

**Before the Hearings Panel
At Wellington City Council**

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of the Proposed Wellington City District Plan

Between **Various**

Submitters

And **Wellington City Council**

Respondent

Supplementary evidence of Deyana Ivanova Popova on behalf of Wellington City Council (Urban Design)

Date: 3 May 2023

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Deyana Ivanova Popova. I am a qualified urban designer and a Director of Urban Perspectives Limited.
- 2 My evidence-in-chief sets out my qualifications and experience as an urban design expert.
- 3 I confirm that I am continuing to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023, as applicable to this Independent Panel hearing.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 4 My supplementary statement of evidence comments on submitter expert evidence relating to Schedule 5 Viewshafts, including:
 - i. Evidence on behalf of Kainga Ora - Veronica Cassin (Heritage Consultant for Archifact Architecture and Conservation Ltd); and
 - ii. Evidence on behalf of David Walmlsey - Cameron Peter de Leijer (Senior Surveyor and Planner at Spencer Homes Ltd).
- 5 My supplementary evidence is focused on issues directly related to my area of expertise and viewshaft matters discussed in my evidence-in-chief.

EVIDENCE ON BEHALF OF KAINGA ORA

- 6 The evidence of Ms Cassin on behalf of Kainga Ora, submitted under 'Built Heritage', is focused on the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct. The key issue raised in the heritage evidence that is directly relevant to Viewshaft matters references the original Kainga Ora submission stating

(paragraph 3.1) that: *'The Kainga Ora primary submission sought that the Council review the methods adopted to manage identified townscape values and noted that the creation and identification of a viewshaft would be an option for managing these significant views to the monastery and maunga'*.

7 I note, however, that the original Kainga Ora submission (#391.769), which I responded to in my evidence-in-chief, was clearly made in relation to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct and its townscape values, not the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct, and sought that: *'the Council reviews the methods adopted to manage the identified townscape values in the proposed Oriental Bay Precinct'* and ..*'that it is an option to create and identify a viewshaft managing those significant public views to the monastery and the maunga (Mt Victoria)'*.

8 I note that Ms Cassin's evidence is solely focused on the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct and the management of its historic heritage values, rather than on the Oriental Bay Height Precinct and the specific management of significant public views to the monastery and the maunga, as originally sought by Kainga Ora.

9 Assessment of historic heritage values is outside of my area of expertise and therefore I will not comment on the expert evidence of Ms Cassin, noting only that viewshafts as included in the PDP are not a tool for managing heritage values.

10 In relation to new viewshafts to manage views to the monastery and Mt Victoria as sought by the original Kinga Ora submission, the response in my evidence-in-chief (paragraphs 39-46) still stands.

EVIDENCE ON BEHALF OF DAVID WALMSLEY

11 The evidence of Cameron Peter de Leijer (Senior Surveyor and Planner at Spencer Homes Ltd) on behalf of David Walmsley challenges my

comment that 1 Carlton Gore Road has always been included in the viewshaft overlay as the PDP Vs14 is the same as the ODP Vs15. In response, I make two clarifications: (a) my comment was made principally with reference to the graphic representation of the subject viewshaft (as drawn on the relevant maps in the ODP and PDP respectively) and associated description detail which are the same; and (b) my understanding based on conversations with Council planners was that viewshaft considerations were a relevant matter for any development within the physical/spatial realm of a viewshaft as graphicly defined in ODP Appendix 11. I accept that this interpretation, which is a matter for the planners, might not be correct.

12 Notwithstanding that, the comment I made regarding the possible management of development at 1 Carlton Gore Road under the PDP still stands (paragraph 100 of my evidence-in-chief), regarding a possible option that allows for a 'complying development' under MDRS without a resource consent, while applying the viewshaft considerations only for development that exceeds the 11m height limit.

Date: 3/05/2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Howarth', is positioned above a horizontal dotted line.