INTRODUCTION

1 This assessment has been prepared for the purposes of assisting Regenerate Christchurch (Regenerate) in their evaluation and preparation of a proposal under section 65 of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (GCRA) to exercise power under section 71 of the GCRA. Regenerate proposes to amend the Christchurch District Plan (the District Plan) rules to enable Canterbury Cricket Trust (CCT) the opportunity to host all international cricket fixtures at Hagley Oval (the proposed amendments). The amendments sought are intended to allow the Hagley Oval to operate consistently with the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan (CCRP).

2 This assessment considers the appropriateness of the proposed amendments to the District Plan having regard to the potential landscape effects of the proposal on the environment. Where relevant these effects will be assessed in light of the current planning framework as well as the existing resource consent and conditions.

3 In this assessment the following matters are addressed:

3.1 A description of the landscape components of the existing environment;

3.2 Consideration of the proposed amendments relevant to landscape;

3.3 Landscape considerations in the GCRA;

3.4 Landscape considerations in the Hagley Park Management Plan 2007;

3.5 An assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the proposed amendments; and

3.6 A conclusion.

4 Landscape effects are those arising from changes to the landscape irrespective of whether they are visible. Visual effects are those that are visible from neighbours and publically accessible vantage points such as roads and parks.

5 In preparing this assessment reliance has been placed on the following three documents attached to this report. These are in addition to the Graphic Attachment prepared as part of this report.

5.1 Two Photo-simulations showing the six light poles prepared by "Virtual View Ltd” – Attachment 1
5.2 Some photo-simulations\(^1\) prepared on behalf of the ‘Hands off Hagley Incorporated’ group, who presented these as exhibits to the Environment Court - Attachment 2

5.3 Landscape assessment prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited (BML) on behalf of Canterbury Cricket Association for the original application\(^2\) - Attachment 3.

In this report I do not address the matter of light spill, as this is not within my area of expertise. Nonetheless, it is acknowledged that light spill has the potential to adversely affect amenity. It is understood however that this is a matter to be addressed by others in relation to the proposed amendments.

Instead, the focus of this assessment is on the effects arising from the most prominent physical structures of the proposed amendments – the proposed lighting poles, essentially comprising 6 permanent poles and head-frames. While the focus of this report is on the proposed lighting poles (as these are likely to have the most adverse visual and landscape effects of the proposed amendments), where appropriate, the landscape effects of the other proposed amendments are also considered.

In preparing this assessment reference is also made to the landscape assessment (2012) undertaken by Boffa Miskell Ltd (the BML Report) prepared on behalf of Canterbury Cricket Association. The purpose of the BML Report was in support of the initial resource consent application, and consequently details effects arising from the entire proposal. The aim of this report is not to repeat the observations and conclusions reached in the BML Report; instead the focus of this assessment is on the proposed amendments as compared to the existing resource consent – notably on the proposed six permanent lighting poles (as opposed to four retractable lighting poles).

The BML Report contains some useful photographic modelling which include graphics indicating the location and height of the now consented lighting poles. To some extent these have been relied on to ascertain visual effects from the various vantage points appended to the BML Report. This is particularly the case where an assumption is made that the visual effects arising from the proposed six lighting poles will likely be the same or similar to the four assessed by BML. As mentioned however, in preparing this assessment two photo-simulations (Attachment 1) have been prepared\(^3\) so as to accurately depict what the proposed six lighting poles will look like from vantage points within South Hagley Park.

\(^1\) Also prepared by Virtual View Ltd
\(^2\) Prepared 14th December 2012
\(^3\) Prepared by ’Virtual View Ltd’ – specialists in the preparation of photo-simulations.
LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION OF THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

Here the landscape character and amenity of the existing environment (being the Hagley Oval as under its current resource consent) is described as this determines the appropriateness of the proposed amendments in the context of the existing environment. Also described is the overall parkland setting of Hagley Oval.

Hagley Oval

Being devoted to cricket, the landscape character of Hagley Oval exhibits all the hallmarks of the game. These comprise closely mown lawns (the wicket) encircled by audience seating. The latter include grassy embankments and more formal pavilion seating. The oval is essentially an outdoor arena.

Exotic trees, most of which are mature, more or less fully enclose the oval. They form the outer perimeter and as such contain the oval, rather like a permeable wall. In their species, layout and size the trees meld in with those elsewhere in the park. In combination with the open green space of the oval and surrounding trees results in a high level of integration with the wider parkland setting.

Physical features such as buildings and car parking are present but not dominant. All are either back drooped by trees or are set among them. The trees being in their bulk substantially larger than the buildings are therefore dominant. So too is the extent of green open space, that in proportion to that occupied by buildings is predominant. Thus physical features are subservient to the vegetated open space of their setting.

It is the predominance of this green open space, surrounding large trees and integration with the surrounding parkland that results in a high degree of amenity. The naturalistic character of this is also key to the provision of amenity. Ephemeral activity such as cricket also contributes amenity in that it denotes pleasant activity in a pleasant setting. The same applies to surrounding activity such as that at the netball courts and on the neighbouring playing fields.

Overall, Hagley Oval is very much part and parcel of Hagley Park environment. It is entirely in keeping with the character and amenity of its parkland setting. As such its presence cannot be considered unexpected or incongruous in any way.

The wider setting

As the application site (Hagley Oval) is located in a parkland setting it is, as expected, dominated by vegetated open space. Very fundamentally, the parkland comprises a series of extensive lawn areas encircled by large mature exotic trees. Essentially these form large interlinked outdoor rooms – the lawns being floors and the trees walls – see Graphic Attachment photographs 1 and 2 (page 1). Regarding surfacing, the exception is the extensive asphalt netball courts located alongside Hagley Avenue.
In South Hagley Park most of these lawn area spaces are used for various sporting activity, some of which is reflected in the make-up of the space such as Hagley Cricket Oval and the aforementioned netball courts. The remaining lawn areas are less apparently dedicated, and as a result appear more informal. Consequently when not in use they provide passive open space amenity.

With South Hagley Park there exists infrastructure whose primary purpose supports recreational activity. This includes the Horticultural Society Hall located close to Hagley Oval. Other buildings include the Netball Pavilion, Hagley Oval Pavilion, and the sports centre. Public toilets are also present. Associated with these is on site car parking and access-ways. Generally the buildings are not so big that they dominate the open space character of the parkland setting. Regarding visual bulk, none exceed the size of existing mature trees.

Cycleways and pedestrian paths are also a feature of the park. Generally they are confined to its perimeter beneath the trees.

A further physical feature is existing lighting standards or poles. These are a relatively common feature within the park – see Graphic Attachment photograph 3 (page 2). Some serve as lighting for night time sports events while others provide pedestrian lighting. The tallest existing poles are approximately 22m high. Regarding this it is understood that lighting can occur within the park up to 30m high without constraint – that is, it is a permitted activity.

Overall, amenity is very high due to the dominance of open space and various forms of vegetation. Appreciation of this is heightened by the contrasting surrounding presence of the central city and associated hard urban landscape. The exception is nearby North Hagley Park incorporating Christchurch Botanic Gardens and adjoining Christchurch Hospital.

As the public would see it, and in contrast to the Botanic Gardens, South Hagley Park is clearly dedicated to sporting activity. Denoting this is the various sports fields and associated paraphernalia such as boundary marking, lighting, car parking, pedestrian access ways, some seating, toilets and changing sheds. There appears to be sporting activity occurring anytime during the week, but it is much more prevalent on weekends.

**THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

As mentioned, the proposed amendments involve (among other things) the permanent installation of six 48.9m high lighting poles at Hagley Oval cricket ground. These lighting poles will be more or less located at hexagonal intervals, around the Hagley Oval perimeter. Essentially the proposed light poles will replace the four retractable lighting poles already consented, whose ultimate height is also 48.9m.
It is also understood that the proposed design of the lighting poles is fundamentally the same as that for those consented. There are differences however. No longer being telescopic and therefore devoid of associated mechanics the poles will appear slimmer and tapered. Consequently they will look somewhat more elegant than those consented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary structure</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight screens.</td>
<td>No restriction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picket fence no more than 1.2m high and positioned within the interior of the embankment.</td>
<td>May remain in place for all of the cricket season. When games are not being played, public access is to be maintained through the picket fence and signage shall be erected on the fences to communicate this to the general public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television scaffolding poles.</td>
<td>May be established four days prior to the first televised match of the cricket season, and shall be removed no later than three days after the last televised match of the cricket season.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary grandstands</td>
<td>Five days either side of an event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising signage.</td>
<td>Three days either side of an event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter fencing around the edge of the site as shown in the Development Plan in Appendix 18.11.6.</td>
<td>Three days either side of an event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and safety fencing within Hagley Oval</td>
<td>Three days either side of an event, or five days either side of an event for fencing required for the commissioning and decommissioning of temporary grandstands, provided that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Fencing shall be limited in extent and duration to that which is required for security purposes and/or in order to comply with Health and Safety regulatory requirements; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Public access to the site shall otherwise be maintained to the fullest extent practicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other temporary facilities and structures (i.e. portable toilets, food and beverage outlets etc).</td>
<td>Three days either side of an event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The appearance of the proposed lighting poles is shown in the proposed rule amendments (proposed Appendix 18.11.7-Floodlight Plans and Specifications); and in the Attachment 1 photo-simulations. As shown in these, the appearance of the poles comprise a mono-pole atop which sits a roughly ovoid head-frame incorporating the lighting. They are a simple utilitarian structure whose form unequivocally reflects its function. As a consequence of their 48.9m height, and of functional necessity, the poles are assertively vertical in proportion to their 1300mm width. Resulting from these proportions they therefore appear tall and elongated.

The ovoid lighting head-frames are 14m wide by 8m tall. They comprise five horizontal cross bars upon which the lights are attached. Consequently the head-frames do not appear opaque as there are gaps between the cross bars and lights – see Graphic Attachment Photo – montage 1 (page 3) and proposed Appendix 18.11.7-Floodlight Plans and Specifications.

So overall the proposed lighting poles are quite simple structures. They are tall, elongated and generally lack any great bulk in the sense that a building would. The effects of these are addressed next with reference to the aforementioned relevant statutory matters.

In addition to lighting changes, the amendments seek to allow an increase in the number of matches that can be played at the Hagley Oval (from 13 to 25 days per annum for major fixtures) and times/hours of play, an extended activity area (to the south), and longer pack-in pack-out periods for temporary infrastructure as set out in the table below.

Each of these is addressed later in the report under the heading ‘Other proposed features potentially affecting landscape amenity’.

**Landscape considerations in the GCRA**

It is understood that the GCRA’s purpose is to support (among other things) regeneration of greater Christchurch through enabling a focused and expedited regeneration process and facilitating the ongoing planning and regeneration of greater Christchurch. As is apparent in Part 1 section 3(2) landscape considerations are implicit in the concepts of ‘regeneration’ and ‘urban renewal’ in the GCRA.

Part 1 section 3(2) GCRA defines ‘regeneration’ as “improving the environmental, economic, social, and cultural well-being, and the resilience, of communities through—(i) urban renewal and development; (ii) restoration and enhancement (including residual recovery activity).” ‘Urban renewal’ is defined in section 3(2) as “the revitalisation or improvement of an urban area” and includes...
rebuilding and the “provision and enhancement of community facilities”. In addition, section 112(1) GCRA states that Regenerate’s purpose is “to support a vibrant, thriving Christchurch that has economic, social, and lifestyle opportunities for residents, businesses, visitors, investors and developers”.

32 This assessment has been prepared with this context in mind and appreciates that overall the proposed amendments will provide for revitalisation and improvement of an urban area through the provision and enhancement of community facilities from which a section of the Christchurch community will benefit. In this assessment, which primarily focusses on the four consented and two additional light poles, it is recognised that the pursuit of cricket at Hagley Oval will be significantly enhanced.

33 The improvement of well-being and community resilience through urban renewal and enhancement, and therefore implicitly of the landscape, under the GCRA invites consideration of landscape issues. Landscape integrity and visual amenity can contribute positively to community resilience and a sense of wellbeing. In this case this is particularly so with regard to the appropriate use of open spaces and their overall landscape character. What constitutes appropriate use is determined by those who manage the space – namely Christchurch City Council – subject to the statutory guidance of the Christchurch District and Hagley Park Management Plans. From these it is clear that recreational activity is expected to occur within Hagley Park with a view to providing for and enhancing community wellbeing. Such activity includes cricket.

34 In this case, regeneration activity associated with the Hagley Oval will result in the acceptable retention of landscape and amenity values in Hagley Park and Greater Christchurch more generally as the proposed amendments provide for the enhancement of community facilities and the appropriate use of open space. This is demonstrated in the assessment of effects below.

Landscape considerations in the Hagley Park Management Plan 2007

35 The Hagley Park Management Plan 2007 (HPMP) guides maintenance and development of the Park. It does this via a set of objectives and policies, some of which are relevant to the proposed amendments where they concern landscape outcomes. These are addressed as follows, in order of how they appear.

1.0 Landscape

OBJECTIVE 1: (a) To protect the English heritage style landscape character, atmosphere and scenic amenity of Hagley Park and promote this as a major objective of the plan. (b) To also develop, where appropriate, features that represent New Zealand landscapes.

POLICY: 1.1 The English heritage style landscape character of Hagley Park shall be protected and enhanced, but there shall also be, where appropriate, representation of New Zealand landscapes.
It is understood the Hagley Cricket Oval was established in 1866 and so is an integral part of South Hagley Park’s heritage. The English landscape style referred to in the objective and policy is described in the comments to them as:

‘... open, mown grass areas framed by avenues of specimen trees.’

And in Section 6.1 Landscape Character Hagley Park is described thus:

'Hagley Park does not have a single landscape character but instead has a series of these. North Hagley Park is the most evocative of the classical English landscape style. At its present state of development, South Hagley Park lacks much of the appeal of the English parklands Hagley Park is modelled on. Simplicity of form and a reduced level of maintenance characterises Hagley Park these days. This is in sharp contrast with the adjacent Botanic Gardens.'

It is evident from this that South Hagley Park is regarded as a somewhat more prosaic space compared to North Hagley Park and the Botanic Gardens. Clearly the HPMP recognises that there is an aesthetic hierarchy, where South Hagley Park is at the lower end of the scale. Consequently of all the spaces comprising the Hagley Park complex, South Hagley is the most appropriate venue for the proposed amendments (notwithstanding that the Hagley Oval is already located in South Hagley Park).

2.0 Open Space Component

OBJECTIVE 2: To protect the open spaces of Hagley Park and the visual amenity of the road users.

To promote Hagley Park as a major feature of the open space system of the inner city.

POLICY: 2.1 The Hagley Park open spaces (as identified in the Resource Section) shall be retained as essential elements of the park.

Comment: For example, the Carlton Mill sports ground is a highly valued open space and is used for both passive recreational and organised sporting activities.

2.2 Views of the open spaces from the surrounding roadways will be retained.

Comment: The open spaces are frequently viewed from the surrounding roadways. Understorey planting or any other form of development which may obstruct the views into the Park are not promoted.

Overall, the essential treed open space character of South Hagley Park will not change following installation of the proposed lighting poles. No trees will be affected and the overall openness of the Park will be maintained.
17.0 Buildings and Structures

OBJECTIVE 17: To keep to a minimum the number of new buildings and structures on Hagley Park and to coordinate and integrate the existing Park buildings and structures into the Park environment.

To protect historic buildings and structures within the Park.

POLICY: 17.1 Erection of new buildings or structures, or extensions to existing buildings or structures, shall only be permitted where such provision is necessary for the use of Hagley Park for both informal and formal outdoor recreation, and the physical welfare and enjoyment of the public, subject to:

(b) There being no significant reduction in the overall maintenance of the Park’s open space landscape character and natural environment, which is presently not dominated by buildings and hard surfacing.

40 Being internalised within the Park and beyond the trees that surround it, the proposed poles will not obscure views from surrounding roads of open spaces. The outcomes advanced by this policy will therefore be maintained.

17.4 Any proposal for new buildings and structures shall take into account the following:

(a) The effect of the building or structure on the Hagley Park environment. All designs (including external materials, colour scheme, and associated landscaping) must be approved by the Council to ensure the building or structure is properly integrated into the Park environment.

17.6 Colour schemes shall be prepared that are complementary to the Hagley Park environment, appropriate to the architectural character of each building and structure and be in harmony with the adjoining buildings and structures.

41 In preparing this assessment no reference could be found concerning an approved colour scheme for Hagley Park. If such a scheme exists then the proposed poles will be finished accordingly. In any event the poles will be finished in a relatively light grey colour so as to blend in with the sky. This effect is shown in Attachment 1 Photo-simulations and is specified in proposed Appendix 18.11.7.

---

4 Structures are defined in the HPMP as: Use of the term “structures”, in the context of the above policy, is taken to mean all physical constructions, developments and objects on, and adjoining, Hagley Park, including recreation facilities such as tennis courts, goal posts and pathways, and other facilities such as roads, car parks, gateways, memorials and plaques, artworks and bridges.
**HPMP summary**

42 It appears that the key outcome of relevance is preservation of the open space character of Hagley Park. This in addition to its English parkland character essentially comprising avenues and groupings of large trees enclosing grassed open space.

43 The presence of the proposed lighting poles will have negligible effect on these outcomes. This is mostly due to their relatively low bulk and small footprint. They will however exert a presence due to their considerable height. Otherwise, in terms of their function the proposed lighting poles are not out of keeping with what the HPMP expects to occur within the Park. And there is a suggestion in the HPMP that South Hagley Park might be the most appropriate setting for this.

**ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL AMENITY EFFECTS**

**Potential light pole visual dominance and prominence**

44 One of the GCRA aspirations is to provide for the provision and enhancement of community facilities which in this case includes all of Hagley Oval and accessory structures. The proposed light poles are a necessary component of this. But as the Attachment 1 photo-simulations show, they are very tall relative to surrounding landscape features such as trees. Consequently they harbour the potential to appear dominant and prominent, thereby detracting from the open space character of their Hagley Park setting. Nevertheless, as discussed HPMP Policy 17.1 allows for such structures provided they are necessary for (of relevance) ‘...informal and formal outdoor recreation, and the physical welfare and enjoyment of the public’, which aligns with the aforementioned GCRA aspirations. This is provided, however, the Park’s open space character and natural environment is maintained, where currently it is ‘...not dominated by buildings and hard surfacing’.

45 An important consideration in any landscape assessment is the distinction between visual dominance and prominence.

46 Visual dominance occurs where an object occupies the field of view to such an extent that appreciation of all other elements comprising the surrounding landscape is significantly diminished or lost. Visual dominance is not necessarily a bad thing – for example appreciation of an environment can be dominated by the presence of trees when walking through a forest. Or a lake when sailing across it.

47 For the proposed lighting poles to be visually dominant people would have to be sufficiently close to them to significantly suffer diminished appreciation of the surrounding cricket ground and park land. This is due to their significant vertical height in proportion to their relatively smaller width.

---

5 Part I section 3(2)
Prominence on the other hand occurs when a landscape element – a building, a tree, a lake or a rock outcrop for example – stands out because it contrasts with its wider setting. The key factor here is contrast.

The proposed lighting poles will certainly be prominent. Due to their engineered geometric appearance they will contrast with the natural organic character of their predominantly verdant setting. Their height will contribute significantly as well where the proposed poles will be more than twice as high as surrounding trees and nearby existing light standards.

Their prominence will for the most part be confined to the open spaces within South Hagley Park. Somewhat contrary to expectations, the proposed poles will not generally be visible from roads surrounding the park and nor from the nearby Botanic Gardens. There is therefore a significant separation of the proposed lighting poles from neighbouring buildings. This conclusion is based on the modelling in the BML assessment and Attachment 2 photosimulations6 (particularly photo-point 1).

The exception will be from the Christchurch Public Hospital buildings. As these are close to Hagley Oval and are multi-storeyed, those occupying the buildings will have clear unimpeded views of the poles when looking southward. They will certainly be prominent from this particular vantage point.

From further afield the poles will be visible from certain vantage points – mostly road corridors that align with Hagley Oval. But the extent of views will depend on the presence of intervening screening features such as buildings and trees. Paradoxically, the closer one moves toward the poles the less visible they will become, provided there are intervening screening features such as trees. This effect is shown in the Graphic Attachment Photographs 4, 5 & 6 (page 4) using the existing lighting poles at Addington Raceway and Events Centre as an example. Although the lights at Addington are substantially lower than that consented and proposed at Hagley Oval, they are similar in structure and likely light output. Given that these are the only ones in Christchurch approximating those proposed; they provide some guidance as to what the landscape and visual effects might be at Hagley Oval. There are four lights at Addington of approximately 20 to 25 metres high. They are not however a substitute for effects as the settings are different as is the statutory framework for their establishment. Also see Graphic Attachment Photograph 7 (page 7) which illustrates the effect of lighting at Addington without trees.

Prominence will increase significantly when the proposed lighting is illuminated, especially when natural light is dull or dark. Consequently it is very likely that attention will be drawn to their presence from multiple vantage points from within and well beyond

---

6 Prepared by Virtual View Ltd on behalf of ‘Hands of Hagley’.
the confines of the South Hagley Park. This will be particularly so for elevated vantage points such as those from tall buildings and areas on the Port Hills. This effect is shown in Graphic Attachment Photographs 8 & 9 (page 6), again using the existing lighting poles at Addington Raceway and Events Centre as an example.

54 So while it is clear that the proposed lighting poles are prominent, the question remains as to whether they are dominant.

55 The aforementioned Attachment 1 photo-simulations and in particular that of ‘Photo-point 02’ showing the extended 48.9m light poles give a good indication of what the poles look like from a vantage point immediately west of Hagley Oval. This is about as close as one can get to the poles where all six are collectively visible. It is a distance of around 170m away.

56 In the Attachment 1 photo-simulations, the proposed poles are clearly visible and indeed are very prominent. Note that the more distant light pole shown in Attachment 1 photo – sim viewpoint 2 is almost fully obscured by a foreground tree. However, they are not dominant. The reason is that they do not impinge on peoples’ appreciation of the park’s fundamental treed open space character. This is because the poles, while very tall, are not particularly bulky compared to say, a building such as the nearby hospital. As a result they do not overwhelm the overriding character of the park and in this regard cannot be considered dominant. As stated though, they are very definitely prominent.

Potential light pole effects on residential outlook

57 The presence of Hagley Oval as a fully functional international class cricket ground signals economic, social and cultural wellbeing; an outcome sought as being necessary to the City’s regeneration via the GCRA. It is understood the light poles comprising the four consented and two additional ones are key to achieving this.

58 The presence of the light poles however, by virtue of their height, will potentially affect the outlook and therefore the visual amenity of nearest residents. The character of this outlook is repeatedly stressed in the HPMP which seeks to maintain the Park’s verdant open space while accommodating formal and informal recreational activity.

59 As mentioned there will be significant separation of the proposed poles from neighbouring buildings.

60 The nearest residential areas are the Residential Medium Density and Central City zones located on Deans and Hagley Avenues respectively – with the nearest dwellings on Hagley Avenue being around 340m away, and on Deans Avenue 430m away. These separation distances are considered sufficient to avoid overshadowing and visual dominance. But as discussed above, the proposed poles will still appear prominent from these vantage points.
It is likely the tops of the proposed poles will be visible from some upper storeys of dwellings in these nearby residential zones. Consequently outlook for some residents will likely be affected. As mentioned the poles will be prominent. Further they will diminish view quality, which at present entirely comprises trees and open space. Nevertheless, the open space and trees surrounding and within Hagley Park will retain their dominance as they form the bulk of views as viewed from surrounding roads and nearest residential areas.

Overall the adverse effects on views from upper floors of surrounding residential areas and for that matter the hospital, will be acceptable from a landscape perspective.

From ground floor vantage points the poles will be largely screened by intervening trees. This is because the proposed lighting poles will have very little impact on the predominance of open space due to their relatively small footprints or site coverage. This effect is represented in the Attachment 2 2013 Photo-simulation photo-point 01. The residential outlook from these lower vantage points will therefore be largely unimpeded and acceptable from a landscape perspective.

Compatibility

Part of providing social and cultural wellbeing is ensuring that the location and extent of activities are appropriate. In landscape terms this focusses on the question of whether an activity is in keeping with its setting. This is in accordance with what people might reasonably expect to occur within any one particular setting.

As lighting poles already exist within South Hagley Park (both generally throughout the park and the existing four retractable lighting poles authorised by resource consent) – see again Graphic Attachment Photograph 3 (page 2) – those proposed are not, in generic terms at least, out of keeping. Where they deviate is in their size – or more precisely their height, which exceeds that permitted under the District Plan by 18.9m. There are no existing light poles within Hagley Park of similar dimensions – therefore their prominence will be significant.

Overall, however, it is concluded that in their generic character at least, the proposed poles are largely compatible with what exists and what can exist in the setting (having regard to their function and form). That is, their function and form is something expected to exist within Hagley Park. And, whilst a matter addressed in more detail by others, the Vibrant City chapter of the CCRP clearly envisages sports lighting to international broadcast standards in this part of Hagley Park, in association with Hagley Oval. In this regard, the prominence of the height of the proposed lighting poles will be

---

7 As consistent with Objective 18.2.1.3(a)(i) of the CDP.
8 Rule 18.4.2.4(v) of the CDP.
9 As consistent with Objective 18.2.1.3(a)(ii) of the CDP.
acceptable in the wider Hagley Park context as the proposed amendments specifically provide for the enhancement of community facilities within an open space contemplated for community facilities consistent with the GCRA.

Integration

Allied to integration is aforementioned compatibility. Whether an activity is seen as being compatible depends on the extent to which it is integrated with its setting. The reason is that the setting informs congruity and therefore appropriateness. If an activity is well integrated, that is aligned with like for like activity in the vicinity and is in an environment that reads as one, then it is much more likely to be considered appropriate and acceptable. As discussed, such outcomes are stressed in the statutory documents managing the Hagley Park environment.

Particularly concerning the four consented and two additional poles, it is evident regarding integrated landscape outcomes that what is proposed will be clearly part and parcel of Hagley Oval. Further, their function to provide illumination for sporting activity is consistent with that occurring elsewhere in South Hagley Park. In this sense the proposed poles could be considered integrated in that they belong to a network of like for like activity within a common open space.10

As addressed there are no means by which to minimise effects except those arising by dint of circumstance. That is, any adverse effects are minimised due to the proposed poles’ location within an open space where such activity is expected to occur. Further, the location of the poles is relatively remote in relation to sensitive vantage points such as residential areas and significant cultural sites.

Protection of visual landscape characteristics and functionality of the Hagley Oval

The function of the four consented and additional two poles dictate their location and dimensions. That is, the pole dimensions and location are at a point where they function just sufficiently, and so would be compromised should these factors be less.

There does not appear to be any significant ecological features on or near the site, and so there will be no effect in this regard. The same could be said of natural values where they are derived from indigenous environments.

The presence of exotic trees and green open space however, does exhibit natural character. As discussed, the extent of this will not be directly affected by the proposal.11 The poles will however introduce a significant physical element in an otherwise predominantly natural open space environment. That is, they are not natural in

10 As consistent with Objective 18.2.1.3(a)(iv) of the CDP.
11 As consistent with Objective 18.2.1.3(a)(viii) and (b) of the CDP.
appearance and so will contrast with and therefore detract from the prevailing naturalness of the setting. But as mentioned, little can be done about this to minimise or mitigate this adverse effect.

73 One of the chief roles and functions of South Hagley Park is to provide for sport and recreation, which includes cricket. The lighting of sporting venues is common within the Park and four lights are already authorised in this location. So generically the proposed (six) lighting poles are consistent with the current role and sporting function of the open space.

74 Nor will the presence of the proposed lighting poles impact on the amount of open space in the park. Site coverage will be extremely low as the footprint for each pole will be less than 3m². For six poles the overall total site coverage will therefore be no greater than 18m². The same applies to other elements such as temporary fencing, signage, television scaffolding and the alike. Consequently there will be very little green open space lost, and so the effect on this will be negligible. As a result the ability of people to enjoy the green open space will not at all be impeded by the poles.

Other proposed features potentially affecting landscape amenity

75 In addition to the six light poles other features are also proposed. Each of these is identified and addressed as follows.

Additional and / or extended fixtures

76 As these are essentially ephemeral, they will have no material or long lasting effect on the landscape of Hagley Oval and its setting. The presence of various numbers of people recreating in the park is entirely expected and as such contribute to its character and amenity.

77 While it is accepted that extended fixtures result in the prolonged presence of accessory structures, none will be permanent. Such structures include, for example, temporary fencing, signage and television scaffolding. Mobile food outlets will also be present. None of these features occupy much space, and nor do they present substantial visual bulk. Further, they are not of a size and scale¹² that would overwhelm that of trees and surrounding open space. In fact, the opposite is true. Certainly as viewed from outside the park, there would be little appreciation of the effects. Consequently they will not dominate their parkland setting.

78 The ability to maintain the Park’s green open space character is therefore not precluded by extended fixtures and the accessory structures they incur. It is concluded therefore that the landscape and amenity effects arising from extended fixtures are acceptable.

¹² Scale being the proportion between one object and another – eg; trees and buildings. Size relates to how big an object is in terms of its dimensions.
Hagley Oval Layout Plan extended zone area

It is understood that the zone and Hagley Oval Layout Plan area corresponds to the area in which cricket activity will occur, including ancillary activities for larger match fixtures. The location and extent of this is shown on the proposed Hagley Oval Layout Plan\textsuperscript{13}. Essentially it incorporates all buildings, accessory structures including lighting, audience areas, access and the wicket or playing field. The zone also includes most trees among which Hagley Oval is located.

The extended\textsuperscript{14} zone will have negligible effect on the character and amenity of Hagley Oval and its parkland setting. Apart from the presence of the six proposed lighting poles, little of any great substance is expected to occur within the extended zone. Consequently, and from the point of view of onlookers, there will appear to be very little visible difference to what currently occurs. Importantly, the treed green open space that is expected of Hagley Park will most certainly be retained.

For the foregoing reasons, it is concluded therefore that any landscape and amenity effects arising from the extended zone will be acceptable.

CONCLUSION

There is no question that the proposed poles will be very prominent from certain vantage points. They will be by far the tallest structures in South Hagley Park and for that matter, the whole of Hagley Park generally. They will undoubtedly become de facto landmarks pinpointing the location of Hagley Oval.

Despite this, their presence is in generic terms at least, not incongruous. Lighting poles, albeit of a comparably modest scale, are a common feature within South Hagley Park and four floodlights are already authorised within the Oval. So in this sense the six proposed poles are not out of keeping with what is expected to occur in the Park, particularly given that most of it is dedicated to organised sporting activity. This in turn informs landscape character in that the function of the park is evidently expressed in the environment it presents.

Much emphasis is put on the green open space character and the amenity derived from it in the HPMP provisions relevant to landscape outcomes. While the proposed poles are tall, they are not bulky - at least not in the sense that they occupy a lot of ground. No trees will be lost; nor space. It is clearly evident that this cornerstone characteristic will be preserved should the poles be installed.

\textsuperscript{13} To be incorporated into the Christchurch District Plan marked ‘Appendix 18.11.6 Hagley Oval Layout Plan – Open Space Community Parks Zone’

\textsuperscript{14} Relative to the area authorised by the resource consent which initially provided for the establishment and use of Hagley Oval.
As four of the light poles are consented it follows that the effects from these are acceptable subject to height reductions out of play and their removal off season. In any event the effects of the four consented poles are, with regard to landscape effects acceptable in that their presence has negligible effect on the overall open space and vegetation of Hagley Park. The same applies to the proposed 6 permanent poles (being two additional poles than that consented), whose cumulative presence will have little effect on open space character.

While it would be desirable to reduce visual prominence of all six proposed poles via mitigation, it is simply not practical to do so – at least not with landscaping. An appropriate colour finish as is proposed will however assist in the minimisation of adverse visual effects. Otherwise the effects are lessened by circumstantial conditions such as that concerning location. That is, the separation distances from nearest residents are reasonably significant. Additionally the presence of mature trees in the vicinity of the proposed poles will, contrary to expectation, result in quite effective screening when viewed from close quarters.

It is understood that the potential adverse effects of the proposed poles has to be balanced against the benefits. As discussed there will be a range of visual and landscape effects. Overall they tend toward the lower end of the spectrum, particularly with regard to preservation of green open space which is doubtless one of the most important outcomes to consider. From a landscape perspective the proposed amendments are therefore considered acceptable and appropriate in the wider Hagley Park context.

It is further understood that environmental, social and cultural wellbeing and the provision of enhanced community facilities are core components of regeneration under the GCRA and are also key aspects of Regenerate’s purpose; and the GCRA’s purpose is to enable and facilitate the regeneration of greater Christchurch.

It is evident the proposed amendments will facilitate and contribute to the regeneration of Christchurch and are acceptable from a landscape perspective. The proposed amendments will enhance the community facilities at Hagley Oval – consistent with what people expect to occur in South Hagley Park and what is contemplated by the two statutory documents that set out to manage it. While it is acknowledged there will be some cost to visual amenity resulting from prominence of the light poles, the greater effect is positive where the value of Hagley Park as a public open space and recognised recreational venue is generally enhanced.

Dated: 27 June 2019

Andrew Craig