

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management
Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of the Proposed District Plan
for Waimakariri District

**HEARING STREAM 12: REZONING REQUESTS (LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL
ZONE)**

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF DAVID COMPTON-MOEN
(LANDSCAPE VISUAL IMPACT)**

ON BEHALF OF

ANDREW CARR (SUBMITTER #158) 308 CONES ROAD

5 JULY 2024

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is David John Compton-Moen.
- 1.2 I have previously provided a Statement of Evidence (dated 5 March 2024) regarding landscape visual amenity matters in respect of the Submitter's request for the rezoning of 308 Cones Road and 90 Dixons Road (**the site**). My qualifications and experience remain as set out in that Statement of Evidence.
- 1.3 I have been asked to review and provide comment on the s 42A report of Mr Buckley, which in turn relies upon advice from Council's Greenspace and Community Facilities Planner, Mr Jon Read. I have also reviewed the answers of Mr Buckley to the Hearing Panel's questions.
- 1.4 I confirm I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

2. RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICERS

- 2.1 The Officers' assessment of the site is set out in Section 5.4 of the s 42A report and on the third page of Appendix I, being a memorandum of Mr Read (paragraphs un-numbered).
- 2.2 Mr Read appears to respond to three matters raised by Mr Buckley. For the first of these, Mr Read sets out his view that although the rural character of the site may not be maintained, he considers that rural landscape attributes, values and aesthetic perceptions of the site are unlikely to be diminished or modified such that they will no longer be in keeping with the surrounding rural character.
- 2.3 For the second issue, Mr Read confirms that the proposed LLRZ is consistent with the surrounding character of development in the wider area.

- 2.4 Finally, Mr Read agrees that the landscape mitigation measures proposed in Section 4 of my technical report are suitable to mitigate any effects. In fact, in answering the question posed, he simply responds “yes”.
- 2.5 For the reasons set out in my technical report (Annexure A of my Evidence in Chief), I concur with Mr Read’s opinions.
- 2.6 Mr Buckley’s report largely repeats the responses of Mr Read. However I note that with regard to the last question Mr Buckley says that the landscape mitigation measures proposed in Section 4 of my technical report “*would go some way*” to mitigating any effects. This wording appears to be an insertion of Mr Buckley – Mr Read’s response is unequivocal (in fact, it is just one word).
- 2.7 The difference is important because Mr Read’s response does not suggest that further or revised mitigation measures are required (Q: *Do you agree that the landscape mitigation measures proposed in section 4 are suitable to mitigate any effects? A: Yes*). Conversely, Mr Buckley’s additional wording could be read as meaning that additional or different measures are needed.
- 2.8 I remain of the view expressed in my Evidence in Chief, that adverse residual effects from the proposal are Less than Minor with a Low magnitude of change, and that the mitigation measures proposed are appropriate.
- 2.9 For completeness, I confirm that I have reviewed the responses of Mr Buckley to the Hearing Panel’s questions. However none relate to landscape visual amenity in respect of the site.

3. CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 Having reviewed the Officers’ Reports, I remain able to support the submission for the site to be rezoned as LLRZ.

DAVID COMPTON-MOEN

5 July 2024