Boffa Miskell

Memorandum

Christchurch
Level 1
141 Cambridge Terrace
Christchurch 8013
PO Box 110
Christchurch 8140

+643 366 8891

Whangarei	15 Porowini Avenue, Morningside, Whangarei 0110	+649 358 2526
Auckland	PO Box 91250, Auckland 1142	+649 358 2526
Hamilton	PO Box 1094, Hamilton 3240	+647 960 0006
Tauranga	PO Box 13373, Tauranga 3141	+647 571 5511
Wellington	PO Box 11340, Wellington 6142	+644 385 9315
Nelson	27 Vanguard Street, Nelson 7010	+643 548 8551
Queenstown	PO Box 1028, Queenstown 9348	+643 441 1670
Dunedin	49 Water Street, Dunedin 9016	+643 470 0460

Attention:	Jacqui Hewson
Company:	c/- Nelson City Council
Date:	4 October 2024
From:	Rhys Girvan (Registered landscape architect)
Message Ref:	PC29 – Church Hill Viewshaft
Project No:	BM240122

This memorandum sets out a review of additional survey information and provisions relating to my landscape evidence and the recommended deletion of the Church Hill / Piki mai Viewshaft provisions as proposed as part of Proposed Plan Change 29 (PC29).

Since I presented my evidence at the PC29 hearing on the 26th August 2024, Nelson City Council has engaged a surveyor to identify and reinstate an 'iron spike' at the origin point of the Church Hill Viewshaft through which the existing Church Hill Viewshaft provisions apply. This accords with the observer point identified in Appendix 8 of the District Plan and modelling used to understand the parameters of the existing viewshaft which informed my assessment. A summary of the exact co-ordinates of the reinstated iron spike and the coordinates used in our model provided by NCC based on GIS parameters are set out below.

Source	Northing (NZTM)	Easting (NZTM)	Elevation (NZVD2016)
Surveyor[1]	1623764.371	5430602.101	18.815
NCC Viewshaft (NRMP Appendix 8)	1623764.419	5430602.056	18.82

Based on the above, I can confirm the accuracy of my Church Hill viewshaft model reflected in my assessment and visual simulations used to understand the proposed change in views from the Church Steps looking towards Nelson Haven and from Trafalgar Street and Akersten Street towards the Cathedral. In spatial terms, the observation point above the reinstated iron sike adopts the same elevation and is within approximately 7 cm horizontal distance based in differences between decimal points because of reprojection of GIS data. This accords with the accuracy of my visual simulations and in terms of understanding the potential for changes in available views from the Church Steps as currently defined.

During the hearing, I heard submitters concerns relating to the Church Hill Viewshaft. While I acknowledge and agree that views from the Church Steps have high associative values, I consider these primarily relate to available views along the legible alignment of Trafalgar Street and correlated concerns with protecting views towards the Cathedral given this context. The very limited extent to which Nelson Haven or the Tasman Sea remains evident from the Church Steps is reinforced within photos subsequently provided by Nelson City Council which show the view looking down Trafalgar Street from the origin point of the Church Hill Viewshaft in 1995 (see Plates 1 and 2 overleaf). In my onion, I consider this demonstrates Nelson Haven formed no more than a very small aspect of this previous view which no longer remains apparent in the context of the legible alignment of Trafalgar Street which remains.

[1] Staig and Smith Ltd..(2024)



Plate 1: *Views from Church Hill Viewshaft Origin Point –* ***Source:*** *NCC Archives*



Plate 2: *View from Church Hill Steps (circa. 1995) –* ***Source:*** *NCC Archives*

In response to recommendations to explore reinforcing recognition of the visual relationship between the Cathedral and the alignment of Trafalgar Street, I have reviewed the reply statement version of the provisions provided by Ms Hewson relating to Significant Views and Policy IC2.4: Views and Rule ICr.21: Buildings over Reserve. Whilst I acknowledge this is a matter of scope relating to the inclusion of views **to** the Cathedral, I concur with the inclusion of wording which better acknowledges and focusses on the importance of views along the alignment of Trafalgar Street, including views south towards the Cathedral. In my opinion these are articulated to address the key relevant matters to be included in Table 9-1: Significant Views in Appendix 9.

When managing visual effects, it is also important to emphasise that a change in a landscape or view does not, of itself, automatically constitute an adverse effect. Landscapes are dynamic and change in both subtle and more dramatic transformational ways. What is important when assessing and managing the potential for changes in views is ensuring the key values to be protected are well articulated and will be appropriately addressed through effective planning provisions. In my opinion, views of Nelson Haven can no longer be considered a key characteristic or value of available views from the Church Steps through which provisions relating to the Church Hill Viewshaft can be expected to manage.

In summary, given the established context of the Church Hill Viewshaft and nature of Significant Views, I consider the recommended changes to provisions as set out in Ms Hewson's Right of Reply provide greater clarity ensuring the significant view along the legible alignment of Trafalgar Street will remain, including views south towards the Cathedral. On this basis, I consider the potential for adverse effects on Significant Views within this evolving urban context which results from PC29 will be effectively managed.



Rhys Girvan
Senior Principal: Landscape Planner
Telephone: (3) 364 4779 (ddi)
or email rhys.girvan@boffamiskell.co.nz