



REPORT TO: Vicki Jones – Senior Policy Analyst, QLDC
FROM: Marion Read – Principal Landscape Architect
REFERENCE: Plan Change 36 – Wanaka Industrial Zone Extension
SUBJECT: Response to submitters
DATE: Friday, 14th January 2011

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Subsequent to the receipt of submissions and further submissions on the Plan Change 36 proposal I have been asked to respond to relevant issues raised.

2.0 Bunding and planting

- 2.1 I continue to consider that the bunding and planting should be undertaken prior to any construction within the zone. However, I agree with the submission by the Gordons' that the time delay is currently undefined and that this is not reasonable. Rather than a time period it is my opinion that a performance standard would be more appropriate, for example, that 'construction may occur once 70% of the western boundary planting in combination with the mounding has reached a minimum combined height of 6 metres and a continuous screen in the horizontal plane'. This would enable the developers, if so inclined to purchase large trees to possibly accelerate the development of the screening effect.
- 2.2 The original report to Council recommended mounding no higher than 2 metres along the western boundary of the site and wrapping around the southern corner towards Connell Terrace. This was to be located to the inside of a 10 metre wide landscape strip of predominantly evergreen trees. I have recommended combining higher (3 metre) mounding and planting which enables a reduction in the width of the buffer but an increase in the depth of the vegetated screen.
- 2.3 The landforms in the vicinity are hummocky and so the argument for allowing variations in the height of the mounding has some merit. However, the planting will not look natural within the landscape, appearing more like a shelter belt. Consequently I do not think there is any landscape advantage to varying the height of the mounding. There may be noise mitigation advantages, however.
- 2.4 It would be possible to increase the height of the mounding without increasing the width of the mound to an extent. (The maximum reasonable slope on the sides of the bund would be 30% which would allow for a mound 15m wide at the base and a maximum height of approximately 4m, as the top of the mound needs to be flat). However, increasing the height of the mound is likely to increase the difficulty of establishing plants on it effectively as irrigation water would run off more easily restricting its availability to plants and also potentially eroding the faces of the mound.
- 2.5 It is my opinion that allowing complete flexibility in the mound + vegetation equation would potentially allow for just mounding with minimal planting. I do not think variable height mounding would be an effective mitigation solution even if the 'just mounding' position could be avoided as, rather than a dense line of vegetation in the landscape, something like a

shelter belt, seemingly random variations could occur. These variations in the form of the mounding would most likely relate to the intended use of the adjacent sites rather than any natural environmental cue and would not be a positive addition to the landscape.

- 2.6 The aim of establishing a height for the vegetative screen is to ensure that the species selected would be adequate to the task of screening the development from view. While some of the adjacent land to the west is lower than the site, and consequently a lower screen would obscure buildings from view, the land further to the west, adjacent to the Cardrona Valley Road, is higher and I continue to consider that a total height of 8 to 9m is desirable in order to screen the industrial zone in these more distant views. Assuming a row of trees 6m high were arrayed along the top of the mound producing a 9m high screen there would still be areas between each canopy where there would be a lessening of that height. While this should be filled to some degree by other vegetation in front of and behind them there are still likely to be gaps through which a 7m high building might be glimpsed. Consequently I continue to consider that the height of the combined screening incorporating a 3m bund and 5 – 6m high planting (as a minimum) is necessary and appropriate.

3.0 Effects on Golf Course Road residents.

- 3.1 There are six residential properties in the Golf Course Road Rural Residential zone adjacent to the site, five on the elevated Golf Course Road moraine crest and one, the most easterly, on a lower site located on Ballantyne Road. All of these properties are heavily screened from the south east by vegetation in the form of macrocarpa hedges and other amenity tree planting within those lots. The Wilson dwelling, being two storied, currently has a view over the hedge to the south. All of these properties have been built for the sun and views to the north over the lake and consequently while views to the south would be adversely affected by the development most residents would have to actually go and have a look to see these views. The impacts of increased noise, dust and odour on their rural amenity, however, could be significant. The mitigation of the effects of dust and odour are beyond the reach of my expertise. Noise attenuation could possibly be achieved by requiring mounding along the boundary between the new zone area and the rear of the existing properties in Gordon Road. However, as the dwellings in Golf Course Road are elevated above the site and the plan change site slopes up to the south the effectiveness of this would likely be limited. It is the case, also, that there are as yet undeveloped industrial sites between the plan change area and these residences which may also impinge on this amenity. I understand also that there are specific noise controls proposed for activities within the plan change area.
- 3.2 The residential property to the south west of the Wilson property, the Orkney site, is significantly more exposed to views of the site primarily because of the open nature of their own property. This property currently has views over open pasture which is zoned Rural General. Views to the plan change area from this site are east south east and because of this the mounding and planting along the western boundary of the site would be seen almost end on reducing its effectiveness.
- 3.3 The residential properties to the south west of the Orkney property, the Mills and Coe properties have some vegetative screening along their south eastern boundaries. The boundary mounding and screening would be much more effective in reducing views from these properties to the plan change site. However, these two properties are adjacent to the site of the Aspiring Retirement Village and will have their view radically altered from open pasture to intensive residential development in the next years as that site is developed..
- 3.4 The following table identifies the potentially affected properties in Golf Course Road and measures their proximity to the nearest site boundary within the plan change area (rather than the boundary of the open space area); the distance to the nearest existing industrial site (whether developed or not); and the effectiveness of the proposed mounding and planting as mitigation for the visibility of the proposed industrial development.

Property	(a) Distance to proposed industrial area	(b) Distance to existing industrial site	Proposed mitigation planting / mounding intervenes
Mills/ Montague – Lot 1 DP 25837	196m	Adjacent	No
Braid – Lot 4 DP 25837	167m	Adjacent	No
Fogarty – Lot 1 DP 24115	148m	Adjacent	No
Gordon – Lot 2 DP 25065	151m	Adjacent	No
Duell – Lot 6 DP 314516	186m	44m	No
Wilson – Lot 5 DP 314516	171m	35m	No
Orkney – Lot 1 DP 12599	180m	80m	Marginally
Mills – Lot 3 DP 315127	251m	182m	Yes
Coe – Lot 4 DP 315127	322m	267m	Yes

Table 1: Distances between the centre point of the residential property boundary and (a) the nearest boundary of a developable site within the proposed zone and (b) the distance to the nearest boundary of a site within the existing industrial zone.

4.0 Effects on Heritage Park Residents

- 4.1 Heritage Park is a multi unit development on Rural General zoned land with a (current) total of 17 approved building platforms (11 built) and 21 units. The building platform closest to the proposed plan change site is approximately 750m from the edge of the development (not including the open space buffer). The approved building platforms within Heritage Park are dispersed across an elevated terrace area which is still slightly lower than the terrace which is the subject of the plan change request.
- 4.2 While the lots within Heritage Park currently have relatively unimpeded views across an open landscape to the Golf Course Road moraine ridge and towards Mount Iron it is the case that the Mount Aspiring Retirement Village is to occupy a considerable portion of this open land to the north of Heritage Park. Industrial buildings in the vicinity of Fredrick Street are currently visible from locations within Heritage Park and the cement tower located on the Firth Concrete site is also visible.
- 4.3 I think it is without doubt that development in the plan change zone will adversely affect the visual amenity of the more northern and eastern sites within Heritage Park. However, I think that the proposed mitigation would be effective in reducing this effect to an acceptable level.
- 4.4 I do not consider that the mitigation proposed, the excavation of the site down to the level of Ballantyne Road, is appropriate, and consider it likely that it would tend to actually make the industrial buildings within the plan change area more obtrusive from this direction. This is because the highest point within the plan change area is actually the southern corner, the land sloping down to the north, away from Heritage Park.

Report prepared by

Report reviewed by

Marion Read
PRINCIPAL : LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Robin Rawson
SENIOR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT



Fig 1: Map showing the location of residential lots in Golf Course Road which are potentially affected by Proposed Plan Change 36