

## Memorandum

---

**TO:** Connor Marner, Planner

**FROM:** Barry Knox, Senior Landscape Architect

**DATE:** 9<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

**SUBJECT:** **LUC-2006-370735/A, 15 DARNELL STREET. COMMENT FROM LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.**

---

This memorandum is in response to a request for comment on an application to vary conditions included on RMA-2006-370735 which approved a residential activity on a lot less than 15 hectares. The original hearing was in 2006 and circumstances appear to have changed over the intervening time – principally that the site owner now wishes to live permanently in the building which was originally proposed as a temporary residence while building of the permanent dwelling proceeded, and the original site for the new dwelling is now proposed as a smaller accessory building.

I provided comments for the original application, RMA 2006 0973, in November 2006.

The conditions proposed for variation are conditions 1, 4 and 5, all of which relate to original landscape mitigation or effects on visual values. The site is zoned Rural in the Dunedin City District Plan, and it is within the Peninsula Coast Outstanding Landscape Area (PCOLA). I understand that the original application for erection of the building was for a non-complying activity.

I visited the site with Connor Marner and John Sule on 26 June 2017. I note that the application has now been put on hold at the request of the applicant pending consideration of the requirement for assessment by limited notification.

### General Comment

The original application was in 2006, with substantial inputs by Landscape Architect Mike Moore for the applicant, and submissions from several opposed residents. The section 42A report initially recommended not granting the consent, but the proposed conditions provided some certainty that effects would be mitigated. It is reasonable to say that after ten years there has been significant non-compliance with these conditions.

The current property owners note in their application that they *"only became aware of the conditions of the granted resource consent RMA 2006-0973 during the process of applying for a building consent for the proposed shed"*. Unfortunately my experience with landscape related conditions which need to be administered over several years is that non-compliance often occurs.

If the condition variations are approved I consider the original plans by Mike Moore should be referred to more extensively than they are in the proposed new conditions, and the times for work completion needs to be made more definite than *"within 12 months of the completion of the farm shed"*. In my opinion any timeframe should be related to the approval date of new conditions, should this occur, rather than a "completion" time, which could be variable.

I perhaps should not comment on what is predominantly a planner prerogative, but it appears that the activity now proposed for an accessory building rather than a new dwelling is so different from the original that a new application may be more appropriate. (I consider this may apply even although the new proposal would potentially create fewer adverse effects on the PCOLA than the original 2006 application).

## Effects on the Peninsula Coast Outstanding Landscape Area (PCOLA)

The following principal features and characteristics are identified as being important in the Dunedin City District Plan:

- *The general visual dominance of the natural landscape elements over human landscape elements (eg buildings or shelter plantings) giving the area a sense of maturity and harmony.*
- *An apparently remote, isolated rural character.*
- *The integrity, extent, coherence and natural character of the landform, streams and remaining areas of indigenous vegetation.*
- *The minimal influence of any large scale structures or exotic plantings to diminish the impact of the natural landscape forms and features.*
- *The dramatic coastal landforms and views.*
- *The presence and quality of human-made features which are relics of the past, eg old lime kilns, stone walls.*
- *Highlights of 'transient' wildlife interest, eg seals, penguins, etc.*
- *Outstanding and dramatic landform features including the following which are included in the NZ Geological Society Geopreservation Inventory for the Otago Region:*
  - Hoopers/Papanui inlets*
  - the Pyramids*
  - Sandfly Bay earthflow*
  - Sandfly Bay lag surface and ventifacts*
  - Sandymount sea arch*
  - Sandymount terracettes.*
- *The extent and quality of areas of remnant forest, eg Taiaroa bush.*
- *The significance of places which are special to Maori, eg Pukekura (Taiaroa Head), Pyramids, etc.*

The application is for variation to conditions from an earlier consent, and the potential adverse effects on the PCOLA of the consented activity would be similar. In my original comment I noted that these would be:

*"..no more than minor. Several factors contribute to this conclusion. These include the relatively low visibility from key viewing points, the location of the building platform as close as feasible to existing urban development, protection of the native vegetation and rural character of the bulk of the site, and proposed conditions which would ensure an appropriate dwelling design."*

In terms of effects on the characteristics of the PCOLA, I consider maintaining the existing building as a permanent residence and constructing an accessory building where the proposed new residence was to be, will lead to effects which would be no more than minor, assuming the mitigation alluded to in conditions is carried out.

### Proposed Amended Conditions

Should approval be given to amend the conditions as requested, I consider that the original wording should be retained as much as possible.

Condition 1. This condition is not applicable now, as the proposal has been considerably altered (Refer to my comments about the possible need for a new consent application)

Condition 4. The essence of the original condition should remain – that is, reference to the original *"detail outlined in Mike Moore's evidence tabled at the hearing"* (As is noted at the preamble of the condition).

For subsequent parts of the condition, I recommend:

Stage 1. Leave as it is, except, *"This work must be completed within two years of the date of acceptance of the condition variation..."*

Stage 2. Leave as it is, except, *"This must be completed within twelve months of the date of acceptance of the condition variation..."*

Stage 3. Leave as it is, except, "*This work should be undertaken at a steady rate and shall be completed within five years of the date of acceptance of the condition variation...*" (The original condition was for 10 years, but given the time from the original application, I consider 5 years is now reasonable.)

Condition 5. In the original this related to appropriate cladding of the dwelling, which is now proposed to be an accessory building. (Refer to my comment about a possible new application). If this condition is to be approved for alteration, I recommend a modification of the new condition proposed in the application along this or similar lines:

*" The proposed farm shed shall be clad with 'Endura Colour steel' in a 'Grey Friars' colour".*

Barry Knox  
Landscape Architect

Appendix 1. Photographs Taken 26 June 2017.



Photo 1. View towards the west showing the building now proposed for a permanent dwelling. (Originally to be a dwelling while the proposed new dwelling was established)



Photo 2. View from the dwelling site towards the northeast.