

APPENDIX G

VISUAL AND LANDSCAPE REVIEW
PREPARED BY BOFFA MISKELL

28 October 2020

Victoria Majoor
Senior Planner
Waikato District Council
Private Bag 544
Ngaruawahia 3742



Dear Victoria,

McPhersons Quarry Expansion Proposal Landscape and Visual Assessment: Review of Submissions

1.0 Background

In June 2019 Waikato District Council (WDC) engaged Boffa Miskell Ltd (BML) to undertake a review of the landscape and visual assessment (LVA) prepared by WSP Opus for the proposed McPhersons Quarry expansion. Following BML's review, Mansergh Graham Landscape Architects Ltd (MGLA) were engaged by the applicant to review and respond to the s92 request for information.

Following this response, Boffa Miskell confirmed its support of the methodology, effects ratings and conclusions and considered them to be a reliable assessment of the proposal and existing landscape.

The application was limited notified in accordance with s95A(8)(b) by Waikato District Council as it was considered that “ *visual landscape effects will be more than minor on the environment*”¹ due to the proposed activity.

54 properties were notified as part of this process and 36 submissions were received. Of these submissions, 16 opposed the activity for reasons regarding landscape and/ or visual effects. Following these submissions nine properties were visited by BML, WDC and MGLA on the 6th August 2020 to record and assess potential impacts from these vantage points.

WDC have requested that Boffa Miskell Ltd provide a preliminary assessment of visual effects associated with this view, ahead of receiving a revised MGLA Landscape and Visual Assessment report. This letter provides a preliminary assessment to guide Council on the likely degree of effect however does not form a full independent assessment of landscape and visual effects. The final peer review of the MGLA assessment, considering additional matters, will be provided following receipt of this material.

¹ *Notification Decision Report, Waikato District Council, 10th July 2020*

1.1 Statutory Baseline

During the review of the submissions and after further investigation, WDC became aware that in 1995, Franklin District Council determined that the quarry was operating under existing use rights. It was also determined that future works, including a major benching exercise and partial removal of a grassed knoll would result in “significant and potentially adverse²” visual effects. At this time the quarry was extracting 6-7,000 tonne of material per year.

Between 1997 and the present day, the rate of extraction within the quarry has increased. In the past three years the rate of extraction has been between approximately 320,000 – 400,000 tonnes per year. WDC consider that due to the degree of work, the existing use rights only apply to the visual effects of the quarry between 1994-1997. The existing assessments by WSP Opus and MGLA have not also considered this statutory baseline in regard to the magnitude of the landscape and visual change.

It is considered that although quarrying is an established activity in this area, the increased rate of extraction (and change) has potential to increase the sensitivity of the viewing audience.

As the applicant and WDC have different views on the appropriate baseline environment, this letter considers potential landscape and visual effects against the existing environment (i.e. as assessed by the applicant), and the statutory baseline as determined by WDC.

2.0 Submissions

Of the 36 submissions that were received, 16 submissions opposed the activity for reasons regarding landscape and/or visual effects. Nine properties were selected to be visited to represent 17 properties identified in 12 submissions which had concerns regarding visual effects (listed below). These properties were visited on the 6th August 2020 by MGLA, BML and WDC to record views towards the proposed developments under direction from land owners.

1. 40 McPherson Road (Submitter #30)
2. 209 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #33)
3. 211 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submission #17)
4. 215 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submission #22)
5. 217 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #21)
6. 219 State Highway 2, Heartland Farm (Submitter #29)
7. 231 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #18)
8. 231B Pinnacle Hill Road (Representative of views from 231A, 233A, 233B, 233C, 233D, 233E, 233F and 235) (Submitters #24, #29, #31 and #35)
9. 247 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #15)

The following comments and responses (grouped under issue headings), acknowledge that further details regarding each submission may emerge during the submitters’ preparation of evidence for the council hearing. At present, written detailed responses to the submissions have not yet been received from the applicant. However, it was indicated by a letter from the applicants planners Kinetic Environmental that the MGLA Visual Landscape Report is “based on the quarry as it appears today and compares that to what it will look like should the

² Quarry Status Report, Franklin District Council, 9th November 1995

*consent application be granted*³. This report considers potential landscape and visual effects against the WSP Opus / MGLA baseline of the existing environment and the WDC baseline.

2.1 Landscape Character Effects

11 of the submissions raise concerns regarding the potential for adverse landscape character effects as a result of the application⁴. These submitters have queried the level of effects reported within the assessment, the extent of native vegetation to be removed as part of the application and vegetation removed previously during the expansion of the quarry.

BML response – against the existing environment:

The WSP Opus assessment relies on the existing presence of the quarry and its presence setting a precedent in the landscape *“The quarrying activity is not new to the landscape, as the quarry has been in operation over 60 years, and as such is considered part of the existing landscape character”*. In section *“4.3 Site Landscape Content”* of the assessment, the quarry is described as being *“in operation for 60 years, so the appearance of cut faces has been a consistent element in the landscape and the expansion won’t be a new element in the landscape and is considered to be part of the existing landscape”*⁵. These factors contribute to the landscape character being assessed as being of *“low”* sensitivity for all stages by WSP Opus. Within the context of this baseline and the additional landscape character information provided by MGLA in the s92 response. It is considered by BML that the landscape description, magnitude of change and level of effects rating were reliable.

BML response – against the statutory baseline environment:

With consideration of the 1997 baseline environment, the expected sensitivity of the receiving environment has the potential be greater than when assessed against only the existing environment (at the time of application)..

When applying the statutory baseline of annual extraction rate, and then assessing the proposed expansion of the quarry, the extent of modification and magnitude of change is substantially greater than what exists on site today. By this we mean that had the quarry operated within it’s permitted extraction rate the existing environment would be substantially less modified than what currently exists.

As noted above MGLA have not undertaken an assessment against the statutory baseline and we acknowledge that there are complexities to applying this when it is difficult to determine the likely landform a permitted extraction rate would have resulted in.

It is considered the sensitivity of this landscape remains consistent with what has been assessed by WSP Opus and MGLA. However, when considering the scale and volume of extraction and applying the statutory baseline, the magnitude of change is increased to a moderate degree. As a result, the potential degree of adverse landscape effect are likely to be moderate.

³ LUC0123/19 - 47 McPherson Road – Response to Further Information Request, Kinetic Environmental, 7th October 2020

⁴ Submissions #2, #17, #15, #18, #19, #22, #30, #29, #33, #35, #36

⁵ McPherson Quarry Expansion Proposal, Landscape and Visual Assessment, WSP Opus, 31st August 2018.

2.2 Visual Effects – Proposed mitigation screening vegetation

Several submitters raised concerns that proposed mitigation planting will not provide sufficient screening for all properties.

Subsequent to the aforementioned site visit, the applicant has revised their proposed ecological planting strategy to include additional ecological corridor planting and approximately 0.7ha of 20m wide “exotic screen planting”. This additional screen planting is aimed at mitigating the visual effects of both Stages 2 and 3 of the proposal.

BML response:

The proposed ecological corridor to the north will provide a small amount of visual screening for most properties to the north of the proposal in combination with the existing retained shelterbelt. The additional proposed exotic screen tree planting will reduce visual effects for the properties along Pinnacle Hill Road, in particular at 215 Pinnacle Hill Road which sits at a lower elevation. The audience at 209 Pinnacle Hill Road to the east will also experience some benefit from the additional screen planting, due to their position in relation to the quarry activities. It is considered that overall the proposed mitigation planting for properties accessed from Pinnacle Hill Road will lower visual effects however partial views of Stage 2 and Stage 3 are expected to be attained.

Views from properties to the south (particularly at 219 State Highway 2), will experience little benefit from the proposed mitigation planting due to planting being positioned lower in the view corridor for elevated properties. However, the additional proposed screen planting provided will soften the form of the ridgeline as the trees mature.

It is noted that MGLA has yet to provide an assessment of visual effects pertaining to these views and the degree of effectiveness of the mitigation planting.

2.3 Visual effects on neighbours– Views from individual properties from site visits, not previously assessed

A total of 12 submissions were made regarding the visual assessment representative of their properties and the effects on their properties being greater than those stated. The visual effects cover a range of properties, however due to the limited amount of publicly accessible vantage points the photographs provided within the assessment were unable to accurately represent private viewpoints. Consequently, as a result of the site visit, this preliminary assessment can be undertaken. For consistency these effects ratings are in line with the Landscape and Visual Amenity Effect – Rating System within Appendix Two the MGLA assessment.

Five of the properties visited are considered to have views that do not align closely to the viewpoints described in the MGLA report⁶. These views have been described below with consideration of the existing environment and statutory baseline.

⁶ 40 McPherson Road (Submitter #30), 209 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #33), 211 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submission #17), 215 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submission #22), 219 State Highway 2 and Heartland Farm (Submitter #29)

40 McPherson Road (Submitter #30)

BML response – against the existing environment:

The view from this property are relatively well contained with outlooks from the main living areas generally orientated in a south western direction. Views west towards the quarry face are predominantly screened by a linear band of mature trees around the eastern edges of the property. Oblique views are available to the west of existing quarrying activity and access roads from the side window of the master bedroom upstairs, over intervening trees in the short distance. The proposed further expansion works are expected to be partially visible from inside the residence. The rolling form of the escarpment roll descends into the gently undulating pastoral landscape. Partially filtered views are available of exposed material, ancillary work and accessways to the south of the quarry in the middle distance of the view contrasting with the green fields beyond.

Although residential audiences are expected to have a higher sensitivity to change, the expected changes to this view are considered to be relatively limited. The adverse visual effect from inside the residence at Stage 1 of the works are likely to be Low – Moderate. For Stage 2 the potential adverse visual effects are expected to be Very Low and for Stage 3; negligible.

BML response – against the statutory baseline

Whilst difficult to determine what the exact landform would have been had the quarry operated within its permitted extraction rate, the degree of visual change remains a theoretical exercise. It is noted for this viewing audience, the views to the east have limited visual exposure to the quarry face. This viewing audience is likely to have a moderate to high degree of visual sensitivity. The magnitude of visual change to the view, when applying a 'theoretical' magnitude of visual change from 1997 and including the proposal, is likely to be moderate. This is based on the 1997 scenario that the ancillary works to the south of the quarry would be substantially smaller in scale and possibly not visible at all for this viewing audience.

With this in mind adverse visual effects on this audience with respect to the statutory baseline in Stage 1 of the works are expected to be Moderate in nature, Stage 2 effects are expected to be Low, Stage 3 effects are expected to be Negligible.

209 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #33)

Surrounding mature trees partially enclose this property preventing the availability for panoramic views. Views from this property are predominantly available from the main living floor, central living area, outside deck area and master bedroom. Open views to the west towards Mount William are available from these areas and a limited vista south west towards Pokeno is available from the master bedroom.

As the existing quarry is not visible from this property it is considered that statutory baseline view will be the same as the existing view and has not been considered separately.

BML response – against the existing environment:

The existing view to the south west is tightly framed between existing mature trees, with native forest visible in the near distance. Rising landform in the middle distance of the view comprises retained forest on the southern face, a grassed plateau and partial views of a vehicular access track visible on the east facing slope. Views to the

west comprise rolling landform containing a ridge of native forest in the middle distance with a cleared grass plateau beyond. The background of the view comprises the heavily treed eastern side of Mt William.

Stage 1 of the proposed quarrying activity are expected to only affect the view south west towards Pokeno and not views west towards Mt William. Earthworks lowering the land form and stripping topsoil will be visible in the middle distance as removal of native vegetation and extraction takes place. This will eventually result in elongated views towards Pokeno as the quarrying activity moves below the near distance intervening landform and tree line.

Stage 2 of the proposed works will have no additional effects on the south westerly view. However, quarrying activity will be visible in the middle distance of views west towards Mt William as quarrying activity lowers the landform of the greased plateau. Intervening native vegetation will partially screen views of the continued quarrying works as they lower into the landscape. Views of the northern extent of benching works are expected to be visible in the middle distance of the view through the majority of Stage 2 works. Established screening vegetation will help to screen approximately half of the benching landform, however open views over retained vegetation of half of the benching works will likely remain.

Stage 3 of the works are not expected to be visible. Stage 2 benching will remain visible to the west until greening and re-vegetation works take place as part of a quarry closure plan.

Potential visual effects associated with Stage 1 of the works are expected to be Low – Moderate in nature. Stage 2 effects are expected to be High while the topsoil stripping and early works are undertaken but reduce to Moderate as the activity lowers behind screening and then eventually Low. Stage 3 effects are expected to be Low to Very Low.

211 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submission #17)

BML response – against the existing environment:

This residential property is positioned lower in the landscape than the other nearby properties accessed from Pinnacle Hill Road. This the property is surrounded by established mature amenity planting which restricts views from the property and the immediate surrounding gardens to the near distance. In addition to this the property has a buffer of plantation pine woodland to the south west between the residence and the quarry. Glimpsed long distance views of Mt William are however visible over the top this amenity planting.

As the existing quarry is not visible from this property it is considered that statutory baseline view will be the same as the existing view and has not been considered separately.

Views of the existing and future quarry will not visible from this residence and therefore it is expected that the proposed quarry works will have no visual effects on this audience with respect to the existing environment and statutory baseline.

215 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submission #22)

Panoramic views to the south afforded from this property comprise rising grassed landform to the right of the view in the near to middle distance and falling landform covered in native vegetation the left. Beyond this far reaching views comprise flat pastoral plains with a rising mountain range forming the background of the view in the far distance. Existing quarrying operations are not visible within this view.

The existing quarry is not visible from this property it is considered that statutory baseline view will be the same as the existing view. Therefore the following only considers the existing environment.

BML response – against the existing environment:

Stage 1 of the proposed quarry expansion will require the stripping and lowering of landform in the in the middle distance of the view to the left. Heavy earthworks machinery will be visible as the top soil is stripped and the first few layers of material are excavated. The landform will drop below retained native vegetation and landform in the middle distance of the view as material is excavated. It is not expected that this will not represent a substantial change in the view overall.

Stage 2 of the proposed work will include the removal of a larger area of land form in the middle distance of the view. Extensive views of machinery will likely be available as top soil is stripped and initial layers of material are extracted. This lowering of the landform is expected to open up views towards the eastern extents of Pokeno. However, proposed mitigation planting along the edge of the quarry extension is expected to filter and screen views towards quarrying works and Pokeno as the screening vegetation matures.

From this vantage point it is not predicted that direct views will be afforded of the Stage 3 works, due to proposed intervening screen planting and landform.

Potential visual effects associated with Stage 1 of the works would likely be Low to Low – Moderate in nature, Stage 2 effects would potentially be High while the top soil stripping and early works are undertaken but would likely reduce to Low – Moderate as the landform lowers and then eventually Low, Stage 3 effects would likely be Very Low.

219 State Highway 2, Heartland Farm (Submitter #29)

Views north east from existing dwellings on Heartland farm are relatively well contained by a mixture of mature native and exotic tree species which line the internal access road, lot boundaries and the northern eastern corner of the property. Glimpsed views are available of the top the existing quarry face are available from the top deck of the main dwelling in the centre of the property.

BML response – against the existing environment:

The upper reaches of Stage 1 of the proposal would be expected to be visible over intervening vegetation as vegetation is cleared and benching works occur.

Stage 2 of the proposal is expected to extend the Stage 1 back into the landform partially behind retained landform and vegetation. This stage will not expand the visibility of the quarry or the loss of landscape features.

Stage 3 of the proposal is not expected to be visible from this vantage point.

Due to the limited amount of the quarry visible from the top deck of the dwelling at the centre of Heartland Farm the degree of change is confined. The potential visual effects are likely to be Low for stage 1, Very Low for stage 2 and Negligible for Stage 3.

BML response – against the statutory baseline:

Whilst it is challenging to determine the exact landform that would be visible had the quarry operated with the permitted extraction rate the baseline for this viewing audience would have likely comprise a quarry face approximately 70-80m wide and a large area native vegetation in proximity. From this angle of view it is considered that the quarry face would appear slight.

The view north east towards the quarry is expected to have a limited visual exposure to the quarry face. This viewing audience is likely to have a moderate degree of visual sensitivity. The noticeable change to the view, when applying a ‘theoretical’ magnitude change from 1997 including the proposal, the magnitude of change is likely to be low – moderate to moderate. This is based on the assumption that the extent of the visible quarry face would be substantially reduced in scale and considers the degree of visual change with the proposal.

With this in mind adverse visual effects likely to be experienced from the top deck of the dwelling would likely be Low – Moderate for stage 1, Low for stage 2 and Negligible effect for Stage 3.

BML response – against the existing environment:

Of the Nine properties visited to assess the potential impacts of individual properties. Four of the properties visited (listed below) are considered to be adequately represented by the MGLA assessment view descriptions and level of effects ratings shown in Table 1.

The existing quarry is not visible from this property it is considered that statutory baseline view will be the same as the existing view

1. 217 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #21) – Represented by Viewpoint 2 of the MGLA assessment
2. 231 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #18) – Represented by Viewpoint 2 of the MGLA assessment
3. 231B Pinnacle Hill Road (Representative of views from 231A, 233A, 233B, 233C, 233D, 233E, 233F and 235) (Submitters #24, #29, #31 and #35) – Represented by Viewpoint 2 of the MGLA assessment
4. 247 Pinnacle Hill Road (Submitter #15) – Represented by Viewpoint 2 of the MGLA assessment

2.4 Visual Effects – Views from Mt William Walkway

A number of submissions refer to effects from Mt William Walkway not assessing or adequately assessing the potential visual effects from this audience.

BML response – against the existing baseline:

The visual effects from the Mt William Walkway are represented by viewpoint location seven in the MGLA report. These views are further detailed in the visual simulations provided, which details the expected changes at the proposed work stages. The MGLA assessment considers the impacts on this audience and concludes “*Stage 1 will have a Low-Moderate adverse effect, stage 2 will have a Moderate adverse effect and stage 3 will have a High adverse effect. It should be noted that the rate at which effects change will be a gradual”⁷. It is considered that the visual descriptions and expected visual effects reported by MGLA are accurate and reliable.*

BML response – against the statutory baseline

Although it is difficult to determine what the exact landform of the quarry would have been, had they operated with the permitted extraction rate, it is likely that the eastern facing quarry slope would be less noticeable. The audience at and around Mt William would likely have a high degree of sensitivity. The noticeable change to the view, when applying a ‘theoretical’ magnitude of visual change, 1997 and including the proposal, is likely to be high. This is based on the view from the Mt William Walkway of having very little exposure to quarrying activity when applying the statutory baseline.

Within the context of this adjusted sensitivity of the audience it is considered that Stage 1 would have Moderate adverse effects, Stage 2 would have High adverse effects and Stage 3 would have Very High adverse effects.

2.5 Visual Effects – Removal of intervening landform and ridgeline opening up views

Several submitters have queried the visual effects as a result of quarrying activity opening up views to the south and south west. Submitters residing at 209 Pinnacle Hill Road further assert that the removal of intervening land form opening up views of the Pokeno industrial area.

BML response – against the existing baseline

As detailed in 2.3 of this report, private residences were visited to determine potential visual effects on each individual viewing audience. Although the lowering of landform will open up views in the to the south and southwest for some properties. It is considered that for the majority of properties to the north of the quarry which have existing open expansive views. Within this context wider the loss of landform will neither introduce a new element into the view or result in a dominant feature being

⁷ Response to the s92 Request for Additional Information, Mansergh Graham Landscape Architects, November 2019.

introduced into views, due to the wider context and distance from Pokeno. Potential visual effects on the properties at 215 and 209 Pinnacle Hill Road in particular are likely to be more affected by the lowering of landform in the middle distance than other properties.

2.6 Change to visual effects on previously assessed Viewpoints in relation to the statutory baseline

BML response – against the statutory baseline

Although it is difficult to assess the precise views from the 1997 statutory baseline, however it is possible to say that the increased rate of extraction has made an obvious change to the landscape. However the change in the statutory baseline views from properties to the north of the site are not expected to have substantially change due to the lack of views of existing quarry work. Properties to the south with a direct view of the quarry face are expected to have more pronounced change in view, when considering the statutory baseline coupled with the proposed expansion.

All of the viewpoints provided within the MGLA assessment are expected to have differing exposure to quarrying activity when considered against the 'theoretical' magnitude of visual change from 1997. Viewpoint 2 is expected to have very little or no view of the existing quarry and therefore the level effects is likely to be in line with the MGLA assessment of effects.

As detailed earlier within this review, the sensitivity of the audiences and the resulting magnitude of change of these audiences is likely to be higher than in the existing environment. This will likely result in a potentially higher level of visual effects being experienced. These alternate effects ratings have been listed in Table 1 below.

It should be noted that BML have not undertaken a fully landscape visual effects assessment and the potential visual effects below are in correlation with increase audience sensitivity and the 'theoretical' magnitude of change expected from each vantage point.

Table 1 comparing visual effects from the original WSP Opus Assessment, Mansergh Graham s92 response visual assessment and the level of effects against the adjust 1997 baseline.

Visual Audience from MGLA Assessment	WSP Opus Assessment level of effects ratings	MGLA Assessment level of effects ratings against the existing environment	BML potential visual effects considering the statutory baseline
Viewpoint 1: SH2, Southern Palms	Low	Stage 1: Very Low Stage 2: Very Low Stage 3: Low	Stage 1: Low Stage 2: Low Stage 3: Low - Moderate
Viewpoint 2: 233 Pinnacle Hill Road	Low	Stage 1: Negligible Stage 2: Low Stage 3: Negligible	Stage 1: Negligible Stage 2: Low Stage 3: Negligible
Viewpoint 3: 93 Irish Road	Moderate	Stage 1: Low- Moderate Stage 2: Very Low Stage 3: Negligible	Stage 1: Moderate Stage 2: Low Stage 3: Very Low
Viewpoint 4: SH2, outside 286	SH2 – Very Low Residential - Moderate	Stage 1: Low - Moderate Stage 2: Moderate Stage 3: Low	Stage 1: Moderate Stage 2: High Stage 3: Moderate
Viewpoint 5: 113 Baird Road	Low	Stage 1: Low - Moderate Stage 2: Low Stage 3: Low	Stage 1: Moderate Stage 2: Low - Moderate Stage 3: Low – Moderate
Viewpoint 6: Hitchens Road, Pokeno	Very Low	Stage 1: Very Low Stage 2: Low Stage 3: Moderate	Stage 1: Low Stage 2: Low – Moderate Stage 3: Moderate - High
Viewpoint 7: Mt William Summit	N/A	Stage 1: Negligible and Low - Moderate Stage 2: Very Low and Moderate Stage 3: Negligible and High	Stage 1: Low - Moderate Stage 2: Moderate - High Stage 3: High - Very High

3.0 Recommended Mitigation Measures:

Recent mitigation measures to address identified landscape and visual effects will require further detail to ensure the assessed effectiveness of the mitigation measures are achieved and maintained. With quarry operations these typically will align with staging of works and integrate into quarry management plans. The following measures are considered a way of providing certainty to the 'preferred' mitigation measures. It is important that performance outcomes for mitigation planting, that relate to density, height and timeframes are included in the recommended material below.

A detailed landscape plan and landscape management plan shall be prepared by a suitably qualified landscape architect. This may form part of the quarry management plan and shall be in general accordance with the Landscape Mitigation Plan (Reference). These shall include:

- An annotated planting plan(s) which communicate the proposed location and extent of all areas of planting, including any

- revegetation, reinstatement planting, mitigation planting and natural revegetation
- A plant schedule based on the submitted planting plan(s) which details specific plant species, plant sourcing, the number of plants, height and/or grade (litre) / Pb size at time of planting, and estimated height / canopy spread at maturity
 - Details of draft specification documentation for any specific drainage, soil preparation, tree pits, staking, irrigation and mulching requirements
 - An annotated pavement plan and related specifications, detailing proposed site levels and the materiality and colour of all proposed hard surfacing
 - A landscape maintenance plan (report) and related drawings and specifications for all aspects of the finalised landscape design, including in relation to the following requirements:
 - i. Irrigation
 - ii. Weed and pest control
 - iii. Plant replacement
 - iv. Inspection timeframes
 - v. Contractor responsibilities
- The consent holder shall provide to the council a detailed staging and commitments to performance outcomes and time frames.
- This staging plan should be prepared by a landscape architect or suitably qualified person
 - The staged maintenance plan should outline performance targets for proposed screening planting and should include but not be limited to:
 - Minimum heights of trees
 - Planting density
 - Screening requirements

4.0 Conclusion

It is considered that the applicant's LVA to date is well considered and commensurate to the proposal and its potential effects overall, within the context of the existing environment. However, in lieu of receiving a response from the applicant's Landscape Architect (MGLA) assessing the additional private viewpoints it is not possible to make a determination on the assessment as a whole. The above provides guidance on the potential degree of effect however remains subject to receipt of further assessment from MGLA, particularly taking into regard BML's role as peer reviewer.

The additional mitigation measures proposed by the applicant to address potential effects of Stage 2 and 3 appear to appropriately address identified potential adverse visual effects. Further detail is required to ensure that these measures are successful.

In relation to the statutory baseline provided by council it is considered that this conflicts with the existing environment used in applicant's assessment. This has resulted in the likely visual effects being greater than those predicted in the applicant's LVA assessment. Within the context of the statutory baseline we are not able to concur with the outcomes and conclusions of the applicant's assessment and effects ratings.


If you require any further clarification on the above, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully

BOFFA MISKELL LTD



Oliver May - Author
Senior Professional / Landscape Planner



Rebecca Ryder - Reviewer
Associate Partner / Landscape Architect