

10 February 2020

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



Dear Victoria,

McPhersons Quarry Expansion Proposal Landscape and Visual Assessment: Peer Review Response

Waikato District Council has engaged Boffa Miskell Ltd to undertake a peer review of the landscape and visual assessment (LVA) prepared by Opus for the proposed McPhersons Quarry expansion.

Following the initial peer review of the Opus report, Mansergh Graham Landscape Architects Ltd (MGLA) were engaged to review and respond to the s92 request for information¹. Additional information provided by MGLA² as part of the s92 response was reviewed as a new assessment. A further s92 request for information was issued³ to clarify any outstanding issues.

The following provides a summary of the outstanding requests for information to understand the proposal and level of effects assessments in full

1.0 Review of the Response to the S92 request

Overview

- 1.1 The response to the s92 request is thorough in its content and addresses the queries raised.

#	Section 92 Requests	Section 92 response	Is the response accepted?
1	<i>It is recognised in the MGLA analysis that there is an Identified Significant Natural Feature (SNA) and Schedule 5A Site of Special Wildlife interest at Mt William Walkway within proximity of the proposal. Can it be confirmed what the expected landscape effects are expected to be?</i>	The response clarifies the expected effects on the Significant Natural Feature (SNA) and Schedule 5A Site of Special Wildlife interest at Mt William Walkway. In addition, a map detailing the "Franklin District	Yes

¹ Issued 28th June 2019

² Issued November 2019

³ Issued 18th December 2019

		ONF and Waikato District SNA Boundary Comparison” has been provided to make the association clearer.	
2	<i>The Visual Absorption Capability (VAC) was used within the original Opus assessment as a descriptor for visual audiences. This methodology is also included in Appendix Three of the MGLA report. However, VAC does not appear to be used in the MGLA visual assessment. Does the MGLA assessment rely on the Opus VAC descriptions and how has this been considered in the MGLA assessment?</i>	The inclusion of VAC Ratings table clarifies the ratings for each viewpoint location and the inclusion of the VAC Capability Rating in Appendix Three of the MGLA s92 response.	Yes
3	<i>Considering the additional information provided in the landscape character baseline, is the Opus landscape character sensitivity rating of “low” relied upon?</i>	The change in landscape character sensitivity rating has been clarified in the MGLA report to state that the overall sensitivity is “low-moderate”.	Yes
4	<i>Has the Overburden Disposal Area (ODA) been modelled in the Visual Simulation? The ODA is described as partially visible in the assessment but cannot be seen in the Visual Simulation.</i>	The inclusion of the Overburden Disposal Area (ODA) in the visual simulations clarifies the disparity between the description and the simulation.	Yes
5	<i>Is it concluded that the overall visual effects will be less than minor, as concluded in the Opus assessment? The increased level of effects experienced in the VP4, VP6 and VP7 to moderate and high would suggest that this may have changed. Could MGLA confirm how the additional viewpoints are considered in the round for the overall conclusions?</i>	The response clarifies MGLA’s judgement that “in the round, the overall effect of the proposal on the wider landscape is considered to be Low -Moderate”. It is accepted that this is to be considered with caution but allows for a more direct comparison with the original Opus findings. It is also accepted that the MGLA conclusion of the effects overall being equal to the Minor threshold of the RMLA.	Yes

2.0 Conclusion

- 2.1 It is considered that the information provided by Mansergh Graham Landscape Architects in this s92 response in conjunction with the original Opus report and the MGLA “Response to the s92 Request for Additional Information” provides enough information to support the landscape and visual effects assessment and its conclusions.
- 2.2 Boffa Miskell supports the methodology, effects ratings and conclusions of the report and consider them to be a reliable assessment of the proposal and existing landscape.

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

i