative Plan as it is unable to comply with all relevant subdivision performance standards in standards 9.10(1)(a)-(i) of the Operative Plan. Any subdivision of a site in the Coastal Margin under the Operative District Plan also requires resource consent.

#### **Summary of proposal aspects relevant to landscape and natural character effects**

- 5.6. The proposal seeks to subdivide 48 residential lots across an 18.32ha area, comprising 17.87ha for rural lifestyle and a 15m wide buffer area, with a remaining balance lot of 358ha. Sited in the Rural Zone in both the Operative and Proposed Plans the key matters of consideration in the assessment of landscape and natural character effects comprise:
  - a. The maintenance of the rural character and amenity including the assessment of the biospherical, sensory and associative attributes of landscape. This includes consideration of cultural values and associations of the landscape.
  - b. Protection of natural character and amenity of the coastal environment. The site is identified as being part of the coastal environment however is not identified as being part of an identified high, very high or outstanding natural character area or an outstanding natural feature. Whilst not identified in the Operative District Plan and supporting technical reports, the need to assess natural character of streams and their margins remains relevant to the proposal.

#### **Site locality and description of the environment**

- 5.7. The wider landscape context comprises a rolling pastoral productive landscape, with gently sloping foothills and wide valley floors supporting flat paddocks. The coastal edge is reflective of the dominant coastal processes with the rugged and steep coastal hills making way to steep coastal cliffs and sandy beaches.
- 5.8. The subject site is reflective of a natural valley system that is representative of its geomorphological formative processes. The valley floor is defined by the formative river and streams and natural hydrological processes that have formed the valley floor.
- 5.9. The character of the area is of a localised small settlement set alongside the Pourerere Stream and inlet with a single road corridor leading in and out of the settlement. Housing is clustered in a single row alongside Pourerere Beach Road, with three main clusters of housing. Separately located to this settlement pattern is the siting of Stage 1 of subdivision of the site which is sited

to the north of the Pourerere Stream. Punawaitai Road supports a small cluster of rural housing and sheds and more recently Stage 1 of the subdivision.

- 5.10. Vegetation patterns in the area typically define edges of natural features including the Pourerere Stream, hill sides and surrounds of rural dwellings and residential settlement clusters. This is characteristic of this coastal rural landscape.

## 6. Technical assessment of effects

### Method of Assessment

- 6.1. The landscape assessment for Stage 2 of the subdivision, undertaken by Hudson Associates, provides an outline of the assessment approach in line with earlier guidance documentation (relevant at the time of the assessment), set out by the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects Tuia Pito Ora Ltd. The outline provides an understanding of the assessment process but does not provide further detail of how the effects ratings are reached. The table at the top page 14 of the Landscape Assessment provides descriptive wording that reflects the degree the scale applied to the attributes and effects assessed.
- 6.2. The method of assessment is well set out in the report and applies a method that is clear to follow with the degree of effects. It is noted that the approach taken applies a weighting of sensitivity and magnitude of change which is encouraged to move away from in the recently updated Best Practice Method for Landscape Assessment, Tuia Pito Ora New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects, called *Te Tangi a te Manu*, Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines (adopted May 2022). The nature of the change and effect are key to determining the degree of effect and it is considered that the assessment applies a suitably robust method of assessment.
- 6.3. The assessment also applies a scaling of effect relative to the RMA terms of less than minor, minor and more than minor. It is noted this differs to the above referred guidance which shows:



Figure 1 – Extract from page 151 of *Te Tangi a te Manu*.

- 6.4. Overall, the method statements are clearly laid out and reflective of the time at which they were applied. The assessment suitably details separately the assessment of landscape, natural character and visual amenity. Notably, however, visual amenity contributes to the assessment of landscape character. What does not appear in the assessment is a clear attempt to further integrate and assess the cultural values of the site. This is clear in the method of assessment and paragraph 81 of the Hudson Assessment provides statement with no further descriptions. Applying *Te Tangi a te Manu's* approach to landscape assessment in a bi-cultural approach would suggest that the assessment would benefit with further engagement in understanding the cultural values of the site to inform its conclusions.

## Landscape Character Effects

- 6.5. The assessment at paragraphs 109 – 116 of the Landscape Assessment relies on the localised area for the basis of the assessment. It is considered that the broad context is an appropriate scale to assess the effects as it takes into account the wider contextual patterns of development and rural character. Focusing on the localised area is too narrow of a focus for the assessment of effects on landscape character of the area. The broader context mapped in Figure 4 still remains localised and is considered more appropriate in assessment.
- 6.6. The report assesses that human made structures will reduce the scenic and rural character of the area, but does not provide a scale or magnitude, as outlined in the method of assessment. There is reliance on building colours and reflectivity to mitigate this however it is difficult to align how this responds to the change in landscape patterns and loss of pastoral landcover and openness appreciated in the rural environment.
- 6.7. The assessment places weight to the retention of the hillsides for the open space which creates an intimate scale for the subdivision. Further understanding on the extent of the subdivision and the responsiveness to the landscape characteristics of the valley floor will provide further clarity on the 'extent' and unique characteristics.
- 6.8. Measures to integrate or enhance the landscape patterns of the rural and natural environment are not evident in the subdivision design. A landscape plan does not accompany the subdivision. It is recommended that a landscape plan providing a response to the change in landscape patterns and character is provided. This includes the placement of dwellings for the protection of open space on larger periphery lots and the integration of natural patterns into the site.
- 6.9. Given it is recommended that for the landscape character assessment the broader context is considered, the associative values should be assessed as part of this assessment. At this stage, void of this assessment, I have prepared the following opinion of landscape effects matters which address the biophysical and sensory components of landscape and natural character.

## Visual Amenity Effects

- 6.10. Visual amenity effects are considered to be very low to low, based on the confined visual catchment. It is considered necessary that a viewpoint location map and photographs referenced to be provided to accompany the assessment. Based on my own site assessment, the views will be intersected with the Stage 1 development and associated dwellings. The assessment takes into account the limitation of building height to 8m, enabling up to two storey dwellings within the subdivision.
- 6.11. Similarly, the performance standards of the rural zone should be considered with regard to site coverage rules (Refer 4.9.1) and setbacks (4.9.4 and 4.9.5 of the CHBDP), as they inform the visual amenity with regard to visual dominance of built form. Equally consideration of the domestication of lots with the larger lots enabling larger buildings by way of site coverage rules. The scale of built form contributes to visual amenity effects and in turn landscape character effects.
- 6.12. The assessment of Viewpoint 2 – indicates a range of effects from low to moderate. Further clarity on the following statement is needed: *“Visual amenity effects on this northern aspect are anticipated as being moderate, with the remaining open views to the northwest reducing any higher anticipated effect”*. The degree of an anticipated visual effect should be further

clarified, and the position and visually affected parties identified. Again, it is assumed the author refers to an adverse visual effect however it is not stated within the report. Noting that effects can be positive, benign and adverse for clarity it would have been helpful to include this in the assessment statements.

- 6.13. In my opinion, the visual catchment is limited and confined, and the effects identified must be considered in the context of the overall landscape effects, with regard to sensory attributes of a landscape. Building control measures are proposed to manage height and building colours and reflectance. However no further measures are integrated into the design response including the provision of a landscape mitigation plan or methods to manage site design responses within the subdivision.
- 6.14. It is my opinion that the visual amenity effects have the potential to be appropriately mitigated to address the sensory attributes of the landscape, however require further design control responses to the subdivision. Without these, there is potential for up to moderate visual amenity effects in particular for Viewpoints 1 and 2.

### **Natural Character Effects**

- 6.15. Human modification can detract from the natural character and natural condition of an environment. The pastoral land use is identified as detracting from this and the assessment determines that the subdivision roading and future dwellings will also contribute toward this. The nature of the change is described with the degree of effect (assumed as adverse) as being very low.
- 6.16. Comparing this scale of effect against the scale at paragraph 43 (Table 3) of the report, I find it difficult to agree with this rating of effect as having an inconsequential change and being indiscernible given the nature of earthworks and inclusion of up to 48 dwellings. The method of assessment also refers to mitigation measures for natural character however this assessment section of the report does not proffer any substantive mitigation or enhancement measures which relate to the natural elements, patterns and processes. Riparian planting is proposed along the tributary stream however little detail is provided on the nature and extent of this. Certainty on these outcomes and the role they will have on mitigating effects is required in my opinion.
- 6.17. The assessment of natural character does not consider the scaling of effect or outlines key mitigation measures referred to under the method of assessment and how these are relied upon to reach the degree of effect. It is understood there is a landscape plan prepared however this has not been available as part of the application material. Any measures to manage effects on natural character should, in my opinion, be integrated into a landscape management plan, which encompasses a landscape and natural character mitigation plan.
- 6.18. In my opinion, based on my site visit and the material provided, I consider that the natural character effects will be low however recommend further measures are provided to enhance the natural character of the natural systems and processes within this landscape, in particular the tributary stream and the effects upon natural dark sky during evenings from the subdivision.

## **7. Conditions of Consent**

- 7.1. The Landscape Assessment Report refers at paragraph 141 to a design control measure for colour and reflectance controls for walls and roofs of houses. Attachment 2 to the Landscape Assessment Report provides an appropriate set of colour controls should they be provided in a



condition. However, the application of this in a condition should, in my experience, be more specific to include reference to all parts of a building and associated structures, including, walls, roofs, doors, gutters, joinery and downpipes.

- 7.2. Appropriate consent conditions should include the development and implementation of a planting plan, aforementioned colour controls and restrictions to building height.
- 7.3. In my experience, when considering land use change in rural landscapes further conditions that manage building placement in the landscape, fencing controls and management of domestication of lots and the varying degrees of domestication are addressed under conditions of consent. These are measure that are relevant in addressing some of the subdivision designs response to the landscape values of rural and natural environment it sits within.

## **8. Statutory considerations**

### **Operative Plan**

- 8.1. The landscape assessment addresses the objectives and policies set out in Sections 4 and 9 of the Operative Plan. Maintenance of rural amenity is addressed in Policy 4.2.2 and natural character is addressed in 4.4.1 and 4.4.2. Policy 9.4.2 addresses the delivery of subdivision and the protection of natural features, trees and indigenous vegetation, maintenance of amenity values through innovative subdivision design and protection of visual amenity from telecommunication and energy infrastructure.
- 8.2. Paragraphs 149 – 153 of the Landscape Assessment address and evaluate the proposal against the provisions. The assessment appears to rely on the residual rural land and the retention of this, and the lots sizes similar to that of the Pourerere Beach Road lots and the minimum lot size of 4000m<sup>2</sup> under the Operative District Plan, to conclude that the objectives and policies of the District Plan are met.
- 8.3. In my view, however, reasoning does not adequately support the conclusion reached, and there is no reliance on design controls or other measures that provide an acceptable outcome.

### **Proposed Plan**

- 8.4. The Proposed Plan includes provisions outlining the intended use of the General Rural Zone. GRUZ-02, 03, 04 and the relevant policies all address matters for assessment for maintaining the natural environment where the farming landscape predominates over the built one. The management of rural character is addressed through policies GRUZ-P1, P2 and P4, P5, P7, P8 and P10. It also requires that minimum lot sizes can be 2500m<sup>2</sup> on the basis that a 20ha balance is created which reinforces the policies of maintaining the predominance of the farming landscape over a built one.
- 8.5. Considering the weighting of these provisions to the open rural character and the predominance of rural landscape over the urban / residential landscape, I am of the view that the subdivision design currently does not sufficiently meet the policies set out in GRUZ-P1, P2 and P4, P5, P7, P8 and P10. In my view, with the limited mitigation measures and reliance on the surrounding hillsides to provide open space, the residential subdivision will dominate the rural valley floor and the role this has in the rural character of this zone. Measures are integrated in the spatial layout of the subdivision however these are not clearly outlined as to how these will be managed in perpetuity to maintain the rural character of the area. Further measures, in my view, are needed to define the extent of the urban development from the rural landscape and minimise the dominance of built form in this rural landscape.

- 8.6. With regard to Objectives CE-01 and CE-02 the proposed subdivision is settled within the coastal environment but separated from the coastal cliffs and beaches sufficiently enough to avoid adverse effects on the coastal environment.
- 8.7. CE-P3 addresses avoidance of sprawling or sporadic subdivision and development in the coastal environment. This policy in my view is challenged by the proposed subdivision by the extension of rural lifestyle development away from the settlement of Pourerere.
- 8.8. Policy CE-P7 provides measures to minimise adverse effects and Policy CE-P8 provides clear direction on encouraging restoration and rehabilitation of natural character. This hasn't been proposed in the subdivision design and application.
- 8.9. As addressed further in this report Policy LIGHT-P1 sets out requirements that also respond to the character and amenity of a zone. With the rural zone the absence of light spill and intensity is apparent and forms part of the key characteristics of a rural zone. The introduction of a subdivision with street lighting and residential amenity lighting will substantively change this and in turn be unable to maintain the predominant character and amenity of the Rural zone.

### **Submissions relevant to landscape effects**

- 8.10. The main submission which addresses rural character and amenity and natural character is from the Pourerere Beach Community and Character Preservation Society, who highlight the sensory, experiential and associative values of landscape:

#### *Character*

- *The character that we feel defines Pourerere is it is an isolated rural/coastal landscape characterised by a large sandy beach. We are concerned that the proposal will diminish the character of the surrounding rural landscape, and that increased vehicles and people on the beach will have adverse effects on coastal character.*

#### *Community*

- *We are concerned that the new subdivision will become another community and will not be contiguous with the existing community. In our opinion it identifies itself as a separate subdivision, even having its own name (Paoanui Point) and accessed down a private road. It is distinctly separate to the existing community.*
- *As a community we were very disappointed that the Esplanade Reserve that is part of the district plan was taken away through the stage one part of this subdivision. This was an opportunity to improve access to the estuary for the public but was removed in favour of private access for this subdivision.*
- *We are concerned that this subdivision provides no additional community access to the beach or any other recreation with it being a private community.*

- 8.11. This submission reflects the concern for the fragmentation of the community and settlement. I note that there are constraints to this landscape in accommodating growth areas for urban / rural lifestyle development growth. The placement of residential development forms part of the landscape assessment for the settlement of Pourerere Beach as part of the context of the landscape assessment additional to the site assessment.
- 8.12. A submission from Dianne Smith seeks a Te Ao Maori approach to the environment / Te Taiao and that the proposed subdivision respond further in this regard. Some of these matters raised by Ms Smith have been addressed in this statement and recommendations. The cultural values are in my view required to be further understood and responded to in the landscape assessment and design response to the subdivision.

### **Adequacy of information**

- 8.13. The above assessment is based on the information submitted as part of the Application. I consider that the information submitted is not sufficiently comprehensive to enable the consideration of the above matters on an informed basis. In particular:
- a. The extent and scale of any adverse effects on the environment in terms of landscape effects, including cultural values and rural character.
  - b. That information accompanying the landscape assessment is missing the appropriate representative viewpoints to accurately define the proposed landscape treatments suitable to mitigate the identified visual amenity effects.
  - c. Landscape mitigation measures associated with enhancement of natural character and integration of the proposed subdivision into the rural landscape.
  - d. Comprehensive site design controls to manage rural character, including fencing, building site placement, extent of domestication of lots, road treatments and comprehensive landscape treatments within private lots and common lots.

#### **Conditions: Landscape Character and Natural Character**

- 8.14. Notwithstanding the matters of addressing the scale of the localised context of landscape assessment and the need to appropriately assess and respond in application to the cultural values that relate to the construct of landscape, the following additional conditions are recommended, should the Hearing's Panel be of the mind to grant consent. It is noted that the following conditions rely upon the production of a landscape mitigation plan that is yet to be provided and the demarcation of defined building areas:

- **Landscape Management Plan**

Preparation of a landscape management plan, prepared by an appropriately qualified landscape architect, for the approval of Council prior to subdivision certification. This shall include, but not be limited to, addressing built development, earthworks and vegetation measures. This shall be implemented in accordance with the Landscape Management Plan. The following measures are included:

#### **Vegetation**

- Mitigation vegetation, as detailed in the Landscape Management Plan shall be implemented at subdivision stage.
- Vegetation cover shall be managed in perpetuity and shall be allowed to grow to natural height and form.
- Performance measures of native vegetation including canopy coverage, percentage of acceptable failure and maintenance requirements.

#### **Buildings & Structures**

- **Placement:** All buildings must be located within a Defined Building Areas including ancillary buildings, garden sheds and above ground water tanks.
- **Height:** All buildings shall be single storey and a maximum height of 8m from pre-development ground level.

- **Watertanks:** All water tanks shall be screened from view in a manner and/or with screening and materials/colours harmonious with the dwelling and should be installed on each respective lot.

### **Form**

- Buildings shall have a dominant horizontal profile that is congruent with the natural contour of the valley floor.
- Management of site coverage including placement of ancillary dwellings
- Design roofs that integrate buildings into the landscape and use a sheltering form with deep overhangs of more than 1.0m.
- Roofing: Roof materials shall be colour in recessive colours no greater than the reflectance values set out in Attachment 2 of the Landscape Assessment Report.
- Use building modulation to break the length of a building facade by changing direction, stepping in and out of the main facade, balconies, eaves, pergolas and other structures.
- Recess large areas of glazing below wide eaves and dividing glazing with walls, pergolas and the like.
- Use of dark tinted glass, but not mirror glazing, is required.
- Use window joinery, doors and balustrades that are consistent and no greater than the reflectance values set out in Attachment 2 of the Landscape Assessment report.
- Design buildings that use natural materials including natural stone, timber and concrete and cladding that has a reflectance value no greater than those set out in the Attachment 2 of the Landscape Assessment report.
- Ancillary Buildings: Garages, storage, and other ancillary buildings associated with the house shall be contained within the house site and shall be a comparable quality to that of the main building on the site.

### **Materials and Colour**

- Select materials that respond to the natural landscape and native vegetation immediately surrounding the subject site.
- Select colour palettes that have a reflectance value no greater than those set out in Attachment 2 of the Landscape Assessment Report.
- Use natural material finishes such as stone and timber which will weather naturally.
- Apply dark oxide colouring to concrete materials to reduce reflectivity of the material.
- Timber cladding and other natural elements (stone) naturally weathered or stained dark.
- Painted timber, blockwork or other materials may be used and must contribute to receding the building into the landscape.

- The reflectance value of surfaces, including joinery, gutters, downpipes, cladding and roofing materials shall have a reflectance value of no greater than those set out in Attachment 2 of the Landscape Assessment Report.

### **Hard Surfaces**

- Providing all driveways with flush kerb with either rip rap, grass or planted swales for stormwater management.
- Providing asphaltic concrete, dark coloured concrete or exposed aggregate concrete driveway surfaces.
- Impervious outdoor areas, including patio, outdoor entertainment areas and turning areas (within the driveway), all located within the Defined Building Areas.

### **Fencing**

- Using post and 3 - 5 timber rail or post and wire fencing and/or vegetation to demarcate boundaries of properties to reflect the rural character of the wider area. Closed boarded post and panel fencing shall be avoided.

### **Lighting and Utilities**

- All exterior lighting should be contained within the Building Areas and shall be down lights only.
- All utilities and services shall be located below ground. No above ground wiring will be permitted. Aerials, satellite dishes and other utilities shall be maintained within the 8.0m building height plane.
- Downward facing bollard lighting is acceptable along the accessway corridor and to demarcate driveway entrances.
- Road lighting shall be avoided.

### **Conclusion**

8.15. While I generally agree with parts of the Landscape Assessment Report, I do not agree with the reliance on undefined outcomes, e.g. house siting, unknown landscape treatments and site design controls. It is my view that the assessment and application do not provide sufficient detail to understand the landscape response to the unique characteristics of the site, that differentiate the site from its immediate adjoining valley floor. Reliance on the hillsides to provide open space is not, in my opinion, suitable to mitigate the loss of rural open space and dominance of built form in this rural landscape.

8.16. It is my view that the cultural values have not been appropriately addressed in the assessment and that there remains potential for moderate adverse landscape effects, in particular to the landscape character. Further mitigation measures identified in recommended conditions, have the potential to mitigate the effects however these need to connect to the characteristics of the site and why this area of the valley can support subdivision and what reliance is placed on the remaining valley floor and hillsides as open rural landscape. I remain however of the view the scale of the subdivision in the context of the valley floor does not meet the Proposed District Plan policies of avoiding dominance of residential subdivision over the rural landscape.

9. Overall, I conclude, with the information at hand, that there remains potential for moderate adverse landscape effects on the rural landscape character of the area.



Rebecca Ryder

FNZILA (Registered)

