

Before Waipa District Council

In the Matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**Act**)

And

In the Matter Resource consent application to construct a single row of six, two-storey compact houses in the 'Residential' zone at 3 Kelly Road, Cambridge.

Council Reference Resource consent – LU/0125/23

Rebuttal Evidence of Francis ('Frank') Pierard on behalf of Kelly Road Investments Limited

Dated: 14 March 2024

RIGHT OF REPLY

1. The following rebuttal evidence has been written in response to the memorandum provided by Ms. Jones dated 11 March 2024. Overall, Ms. Jones appears supportive of the proposed changes specified within my evidence in chief dated 27 February 2024. Our views largely align on all matters except the potential visual effects experienced by the occupants of 5 Kelly Road, Cambridge.

VISUAL EFFECTS

2. One of the recent and key amendments proposed to the scheme relates to the varied roof profile. Units 2 and 5 now incorporate a 15-degree roof pitch from the northern edge to the south. This reduces the ridgeline by 920mm for these two units, resulting in a staggered / stepped roof form.
3. In response to this amendment Ms. Jones notes the following:

“While this breaks down the bulk of the building this will not be how the building will be seen or experienced from the ground as outlined above. It is therefore an unsatisfactory design response to alleviate the visual bulk of the building”.¹
4. Mr. Kingma subsequently generated a 3D render from within the rear yard of 5 Kelly Road in response to the above statement (refer to figure 1). The camera is set to a height of 1.6m which represents an eye level based on the average between men and women. Figure 1 clearly illustrates the amended roof profile will be appreciable and experienced by the occupants of 5 Kelly Road at ground level.

¹ This statement was caveated on the basis that Ms. Jones had not yet reviewed any 3D renderings from this location.



Figure 1: 3D render / viewpoint of the proposal from 5 Kelly Road.

5. Whilst Figure 1 does illustrate that a physical break in the building form may be perceived from the outdoor living space of 5 Kelly Road (depending on one's orientation), this is just one design technique of a number that could be employed to mitigate potential visual effects. The applicant has chosen to employ a number of other design techniques including; the provision for a highly modulated and articulated building façade, a varied roof profile, a visually interesting material and colour composition, a cohesive glazing strategy, strategic specimen tree planting and general compliance with the yard, building height and height in relation to boundary standards. All of these techniques are commonly accepted design responses to mitigate potential visual effects.
6. As discussed within paragraph 35 of my evidence in chief, if a physical break of around 2m was to be introduced, one would be required to stand directly in front of this break to appreciate any discernable sense of space created. When viewed from anywhere else within the existing outdoor living area, a physical break would simply provide the same level of depth and visual interest currently afforded by the existing protruding and recessed elements already proposed to the northern façade.
7. A break in the building footprint would also see a reduction of one unit without providing any significant benefit from a visual effects perspective. In my view, the current proposal sufficiently mitigates any potential adverse visual effects to an acceptable degree and I consider the provision of a

physical break in the building form unnecessary.

8. In the initial assessment provided by Ms. Jones, dated 11.09.2023, she states:

*“In retaining the proposed footprint there are additional mitigation measures that can be made to break down the lineal nature of the elevation. The proposal has used a variety of materials and stepped the façade so that the block is articulated as six dwellings. Other methods are a change in wall colour or placement of specimen trees to further break this elevation for the viewer beyond the site.”*²

9. Based on the above statement, the applicant retained the building footprint and incorporated a more varied roof profile in combination with the additional specimen tree planting which was interpreted to be an acceptable mitigation measure that would sufficiently break down the lineal nature of the elevation.

10. Ms. Jones notes:

a. *“It is my view as raised in my initial urban design commentary that the visual bulk of this elongated building mass when viewed from the adjacent neighbouring properties to the north would be more successfully addressed by stepping or having a separation between units. This is a common approach that when employed on a site of this size references the scale of surrounding residential dwellings and responds with a length similar to the wings of the motel development to the south.”*

11. The horizontal length of the proposal will only be fully appreciated in plan-view rather than from the adjoining street / public realm where the primary views of the building will comprise the 10m wide western façade of Unit 1 and only oblique views of the northern and southern elevations.

² Emphasis has been provided by way of underline.

12. In my view, the proposed building form and scale is not dissimilar to the surrounding environment, including the height and length of the Motel to the south (two storeys and approximately 37m in length) and the length associated with the buildings located within the Cambridge Road commercial precinct to the south east (approximately 42m and 69m in length respectively).

CONCLUSION

13. The provision of a physical break is one of a number of common design techniques that can be employed to address potential visual effects of a new building. The proposal has integrated a number of different design techniques including; a highly modulated and articulated building façade, a varied roof profile, a visually interesting material and colour composition, a cohesive glazing strategy, strategic specimen tree planting along with general compliance with the yard, building height and height in relation to boundary standards.
14. In my opinion, and as previously highlighted within my evidence in chief, the design changes proposed by the applicant sufficiently mitigate potential adverse visual effects from the elongated building mass on the residents at 5 Kelly Road to a level which I consider to be acceptable in urban design terms. Based on the extensive design techniques already employed by the applicant to mitigate potential visual effects, I consider the provision of a physical break in the building form unnecessary.

Francis ('Frank') Pierard

Date: 14 March 2024