



richard@bluemarble.co.nz  
+64 6 7578903

4/34 Egmont Street,  
New Plymouth, 4310

To: Rachelle McBeth

**RE: MOUNT MESSENGER BYPASS - LANDSCAPE MATTERS**

Please find my comments below in regard to the following documents:

**Ecology and Landscape Management Plan  
March 2018**

**Response to New Plymouth District Council request for further information on the Mt  
Messenger Bypass project resource consent application and notice of requirement  
6<sup>th</sup> April 2018**

**Ecology and Landscape Management Plan (ELMP)- March 2018**

A proposed condition of consent is the requirement for an ELMP.

The ELMP is primarily an ecological management plan but does say that it has been informed by a number of technical reports, including Technical Report 8a (Landscape, natural Character and Visual Assessment) and 8b (Landscape and Environment Design Framework LEDF). Further, clause 2.4 provides a summary of landscape values and 2.5 a summary of landscape effects.

However, the ELMP appears to focus primarily on ecology. There is little mention of how aesthetic qualities, legibility, distinctiveness, and memorability are managed (as described under 2.4). Reference is made to the Landscape and Environment Design Framework (LEDF) but only in regard to its objectives.

Again in chapter 4, reference is made to Landscape values but the text goes on to only describe ecology in any significant detail. 4.3 states that the LEDF is intended as a 'living' document, which will inform the development of detail design in order to integrate landscape character and context.

I note that none of the authors of the ELMP were listed as authors of Technical reports 8a or 8b.

The ELMP is an extensive ecological mitigation plan that makes fleeting reference to landscape.

This rather reinforces my earlier correspondence and need for the EEDF to be referenced into consent conditions. Again, how do we have confidence that the landscape principles so fully expressed in the ELMP will transfer into reality. 'Informing' detailed design does not provide sufficient certainty that landscape values will be integral to outcomes.

**Response to New Plymouth District Council request for further information on the Mt Messenger Bypass project resource consent application and notice of requirement. 6<sup>th</sup> April 2018**

The response deals with landscape matters on pages 47 and 48 under clause 142 and 143. The response to the 13 mitigation items in Technical Report 8a is to just make reference to Section 5.1 and 5.4 of the LEDF. I think this response rather misses the point of the request. That being, how do we have certainty that the landscape mitigation measures shown in the LEDF will occur? They are not reflected in the consent conditions. As referred to above, saying that the LEDF is a 'living document' to inform detail design does not provide certainty, and the ELMP is heavily focused on ecology with little mention of landscape mitigation. As per my earlier correspondence, I agree with the desirability of this (the LEDF as a living document) but consider that this should be overtly reflected in consent conditions. I would like to see conditions related to the LEDF and a requirement for Landscape Plans (with cross sections) similar to those that appear at the end of the LEDF to be provided by way of consent condition.

Richard Bain

Landscape Architect

