BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF	The Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA** or **the Act**)
AND	
IN THE MATTER OF	Of the Central Otago Operative District Plan (**CODP**) and Proposed Plan Change 19 to the Central Otago District Plan (**PC19**)
AND	
IN THE MATTER OF	Applications to the Central Otago District Council (**CODC**) by **D. J Jones Family Trust and N.R Searell Family Trust** for subdivision and land use resource consents for residential subdivision and development at 88 Terrace Street, Bannockburn (**RC230398**)

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

Dated: 10 February 2025

Presented for filing by:
Chris Fowler
Saunders & Co
PO Box 18, Christchurch
Telephone: 021 311 784
Email: chris.fowler@saunders.co.nz

INTRODUCTION

1 My full name, credentials and experience are as detailed in my primary Statement of Evidence dated 27 September 2024. I reiterate the Code of Conduct paragraphs 4 and 5 of my primary Statement of Evidence dated 27 September 2024.

2 This Supplementary Statement of Evidence relates to a 25-page document entitled 'Bannockburn Subdivision Visual Simulations' dated 10 February 2025 (**Visual Simulations Package**) which accompanies this Supplementary Statement of Evidence. This supplementary statement of evidence should also be read in conjunction with Appendix A to my primary Statement of Evidence.

3 Following the direction given (Minute 4 dated 15 October 2024) issued by the hearing commissioners, I instructed Jeremy London (Method Visual) to prepare visual simulations for Viewpoints 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Jeremy London is a landscape architect with a bachelor's degree of Landscape Architecture from Lincoln University, with over 17 years' experience. Jeremy London was a former employee of RMM before he established his own company Method Visual specialising in rendering and visual simulations, as well as landscape architecture.

4 In regard to the chosen Viewpoints, I instructed Jeremy that the visual simulations were to be from the same positions (or as close as physically possible) as shown in the Graphic Attachment to my primary Statement of Evidence dated 27 September 2024.

5 The visual simulations 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. That is the only change that has taken place following my primary Statement of Evidence.

6 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 input[1].

7 The technical details relating to preparation of the photo simulations are detailed in the Methodology Statement on pages 2 - 6, including the location of the photo control points for each simulation, of the Visual Simulations Package. I have overseen the preparation of the Visual Simulations Package. I confirm that the methodology as described in the Visual Simulations Package is correct and appropriate to the circumstances.

Summary description of the contents of specific pages of the Visual Simulation Package

8 I provide a summary description of the contents of specific pages of the Visual Simulation Package as detailed below.

9 Page 7: Identifies **Viewpoints 3 - 8**, being the locations from which the visual simulations have been taken and prepared.

10 Page 8: Shows the **Subdivision Master Plan** to assist in the interpretation of the visual simulations.

11 Page 9: The two images on this page are 124° x 55° panoramic photographs that represent the primary field of view. The top image on page 9 is the existing view from **Viewpoint 3**, whereas the bottom image is the visual simulation of the proposal as seen from this viewpoint. The proposed buildings and landscape redevelopment have been modelled into this view. In this view future built form on Lots 15 - 17 can be seen, as can a small part of a future dwelling on Lot 18. These sit below and to the right of existing dwellings that can also be seen. It is possible a small part of a dwelling on Lot 14 can be seen in this view, as will the roof line of a future dwelling on Lot 5 until mitigation planting takes effect. The open space reserve (Lot 40) is visually obvious in front of these Lots. Native mitigation planting within the Lots, including Lot 30

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

can also be seen. Below these two images is written technical information regarding the photo taking methodology and viewing instructions. When viewed at the specified print/display size and reading distance, each panorama closely approximates the field of view that would be experienced by a person standing in the same location and at the same time that the original photograph was taken.

12 Page 10: The image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 3**. This shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the existing view, that when viewed as per the instructions on this page, closely approximates the centre portion of the view that would be experienced by a person standing in the same location and at the same time that the original photograph was taken.

13 Page 11: Following [12] above the image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 3** and shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the simulated view. It is important to note that this image, when viewed without the surrounding context of the photography location, may appear to place greater emphasis on the visual impact of the depicted proposal than one would experience on site, due to being cropped and focused on the proposal site.

14 Having reviewed the visual simulation for **Viewpoint 3**, my opinion regarding potential adverse effects on visual amenity from this viewpoint remains unchanged. That is, the magnitude of change as experienced from **Viewpoint 3** is considered to be low due to the small scale of the proposal in the scene. Further, in the context of the existing visible development, the proposed design controls and mitigation planting, the proposal will not contrast significantly with the existing scene and will appear as an extension to existing visible built development. As a result, I consider that adverse effects on visual amenity as experienced from this viewpoint will be low-moderate. This change will result in a small reduction in rural amenity and scenic quality due to the temporary effects of earthworks and the increase in built form on Water Race Hill. It will also contribute to a minor loss in the visual simplicity of the site as perceived from this location. However, there is a visual complexity within the mid ground of this view within which the proposal fits.

15 Page 12: The top image on page 12 is the existing view from **Viewpoint 4**, whereas the bottom image is the visual simulation of the proposal as seen from this viewpoint. As per [11] above the proposed buildings and landscape redevelopment have been modelled into this view. In this view future built form on Lots 15 - 17 can be seen. These sit below and to the front of existing dwellings that can also be seen. A small part of future dwellings on Lots 13 and 14 can be seen in this view, along with a dwelling on Lot 9, and the corner of a dwelling on Lot 8. Both Lot 8 and 9 are not within the Building Line Restriction (**BLR**). To the right of this in this view, the built form of Bannockburn township can be seen. The roof line of a future dwelling on Lot 5 will be seen until mitigation planting takes effect. The open space reserve (Lot 40) is visually obvious in front of these Lots. Native mitigation planting within the Lots, including Lot 30 can also be seen in this view. The technical information and viewing methodology are the same as previously described in [11] above.

16 Page 13: The image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 4**. This shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the existing view, that when viewed as per the instructions on this page, closely approximates the centre portion of the view that would be experienced by a person standing in the same location and at the same time that the original photograph was taken.

17 Page 14: Following [12] above the image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 4** and shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the simulated view. As per [12]) above it is important to note that this image, when viewed without the surrounding context of the photography location, may appear to place greater emphasis on the visual impact of the depicted proposal than one would experience on site, due to being cropped and focused on the proposal site.

18 Having reviewed the visual simulation for **Viewpoint 4**, my opinion regarding potential adverse effects on visual amenity from this viewpoint remains unchanged. That is, the magnitude of change as experienced from this viewpoint is considered to be low due to the complexity of the view and small proportion of the development which will be visible. In the context of the existing visible development, along with the proposed design controls and

mitigation planting, the proposal will not contrast significantly with the existing scene. This change will result in a small reduction in rural amenity and scenic quality due to the temporary effects from earthworks and the increase in built form on Water Race Hill. As a result, I consider that adverse effects on visual amenity as experienced from this viewpoint will be low-moderate. In regard to the parts of the dwellings on Lots 8 and 9 can potentially be seen in this view, this is not unexpected given the underlying zoning.

19 Page 15: The top image on page 15 is the existing view from **Viewpoint 5**, whereas the bottom image is the visual simulation of the proposal as seen from this viewpoint. As per [11] above the proposed buildings and landscape redevelopment have been modelled into this view. In this view only parts of a future dwelling on Lot 15 can be seen. A sliver of the roof line of a future dwelling on Lot 5 will be seen until mitigation planting takes effect. The open space reserve (Lot 40) is to the immediate right of Lot 15 in this view. Native mitigation and enhancement planting within the Lots 4, 5, 14, 15 and 30 can also be seen in this view, along with street trees. The technical information and viewing methodology is the same as previously described in [11] above.

20 Page 16: The image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 5**. This shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the existing view, that when viewed as per the instructions on this page, closely approximates the centre portion of the view that would be experienced by a person standing in the same location and at the same time that the original photograph was taken.

21 Page 17: Following [12] above the image on this page is also from Viewpoint 5 and shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the simulated view. As per [12] above it is important to note that this image, when viewed without the surrounding context of the photography location, may appear to place greater emphasis on the visual impact of the depicted proposal than one would experience on site, due to being cropped and focused on the proposal site.

22 Having reviewed the visual simulation for **Viewpoint 5**, my opinion regarding potential adverse effects on visual amenity from this viewpoint remains unchanged. That is, the magnitude of change for this view given the scale of

the proposal in the overall scene and the scale and colour of the built form (as guided by the design controls) is anticipated to be low. However, from this viewpoint, this is the only built form visible and therefore a new element in the view. This change will constitute a minor loss of the key values for this scene, being rural amenity, the ruggedness of the topography, and the sense of containment due to the temporary effects of earthworks and the introduction of built form on an elevated and currently open hillside. As a result, I consider that adverse effects on visual amenity as experienced from this viewpoint will be low-moderate.

23 Page 18: The two images on this page are 124° x 55° panoramic photographs that represent the primary field of view. The top image on page 18 is the existing view from **Viewpoint 6**, whereas the bottom image is the visual simulation of the proposal as seen from this viewpoint. As per [11] above the proposed buildings and landscape redevelopment have been modelled into this view. In this short-range view future dwellings on Lots 15 – 17 can be seen. Native mitigation planting within these Lots, as well as Lots 4, 5, and 30 can also be seen. Future street trees can be seen as well. The technical information and viewing methodology are the same as previously described in [11] above.

24 Page 19: The image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 6**. This shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the existing view, that when viewed as per the instructions on this page, closely approximates the centre portion of the view that would be experienced by a person standing in the same location and at the same time that the original photograph was taken.

25 Page 20: Following [12] above the image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 6** and shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the simulated view. It is important to note that this image, when viewed without the surrounding context of the photography location, may appear to place greater emphasis on the visual impact of the depicted proposal than one would experience on site, due to being cropped and focused on the proposal site.

26 Having reviewed the visual simulation for **Viewpoint 6**, my opinion regarding potential adverse effects on visual amenity from this viewpoint remains unchanged. That is, given that there are no existing buildings visible from this

viewpoint, the close proximity to the Site, I consider the magnitude of change for this view to be moderate. This change will result in a reduction in the rural amenity and scenic quality of this view, through a change to the open and unbuilt nature of the hill and the ruggedness and visual simplicity of the upper pasture due to the introduction of built form and earthworks. I consider that adverse effects on visual amenity will be moderate.

27 Page 21: The two images on this page are 124° x 55° panoramic photographs that represent the primary field of view. The top image on page 21 is the existing view from **Viewpoint 7**, whereas the bottom image is the visual simulation of the proposal as seen from this viewpoint. As per [11] above the proposed buildings and landscape redevelopment have been modelled into this view. In this short-range view a small part of a future dwelling on Lot 15 can be seen. Proposed native mitigation planting within Lots 14 and 30 can also be seen. The technical information and viewing methodology are the same as previously described in [11] above.

28 Page 22: The image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 7**. This shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the existing view, that when viewed as per the instructions on this page, closely approximates the centre portion of the view that would be experienced by a person standing in the same location and at the same time that the original photograph was taken.

29 Page 23: Following [12] above the image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 7** and shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the simulated view. It is important to note that this image, when viewed without the surrounding context of the photography location, may appear to place greater emphasis on the visual impact of the depicted proposal than one would experience on site, due to being cropped and focused on the proposal site.

30 Having reviewed the visual simulation for **Viewpoint 7**, my opinion regarding potential adverse effects on visual amenity from this viewpoint remains unchanged. That is the magnitude of change for this view is considered to be low (at most), based on the small amount of the proposal which will be visible and the recessive colour of the built form (as guided by the design controls). This change is likely to result in a small reduction in the rural amenity and

scenic quality experienced from this view due to the presence of built form on the hillside. At this angle of view a future dwelling will potentially be seen against the skyline. As a result, I consider that adverse effects on visual amenity as experienced from this viewpoint will be low-moderate (at most).

31 Page 24: The two images on this page are 124° x 55° panoramic photographs that represent the primary field of view. The top image on page 24 is the existing view from **Viewpoint 8**, whereas the bottom image is the visual simulation of the proposal as seen from this viewpoint. As per [11] above the proposed buildings and landscape redevelopment have been modelled into this view. In this mid-range view parts of future dwellings on Lots 15 - 20 can be seen. A very small part of the future dwellings on Lots 10 and 14 can also be seen and it is anticipated the roof line of a future dwellings on Lots 5 and 6 will be seen until mitigation planting takes effect. Visually the dwellings on Lots 15 - 20 appear to extend the existing built form that can also be seen, within this view. Proposed mitigation planting within Lots Lots 4, 5, 14 – 20 and 30 can also be seen. The technical information and viewing methodology are the same as previously described in [11] above.

32 Page 25: The image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 8**. This shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the existing view, that when viewed as per the instructions on this page, closely approximates the centre portion of the view that would be experienced by a person standing in the same location and at the same time that the original photograph was taken.

33 Page 26: Following [12] above the image on this page is also from **Viewpoint 8** and shows a cropped centre portion of the panorama of the simulated view. It is important to note that this image, when viewed without the surrounding context of the photography location, may appear to place greater emphasis on the visual impact of the depicted proposal than one would experience on site, due to being cropped and focused on the proposal site.

34 Having reviewed the visual simulation for **Viewpoint 8**, my opinion regarding potential adverse effects on visual amenity from this viewpoint remains unchanged. That is, the magnitude of change as experienced from this viewpoint is considered to be low due to the small scale of the proposal in the

overall scene, in combination with the visual complexity of this scene. Existing visible development, coupled with the proposed design controls, and mitigation planting, means the proposal will not contrast significantly with the existing scene and will appear as an extension to existing visible built form. As a result, I consider that adverse effects on visual amenity as experienced from this viewpoint will be low-moderate. As per the other viewpoints (outlined above), this change will result in a small reduction in rural amenity and scenic quality due to the increase in built form on Water Race Hill. It will also contribute to a minor loss in the visual simplicity of the site as perceived from this location. The overall rural character of the scene will be maintained, as will the scenic quality of the mountains in the distance.

Comments on visual simulations

35 Following the additional analysis undertaken I am comfortable that the potential effects of the proposed development within the Building Line Restriction (**BLR**) and visibility of development have been thoroughly considered, assessed accurately and appropriately.

36 While the visual simulations assist in understanding the potential visibility of the proposal, they have not caused me to change my original position regarding the level of adverse effects as assessed from each of the selected Viewpoints. As stated in [5] above the only change that has been made is the extension of the proposed mitigation planting along the eastern boundary of Lot 14.

37 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.

(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), then I consider the degree of adverse effects as described above to be appropriate within the receiving environment.

Tony Milne

10 February 2025