

BEFORE THE WAIPĀ DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Plan Change 20 – Airport Northern
Precinct Extension to the Operative Waipā
District Plan

REBUTTAL STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LISA JACK

(LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL AMENITY)

10 March 2023

Counsel acting:
JR Welsh
ChanceryGreen
223 Ponsonby Road
Ponsonby, Auckland 1011



INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Lisa Jack. I am employed by Harrison Grierson as a Principal Landscape Architect. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Primary Statement of Evidence date 28 February 2023. I repeat the confirmation in my Primary Statement of Evidence that I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses.
2. In this statement of rebuttal evidence, I respond to the evidence of Mr Cuff on behalf of Joan and Robin Cuff who own 3347 Ohaupo Road.
3. The fact that this rebuttal statement does not respond to every matter raised in the evidence of a submitter within my area of expertise should not be taken as acceptance of the matters raised. I have focussed this rebuttal statement on the key points of difference that warrant a response.
4. Mr Cuff raises concerns with the absence of consideration of the Rukuhia Neighbourhood 'Zone' (RNZ) within the Landscape Visual Assessment ("LVA"). I address below the concerns relevant to landscape and visual effects.

Absence of consideration of the RNZ within the LVA, and adverse effects to the RNZ due to height differences of sites.

5. The RNZ is not a defined zone in the District Plan. For the purposes of response to Mr Cuff's evidence, I have assumed this area is comprised of the Residential and Rural-Residential Zones surrounding the intersection between Rukuhia Road and Ohaupo Road. Beyond the RNZ, it is surrounded by Rural zones which could have an associated or perceived connection with the RNZ.
6. An investigated viewpoint was identified in the LVA report located adjacent to the Cuff property at a farm gate entry to 3323 Ohaupo Road. This is illustrated in the Viewpoint Location Map which is in Appendix 1 of my Primary Statement of Evidence. This viewpoint was not illustrated within the LVA, as views to PC20 would be screened by existing vegetation and landform within the Rural zone in the foreground. I concluded that PC20 would not alter views as seen from this location. I hold the same opinion for the adjacent Cuff property.
7. The investigated viewpoint is illustrated in Appendix 1 to this statement.

8. Views to the PC20 site from elevated locations of the RNZ were not visible from public viewpoints during site investigations due to vegetation and dwellings in the foreground. To gain a greater understanding of views available to nearby Rural zoned residents in an elevated position, points along Raynes Road were investigated.
9. Viewpoint 10 in my LVA is located adjacent to the driveway for 97 Raynes Road and illustrates elevated views available towards the PC20 site. Two sections of the existing 'Airport Business Zone' are visible beyond foreground pasture and vegetation. Development in these visible locations is already enabled and expected in accordance with the District Plan. The proposed zoning extension will provide no further visible changes to what is currently enabled from this viewpoint. I conclude that the landscape and visual effects for the extension of the 'Airport Business Zone' from this location are considered very low.

Removal of hills may mean RNZ will have an increased sight line to airport activities.

10. The smaller hill on the southern part of the Site is identified for possible removal in PC20. The majority of this landform (approximately 85%) sits within the existing 'Airport Business Zone' on the site. Development in this location is already enabled and expected in accordance with the District Plan. As enabled by this zone, buildings can be developed to a maximum height of 20m.
11. Removal of this landform would mean that buildings developed in this location would have a lower elevation and would be similar to the heights allowed in the balance of this zone (excluding the small hill with the homestead).
12. From a landscape and visual perspective, I consider the reduction in enabled building height (from ground level) provided by the removal of the small hill results in a lower landscape and visual effect to the wider community. Development of buildings will not be elevated in comparison to those enabled by the surrounding Airport Business Zone and are likely to screen views of the Airport and its activities.
13. In response to these factors, I believe that PC20 has adequately addressed and responded to changing landscape and visual amenity values. It is my opinion that the proposed Structure Plan and planning provisions are sufficient to ensure a future environment that visually integrates with existing and future uses.

Lisa Jack
Harrison Grierson
10 March 2023



APPENDIX 1

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE - REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 20 - TITANIUM PARK LIMITED AND RUKUHIA PROPERTIES LIMITED - AIPOORT NORTHERN PRECINCT EXTENSION

March 2023

**HARRISON
GRIERSON**



FIG 1 - REPRESENTATIVE VIEWPOINT FROM 3323 OHAUPO ROAD FARM ENTRY