

From: [Rachael Annan](#)
To: [Shay McDonald](#)
Cc: [Melissa Davis](#)
Subject: Re: EXPERT AUDIT/ REVIEW - Coastal Occupation - Onumai Enterprises Limited – Due date TBC
Date: Tuesday, 11 April 2023 9:52:51 a.m.
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Hi Shay

It's good to see some changes put forward. However, overall, I don't think that the proposed slats go far enough to tone down the open glazed residential aspect overlooking the water.

Secondary to that -

- The proportions of solid timber to gaps between isn't annotated (and this proportion makes a difference).
- There's no annotation clarifying the changes to points 1 and 2 (red bubble/cloud hatched areas). While the visuals can assist, they don't give the same assurance as annotated elevations of proposed updates which give key dimensions.
- The visuals illustrate there are two different colour exterior claddings - charcoal grey to 2 facades and a white/cream to the north side. Is this intentional?

Having seen these amendments, and to provide clear feedback on achieving effective/appropriate outcome to integrate the proposal in this setting...

I recommend that a proportion of the width of the glass façade is made solid (suggested 1/3 to 2/3 of the width). These might be sliding doors as per the road facing west elevation, or an alternative technique at the architect's discretion to pare back the residential character. Sliding doors would allow flexibility of where outlook or privacy are achieved. When the boatshed is not in use, this aspect could be more shut off and read more clearly as a boatshed.

Regards,
Rachael

From: Shay McDonald <Shay.McDonald@orc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 2:43 PM
To: Rachael Annan <rachael.annan@4sight.co.nz>
Subject: RE: EXPERT AUDIT/ REVIEW - Coastal Occupation - Onumai Enterprises Limited – Due date TBC

Hi Rachael,

I hope your ankle is improving.

The Applicant (boat shed, Taieri mouth) has provided updated plans which are designed to be in accordance with some of the mitigations you have proposed in your emails below.

Do you consider that these changes:

- Are in line with your recommended mitigations to reduce the visual impact?
- Reduce the adverse effect to a very low level?

Thanks

Shay

From: Rachael Annan <rachael.annan@4sight.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 27 February 2023 10:12 a.m.
To: Shay McDonald <Shay.McDonald@orc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: EXPERT AUDIT/ REVIEW - Coastal Occupation - Onumai Enterprises Limited – Due date TBC

Hi Shay,

Apologies, for not getting back to you on Friday, I didn't see your email come through in outlook on my phone (I was out of the office).

The primary concern is the visual effects for the fixed/permanent outlook of residents across the river. I consider that the visual amenity effects (derived from the shift in landscape character set out by the application as proposed) will be at least low, and may be low-low moderate for some, depending upon the openness of their view towards the site area. With reference to the table below, I note that this aligns with a minor level of effects.

If aspects of the design are refined as earlier noted, it could be possible to reduce the level of effects to very low. This is with regards to the level of glazing and use of black aluminium joinery and visible internal framing (facing or visible to the river side and beyond).

Regards,
Rachael

Rachael Annan

Principal Landscape Planner

Mobile: 027 535 0720

[4Sight.Consulting – Part of SLR](#) [LinkedIn](#)

From: Shay McDonald <Shay.McDonald@orc.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2023 12:51 PM
To: Rachael Annan <rachael.annan@4sight.co.nz>
Subject: RE: EXPERT AUDIT/ REVIEW - Coastal Occupation - Onumai Enterprises Limited – Due date TBC

Hi Rachael,

Just one follow up question for you. I'm hoping to get a bit more (a sentence or two) on the below statement from your report:

"...This is not to say new boatshed development or renovation is not appropriate in this location. However, I do not consider the combination of the proposal's scale and it's 'amount of glazing and obvious usage of the building for accommodation' (p.12) demonstrates the very low level off effects arrived at by the application's landscape assessment..."

Given you disagree that the proposal demonstrates the very low level of effects as arrived at by the Applicant's consultant, what level of effects do you consider that there are? If you could give an answer based on the scale below that would be very helpful.