

SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF TONY MILNE ON BEHALF OF D. J JONES FAMILY TRUST AND N. R SEARELL FAMILY TRUST

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Tony Douglas Milne. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence in Chief.

SCOPE OF SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 2 This summary of evidence sets out the key points within my evidence in chief (**EIC**) and supplementary evidence. I also outline changes made to the application following lodgement of my EIC.
- 3 In my summary of evidence, I address the following matters related to the evidence prepared on behalf of Bannockburn Responsible Development Incorporated (**BRDI**):
- (a) those parts of the BRDI evidence that address matters within scope of my expertise, with particular emphasis on matters where there is a difference of view between myself and the BRDI evidence.
- 4 In my summary of evidence, I also address the recommendations made by Ms Yvonne Pfluger within her supplementary evidence.

APPLICATION AMENDMENTS

- 5 There have been changes made to the Proposed Subdivision Master Plan (**Master Plan**) (attached as **Appendix A** to this summary of evidence), and the Proposed Subdivision Landscape Plan (**Landscape Plan**) (attached as **Appendix B** to this summary of evidence). These amendments include the following:
- (a) A number of changes to the 'walkways' shown on the Master Plan including:

- **removal** of the red walkway connection from lot 50 to lot 40;
- change in colour of the walkway within lot 51 from **red** to **yellow**;
- change to the track key so yellow walkways are described as **“Indicative Proposed Tracks”**; and
- change to track key so red walkways are described as **“Existing informal tracks”**.

(b) Following review of the visual simulations, additional mitigation planting has been added to the Landscape Plan, and is shown on the eastern boundary of Lot 14.

6 I also attach as **Appendix C** to this summary a plan ‘Viewpoint and Proposed Lot Layout Map’ that amalgamates pages 7 and 8 of the Method Visual visual simulation package. For clarity and ease of interpretation of the visual simulations, this plan includes the photo viewpoint locations, the lot layout and the building platforms.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE IN CHIEF

7 The layout of the subdivision has been thoughtfully designed to minimise its visual impact on the surrounding landscape, while maintaining the character of Bannockburn. The careful placement of building platforms within the natural contours of the site ensures that new dwellings will not disrupt the visual integrity of the landscape. Key design controls will be applied to ensure that new residential dwellings blend harmoniously with the surrounding environment. These controls include restrictions on building height, platform location, and materials, aiming to minimise the visual prominence of the development from key public viewpoints, such as the Bannockburn Inlet, Cromwell Basin, and residential areas along Terrace Street.

8 Regarding potential landscape and visual effects of the proposed subdivision my conclusions are summarised below.

Building Line Restriction (BLR)

- 9 The Site includes areas subject to a BLR, established to prevent development from being visible from the Cromwell Basin and to protect views of the Bannockburn Inlet. The lots within the BLR are subject to strict design controls, including limitations on building heights and platform sizes. These measures ensure that new dwellings will overall be visually unobtrusive and aligned with the BLR's purpose of protecting the visual amenity of key public viewpoints.
- 10 Regarding the BLR, compliance is obviously not achieved. Given the recent history of development in Bannockburn which has seen dwellings built along the south eastern side of Terrace Street resulting in built form visible on the ridgeline (albeit outside of the BLR), it is reasonable to conclude that landscape change arising from the proposed development within the BLR is not a 'new' proposition in terms of visibility of built form in this part of Bannockburn. Therefore, while there is no development approved in the BLR, dwellings already present within the immediate setting suggests that there is potential for the landscape to absorb some development beyond the BLR within this location. Additionally, it is important to remember that the CODP entertains future building within the BLR, it is a RDA rather than non-complying.

Effects on Bannockburn's Character

- 11 The subdivision is consistent with the RRA(4) zoning, which allows for low-density residential development while maintaining the area's rural character. The proposed lot sizes and layout are comparable with those of neighbouring properties, ensuring that the new development complements and aligns with the existing settlement pattern. The retention of open space and rural use on the balance lots reinforces the semi-rural atmosphere of the site, helping to preserve Bannockburn's identity as a country village. The creation of the public reserve will provide recreational opportunities for both residents and visitors, while also serving as a visual buffer between the residential development and the surrounding landscape.

Natural Character of the Bannockburn Inlet and Kwarau River

- 12 The proximity of the development to the Bannockburn Inlet and Kwarau River is a critical factor in the assessment of its landscape effects. While the subdivision introduces built form to the escarpment above the Inlet, the dwellings are set back from the escarpment edge to preserve the natural landform. Regarding potential adverse effects on the natural character of the Bannockburn Inlet, the proposed built form within the BLR will result in new built form on the slopes above the Inlet. While located well away from the water body margin this will constitute a modification to the landforms near to the Inlet which contribute to its natural character within the landscape setting. As a result, it is likely that built form on the terraces surrounding the Inlet will result in a reduction in natural character. This is considered to be an adverse effect of a low-moderate degree.

Landscape Effects Summary

- 13 The development envisaged by this subdivision proposal carries and builds upon the existing development along Terrace Street. Therefore, one needs to consider that landscape effects will be in the context of this adjacent, and, in places, recent residential development. Given the recommended design controls and guidelines, it is considered the nature and scale of the proposal will align with and not degrade or erode the overall landscape values and landscape character of the receiving environment. The unique character, sense of place, and heritage values of the Site and surrounding environment are acknowledged and maintained.

Visual Effects Summary

- 14 The effects of the proposal on the existing visual amenity will extend beyond the Site but are relatively contained. The more distant views (**Viewpoints 1 & 2**) will be viewed against a vast and complex landscape, making the proposed development difficult to discern. Views near to the Site from the east, from around the Bannockburn Inlet, Cairnmuir Road and the surrounding rural environment (**Viewpoints 3-8**) are most relevant and potentially most impacted, as demonstrated from the key viewpoints identified. Views from Bannockburn

township to the west of the site (**Viewpoints 9-11**), while also impacted, portray a different character given the existence of residential built form in the context. As a result, I consider that the effects on visual amenity overall are low-moderate and consider this degree of effects to be appropriate in the context.

- 1 Proposed conditions of consent will result in the architecture of future built form utilising recessive colours and materials that reflect the natural tones of the surrounding landscape. Planting plans include the use of endemic native species to provide visual screening and enhance biodiversity. Furthermore, a Landscape Management Plan is now proposed as a design control, and in my opinion, this will assist in ensuring certainty of the effectiveness of proposed mitigation planting. Overall, the subdivision's design reflects a sensitive approach to maintaining the balance between new development and the preservation of Bannockburn's identity.

SUMMARY OF SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE

- 2 The supplementary statement of evidence related to a 25-page document entitled 'Bannockburn Subdivision Visual Simulations' dated 10 February 2025 (**Visual Simulations Package**) which accompanied my supplementary statement of evidence.
- 3 The visual simulations from Viewpoints 3-8 demonstrate the anticipated visual effect, that the depicted proposal will have on the selected photographic views shown in late Spring/early Summer. Within all the visual simulations the proposed buildings and landscape mitigation have been modelled into the views. Other expected landscape elements including post and rail fencing, and low-level planting associated with each dwelling have also been modelled into the views. Following the review of the visual simulations, additional mitigation planting has been added, and shown, on the eastern boundary of Lot 14 (as shown on the Master Plan at **Appendix A**). That is the only change that has taken place following my EIC.

- 4 The height of the mitigation planting in the views has been shown after 10 years of growth. This has been informed by both the observation of the growth rates of planting of the same species on projects we are currently working in in the Central Otago District and following ecological input¹. All other technical details relating to preparation of the photo simulations were detailed in the Methodology Statement contained in the Visual Simulation Package.
- 5 The visual simulations have not caused me to change my original position regarding the level of adverse effects as assessed from each of the selected Viewpoints. In summary, I make the following comments regarding visual simulations:
- (a) Views near to the site from the East, from around the Bannockburn Inlet, Cairnmuir Road and the surrounding rural environment (Viewpoints 3-8) are most relevant and potentially most impacted, as demonstrated from the key viewpoints identified. Having analysed the visual simulations I consider that the effects on visual amenity overall are low-moderate to moderate from these viewpoints.
 - (b) Potential adverse landscape and visual effects have been appropriately mitigated and controlled by a combination of deliberate measures. First, at a subdivision layout scale, the larger lots size and a reduction of overall lots responds to the sensitivity of the landform, the considered location of building platforms to avoid skyline effects and overall design controls all combine to provide an appropriate land development approach. Second, and following this the proposed mitigation planting and building controls are integral to the successful and acceptable 'settling in' of future built form on the Site within the surrounding landscape context, from a landscape and visual amenity perspective. The visual simulations illustrate this.

¹ As per comms with Alexandra based ecologist Simon Beale with whom we are working on other projects within the area.

- (c) The establishment of the mitigation planting on Site is an important component in the realisation of landscape outcomes for the Site, and I am confident the Landscape Management Plan will achieve this.
- (d) When one considers the context of these views (i.e. what else is seen in the views along with the viewer themselves and the activity they are engaged in), then I consider the degree of adverse effects as described above to be appropriate within the receiving environment.

RESPONSE TO BRDI EVIDENCE

- 6 I have read the Evidence of Mr James Dicey, Ms Anne Steven (including supplementary evidence) and Mr Werner Murray on behalf of BRDI.
- 7 In this section I address those parts of the BRDI evidence that address matters (landscape and visual) within scope of my expertise. I note Mr Murray leans heavily on heritage matters and heritage landscape, and while I respond within my scope, I rely on the expertise of Mr Sole on these matters. The approach I have adopted in this response section is to identify those parts of the BRDI evidence where I disagree, and to explain my reasons for disagreement.

Evidence of Mr James Dicey

- 8 In regard to Mr Dicey's chief concerns outlined at [18] in his evidence, I am of the opinion these have been adequately addressed within the application, my EIC and supplementary evidence. In a nutshell, the proposed development follows the pattern of the adjacent existing development. Physically and visually the proposal will be seen as an extension of the existing development pattern of Bannockburn. The development is not unanticipated by the district plan – it is a residential subdivision in a residential zone. In the context of potential future development around Bannockburn, the proposal is located appropriately and sympathetically in parallel with the existing development in the receiving environment.
- 9 In regard to [18] (f) the mitigation of foreseen lighting impacts has been covered in my EIC [46] – [49]. Development control measures have been put forward to

minimise night-sky intrusion *and* mitigate any potential lighting effects, with the inclusion of these provisions affecting the proposed lots within the BLR and all street lighting within the development. These are captured in the conditions of consent (*Refer proposed Conditions 6 m) and 7 h*).

Evidence and Supplementary Evidence of Ms Anne Steven

- 10 I have not read anything in Ms Steven's EIC or her Supplementary Evidence that causes me to resile from my opinion formed regarding landscape and visual effects arising from the proposal. However, I would like to make the following comments.

Evidence in Chief

- 11 At [48] in her EIC Ms Steven discusses Bannockburn as a gateway landscape. I disagree. The concept of a gateway landscape is somewhat conflated here. The CODP does not describe Bannockburn as a gateway landscape. I agree you can pass through Bannockburn to access the backcountry, but the features Ms. Stevens refers to fall within the wider receiving environment and the experience of them is not impacted by this proposal. Furthermore, the CODP anticipates change within Bannockburn, including on the Site which has a residential zone; therefore, the experience driving through Bannockburn will continue to change over time too.
- 12 At [53] of her EIC Ms Steven discusses the setting of the Bannockburn Inlet. I do not entirely disagree with her comments. In some views of the Site the generally east-facing parts of the Site form the immediate backdrop to the Bannockburn Inlet, and this is most obvious in **Viewpoints 4–7**. A panoramic view from the Inlet reveals a landscape of mixed character, which in combination confers character to the Inlet and its margins. With regard to the extent of the Inlet margin I take guidance from TTatM (Part 9.2) which states that *"margins are likely to be areas beyond the wave action of a lake or extending away from the banks of a river for, depending on topography and other factors, at least 20–50 metres and sometimes more"*. Furthermore *"margins should be determined with reference to*

the attributes and context of the lakes and rivers themselves" ... and ... " The extent is likely to be influenced by the size of the feature." Finally, "...margins are also likely to be influenced by topography (for instance, the sides of a gorge) and land use (for instance, the boundary between cultivation and natural riparian vegetation)."

- 13 Therefore, in regard to the Bannockburn Inlet, it is considered due to its edge profile (which in parts is a gravel beach) coupled with the trees that currently grow around its edge, the margin is well contained to its waters edge. While the Sites eastern facing slopes provide a physical and visual backdrop to this, in my opinion they are not within the Inlets margin, rather the overall landscape setting.
- 14 It is my opinion the generally east facing slopes of the Site are not within the margin of the Inlet. Rather they form a recognisable part of the wider landscape setting, that in places is modified through built form and land use practices. I agree that in select 'closer' views (**Viewpoints 6 and 7**) for example, the Site is seen in 'isolation and adjacent' to the Inlet. This should not to be misconstrued as being within the Inlet margin. For the most part the predominant views are of the wider landscape setting within which the eastern slopes of the Site are seen away from the Inlet margin.
- 15 I agree the current open rural space character within the BLR will change, however given the RDA status for any development within the BLR, the CODP does not preclude this character from changing. I therefore do not agree with Ms Steven's assertion at [133] that open rural space is meant to remain.
- 16 Regarding Shepherds Creek and its margins, exotic trees, weed species and pasture mark the course of the creek within the valley that the eastern slopes of the Site drain too. Within this locale, there are currently houses within the upper slopes of this stretch of the Shepherds Creek catchment.
- 17 The proposal will result in additional dwellings at similar distances away from the creek. I agree with Ms Steven at [135] where she states the buildings would reduce the natural character of the valley. However, I am of the opinion the level of

adverse effect would only be low, when the positive effects of the biodiversity gains through new indigenous vegetation planting is also considered.

- 18 At [14 – 128] Ms Steven discusses the proposed design controls. Ms Stevens makes considered recommendations in regard to suitable plant species. These can be added to the current proposed plant species and their addition would provide a richer vegetated outcome for the Site.

Supplementary Evidence

- 19 Ms Stevens supplementary evidence focuses on the visual simulations. For the purposes of providing clarity for the Commissioners I respond accordingly. Further, the role of a visual simulation is understood to be the accurate depiction of a proposal in accordance with the proposed conditions of consent, as opposed to the depiction of hypothetical breaches of those proposed conditions.

- 20 In response to Ms Stevens comments at [4] I make the following comments:

- (a) The range of external materials and colours specified in the application has been randomly applied the buildings as a whole, as opposed to being randomly applied to individual walls or building components. This style of residential building depiction has been informed by numerous reference images (both photographs and architectural illustrations) of modern Central Otago residences that feature a single external cladding material.
- (b) The common requirement in urban design and planning scenarios for buildings to feature variation of both cladding material and façade alignment is taken to indicate that these are generally considered to be desirable qualities in a building. In the absence of any such requirements among the proposed conditions of consent for the current application, the depicted simplicity of building form and homogeneity of each building's external cladding is considered to be an appropriate representation for the purpose of assessing the potential visual impact of the proposal.

- (c) The tone and colour of depicted external glazing is based on the appearance of glazing on nearby existing residential dwellings visible in the photographs. If light-coloured curtains or blinds immediately behind the visible windows happen to remain drawn during the daylight hours depicted in the visual simulations, I agree that those windows would likely appear as a lighter colour.
- (d) The visual simulations are intended to depict hypothetical building forms as would be permissible under the proposed conditions of consent, to assist in determining the maximum potential visual effect of the proposed subdivision. That is not to say bespoke, detailed architectural design for each proposed lot will not happen. Architectural design that reflects historic heritage or local context is not among the specified requirements of the proposal, and any such qualities are considered unlikely to result in a more significant visual impact than the indicative building forms depicted.

21 At [6] Ms Steven comments on foliage colour. The foliage of *Liquidambar styraciflua* 'Worplesdon' trees depicted in the visual simulations has been intentionally shown on the cusp of its transition from green spring foliage (likely be present at the date of photography) to the red autumn colour that the species is commonly known for. This has been done to assist identification of this tree species within the image, and to avoid any potential under-representation of the domesticated appearance that regular placement of these street trees may give to the proposal site during autumn, due to the time of year that the visual simulations otherwise depict. *Liriodendron tulipifera* 'Fastigiata' foliage is shown in green as per its common depiction by tree propagators and suppliers, and as it would likely appear at the time of year depicted by the visual simulations.

22 In response to Ms Stevens comments at [7/8] the Lot 30 planting depicted in the visual simulation imagery is modelled as per item 10 of the Proposal Modelling Methodology provided on Sheet 2 of the visual simulation document. The landscape plan has informed both the placement of, and the vegetation species

used in the simulations. Therefore, with the exception of some low shrub species around each dwelling, no additional planting is depicted in the visual simulations.

- 23 The mitigation planting areas have been populated with the three species in the Mitigation Plant List referred to above, in approximately equal quantities at 1.5m centres. These planting areas appear as relatively homogenous green masses due to the *Kunzea serotina* and *Leptospermum scoparium* species being very similar in appearance at the viewing distances shown, and the coprosma species being sufficiently smaller than the other two species that it is likely to be largely obscured by them at the age of planting shown. The homogenous appearance of the proposed mitigation planting areas is considered consistent with the observed appearance of stands of young kanuka, which these planting areas are anticipated to appear as.
- 24 In response to Ms Stevens comments at [10/13] regarding depicted height of planting in the visual simulations, as previously stated in my supplementary evidence height has been chosen following local observation/experience and ecological advice. The advice received is that the mitigation planting height shown can be expected to be achieved at Bannockburn provided that they are irrigated for at least three years following planting. The size of mitigation planting depicted in the visual simulations is randomised from -10% to +10% of the specified size. This results in a size variance for each species of approximately 20%.
- 25 In response to [12] the extension of mitigation planting to the north east corner of lot 14 is shown in the visual simulations, and is most visible from viewpoint 4. The size and species variation of the mitigation planting is particularly evident in this planting area due to its relatively narrow width, permitting views above the smaller species to the building beyond. Elsewhere the relative thickness/depth of mitigation planting areas results in a more uniform appearance due to the visual layering of multiple plants of varying sizes.
- 26 In response to [14] the '*actual fixed human view*' is not a term used by Method Visual in the visual simulation documentation. The A3 RD 500 images are stated in the Visual Simulation Viewing Instructions to depict a central portion of the

human primary field of view described in NZILA BPG 10.2. These cropped images are provided as a practical method for viewing the focal portion of the panoramic visual simulations in a readily printed and easily handled format, and the accompanying note is to remind the viewer of how they should be interpreted. The executive summary of NZILA BPG 10.2 states the following in regard to visual simulations, and the visual simulations produced by Method Visual have been prepared on this basis:

- *Visual simulations are not “real life views” – they are, however, very useful tools to assist in the assessment and decision making processes whereby better informed and more transparent judgments on appearance and effects can be made.*
- *Visual simulations illustrate a two dimensional view of a proposed activity from a particular viewpoint as depicted in a photograph – not as it would appear as a three dimensional image as seen in the field with the human eye.*

27 In response to [15] the accurate depiction of a proposal in a visual simulation requires that the proposal appears at the correct position in the photograph's depth of field, which is achieved through a combination of accurate scaling and occlusion by intervening foreground elements. If the depiction of the proposal was not masked by intervening vegetation it would appear to float in front of that vegetation in an unnatural manner that hinders interpretation of the proposal's correct location. Alternatively, if all visually intervening vegetation was digitally removed from the photographs, to depict its hypothetical removal and avoid said 'floating' effect, accurate interpretation of the nature and magnitude of proposed change to the landscape would be hindered by the resulting additional differences between proposed and existing views. The same applies to any seasonal alteration of the appearance of intervening trees between the existing and proposed images. Thus, the approach taken to compositing the 3D-modelled proposal into the existing photographs is considered to be best-practice.

28 Following consideration of Ms Stevens further assessment of potential visual effects, I do not agree with her and my view remains unchanged.

Evidence of Mr Werner Murray

29 The Evidence of Mr Murray discusses the cultural landscape of the setting. As Mr Murray describes, he initially approached and engaged RMM to work alongside himself and Mr Sole in preparing an overall masterplan/landscape strategy for the entire landholding, including the Site of this application. I have been aware of the Bannockburn Cultural Landscape Study (**BCLS**) since at least 2017, and it is referred to in the Landscape Strategy prepared in 2017 by RMM. The Landscape Strategy 2017 addressed an area of land including Lot 4 (the land included in the current Proposal) and Slaughteryard Hill. The Study, along with the advice of Mr Sole, has informed the work we have undertaken on this project since. Further to that Mr Sole describes this in detail within his EIC and in his summary of evidence.

30 The BCLS influenced the Landscape Strategy prepared in 2017 by way of identifying culturally sensitive elements and areas of the site and proposing management of these by avoiding development within these areas, the introduction of educational and recreational opportunities and locating future development in a way that respected the underlying cultural landscape values. A land systems approach was adopted with a series of strategies, including a heritage strategy mapped.

31 Following the development of an overall vision, objectives and strategy development scenarios were prepared with Mr Murray for the overall site. One of the recommendations arising from this work at the time was for greater intensity of building within the BLR Area than currently being proposed. Interestingly, at the time 28 lots were proposed within the area of the current Proposal with 16 lots located within the BLR.

32 At [7] Mr Murray makes comments regarding the importance of the visibility of the historic water race that is shown to remain in Lot 30 and that it will be *'completely planted over by screen planting and will not be visible in the*

landscape’. I defer to Mr Soles expertise in this matter and note he has extensively commented on matters of visibility and interpretation of the historic features in the landscape at [29 and specifically 29.2] of his EIC and addressed Mr Murrays comments in his summary of evidence. Further to that I am confident that the proposed conditions of consent and advice notes will result in an appropriate approach to the detailed layout of the proposed mitigation planting and the water race alignment.

RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF YVONNE PFLUGER

- 33 I have read the Supplementary Evidence of Ms Yvonne Pfluger and note that following her assessment of the visual simulations Ms Pfluger generally agrees with my assessment of effects and the conclusions I have drawn regarding landscape and visual effects.
- 34 Further to that I have considered the further recommendations regarding overall building height and additional planting Ms Pfluger has made and would endorse those as making the proposal stronger. Therefore, it is my further recommendation that these be adopted as further conditions of consent.

CONCLUSION

- 35 The proposed 20-lot subdivision has been carefully designed to minimise its impact on Bannockburn’s landscape and visual amenity. The layout, combined with strict design controls and comprehensive mitigation measures, ensures that the development will have *low to very low* long-term visual effects. The subdivision complies with the zoning requirements and landscape provisions of the CODP and aligns with the objectives of PC19. By retaining open space, enhancing public access, and integrating archaeological and recreational features, the proposal delivers positive outcomes for both the landscape and the Bannockburn community. The subdivision is considered appropriate for the Site and will have no more than minor adverse effects on the landscape character and values of Bannockburn.

36 Thank you for the opportunity to present my evidence and I am happy to answer any questions.

Tony Milne

28 February 2025

ASPHALT PATH
NZCT G 1/2 GRAVEL PATH
INDICATIVE PROPOSED TRACK
EXISTING INFORMAL TRACK

Digital map data sourced from Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> It is made available in good faith but its accuracy or completeness is not guaranteed. Landpro accepts no responsibility for incomplete or inaccurate information. If the information is relied on in support of a resource consent it should be verified independently.

ISSUED FOR HEARING SUMMARY EVIDENCE 21.02.2025

LANDPRO.

OFFICES IN CROMWELL, GORE, AND NEW PLYMOUTH - www.landpro.co.nz

Client
JONES SEARELL FAMILY TRUST

NOTES

- All dimensions shown are in metres unless otherwise shown
- Copyright on this drawing is reserved
- Check any electronic data against the hardcopy plan to ensure it is the latest version
- If this plan is being used as part of sale and purchase agreement then it is done so on the basis that it is preliminary only, final dimensions and areas may vary on final survey

OVERVIEW: LOTS 1 - 20, 30, 40, 50, 51, 100 & 101
BEING PROPOSED SUBDIVISION OF LOT 4 DP 339137
TERRACE STREET, BANNOCKBURN

Rev.	Date	Revision Details	By	Surveyed	Signed	Date	Job No.	Drawing No.
A	16.11.22	ADD BLR	RAF	DRONE		SEP 16	S15303	RC2_01
B	11.04.23	LOT 200 SPLIT INTO LOTS 30, 40 & 51	RAF					
C	25.08.23	ISSUE FOR CONSENT APPLICATION	RAF	Drawn	Signed	Date	Scale 1:1,250 @ A1	
D	21.02.25	ISSUE FOR HEARING SUMMARY EVIDENCE	RAF	RAF		19.07.22	1:2500 @ A3	
				Designed	Signed	Date	Datum & Level	Rev.
				RAF		12.07.22	NZTM 2000 & MSL	D

APPENDIX B - PROPOSED SUBDIVISION LANDSCAPE PLAN



Legend	
	Overall Property Boundary
	Building Line Restriction
	Residential Lot
	Building Platform
	Road Reserve
	Private Reserve
	Balance Lot
	Easement
	Road
	Indicative proposed walkways
	Existing informal walkways
	Car Parking
	Proposed Mitigation Planting
	Street Trees Type 1
	Street Trees Type 2
	Potential Soakpit and Secondary/ Tertiary Over Land Flow Path Locations

Scale: 1:2,500 @ A3



LEGEND

- LAND PARCEL BOUNDARY (LDS)
- SITE BOUNDARY
- PROPOSED LOT BOUNDARY
- PROPOSED BUILDING PLATFORM
- VIEWPOINT

PROPOSED SUBDIVISION LAYOUT
AS PER RECEIVED DRAWINGS BY
LANDPRO

0 100 200 m
SCALE 1:5000 @ A3