

## Shannon Watson

---

**From:** Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 20 February 2020 4:11 PM  
**To:** Shannon Watson  
**Cc:** Hamilton, Catherine  
**Subject:** RE: Summary notes memo

Hi Shannon,

See my feedback below in red....

Kind regards,

### Jeremy Head

Senior Landscape Architect

T:+64 3365 0525 M:+64 21308 048

Jeremy.Head@wsp.com

WSP Opus  
12 Moorhouse Avenue  
Christchurch  
8011 New Zealand

**wsp-opus.co.nz**

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

---

**From:** Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, 18 February 2020 4:53 PM

**To:** Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>

**Cc:** Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>; Dan Kellow (InTouch) <dan.kellow@huttcity.govt.nz>

**Subject:** RE: Summary notes memo

Hi Jeremy

Thanks for this, sorry I am only getting to it now. Could you please expand upon the design opportunities you mention in your 'submissions' section - what specific opportunities are mentioned, are they realistic/achievable/practical etc to your mind? **Nothing new is mentioned in the submissions that hasn't been alluded to already. Just observations/suggestions by the public around retention of landscape character and some desired design aspects that will be brought up in the LUDP no doubt, and more likely so if that particular person**

attended the LUDP. The comments were all feasible on the face of it, but as again fully dependant on the framework / outcomes of the LUDP. From my perspective there is no need to dwell on them in any detail in evidence.

In relation to your section on the LUDP Process you state:

*“There is no guarantee as to the framework of the LUDP, who will be attending and how much weighting will be given to individual disciplines. This could have a significant impact on the outcomes reached. As the LUDP is set up and wholly reliant by the applicant to capture design controls it is imperative that any refinements to the proposal be robustly audited and reviewed by an independent party. Nonetheless, it is difficult to see how much weighting can be placed by the decision-maker on the LUDP process as it will occur after the hearing of the proposal.”* If we were able to influence/manipulate this framework and the parameters of the LUDP to ensure it was urban design led, had the right people involved at the right stages, and had written objectives (prescribed into the condition) that were focused on maintaining or enhancing visual amenity and natural character, would you be more supportive of the LUDP process in principle? *I’ve always been supportive of the LUDP process, but as an add-on to a better resolved design which I had hoped would have been presented between the peer reviews of the first application then tested through the hearing.*

The LUDP process will occur after the hearing but this timing should not be of significant concern if we can get to a stage where we have a framework in which the LUDP can only deliver an outcome that you are comfortable with. *Sorry I don’t agree. In my view the LUDP can only be considered a ‘promise’. Sorry to re-state things but it is highly unusual that a proposal such as this is being decided on in a hearing without sufficient detail. Conditions set in hearings are to do with how the details of a proposal are achieved, not how the details are formed.*

It’s important to note that we could also impose a restriction on construction works commencing until the LUDP is to the satisfaction of the Manager, GWRC (Managers satisfaction will be influenced by the comfort of relative experts with the design – if valid reasons as to why LUDP not appropriate than the certification would be withheld). *This could be overly complex and time-consuming and raises the point as to why not have the hearing after the LUDP process has honed the design.*

Another thought is that we could also recommend/require ongoing involvement, auditing and review of the project as it progresses through the various design stages as part of this condition if there was a feeling it would add value or additional certainty that the desired outcomes would be achieved. *All of these conditions suggested could be potentially open to abuse/political pressure.*

Sorry to keep bashing you with this/testing you on your feelings on the LUDP process/framework, but I feel it is important to exhaust all options that we can possibly think of to find some way to resolve the concerns using the conditions framework, as I do not believe the applicant will be willing to lock in a conceptual design in advance of the hearing given the time it will likely take to reach agreement with the required stakeholders. *This comment suggests timeframes are more valuable than the outcome of the project. Applicants need to be willing to lock in a design prior to a hearing. That’s the normal statutory process in my experience. At the LUDP then, how can the stakeholders agree on something that hasn’t been designed? Couldn’t it all get bogged down in politics?*

As I mentioned last time I’m happy to have my thoughts tested, but I still fundamentally disagree with the process of having a hearing decide on a substantial project going ahead or not based on little visible evidence of how the proposal is shaped. My evidence will essentially address this shortcoming and respond to only what is currently on the table in the application. Essentially a route. I can’t assess the landscape and visual effects of a proposal that hasn’t been adequately developed given the importance of the setting, and the potential value of the project.

Your suggestions on conditions above may be all we have to fall back on, and can be worked up to a point where they are better than nothing, but I have to reiterate I would be very uncomfortable with that approach. My preference is that the applicant do the LUDP, develop the proposal, present for review, then present it at a hearing with full stakeholder support. I understand that the current timeframes don’t allow for this to happen.

Kind regards

**Shannon Watson**  
Environmental Planner

**GHD**

*Proudly employee owned*

T: +64 04 474 7330 | V: 517330 | F: 04 472 0833 | E: [shannon.watson@ghd.com](mailto:shannon.watson@ghd.com)  
Level 2, Grant Thornton House, 215 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6011 | [www.ghd.com](http://www.ghd.com)

**Connect**



[WATER](#) | [ENERGY & RESOURCES](#) | [ENVIRONMENT](#) | [PROPERTY & BUILDINGS](#) | [TRANSPORTATION](#)

Please consider our environment before printing this email

---

**From:** Head, Jeremy <[Jeremy.Head@wsp.com](mailto:Jeremy.Head@wsp.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, 14 February 2020 5:59 PM  
**To:** Shannon Watson <[Shannon.Watson@ghd.com](mailto:Shannon.Watson@ghd.com)>  
**Cc:** Hamilton, Catherine <[Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com](mailto:Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com)>  
**Subject:** Summary notes memo

Hi Shannon,

Please find attached my memo regarding the general content and tenor I intend to use in my evidence. Please feel free to comment or suggest any areas you think I need to consider further.

I've been in discussion with Catherine as I've written this.

Kind regards,

**Jeremy Head**

Senior Landscape Architect



T:+64 3365 0525 M:+64 21308 048

[Jeremy.Head@wsp.com](mailto:Jeremy.Head@wsp.com)

WSP Opus  
12 Moorhouse Avenue  
Christchurch  
8011 New Zealand

**wsp-opus.co.nz**

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

-LAEmHhHzd.JzBITWfa4Hgs7pbKI

---

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately, and please delete it; you should not copy it or use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. GHD and its affiliates reserve the right to monitor and modify all email communications through their networks.

---

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses