

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL S92 RESPONSE

Goodland Coastal Farm 2127 Kaipara Coast Highway, Kakanui

Written by: Geraldine Bayly

Date: 12 August 2024

Application Numbers: BUN60406128 (LUC60406129, SUB60406160)

Kaipara Coast Landscape Architecture prepared a Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment for the proposed development of 2127 Kaipara Coast Highway, Kakanui into 25 Lots, with an updated version of the document produced in May 2022 further to changes arising from an informal S92 request issued in December 2022 which was then responded to.

The following is a response to additional formal Section 92 request for further information regarding landscape and visual matters. The numbers of this document correspond with the number of the Auckland Council additional S92 questions.

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

2. Thank you for the letter from NZTA dated 30/4/2024. The letter refers to the retaining wall associated with the new vehicle crossing not being provided to date to NZTA and not included in the Geotechnical Investigation Report. Can you please clarify what is proposed, what plans show what is proposed and what investigations have been undertaken in relation to the retaining wall highlighted by NZTA.

The letter from NZTA dated 30/4/2024 also does not appear to refer to the vegetation removal proposed within the legal road (as set out in your response to question 8). Do you have landowner approval in relation to these works?

We are currently waiting for feedback from NZTA to see what their position is on the removal of trees within the road reserve, whether they would require replacement planting and the nature of this planting, if required.

8. *I note that the applicant now seeks consent to remove 97 trees, under rule E17.4.1 (I assume (A10)). Please provide more detailed information identifying and describing the trees for removal and provide the related assessments. This should include arboricultural assessment addressing all matters set out in E17, and also planning assessment of relevant objectives and policies.*

Please ensure that the arboricultural assessment also includes:

- *Confirmation (and demonstration) that permitted activity rules and thresholds are met in relation to other vegetation removal or alteration proposed as part of this development.*
- *Quantification (the vegetation affected) and assessment the infringements proposed under E15.4.1(A16) and (A18).*
- *Mitigation measures such as arboricultural supervision, tree protection zone (construction exclusion zone) and erosion and sediment management protocol for the tree works proposed over the site to avoid or mitigate the tree impacts during period of construction, in particular for these trees located within sensitive habitats (riparian margin of stream, wetlands and SEA overlay).*
- *Any additional planting to mitigate the adverse effects created by removal now proposed. The council's Senior Arborist has suggested that a replanting plan is appropriate, to mitigate potential adverse effects, such as those related to amenity, ecological function, soil stability and visual screening.*

From a landscape and visual perspective, it is noted that the removal of the vegetation on the southern side of the state highway will likely open up views in the open pastureland of the subject property which will not affect the rural character of the area.

The removal of the trees on the northern side of the state highway will include the removal of large pine and wattle trees, which are weed species. This is considered to be at least part mitigation for the removal of any native trees in and around this area. Any requirement for replacement planting in and around this area will be at the discretion of NZTA. As noted in question 2, we are currently waiting for NZTA feedback regarding the proposed vegetation removal.

20. Please clearly identify on a plan what sections of the walls/fencing meet the definition of building, the total height and appearance, and provide the relevant assessment under H19.

The attached Earthworks plans prepared by Crang Civil Consulting Engineers illustrate the proposed earthworks associated with the proposed accessways along with the location of the corresponding retaining walls. Cross sections of these retaining walls are also attached with the retaining walls over 3m in height clearly depicted. It is understood that retaining walls over three metres meet the definition of building.

The information from the engineering plans has been superimposed over the Landscape Plan on the attached 'Goodland Coastal Farm Retaining Walls Plan'. This clearly depicts the correlation between the location of these walls and where screening is proposed. The following summarises the potential visual effects of each of the proposed retaining walls:

Retaining Walls 1 and 2: These walls on either side of the site entry are to extend up to heights of 5.63m and 4.31m respectively. They are to be constructed out of either

gabion basket, stacked concrete blocks, or a reinforced soil system that can be planted. They will both have a fence along the top. The exact nature of these walls have not yet been finalised and will likely change during the detailed design process. However, the intention is for these walls to be as narrow as possible so that they have as small a footprint as possible and for them to disappear into the surrounding landscape and be as inconspicuous as possible.

- Retaining Wall 3: Retaining wall 3 is to be 108 metres long and is to extend up to a height of 3.88m at its highest point. As with all of the following listed walls it is to be constructed out of timber, stained dark grey with a fence along the top. This wall is screened by landform and vegetation to the west, south and east and is to have climbers spilling over the top to assist in softening the wall face from views to the immediate north.
- Retaining Wall 4: Retaining wall 4 is 42.28 metres long and located directly across the accessway from RW3. It is 0.83m at its highest point. This wall will be screened by landform to the west, south and east with vegetation to be planted within the gully system to the immediate north which is anticipated to completely screen this hard landscape feature within a period of five years.
- Retaining Wall 5: Retaining wall 5 is to be 45.81m long with a maximum height of 3m. It is located adjacent to planting at the head of a gully system. The planting separated from the retaining wall by a narrow section of pasture that enables stock to pass between paddocks. The adjacent vegetation is anticipated to completely screen the retaining wall within a period of five years.
- Retaining Wall 6: Retaining wall 6 is a 72.76 metre long wall that is 4.04 at its highest point. This wall is located to the north of Road 3, sitting just above the head of a gully system that is to be restored. The vegetation within this gully system will be restored, completely screening this retaining wall over a period of approximately 5 years. The vegetation at the head of this gully system has been adjusted on the Retaining Wall Plan to align with the engineering plans. This differs slightly from the Planting Plan which will have small adjustments at detailed design phase to correlate with these changes.
- Retaining Wall 7: Retaining wall 7 is 127 metres long and located in the lower reaches of the property on the northern side of Accessway 1, reaching a maximum height of 1.77 metres. This wall is located immediately adjacent to vegetation in and around a wetland and will be completely screened by this vegetation.

Retaining Walls 8, 9 and 10: Retaining walls 8, 9 and 10 are located in the lower reaches of the property framing Accessway 5. RW 9 located on the northern side of the road being 240 metres long with a high point of 4.55 metres. These walls are enclosed by existing and proposed vegetation which will completely screen them.

Retaining Wall 11: Retaining Wall 11 is 22 metres long and low. It is located between the existing farmhouse and proposed Orchard 4 on the eastern side of Road 1. It is unlikely to be visible from the surrounding catchment.

In summary, the overall design of this proposed development has been strategically undertaken so that the existing and proposed vegetation will assist in screening and softening views of the proposed retaining walls from the small potential viewing audience in the broader surrounds. While some of these retaining walls may be visible immediately following construction from a few locations in the broader surrounds, the colour controls and strategic location of vegetation adjacent to them is anticipated to screen them within a period of approximately five years.

57. The Crang Civil Response dated 31/1/2024 provides a response to this question, as does the Kaipara Coast Landscape Architecture response dated 15/2/2024. The Kaipara Coast response is relied on in this regard (the Crang Civil response does not provide the detail required to address this question).

Please refer to question 2 relating to the works noted by NZTA and provide any updated information as required to address this question.

See response to question 2 above.

59.a How is the design review group proposed to operate, and who will be on this group?

- i. The Design Guidelines outline the information required for development approval of the Residents Association, but not the composition of the Committee. The S92 response from Kaipara Coast Landscape Architecture (15/2/24) states that a review panel will be formed, comprising professionals such as architects, urban designers and landscape architects. Will the Design Guidelines be updated to include this requirement?

The Design Guidelines have been updated. There is provision for the Residents Association to decide which professionals they will have on the panel, at their discretion.

- b. The language used in some aspects of the Design Guidelines enables a degree of flexibility and could result in different conclusions by the design review group and the Council. Is this your expectation (i.e. that this could occur) and that this could require individual future owners to obtain consents (such as 221 RMA variation)?
 - i. Will other domestic elements such as swimming pools, tennis courts etc be restricted to the specific building area on each lot?
 - ii. Please clarify why it is proposed that Lots 1, 2, 3 10, 11 and 12 have a 50m² area that is permitted to 8m in height. The rationale for this is unclear.

The building platform / approved building area identified on each lot has been created to restrict the location of buildings only. Additional infrastructure, such as swimming pools and tennis courts have no additional restrictions in terms of location.

The building height restrictions have been proposed to ensure that views are maintained for all lots and that buildings are visually nestled into the landscape. The 50m² area that is permitted to 8m in height has been included to provide for and enable a degree of diversity, flexibility, and creativity in architectural form.

58. 60. 61.

It is noted that there is a difference of opinion on scale of adverse effects and consistency with related objectives and policies between the Council's landscape specialist and me regarding:

- The scale of adverse character and landscape effects.
- The conclusion that the lifestyle sites and associated infrastructure will be integrated such that built development and infrastructure will be subservient to the rural landscape.
- That the proposal will “. . .manage the effects of rural activities to achieve a character, scale, intensity and location that is in keeping with the existing landscape character and attributes, including a sense of spaciousness.”
- The cumulative density and number of lots given the expectations of the zone provisions.

In terms of experience I note the following:

I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Planning from Auckland University and a Master of Landscape Architecture from Melbourne University.

I am a registered member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects.

I have practiced as a Landscape Architect for twenty eight years, including in both New Zealand and Australia. Upon my return to New Zealand I worked for D.J.Scott Associates for a year and a half before working at Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited for five years where I assisted in setting up the landscape architecture team.

I have been operating my own practice for the last twenty years.

During the course of my career I have been involved in a wide range of landscape architecture projects. One of my specialties is landscape planning, in particular the preparation of landscape and visual effects assessments and their associated designs for a wide range of projects. Many of these have been in the rural environment, and many rural subdivision developments.

I have lived on a rural property (a plant nursery and beef farm) on the Kaipara Coast Highway, in Kaukapakapa, just ten kilometres south of the subject property, for twenty one years and am therefore very familiar with the locality and the nuances of this particular rural coastal location.

This background has given me a sound knowledge of the landscape in and around this Kaipara Harbour location and rural landscape development within Auckland. I have a very good

appreciation of what consists of best practice in relation to using native restoration to manage sensitive landscapes, create ecological corridors and enhance the natural landscape patterns on rural land. I have a very good appreciation as to how to place development within the rural coastal landscape to minimise potential adverse landscape and visual effects.

This S92 Response is to be read in conjunction with:

- Goodland Coastal Farm Overall Earthworks Plan, prepared by Crang Civil Consulting Engineers, Revision D, 21/07/23
- Goodland Coastal Farm Retaining Walls Plan, prepared by Kaipara Coast Landscape Architecture 12 August 2024