

IN THE MATTER

**of applications pursuant to the Resource
Management Act 1991**

BY

Weston Lea Limited

FOR

**land use and subdivision consents for a
large scale residential development and
associated land use activities and sites
works at Peacocke, Hamilton**

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE (Landscape Architecture)

Dave Mansergh

10 May 2019

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is David Mansergh. My qualifications and experience are outlined in my evidence in chief.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

2. This evidence is produced in response to the evidence presented by the Applicant's Landscape Architect and Submitters during the hearing.

Bat Ecology and Landscape/Visual Amenity

3. A number of alterations have been made to the width of the riverside reserve area in the north of the application site in response to ecological issues associated with the long tail bat use of the area. While I do not provide evidence in relation to whether the proposed extension of river bank planting will be successful from this perspective, I note there is a positive corollary between these works and the mitigation of landscape and visual amenity from the perspective of viewers on the eastern side of the river.
4. In my opinion, the increased width of the reserve and the increased depth of planting, together with increased light management proposal will also help to mitigate the visual and landscape effects of the proposed development by moving lot and dwelling locations further from the viewers on the eastern side of the river, allowing increased levels of riverside restoration planting and screening; and reducing light spill.
5. I also note in the amended conditions attached to Mr Serjeant's evidence, clause 88 offers a condition that requires planting to meet a minimum height of 4m and canopy closure of between 80% and 90% (dependant on location) before building development occurs within the identified lots.
6. The consequence of this, from a visual and landscape perspective is that some screening of the closer lots will be established before construction occurs within the identified lots closest to the river. Because the rear lots will be able to be built upon immediately, any screening benefit will start out small but will increase over time.
7. I would expect it will take somewhere between 5-7 years for planting to reach 4m high and 80% closure unless larger sized plants and/or fast growing species are used during establishment.
8. I would also expect that any light shielding requirements associated with the bat mitigation would also have a mitigating effect on light shed to the more elevated properties on the eastern side of the river.

Evidence of Rachel de Lambert

9. I confirm that, as outlined in the evidence of Ms de Lambert, and in my evidence in chief, we are largely in agreement in terms of what landscape and visual amenity effects will occur. Our opinions differ in terms of the extent (or rating) of those effects.
10. The difference between our ratings of adverse effects can be interpreted as the extent to which the proposed mitigation works and design compensates for the loss of existing rural amenity. While there is still some disagreement between us over the

level of effect, the difference in our ratings is not substantial. I note we both use a very similar methodological approach which is consistent with NZILA best practice.

11. Ms de Lambert and I both appear to agree that there will be a significant change in the existing character of the site as urbanisation occurs. This change is signalled by the district plan. We both appear to agree that the proposed riverside reserve will help mitigate the adverse effect of the proposal on visual amenity. It will do so by introducing a number of features (such as the riverside ecological and amenity plantings) that will contribute to the new urban characteristics and amenity of the site. It will however be a different type of amenity to that currently experienced.
12. In response to questioning from the Commissioner Lovell over the timeframe required to achieve a low level of effect, Ms de Lambert suggested that a period of 5 years would be required on the basis that mitigation and riverside reserve planting was undertaken early. I generally concur with this statement, but wish to point out to the Commissioners that, while such planting will result in a positive amenity outcome, it is unlikely to result in the full screening of the development within the site for viewers along the eastern side of the river at this time. I note that a number of submitters have accepted that they will see dwellings within the application site.

Submitter Evidence

13. I have listened to the evidence of the submitters who raised concern over the effect of the proposal on landscape and visual amenity, privacy and light spill. The concerns raised are consistent with the original submissions.
14. The Peacocke Growth Cell was brought into Hamilton City (740ha) in 1989 as a result of Local Government re-organisation. From 1989 to 2007 the land was zoned Future Urban which protected land from being subdivided in a manner that would frustrate efficient and effective urban development in the future. The Peacocke Structure Plan Variation to the Proposed District Plan was notified in September 2007. The Structure Plan provided for the urbanisation of this growth cell. In my opinion, this is a sufficient period of time for an understanding that the rural land currently contained within the site will be urbanised. I note that, in response to questioning from the Commissioners, a number of submitters have accepted that the zoning of the site has signalled these changes, and that they are likely to experience a loss of rural character and views to a more urban outlook.
15. A number of submitters have identified that they can clearly see the application site from their properties. I draw the Commissioner's attention to the fact that, from a landscape and visual assessment methodological perspective, there is not always a direct correlation between the visibility of a site and the visual effects of the change within it. In other words, just because a proposed activity is visible, it does not mean that the effects of that activity will necessarily be adverse. Nor does it follow that: the greater the extent of the site visible, the higher the adverse effect. Other factors must be taken into consideration, including as site context, planning context, aesthetic theory, the visual catchment and audience. Consequently this means that sometimes very small changes can result in very high levels of adverse effect. In other cases large scale changes can occur with very little adverse effect.
16. As outlined in my evidence in chief, I am satisfied that the approach taken by Ms de Lambert is consistent with current best practice approach and does not necessary represent the effect experienced by individual submitters or from every location.

17. In terms of specific effects relating to light spill from car headlights identified by Mr Sullivan (Submitter 64), I do not consider this will be an issue as the planting proposed by the applicant (as seen in figures 3 and 4 of Ms de Lambert's evidence) will be effective in screening car headlights once a closure occurs.
18. With regard to Mr Sullivan's concern regarding loss of privacy, I note his house is approximately 210m of the closest part of the road reserve within the application site. In my opinion, this distance is sufficient to alleviate such concerns.
19. I agree with Mr Sullivan that the character of his view will change as a result of his view of the river being back dropped by urban development, as opposed to rural land. This change has been signalled through the district plan and is to be expected. I have not visited Mr Sullivan's property but accept on face value that he will experience a substantial change in his outlook.
20. Messrs Johnston and Finch (Submitter 28) also raised a number of concerns about the dramatic landscape change that will occur and the effect of looking at a sea of grey rooves. They identified that they were not opposed to urban development or losing their rural outlook, but considered that a minimum planted depth of 100m was required to match Hammond Park bush.
21. From a landscape and amenity perspective, in my opinion, the proposed widening and planting of the riverbank reserve at the northern end of the site goes a long way to addressing this concern by creating a deep strip of restoration planting along the river corridor. I would also expect that the issue associated with seeing the "sea of grey rooves" will diminish over time as trees and gardens are established within each lot, greening up the subdivision.



David Graham Mansergh

10/05/2019