



Appendix 3

Methodology



Table One: Effects Analysis

Pigeon Bay Criteria	Effect in Application	Meaning
i) Natural Science	Physical / Biophysical Effects	<i>Those tangible effects on landforms and vegetation resulting from the Project. It includes effects on existing properties in the direct landscape and adjacent environments.</i>
iv) Transient Values		<i>The physical effects also relate to short term and long-term cumulative effects over time.</i> <i>The transient values: occasional presence of wildlife; or its values at certain times of the day or of the year</i>
ii) Legibility Values	Perceptual or Sensory Effects	<i>Effects on people's perceptions of landscape including visual and aesthetic qualities like visual coherence and legibility in the landscape that the proposed site currently inhabits, and the community it is adjacent to.</i>
vi) Shared and Recognised Values	Amenity Effects	<i>"Those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes" (s7 RMA). The criteria are used to define amenity values including aspects such as a sense of spaciousness (wide open spaces), privacy, quietness and absence of traffic and bustle, an environment relatively uncluttered by structures and artificial features, etc.¹</i>
v) Tangata Whenua Values		
vii) Historic Values	Associative Effects	<i>Human connotation with a place or a landscape. Including spiritual, cultural or social associations.</i>
iii) Aesthetic Values	Visibility analysis and influences	<i>The physical orientation and visibility, including fixed views from the properties in the vicinity, the view from any recreational areas, and the transitional views by various road users. and the distance of the proposal from key viewpoints.</i>
	Nature, audience and sensitivity	<i>Being that of the viewing location (orientation of view; public or private locations) and that of the viewing audience (e.g. homeowners and recreationalists) on a per viewpoint basis. Considers the overall scale and bulk of the proposal in relation to the surrounding fabric, and character and existing amenity values.</i>

¹ Goodman, de Lambert, Dawson, McMahon & Rackham (2000). *Impact of development on rural landscape values*. Ministry for the Environment.



Table Two: Landscape and Visual Effects Rating Scale

Relation to Planning Rating	Rating	Description
Less than minor	Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects are not present. The assessment of a “negligible” level of impact is usually based on distance.
	Very Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects are acceptable. Does not require mitigation.
	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects are minimal. Unlikely to require mitigation
Minor	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects are apparent and could be cumulative. Mitigated to an appropriate level.
More than minor	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects are distinct in nature and likely to be cumulative. The potential for additional mitigation to reduce effects to a lower degree.
	Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects are very distinct. Mitigation is unlikely to reduce the degree of effect to any discernible degree.
	Extreme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects are unacceptable for the environment. Cannot be mitigated.

Note: The use of the NZ Institute of Landscape Architects’ ‘Best Practice Note - Landscape Assessment and Sustainable Management 10.1. has been applied for the effects rating scale. The ‘Relation to the Planning Rating’ is my own interpretation of the scale application (i.e. there is no given NZILA assessment criteria that directly relates to this scale).