Before Hearing Commissioners appointed by Selwyn District Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: application RC195454 for land use consent to establish

and operate a supermarket and café, with associated car parking and landscaping at 581 Birchs Road,

Lincoln

and

in the matter of: Lincoln Developments Limited

Applicant

Summary of evidence of Daniel Kamo on behalf of Lincoln Developments Limited

Dated: 28 July 2020



SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF DANIEL KAMO ON BEHALF OF LINCOLN DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

- My name is Daniel Kamo. I have been a landscape architect with Kamo Marsh Landscape Architects for 16 years. I prepared a statement of evidence for this hearing dated 14 July 2020.
- 2 A brief summary of the key aspects of my evidence is as follows:
- 2.1 The key changes from a landscape perspective are primarily associated with the increase in landscaping amenity across the site and the inclusion of the recreation reserve to the southern edge of the site.
 - a. Carpark design includes an increase in specimen tree, hedging and shrub planting within and adjacent to the car park. The updated proposal includes 32 specimen trees across the site, not including trees within the proposed reserve area. The increased landscaping combines to break up the car park area, provide further screening of the development and helps to reduce the effects on the wider visual amenity of the car park area.

The pedestrian connection has been strengthened through a significantly wider, covered footpath across the car park, connecting Birchs Road to the supermarket entrance and café. This ensures a safer, more considered pedestrian solution.

b. Birchs Road & Makybe Terrace - The amended design includes increased planting width within the landscape buffers on the Birchs and Makybe Terrace frontages which provides a green buffer between 3.2m to 10.0m wide to Birchs Road and 3.0 to 5.0m to Makybe Terrace. The proposed planting consists of low hedging, native shrubs and groundcovers to a height that will mitigate views of parked cars and specimen trees to break up the development beyond.

The updated proposal also introduces hard landscape elements ensuring a strong connection to the neighbouring Flemington development as well as the character of the wider Lincoln township. Through the use of locally sourced stone walling and timber post and rail fencing increased landscape amenity and sense of place is achieved.

c. Reserve at entrance to development - The reserve to the south of Makybe Terrace has more than doubled in size extending out to the Birchs Road and Makybe Terrace intersection. The reserve has been included in the application site and will occur in conjunction with the supermarket development. The reserve provides a park-like entrance to the development with an indicative design showing large open lawn space and footpaths meandering beneath medium to large specimen trees. The footpath provides a safe pedestrian connection from Caulfield Crescent and Birchs Road into the site.

The reserve in the updated proposal provides for a visual and physical buffer and 'blurs' the boundary between the proposed development and its neighbouring residential sites to the south.

The reserve design (refer Figure 4 in my evidence) also includes increasing the proposed reserve area and extending the greenspace out to the Birchs Road frontage. The Reserve is approximately 18 to 25m wide and 100m long and has a total area of 1,984m².

d. Acoustic fencing and planting – The introduction of the solid acoustic style fencing in combination with the selected plant species to the ROW on the eastern side of the loading dock will mitigate views of the building and reduce associated noise. The interface with the boundary to the north has also been considered further. A 2.5m high timber acoustic fence shall run along the northern boundary for the length of the proposed supermarket building. Existing shelter belt planting on the neighbour's boundary also mitigates views into the site and associated noise.

The introduction of the solid fencing in combination with the selected plant species will provide some mitigation from views of loading dock and service lane and reduce associated noise.

- e. The Updated Proposal includes a café, a more centralised and covered pedestrian prioritised entrance path from Birchs Road, vertical green wall panels to the southeast corner of the building and a large greenspace area to the south all of these additions combine to present an attractive, activated and pedestrian friendly design.
- 2.2 I consider the proposed landscaping will ensure that any adverse visual amenity effects of the Proposal are appropriately mitigated.

COUNCIL REPORT

Following the above amendments to the proposal, we received the Councils Urban Design Evidence (prepared by Mr. Nicholson). I have reviewed the evidence prepared by Mr. Nicholson. Below are the key matters relevant to landscape architecture/design.

3.1 Residential neighbours and boundary treatments;

- a. In regard to the eastern and northern boundaries, Mr Nicholson is concerned the acoustic fencing and landscape provision will not sufficiently mitigate the scale of the proposed building and the associated activities.
- b. In my opinion the proposed eastern and east end of the northern boundary treatment will provide mitigation of the service and loading area. This proposed fencing and landscaping will provide an effective visual and noise buffer. Furthermore, the depth of the landscape strip to the western end of the northern boundary varies between 2.0m 6.7m, this provides a buffer between future residential development to the north and the proposed area of car parking. Species will reach up to 1.0 to 1.2m high which is sufficient to provide screening of this northern part of the proposed car park and cars within it.
- c. Mr Nicholson comments the landscape strip to Birchs Road and Makybe Terrace are too narrow at 2.0 4.0m and zero to 3.0 4.0m in width respectively. Mr Nicholson has not considered landscape areas which are outside the site boundary in his assessment. As the applicant would be maintaining all landscaping around the site (including those areas which extend beyond the development's boundaries), I feel it is acceptable to consider the combined width of these areas in this situation which are 3.4 4.5m (to Birchs Rd) and 1.8 7.4m (to Makybe Terrace). The depth of landscape areas to the southside of the building is 3.6m wide as well as vertical green screens to the south corner of the building. Whilst these frames are on the southern corner of the building, I am confident appropriate species of climbers (including Clematis, Lonicera and Trachelospermum) would provide a green coverage to these panels.
- d. Overall, I do not agree with Mr Nicholson's views that the landscape treatment is insufficient to mitigate against the effects of the development from residential neighbours. I consider the acoustic fencing and landscape treatment to the east and eastern end of the north boundary to be sufficient to provide mitigation of views and noise. I consider the depth of landscape gardens and the proposed tree and plant species to be of a suitable selection to mitigate the views of the development from the North, West and South.

3.2 Tree framework;

a. While Mr Nicholson concludes that the proposed trees are too few in number and too small, it is my opinion that the proposed tree planting, which is similar to nearby supermarket developments, would provide mitigation of the visual effects of the car park area. When combined with the increased depths of the landscape beds within and adjacent to the car park and accounting for the proposed Lancewoods species at maturity, there will be an appropriate number of suitably sized trees for the car park area which also ensures vehicle and pedestrian safety.

b. Mr Nicholson has not taken into account the proposed tree plantings within the park-like reserve to the south side of Makybe Terrace in his report. These trees will provide further mitigation of the adverse visual effects of the proposed development.

3.3 Landscaping to the carpark area.

a. Mr Nicholson concludes the proposed landscape treatment within the car park would not be sufficient to mitigate the adverse visual effects of the hard surfaces and recommends limiting the rows of car parks to ten cars or less.

b. In my opinion, a 1.8m wide landscape bed within a car park with planting up to 1.0m in height provides considerable levels of planting and softening of hard surfaces. Car parking rows are already limited to a maximum of ten spaces, with breaks created by the generous planting beds, trolley parks or the dedicated pedestrian access route.

From a landscape design perspective, I consider the proposed changes successfully create an attractive and safe development that sits comfortably within its surroundings. The design provides a solution that addresses the Council's concerns which has considered the visual amenity of the development and the connection between the surrounding residential developments and proposal site.

I am happy to answer any questions the Commissioner may have regarding my evidence.

Dated: 28 July 2020

Daniel Kamo