

Visual simulations – general:

2. Please confirm that the specific positions of the buildings as shown on 'General Arrangement Plan' (date 21/04/2022) are correct and consistent with the building positions illustrated in the visual simulations. A Plan confirming the exact location/footprint of the building modelled in the visual simulations would be best.

*Greenwood Associates will provide a plan showing where the buildings are sitting in relation to the building platform.*

3. Please explain why a 10m by 10m house footprint was chosen for the simulations. This is a very small footprint given the building platforms are understood to be 1,000m<sup>2</sup> and the applicant has in correspondence indicated that a private covenant would be imposed requiring that all dwellings exceed 200m<sup>2</sup>.

*As per above response plans will be provided showing the modelled buildings sitting in relation to the building platform. The 10m x 10m size was an oversight and will be rectified for future simulations. However, it is the opinion of Greenwood associates that an increase in building footprint size will not see an increase in any perceived adverse visual effects from the supplied viewpoints.*

4. Please confirm what level of planting is being illustrated for the 'Proposed building' viewpoints – e.g. does this simulation include the installation of new planting?

*Yes it shows them at the install size as indicated on the plans, the distance to the site makes them difficult to see*

5. For the portions of buildings that are visible within the Viewpoints, please confirm that the 'Proposed design controls' (page 20 of the assessment report) are being presented, and also confirm what building materials, colours/reflectivity and external architectural finishes are being rendered for these buildings.

*Modelled buildings are presented with recessive external colour finishes, Greenwood Associates will provide a close view of the building model. Greenwood Associates are not architects, therefore the modelled buildings do not consider specific materials but rather use recessive colours in terms of reflectivity this can be considered to be consistent with BS5252.*

6. Please advise why some visualisations were produced with a 55mm lens, and others with a 35mm lens. A consistent methodology is recommended in preparing all such material.

*To prepare the visual simulations in time for the council's scheduled visit, it was decided to utilise the available 35mm lens in order to ensure a simulation was available. This will be rectified to a 55mm lens for the hearing.*

7. The s92 response stated that Proposed Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 & 7 will have a 7m height restriction but 8m has been modelled in the visual simulations. Please confirm the height limit proposed for these lots.

*8m was modelled as a 'test' for the eastern lots to determine if such a height would have any adverse visual effects over a 7m height. It is the conclusion of Greenwood Associates that the*

*scheduled height of 8m does not have any additional potential for adverse visual effects over a 7m height. Greenwood Associates will discuss with applicant on whether to establish a 7m or 8m height control limit*

#### Vegetation – existing and proposed

A key consideration is assessing the landscape and visual effects of the development is the interplay of existing and proposed vegetation. Further clarity is requested on this aspect of the landscape proposal. A single plan is requested which very clearly distinguishes the extents of the following vegetation categories:

- Site boundary
- Existing vegetation on public and private land not owned by the applicant, including shelterbelts, native planting etc.
- Existing planting on the proposed site to be removed
- Existing planting on the proposed site to be removed
- New planting on the proposed site.
- 

This plan will be a very useful tool to communicate the landscape proposal, and help support the written LV report, and can be used when considering the visual simulations. It is also suggested that this plan does not attempt to convey detailed plant species and layout information as shown on the 'Planting Plans Nos 1, 2, 3 and 4' (which are very useful plans etc), but instead is a higher level planting strategy and presented on a single plan at 1:2000 scale/A3 size. It will also provide clarity over which vegetation the applicant has control over and can therefore rely upon as mitigation.

*An overall planting plan has been provided*

#### Additional visual simulation

Many thanks for the 2 x visual simulations which were used during the site inspection on Friday 22 July. It was agreed views to the site are generally obstructed from the easterly direction by vegetation on the adjoining private property to the east. While the two viewpoints help to illustrate the landscape effects of the proposal, an additional viewpoint is very important to furnish the assessment in a more comprehensive manner given the elevated and prominent nature of the proposed site located on a coastal headland of Ohiwa Harbour. The additional viewpoint should consider a view from the northern quarter. During the site visit yesterday it was agreed that the Ohiwa Spit (at the western end of Ohiwa Harbour Road) is a suitable location for the additional view because it will capture a wide range of assessment related considerations:

- View from the northerly quarter with a clear view of the ridgeline
- View from a public area
- View from within the adjacent area of the ONFL (District Plan)
- View from within the Indigenous Biological Diversity Area (Coastal Environmental Plan)

Following the site visit, the applicant new viewpoint 10 was received and while this simulation is located on a northern direction (which is useful) it does not also have the ability to capture a range of additional factors which directly relate to the landscape assessment as listed above.

*An image will be sourced from this location and an additional simulation will be prepared.*

#### Viewpoint 4

- The elevations (vertical levels) of the buildings 1 – 7 which are shown appear to be very low when examined during the site visit and with regards to the topographical ground contours. Please check the the proposed building levels are correct. In addition it would be useful to show the surface level of the existing paper road (e.g. dashed line) for visual reference.

*Paper road will be added to simulations as a dashed line - An overlay plan showing the modelled terrain over the supplied viewpoint photograph will be provided to show terrain model against photo*

- There does not appear to be any visible difference in levels of vegetation growth illustrated between 'the Proposed buildings' viewpoint and the '5 Years' viewpoint, however this would not seem to be plausible. Is this correct? Please clarify.

*Distance from viewpoint makes 5 year growth (from initial max. 1m-1.5m) install size difficult to be perceptible - Greenwood Associates will provide a 'zoomed view' of this interface.*

Please include the proposed buildings on Lots 10-12 or explain why they have not been modelled. From the site visit it appeared that with removal of the internal shelterbelt all or some of Lots 10-12 would enjoy views to the south and east.

*Greenwood Associates will provide a working file showing the working file sitting over the photo.*

#### Viewpoint 6

After further analysis on site, it is clear that the current location of Viewpoint 6 is an area that is unlikely to receive many visitors despite being a publicly accessible area in the harbour. For this reason it is advised that an alternative location is used on the adjacent Ohiwa Loop Road corridor (for example: from the roadside area opposite 107 Ohiwa Loop Road, as per map below).

*In earlier correspondence with council a pdf document was provided containing both Viewpoint 6 and image taken from the Ohiwa Loop Road corridor adjacent to lot 07. Refer page 12 of this pdf document ('210627-VIEWPOINTS-SELECTED FOR SIMS') for information on why it was determined that viewpoint 6 was utilised over this image for simulations.*

- Same as the comment above, this view from the west does not appear to illustrate any visible difference in vegetation growth between 'the Proposed buildings' viewpoint and the '5 Years' viewpoint. Please clarify.

- 

*Greenwood Associates will provide a 'zoomed view' of this interface.*

- On the 'Proposed building' viewpoint please clarify exactly what planting type is being illustrated on top of the ridgeline in reference to the proposed planting plans.

*Greenwood Associates will provide a 'zoomed view' of this interface.*

- can the applicant please clarify what plant sizes (i.e. grades) will be used?

*Proposed plant grades at install were provided on landscape plan drawings J001233/03-06 under the 'pb' column*

- The landscape assessment contains a number of passages which explain that the planting layout has been arranged to integrate any future proposed built form into the wider landscape. However the VPs seem to illustrate that existing planting to be retained (either on public land or on the Applicants land) is the main device that visually screens the new development and buildings. This query seems especially relevant with VP4.

*The planting layout is proposed with a long term view and has been arranged in such a manner that any anticipated built form is absorbed into the landscape regardless of what happens to off site vegetation (i.e: if it is removed by the relevant authority or individual lot owners) and the assessment has been undertaken on this basis and thus is not reliant on any perceived mitigation from planting located outside of the subject lots.*