RC 216016 – Applicant: Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited

Rolleston PAK'nSAVE Supermarket Development

Peer Review of Landscape & Visual Effects Assessment

Prepared for Selwyn District Council

17 March 2022

Boffa Miskell

Document Quality Assurance

Bibliographic reference for citation: Boffa Miskell Limited 2022. *Rolleston PAK'nSAVE Supermarket Development: Peer Review of Landscape & Visual Effects Assessment*. Report prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited for Selwyn District Council.		
Prepared by:	Gabe Ross Associate Principal Landscape Architect Boffa Miskell Limited	
Reviewed by:	James Bentley Senior Principal Landscape Architect Boffa Miskell Limited	
Status: Final	Revision / version: 1	Issue date: 17 March 2022

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	1
1.0	Peer Review Approach	1
2.0	LEA Methodology	2
3.0	Receiving Environment & Site Description	2
4.0	Landscape Values of the Receiving Environment	3
5.0	The Proposal	4
6.0	Statutory and Planning Context	4
7.0	Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects	5
8.0	Assessment of Visibility and Visual values.	9
9.0	Mitigation and Enhancement	11
10.0	Conclusion and Peer Review Recommendations	13

1.0 Introduction

Boffa Miskell Limited (BML) has been engaged by Selwyn District Council (SDC) to undertake a Peer Review of the Landscape Effects Assessment prepared as part of the resource consent application to establish and operate a PAK'nSAVE (PnS) supermarket. This comprises buildings, signage, parking areas and associated access, loading, earthworks and landscaping at 157 Levi Road, Rolleston. The application has been prepared by Aurecon.

The Landscape Plan and Assessment (dated 1st December 2021), accompanied the resource consent application as Appendix F in the application. This has been prepared by Rough Milne Mitchell Landscape Architects (RMM) and will be referred to as the 'LEA'. Assessment photographs and supporting plans, sections and diagrams are included as a Graphic Attachment (GA).

In response to a request for further information[1] the Applicant has provided a summary response to RFI matters and a revised Landscape Plan and Graphic Attachment (dated 22 February 2022 and Revised Landscape Assessment Report (Dated 23 February 2022).

For the purposes of this peer review these replace the original documentation submitted with the application.

This peer review assessed the Landscape and Visual effects of the proposal and verified the findings outlined in the RMM LEA in relation to the assessment matters of the relevant policy and statutory documents.

In this peer review, we identify some minor of deficiencies in the structure and methodology of the LEA report but generally agree with the proposed the landscape and visual effects ratings of ***Low to Moderate*** . We recommend several consent conditions to further mitigate potential adverse effects.

1.0 Peer Review Approach

This peer review has entailed both a desktop review and site investigations as summarised below:

Desktop Review

Review of the relevant landscape and legislative framework polices and guidelines concerning visual and landscape matters.

Review of the LEA and its findings, including:

- The methodology used.
- The selection of visual assessment viewpoints and visibility assessment.
- The landscape context and site description and analysis.

[1] RFI dated 21 January 2022.

- The landscape and visual effects assessment in relation to the relevant statutory assessment matters.
- Any assessment undertaken to evaluate the cumulative visual effects; and
- Feasibility and effectiveness of any proposed mitigation.

Site Investigations

Following the initial desktop review, BML Landscape Architects James Bentley and Gabe Ross conducted a site visit on the morning of 21st January 2022 between 10am and 12 noon, and undertook the following assessments:

- Review of the existing landscape character of the Site and wider landscape context.
- Review of potential visibility of the proposed development from the RMM viewpoint locations, and
- On-site investigations of any potentially impacted areas highlighted from the desk top review.

On the day of the site visit the weather conditions were generally overcast, enabling good visibility of the site and general surroundings.

2.0 LEA Methodology

The LEA utilises methodology and terminology consistent with the Te Tangi a te Manu - Draft Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines (April 2021) (ANZLG). The methodology and ratings scales for landscape and visual effects outlined in the RMM report is consistent with current best practice.

The accompanying graphic supplement to the LEA provides useful contextual maps and diagrams and includes 11 Site photographs from publicly accessible viewpoints. We agree that these adequately capture the current site conditions, landscape character and visual landscape context.

The only minor point of critique that are considered deficiencies in the LEA is that it does not address lighting effects adequately in the assessment considerations.

3.0 Receiving Environment & Site Description

Section 2.1 of the LEA provides a detailed description of the receiving environment for the project and adequately covers the Site context, underlying topography, soil classes, and existing development and vegetation patterns.

The LEA describes the adjacent built form of development to the north, west and south as typically single-storey residential typologies and low-density arrangements within the Living 1 & 1B zones and new urban growth area (Living Z).

To the east and within the current District Plan Inner Plains zoning, existing development is typically of more rural character and more widely dispersed and includes both residential and farming related buildings. Under the proposed District Plan the Site would change to a General Residential Zone with the land east of the Site boundary changing to a General Rural Zone. The LEA notes that the land east of the Site is subject to Plan Change 71 (PC71) that, should it be adopted, will change the proposed General Rural Zone immediately to the east of the Site to Residential use.

The Site also has an Outline Development Plan (ODP) overlay that under Proposed Selwyn District Plan consists of an indicative loop road connection to Lincoln-Rolleston Rd and a nominal reserve location.

To the south-west of the Site along the Lincoln-Rolleston Road, larger lifestyle blocks and boundary planting. This separates the more higher density residential developments north of Lowe Road and the more recent development of Rueben Ave to the south. We agree with the LEA statement that this area is logically going to be developed for higher density residential more consistent with the typologies seen to the south.

Section 2.2 describes the existing Site as being a 7.24 ha triangular tract of land largely surrounded with shelterbelts. Views into the Site are generally restricted to vehicle entry points from both Levi and Lincoln-Rolleston Roads. An existing dwelling with ancillary buildings occupies the north part of the site with internal fence lines, hedges and shelterbelt plantings.

The Site is currently used for stock grazing and hay cropping.

4.0 Landscape Values of the Receiving Environment

Section 2.3 of the LEA reviews the physical, associative, and perceptual attributes of the Site. We generally agree with the RMM descriptions of these and the conclusion that there are no particular features, perceptual or associate values of note on the existing Site and that it is typical of other modified rural landscapes in the area, that abut areas of urban development.

The anticipated future landscape values of the Site were expected be driven by the existing and proposed underlying residential zoning under the SDP and PSDP, presenting a more residential amenity than rural amenity. We agree that this shift in land use will result in removal of existing trees, hedges and shelterbelts to accommodate the construction of detached, semi attached and attached dwellings and supporting roading and other infrastructure. Furthermore, we agree that whilst the proposal is for a supermarket, this is still an urban-related land use, and retains a different ‘amenity’ to a residential area.

5.0 The Proposal

The proposal is comprehensibly described in detail in Section 3.1 of the LEA. The PnS development is located in the northern part of the triangular Site leaving a residual undeveloped parcel at the southern part of the Site.

The proposed built form includes the primary 7,232 sqm footprint supermarket building located in the north eastern corner of the Site. The building ranges from 7.4m to a maximum height of 12.3m above the finished floor level. Facades consist of a mix of metal profile, precast concrete of smooth and textured finishes and glazing. Some decorative architectural details are included. The colour scheme is primarily Sandstone Grey with Black Zero accents. The corporate PnS yellow is restricted to the main signage panel and signage and entry panels.

Extensive areas of parking wrap around three sides of the building providing 517 spaces. A goods and services lane access runs along the eastern side of the building.

Vehicle access is proposed at two locations on the Lincoln-Rolleston Road with four entry points on Levi Road. The primary entry is on the southwest side of the building with a 'click and collect' facility on the north side of the building. Service and delivery yards along with staff parking is located on the eastern corner of the building.

Two 8m tall, 2m wide, 0.65m thick pylon signs are proposed at the southern entrance off Lincoln-Rolleston Road and centrally at the main entry along the Levi Road boundary. Other access points will receive 1.5 high and 1.2 wide welcome or exist signs in the PnS yellow colour. Signs are noted as being up-lit at night.

The parking area is noted as being lit with light-poles spaced on the centre line of parking rows. Other external lighting of landscape and wayfinding elements are noted as being to be resolved as part of future Detailed Design stages.

Three pedestrian access routes are noted in the LEA from each of the Levi Rd and Lincoln-Rolleston Road boundaries. Of these only the two primary 3.5m wide entries of the Lincoln-Rolleston Road offer a relatively direct clear access to the building's main entry.

Public cycle parks are provided on the southern corner of the building. Additional secure staff cycle parks and a seating area is provided adjacent to the staff parking area on the eastern corner of the building.

The LEA[2] describes the key landscape components in detail, Generally, we support the proposed landscape design with some additional recommendations to both the proposed design and planting selections noted in Section 9 of this report.

6.0 Statutory and Planning Context

Section 4.0 of the LEA outlines the relevant statutory and planning context appropriately and provides analysis of how these planning matters specifically relate to the proposal from a landscape effects perspective.

[2] See page 12 of the LEA report.

The existing and proposed residential zoning of the Site under the OSDP and PSDP form the baseline for the landscape effects assessment.

As the proposed supermarket development is not anticipated under the operative or proposed Selwyn District Plans the LEA also references the matters of discretion for large-scale commercial developments in the Business 1 Zone Part C – Section 16 – Business Zone Rules – Buildings. This provides some general measures around providing quality public open spaces and streetscape interfaces to assess the PnS proposal against.

The Rolleston Structure Plan have been considered as an indication of Council aspirations for the long-term development of Rolleston.

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD): Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Bill, and Private Plan Change 71 relating to the neighbouring area have also been considered in the LEA.

Section 4.1 of the LEA summarises the provisions of the Selwyn District Plan zoning along with the elements set out in the Outline Development Plan.

The LEA lists the relevant landscape provisions of Part B – Section 3.4 – Quality of Environment.

Section 4.2 of the LEA reviews the Proposed Selwyn District Plan (PSDP) and the PSDP Outline Development Plan that is simplified from the Operative SDP ODP but highlights the need for an appropriate transition and boundary treatments along the residential and rural activities boundaries.

Other polices and documents referenced include:

- Part 3 – Section RESZ – Residential Zones
- Private Plan Change 71
- Rolleston Structure Plan
- The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)
- Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Bill

7.0 Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects

The LEA correctly surmises that the baseline for the LEA is a comparison of the proposed development against a complying residential development anticipated under the current and proposed underlying zoning. This must specifically consider the landscape and visual effects that the proposed PnS development will have on the surrounding existing and emerging residential context.

Analysis against Planning provisions

The LEA's assessment 'Against the Relevant Planning Provisions'[3] note key landscape matters in relation to residential character and amenity include:

[3] See page 22 of the LEA report.

- Landscape treatments of street frontages
- Pedestrian Amenity
- Buffering between zoning to avoid reverse sensitives.

The LEA notes NPS-UD policies around provision for public accessibility are addressed through improved pedestrian, public and active transport options, and the ability to utilise the open space on the northwest corner of the Site. It further notes that the PnS proposal may detract from the amenity values experienced by its immediate neighbours, but notes that the proposed landscape interfaces and again, the northwest corner of the Site, will provide amenity values appreciated by others living in the vicinity that regularly pass the proposed Site.

The LEA assessment against the ODP for the Site makes a case that in relation to the potential interface with residential dwellings along the north eastern boundary, the proposed PnS building at the points closest to the boundary is of similar height to a two storey dwelling. It notes that the typical setbacks are similar, but the PnS proposal offers the advantages of the proposed 10m landscape buffer. Two options are presented to allow flexibility for the proposal to respond to adoption or rejection of PC71. In the event PC71 is approved there is the option within the LEA for lower screen planting to reduce the potential for adverse shading effects on new residential sections and offsetting the taller acoustic fence back into the PnS Site.

We agree with this assessment and support this proposed strategy however, provide some recommendations to bolster both the visual screening value, shorten the timeframes for effective screening and improve the biodiversity value of the buffer planting as part of the proposed conditions of consent. Refer to Section 9 of this Peer Review.

The LEA compares potential Medium Density Housing against the proposed PnS building making the following points:

- The ODP is seeking medium density on the northeast corner of the loop road, a similar location to the supermarket building.
- Under the current Living Z zoning the Site could accommodate terraced housing in larger building forms up to 8m in height – slightly taller than the proposed PnS exterior walls.
- The ODP larger lot buffer under the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Bill (EHSAB) could allow dwellings to be developed up to 11m in height – close to the maximum height of the proposed building.

We agree that this is a useful correlation to illustrate that the height and location of the main built form of the PnS development is not drastically dissimilar from what, in theory could be permitted under the existing zoning. We do however, note that concentration of the PnS built form in one contiguous form, set within a large plane of vehicle parking, is unavoidably incongruous with a residential development scenario that will disperse blocks or individual dwellings across the Site.

The comparison between the Neighbourhood Park against the Northwest Open space is, in our opinion, rather tenuous. The location of the proposed Northwest Open space with the busy roads and intersection on one side and the wide expanse of parking lot on the other, will not provide an inviting space of equivalent visual or recreational value to a well-designed neighbourhood park that will be activated through close proximity to dwellings and active street frontages. We do however, agree that having an expanded greenspace in this location

will provide some beneficial streetscape amenity value for pedestrians and traffic passing by the Site.

Accepting that this area has a primary use for stormwater purposes with some secondary amenity benefits, we do recommend planting a larger portion of this open space with appropriate indigenous species to increase its potential biodiversity values.

The LEA 'Assessment of Change in Landscape Character'[4] highlights that the proposal will unavoidably result in a landscape character change when compared to both the existing rural landuse or the anticipated residential use under the OSDP and PSDP.

The LEA states that the existing shelterbelt hedges, while 'not particularly interesting' are rural in nature and provide green screening of views into the Site whereas, the proposal will replace this with a large-scale building surrounded by hardstand carparking and landscaping. This change in character is noted in the LEA as not necessarily resulting in a loss of amenity and elements such as the northwest open space are identified as offering improved amenity.

We agree with the LEA that the expansion of residential development in the immediate vicinity of the area, along with intensification permitted under the EHSAB, will assist in visually integrating the commercial character of the PnS development with the surrounding residential landscape character.

Overall, while it is noted the proposal will result in landscape character change, we highlight that the Site will retain a different type of amenity than expected under the Proposed District Plan zoning. Clearly there are differences between the two differing landuses, where a more diverse range of built forms (dwellings) would provide more effective active streetscape interfaces both externally and internally on the Site. The large setbacks of the proposed supermarket building together with expansive parking areas will always be challenging to fit sympathetically into even a medium density residential setting.

The applicant has indicated[5] that operational requirements make the proposed Site layout the optimal configuration and while the proposed landscaping goes a long way to help visually screen and integrate the development, we do provide some specific recommendations to future improve this as part of the proposed conditions of consent.

Appropriateness of Design

The LEA discussion about 'Appropriateness of Landscape Design'[6] reviews the proposed landscape treatments around the Site boundaries and how they 'mitigate the effects of the character coherence, amenity and outlook of the locale'

Generally, we are supportive of the points made in this Section of the LEA however, note several areas where improvements could be achieved through minor design modifications.

The Levi Road frontage provides an acceptable level of visual screening with layered levels of planting on the boundary and specimen trees within the parking areas.

We would support extending the low planting to building edge, as shown on the western side of the Click and Carry canopy to help ground the building for pedestrians entering the site from the northern most access off Levi Road.

The landscape strip along Lincoln-Rolleston Road is noted as having a more informal aesthetic and providing a high level of amenity while maintaining open views to the PnS

[4] See page 25 of the LEA report.

[5] RFI response dated 25/02/22 matter number 54.

[6] See page 26 of the LEA report.

development. While the Applicant obviously wishes to maintain a commercial road presence this, in our view, runs contrary to reducing the visual impact of the development for existing and future residents and those travelling along the road.

Based on the descriptions and visualisations in the LEA and GA[7] document, views into the Site from east of the main pedestrian entry will be comparatively open and permeable compared to the other boundary treatments of the proposal. Our recommendation is to add additional large growing exotic specimen trees evenly along the Lincoln-Rolleston Road frontage at 10 -15m spacings. This will introduce larger scale trees that will better assist to visually soften the parking area and reduce the visual prominence of the proposed built form and reinforce the future formal avenue sought by Council in the Rolleston Structure plan.

As noted previously, the northwest open space area is expected to provide a level of amenity value however, offer little practical community recreation use, so reduction of the mown grass area in favour of additional native planting compatible with the stormwater soak pit function to provide improved biodiversity values is encouraged.

The LEA concludes with a comparison to the minimum landscape requirements under the business zone rules. While we agree the PnS landscape proposal exceeds the minimum requirements for this zone, the residential context in this scenario requires, in our view, additional care to minimise adverse potential effects on existing and future neighbours.

We agree that the proposal generally provides a high-quality pedestrian experience however, we do recommend minimum soil volumes are required for trees and climbers set within hardstand areas. Long term, the survival and heath of the trees will, in a large part, drive the success of the mitigation of visual and character effects of the proposal and pedestrian comfort as people move through the site. Access to sufficient soil is a fundamental factor determining early tree decline and failure vs. healthy long-term growth and failure to provide for this can result in poor landscape outcomes as commonly observed in large format commercial parking areas throughout the region.

Secondary benefits include opportunities for integration of stormwater treatment within the soil volumes of the trees, reduction of urban heat island effect through improved summer shading, and improved air quality and carbon sequestration for the project. Recommendations for conditions of consent to address minimum soil volumes are included in Section 9 of this report.

The effects of lighting on landscape and visual character is not well addressed in the LEA. We accordingly recommend some conditions of consent are required to assist in mitigating potential adverse effects lighting on viewers from adjacent existing and future residential properties.

The summary of landscape effects concludes with the assessment that the landscape character of effects of the proposed PnS development as being ***low to moderate***. We would generally agree with this provided the recommended conditions of consent measures are adopted to the help ensure the landscape design intent is achieved and provides long term mitigation for the development.

[7] See page 19 of the RMM Graphic Attachment.

8.0 Assessment of Visibility and Visual values.

The LEA does not provide specific assessment from nominated representative viewpoints instead providing general commentary and assessment for each key viewing area. We generally agree with the assessment ratings provided but have provided some commentary on details of the assessment considerations under the headings below.

The LEA correctly notes that the PnS proposal will be visible to people living immediately adjacent to the Site and those travelling along the adjoining road corridors. We agree that the future redevelopment of the lifestyle residences to the west of the Site will likely result in a higher level of effect for views from these properties as existing vegetation and shelterbelts are removed.

Visual effects of Surrounding Roads

Levi Rd

The LEA provides a very detailed description of the existing visibility and visual values for the Levi Rd frontage however only provides a very brief analysis of the differences between the proposed PnS development and the development likely under the underlying Living Z zoning.

The 8m proposed pylon sign does represent a locally dominant element on the road frontage and while proposed adjacent trees at maturity will potentially achieve a similar height, we agree with Selwyn District Council's Urban Designer's recommendations that this should reduce to 6m with appropriate lighting controls to reduce the visual prominence of this commercial element within the residential context.

Overall, given the relatively narrow expanse of the parking area along this frontage, the layered planting strategy that will serve to reduce the visibility of the built form, and a reduced pylon sign height, we would agree with the LEA that the visual effects will be in the ***low to moderate*** range from the Levi Road corridor.

Lincoln Rolleston Road

We generally agree with the analysis of likely viewing audiences from this road corridor and that the building will be most visible to those travelling southeast given the viewing geometry of the of the proposed PnS building. This will be offset by the foreground planting in the northwest open space and rows of specimen trees within the northern part of the hardstand parking area.

Southeast of the proposed pedestrian arbour, the relatively sparse planting both within the parking area and lower narrower forms of the proposed trees in the boundary planting will allow clearer views to the main building.

To help mitigate the more highly visible expanse of parking area and the mass of the built form, we have recommended that additional specimen trees are incorporated within both the parking area and in a row along the Lincoln-Rolleston Road frontage. This will significantly increase the visual screening and softening of the PnS built form and assist to reinforce a future avenue style planting for the road corridor. With careful placement, this will still allow views to key building mounted signage.

Based on the same rationale as to the Levi Road pylon sign comments, we also recommend reducing the pylon sign height to lower the visual prominence of this overtly commercial element within the residential landscape context.

With these modifications we would support the LEA assessment of a ***low to moderate*** visual effects rating from this viewing corridor.

Lowes Road and Masefield Drive Roundabout

We support the LEA assessment that having the treed northwest open space as the interface with the intersection will result in a ***low and possibly positive*** effect when compared against a compliant residential development on the Site.

Visual Effects on Foreseeable Neighbouring Properties

Levi Road Properties

We generally agree with the assessment of visual effects for viewers from the existing residential properties to the west of Levi Road as ***low to moderate*** however, would weight the effects more towards the ***moderate*** rating due to the relative proximity to the main building, particularly during the initial establishment phase of the proposed planting. Effects would reduce in time as the planting matures.

The LEA does not specifically consider nocturnal visual effects, especially concerning signage and building lighting which could result in nuisance light effects on views from neighbouring properties. We have recommended conditions to help mitigate these potential adverse effects.

Lincoln Rolleston Road Properties

We generally agree with the LEA on the likely visibility of the development from existing and future anticipated residential properties opposite the Site on the Lincoln-Rolleston Road. The LEA correctly highlights that properties viewing the proposed building across the southern half of the Site will have the highest potential visual effects. If the applicant implements our recommendations for existing specimen trees in the parking area and along the roadside boundary as well as the reduced pylon sign height and lighting controls, we are would assess the visual effects of the development as ***low to moderate.***

Rural Property to the East

We support the visibility analysis within the LEA considering both the existing rural residence and the future potential residential development should PC71 be approved. The assessed effects rating of ***low*** is in our view appropriate, once the proposed buffer planting is mature however the estimated 10year establishment timeframe before trees reach sufficient height to screen the bulk of the proposed PnS building would likely push this towards a **low to moderate rating**. To help mitigate this we have made recommendations to add additional quick growing trees along the western side of the buffer planting stepping down to lower growing shrubs and small trees towards the east to reduce potential adverse shadowing effects.

Assessment of Construction Effects

We agree with recommendations for phasing and an extended maintenance period to help ensure the landscape successfully established and provides the mitigation outcomes targeted.

9.0 Mitigation and Enhancement

Should consent be granted, we recommended the following conditions are included in addition to that proposed in the LEA:

Soil Volume Considerations

We support the applicants proposed Landscape Plan however, to ensure trees reach their potential mature heights and lifespans adequate soil volumes are essential. This is particularly important for specimen trees set within tree pits within extensive areas of impermeable hard surfacing. To give the project as much chance as possible at realising the full potential of the landscape design we recommend the Applicant adopt the following minimum soil volumes guidelines to carry forward into the detailed design of the project:

Recommended conditions:

- For trees in confined locations provide a minimum[8] of:
    - Small Tree: 5-15 cubic meters
    - Medium Tree: 20-40 cubic meters
    - Large Tree: 50 cubic meters
- For the climbers proposed on the pedestrian arbour increase the available soil volume to 3 cubic.metres per plant to support canopy growth over the arbour structure and indicated in the GA details[9]

Exterior Lighting

The lighting on parking areas and up-lighting on façade and signage elements may have potential adverse effects to existing and future adjacent residential dwellings, in terms of glare and light-spill. To help mitigate this we recommend the applicant consider the following design criteria when completing the exterior lighting design.

Recommended conditions:

- Exterior area lighting be completed using dark sky compliant fixtures to reduce light spill and potential obtrusive light glare to neighbouring dwellings. Use of asymmetrical LED lighting recommended (as used in Foster Park). Consider after-hours dimming.
- Use “warm-white” or filtered LEDs (CCT ≤ 3000 K; S/P ratio ≤ 1.2) to minimize blue light emission which increase glare and can compromise vision, particularly in aging eye[10]s.
- Install dimmers and/or timers to reduce reflective glare or turn off signage lighting after business hours.
- To reduce the risk of nuisance light effects on adjacent dwellings we recommend that the future lighting design complies with luminance levels set in AS/NZS4282:2019 Control of obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting.

[8] https://greenblue.com/gb/how-much-soil-do-urban-trees-need/

[9] See detail 7 and 8 of page 16 of the RMM graphic attachment

[10] https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-citizens/led-guide/

Tree coverage in parking lot

The majority of the parking lot retains an adequate number of street trees however the southeast corner is relatively sparsely treed. As this will be a prominent view for people travelling north bound along the Lincoln Rolleston Road it would be helpful to add some additional trees to provide additional visual screening of the building form and reducing the apparent scale of the parking lot.

Recommended conditions:

- Add approximately 8 -10 specimen trees to the south-east corner of the parking area consistent with the layout established in the western section of the parking lot.
- Incorporate additional specimen trees along the Lincoln-Rolleston boundary and align and space them in a way to support the creation of an avenue effect (a landscape treatment with deciduous tree planting similar to what is proposed along Levi Road is considered an appropriate approach).
- Use species that provide interest (e.g. change colour), vertical form and canopy for shade over pedestrian pathways.

Interface treatment-eastern boundary

Along the eastern boundary there is a tension between achieving effective screening on the proposed built form while preventing negative shading effects on the adjacent property that may be rezoned for residential development under the PC17. We generally agree with the different treatment options depending on future use of adjacent Site; however, 10 years as earliest when effective mitigation occurs is not an appropriate timeframe.

Recommended conditions:

- Explore alternative, faster growing species that provide some screening within a 2-5 year timeframe.
- Add an additional 5-8 fast growing trees that will reach 8-12m at maturity along the western edge of the biodiversity planting strip. This will amplify the bulk of the planting while minimizing the shadowing effects on the adjacent properties.
- Determine height that planting needs to be maintained at to avoid unduly shading for adjacent sites, particularly if zoned residential. Put right plants in right place to avoid having to undertake ongoing pruning/hedging.
- Adjust layout and proposed species mix to place taller species closer to the PnS building. (this could be as part of a condition of consent).
- An alternative configuration could be offsetting the goods access lane on the eastern side from the building by 3m to allow room for a row of fast growing columnar form trees that will reach a mature height of between 8 – 12m to help screen the bulk of the building form. Gaps will be necessary to accommodate access into yard area. This would result in a narrowed 7m wide biodiversity planting strip along the boundary.

Proposed Tree Species

The proposed use of *Fuscospora cliffortiodes* (Mountain beech) in the car parking area and biodiversity planting strip could be problematic as in our experience this has often struggled to handle the dry plains environment and particularly the stresses of urban planting conditions in tree pits within hardstand areas.

- Substitute an alternative species better suited to the Rolleston conditions for the proposed Mountain Beech.

Proposed Pylon Signage

- Reduce height of proposed pylon signage to 6m from the currently proposed 8m.

Northeast Open Space Planting

- Increase areas of indigenous planting for amenity and biodiversity purposes rather than lawn space that will be of limited value for public recreation purposes.

Planting strip north of Click and Carry Canopy

- Extend planting bed to north corner of building to visually soften the building interface in this location.

10.0 Conclusion and Peer Review Recommendations

The structure and methodology of the RMM LEA report has generally followed industry guidelines and best practice.

The LEA report does not specifically address nocturnal lighting effects on landscape and visual amenity which could potentially be a significant nuisance for adjacent residents.

One minor deficiency noted is the effects assessment does not specifically evaluate visibility and associated effects from nominated representative viewpoints and instead provides general assessment from adjacent areas and road corridors. It is acknowledged that given the baseline is an unbuilt residential development anticipated under the existing zoning that this assessment approach is this instance is appropriate.

While we generally support the proposed landscape design, the built form bulk together with extensive parking areas are unavoidably significantly different from the permitted baseline of residential development. We would, on balance, assess the current proposal as having an overall landscape and visual effects as ***low to moderate*** rather than the LEA's rating of ***Low or Low to Moderate.***

We have recommended a number of consent conditions which, should they be adopted, will assist in moving the overall weighting more towards the ***low*** end of the effects scale in the long term (15+ years) provided appropriate mitigation planting is successful established.