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1. This report addresses the proposed subdivision of Lots 1-2 & 28 DP 17701 to create three additional lots, each with a building location area (BLA). The site is located on Teapot Valley Road, Brightwater. The report outlines the assessment of effects on rural character, amenity and landscape.

2. The following appendices must be read in conjunction with the report:
   - Appendix One – Analysis Drawings
   - Appendix Two – Plant Lists

    Policy in the TRMP

3. The objectives and policies relevant to the retention of rural character, the maintenance and enhancement of rural amenity and the landscape within the Rural 2 zone can be found within the following chapters of the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP):
   - 5 – Site Amenity Effects;
   - 7 – Rural Environment Effects; and
   - 9 – Landscape.

Landscape context

4. The Application Site is located west of Brightwater in an area in which the Waimea Plains (the Plains) rise to the Moutere hills.

5. Three spurs\(^1\), extend southeast from the Moutere hills. These define Eves Valley and Pigeon Valley (Fig. 1). The ridges on the west side of the Plains are truncated, having been long since ‘sliced off’ by the Wai-iti River to form escarpments fronting onto the Plains.

Landscape character of the Plains west of Brightwater

6. The Waimea Plains contain the District’s most productive land, wherein a diverse range activities are undertaken including:

\(^1\) A spur is a lateral ridge projecting from the mountain or the main ridge crest. A spur is usually formed by the two roughly parallel streams eroding gullies (draws) down the face of the mountain from the ridge line.
- viticulture,
- small scale grazing,
- production of animal feed,
- pip fruit orchards,
- nursery production and farm gate sales,
- hop fields,
- avocado orchards,
- berries, and
- equestrian facilities.

7. Existing rural residential activity is located within two clusters. One at Teapot Valley Road and the other at Golden Hills Road (Fig. 4 & 5).

8. The general public experience the Plains from the roads, walking / riding tracks\(^2\) and Reserves\(^3\) within the area alongside which shelterbelts and other vegetation affect views of the surrounding area. As a consequence, from most places on the Plains, attention rather than being on the hills is focussed on the productive landscape within the immediate surrounds. In other instances, the hills form a significant part of the view, particularly where a road or vista is orientated toward them.

Landscape character of the foothills west of Brightwater (including the Application Site)

9. The hills are zoned Rural 2 in the TRMP (Ref. Fig. 2). They have varying productive value and potential for a range of plant and animal production\(^4\). Variability in aspect and topography translates to a diverse landscape character, which regardless of the range of elements involved comprises a cohesive landscape.

\(^2\) Waima Riverside Riding / walking track, including on Palmers Road
\(^3\) eg. Waima West Reserve, which includes the Waima West Tennis Club
\(^4\) TRMP7.1.20.1(ii)
10. Within the foothills fronting the Plains - on the north side of Eves Valley the landscape includes the rural residential enclave at Golden Hills Road. The rural residential activity is integrated with the wider rural area to the extent there are no erosion of the character or amenity of the surrounding rural environment. Development on Golden Hills Road is considered compatible with qualities of the rural area the TRMP identifies. There is a ratio of open space to built features in which the visual dominance arising from the density of structures in the landscape incorporates adequate open space involving pasture, forestry, productive use and amenity trees. Despite the rural residential activity, there is little interruption of the low intensity of use and development and consequently a more open and distinctively rural landscape. There are no adverse cumulative effects which would hinder considering of similar development occurring in other areas of the hills.

11. Whilst most of the inland hills are planted in pines, the hills nearer the Plains, including the Application Site involve a mix of land uses, similar to the Golden Hills Road area. There is low intensity grazing, woodlots, amenity trees and rural residential development. The diverse topography and range of land use activities lend the hills capacity to absorb visual change which is carefully managed.

12. Views of the surrounding area for the general public are principally from Waimea West Road. It runs north - south across the front of Eves Valley. The road extends toward the Application Site until the intersection with Teapot Valley Road. A steep escarpment rises from the road, beside which there are three rural residential properties. The Application Site adjoins these properties on the west side. Amenity trees and gardens screen and visually integrate the houses to the extent that they do not provide a contrasting element. The manner in which the buildings are screened by amenity plantings, maintains the open character of the area. Consequently there are no adverse cumulative

---

8 A reference to the Proposed Plan in 1996 sought to change the zone from Rural 1 to Rural Residential but was declined. On appeal the zoned remained but the Court granted a certain number of allotments. The TRMP zone is now Rural 1 closed (Fig. 2)
9 Rural Residential Zone Locations - Suitability for Development Consolidation and Densification. 3.1 II October 2014
10 TRMP 5.2.30
11 TRMP 7.4.20.1
12 TRMP 7.4.3.5A
13 TRMP 9.2.1.3
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effects on rural landscape. The rural residential sites beside Waimea West Road are within a development pattern, which extends south along Teapot Valley Road. Within the small valley occupied by Pītīrere Stream there are 12 rural residential properties located within land zoned Rural 2. The dwellings are located on both the flats and the foothills (Fig. 4). Overall the area is visually well contained, due to its location away from major transport routes, the topography and screening vegetation. Beyond that is located Teapot Valley, zoned Rural 1.

13. From the intersection of Teapot Valley Road and Waimea West Road the Application Site rises across a steep escarpment to a ridge 126m AMSL. The escarpment slopes and ridge front the plains and are visible from ‘Area A’ - west of the Wai-itī River (Fig. 3). The escarpment slopes are a mix of pasture, copses of amenity trees and as previously noted, rural residential development (Fig. 6).

14. West of the slopes fronting the Plains are the heads of two inland basins. These fall northwards to Eves Valley.

15. Access to the site is from Teapot Valley Road via a poplar-lined driveway, which sildes across the escarpment to the residence, located at the head of the main gully. The dwelling and property have rural lifestyle characteristics; set within landscaped gardens and involving several ancillary buildings within an enclave. There is low-key rural productive activity including livestock and woodlots. The buildings and driveways have a low visual effect from Area B east of Teapot Valley Road (Fig. 3) and from a point north of property emergency number 374 on Waimea West Road i.e. north of the Waimea West Tennis Club. This is a consequence of its location back from the escarpment crest, the establishment of plantings and the manner in which the buildings have been dug down into the landform. The low visibility of the existing dwelling indicates there is visual absorption capacity within the gully head landform type. The factors contributing to its low visual effect are:

a) Its location within a gully head where the landforms provide screening from the south, east (including Area A) and west, and from the north wherein

---

12 Rural Residential Zone Locations – Suitability for Development Consolidation and Densification. 3.2 October 2014
13 This property is adjacent the southern entrance to the Eves Valley Saw mill site.
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there are instances in which it falls from view behind the escarpment ridge extending in front of it.

b) The manner in which the buildings are dug down into the landform, which enhances the capacity the surrounding landforms to absorb the visual effects of the various structures.

c) Planting around the buildings and trees elsewhere on the Application Site, which screen the earthworks, buildings and driveways.

d) The recessive colour and low reflectivity of the buildings rooves and cladding.

16. 76 Teapot Valley Road is the neighbouring property to the south. It looks generally over the top of and into the back of the Application Site. (Fig. 6)

17. The aerial photograph overlaid with property boundaries and contours enabled analysis of development patterns within the local\textsuperscript{14} landscape. The results indicate there is a rural residential pattern at the junction between the plains and the hills. This reflects the presence of qualities desirable for rural living including an elevated outlook, sunlight, setback from activity on the more highly productive soils and the areas proximity to Brightwater and Richmond\textsuperscript{15}. The pattern\textsuperscript{16} is centred on two areas; Golden Hills Road at the entrance to Eves Valley and in the valley drained by Pitfire Stream and involving the front slopes and foothills between Eves Valley and Teapot Valley, including the Application Site. The pattern (its location and extent), expressed as a distribution of structures within the landscape is illustrated on Fig. 4 & 5.

*Key Characteristics of the area*

- Foothills edge the Plains;
- The hills further west are managed primarily in pines;
- The hills fronting the Plains are managed in pasture, woodlots of lower intensity and use\textsuperscript{17} and rural residential development;

\textsuperscript{14} TRMP 9.2.1.2 & 7.4.3.3
\textsuperscript{15} Rural Residential Zone Locations – Suitability for Development Consolidation and Denasification. 3.11 October 2014
\textsuperscript{16} TRMP 7.4.3.3
\textsuperscript{17} TRMP 7.1.20.1(ii)
• Escarpment faces and the ridgeline above Waimea West Road beyond Wai-iti River Bridge face the Plains;

• Areas west of the escarpment ridge are less sensitive to change due to lower visibility from the surrounding area and containment provided by landforms and vegetation with higher visual absorption capacity.

**TRMP provisions**

18. The TRMP deals with opportunities to ... address the environmental quality and amenity values of the District\(^8\), including achieving an appropriate level of protection of rural character and amenity values\(^9\).

*The Rural 2 zone covers areas that are generally of lower productive value, but which often have particularly important rural character and amenity values, resulting from a low intensity of use and development and consequently a more open and distinctively rural landscape.*\(^10\)

19. The Plan seeks to balance change\(^\text{21}\) and manage the tension between competing demands\(^\text{22}\) including by enabling a variety of housing types in rural areas\(^\text{23}\) and managing the effects of a range of activities within the rural area.\(^\text{24}\)

To achieve the policy outcome the Plan addresses maintenance and enhancement of rural character attributes involving:

• Openness: involving a high ratio of open space to built features, which can be also achieved by managing the visual dominance of structures in the landscape.

• Greenness: involving large areas of crops, forestry, and land used for productive end.

• Productive activity: Involving productivity, which is the ability to produce any type of plant or animal biomass.

• Separation, style and scale of structures

\(^8\) TRMP 7.0
\(^9\) TRMP 7.4.1.1
\(^10\) TRMP 7.4.20.1
\(^21\) TRMP 6.50.1
\(^22\) TRMP 6.2.30
\(^23\) TRMP 6.2.3.7
\(^24\) TRMP 7.4.2
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20. Chapter 5 of the TRMP addresses values\textsuperscript{25} associated with openness....

\textit{Allotment size and intensity of site development affect the perception of whether buildings or open space are dominant in any locality. They also affect the degree of amenity (including privacy) possible between sites, the proportion of sunlight and shade occurring on any site, and the options for using outdoor parts of a site.}\textsuperscript{26}

21. Continuing subdivision of small allotments\textsuperscript{27} dwelling development\textsuperscript{28} and servicing effects\textsuperscript{29} can result in the cumulative loss of rural character and amenity values.\textsuperscript{30} Such activities should be discouraged unless adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.\textsuperscript{31}

22. Chapter 5 addresses effects which cross property boundaries and which may add to or detract from the use and enjoyment of neighbouring properties. They may also affect natural resource values, such as ...views or local character.\textsuperscript{32} Effects, which cross property boundaries may add or detract from neighbours by affecting the use or enjoyment of other land. The policy seeks\textsuperscript{33} an outcome, which maintains and enhances amenity values on site and within communities\textsuperscript{34} by maintaining privacy\textsuperscript{35} and promoting use of vegetation, landscaping and screening.\textsuperscript{36} In summary, the TRMP policy seeks the following outcomes:

\textit{Table One – Policy outcomes}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRMP</th>
<th>Outcome sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3.1</td>
<td>Maintain privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3.2</td>
<td>Maintain open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.3.3</td>
<td>Maintain and enhance local rural character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.3.5A</td>
<td>Discourage cumulative loss of rural character and amenity values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{25} TRMP 5.3.3.2
\textsuperscript{26} TRMP 5.2.30
\textsuperscript{27} TRMP 7.4.3.5A
\textsuperscript{28} TRMP 7.4.3.5C
\textsuperscript{29} TRMP 7.4.3.9
\textsuperscript{30} TRMP 7.4.3.5A
\textsuperscript{31} TRMP 7.4.3.4
\textsuperscript{32} TRMP 5.0
\textsuperscript{33} TRMP 5.1.3.1
\textsuperscript{34} TRMP 8.2.2
\textsuperscript{35} TRMP 5.2.3.1
\textsuperscript{36} TRMP 5.2.3.4
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&amp; 9.2.3.5</th>
<th>Rural 2 zone expected to retain its current rural character and amenity values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.4.30 &amp; 7.50.4</td>
<td>Ensure structures do not adversely affect visual interfaces such as skylines or ridgelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1.3.6</td>
<td>Manage activities which may cause visual impacts in the rural area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2.3.3 &amp; 7.4.3.3</td>
<td>Retain rural characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2.3.4</td>
<td>Encourage landscape enhancement and mitigation of changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed development

23. The applicant wishes to subdivide Lots 1-2 & 28 DP 17701 to create three additional allotments:

- Proposed Lot 4 comprising 7.28ha,
- Proposed Lot 5 comprising 6.08ha, and
- Proposed Lot 6 comprising 5.43ha.

24. To ensure the effects of the proposal are acceptable each proposed lot has a building location area identified (BLA). A set of controls addressing aspects of the development including water tanks and driveways are included at the end of the report. Access to the proposed BLAs will be from the existing poplar driveway.

Adverse effects and proposed mitigation

25. This section outlines the landscape analysis leading to the design of the subdivision. This involved the identification of opportunities, constraints and local factors influencing sensitivity and the landscape’s capacity to absorb change. Two areas on the Waimea Plains within which there are views of the Application Site are referenced;

- Area A - west of the Wai-iti River Bridge; and
- Area B - north of the Waimea West Tennis Club (Fig. 3)
26. With respect to Area B, beyond the entry to Eves Valley Mill the sensitivity of views is reduced by distance. Views from 76 Teapot Valley Road; the neighbouring property to the south are addressed separately.

Factors within Area A (east)

27. The escarpment face lies in view of Waimea West Road, west of the Wai-iti Bridge wherein the ridge forms the skyline. This area of the Application Site has a low capacity to absorb change due to its visibility from the surrounding area, steep topography and pasture i.e. lacking the screening quality of trees. No change to what currently exists is proposed in that area of the Application Site. Its present rural character will be retained37 (Fig. 6).

Factors within Area B (north)

28. West of the ridgeline the sensitivity of the site to change is reduced. Whilst Inland Basins 1 & 2 (Fig. 6) are not visible from Area A, they are visible from Area B. This is an area of the Plains generally north of the Waimea West Tennis Club, but not far beyond that point due to the effect of distance reducing sensitivity.

29. Views from Area B involving the Application Site are southwards from Waimea West Road; into the gullies rising from Eves Valley. Travelling north, there is a different vista in which the Application Site is not involved. Trees on the Plain partially screen views into the gully heads. Views are also screened by vegetation established on the Application Site and on neighbouring properties. These reduce the sensitivity of ridges and skylines and as noted previously, screen the existing dwelling on the property. Overall the effect of the trees is to increase the sites capacity to absorb visual change when viewed from Area B. The existing dwelling provides evidence of this.

30. Three building site opportunities are identified. The first two (proposed Lots 4 & 6) are located in Inland Basin 1. Here within a gully head, similar to the landform type in which the existing dwelling is located, the land is set down below and in front of 'Crest 104m' AMSL. The gully head is 140 metres wide and encompasses an area of 2.4ha.

---

37 TRMP 7.4.30 & 7.50.4
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31. The building site opportunity on Lot 4 is located on the east side of the basin. It is set back from the escarpment crest identified as sensitive to change in views from Area A. A building here should be set down into the landform (in a manner similar to the existing dwelling) so as to leave higher ground on the east side and ensure views from Area A are not affected by a new structure. The building site will benefit from a landform backdrop and will not break the skyline. There should be a naturally shaped berm constructed on the north side of the building, in a way, which does not unduly impede views from the new building. The recommended mounding addresses, with reference to the existing dwelling, the screening effect of the escarpment landform - extending north, in the foreground. Tree planting in general accordance with the Plant List in Appendix B should be undertaken in the following areas:

a) On the escarpment face, adjacent the proposed building site to maintain views from Area A;

b) Within the gully to provide screening from Waimea West Road and other parts of Area A (requires coordination with mitigation planting for proposed Lot 6 – see below);

c) To replace the screening effect provided by the old man pine, which is likely to be felled at some time in the future;

d) Above and below the proposed driveway cutting to screen the visual effects of it from Area B.

e) To ensure there is a backdrop of trees established behind the gully head in which the new structures, water tanks and driveway will be located.

32. The building site opportunity on Lot 6 is located on the west side of the basin head. This site is visible from Area B. There is approximately 90m of separation between the building site on Lot 6 and Lot 4 i.e. separation similar to houses within the Golden Hills Road rural residential cluster. A building in this location should be dug down below the ridge and leave standing to the rear a landform higher than the building platform. That would ensure the building has a landform backdrop and will not break the skyline. Naturally shaped mounding as for proposed Lot 4 should be located on the north side of the building and similarly tree planting to screen new structures and provide visual absorption
should be undertaken. The recommended controls are illustrated as an integrated site development proposal on Fig. 7.

33. The building site opportunity on Lot 5 is located 380 metres south east of the proposed building site on Lot 6 and 136 metres northeast of the existing dwelling. The site is within the view of the neighbouring house on 76 Teapot Valley Road located 340 metres to the southwest at elevation 130m AMSL. The proposed building site is visible from more distant parts of Area A i.e. north of the entry to Eves Valley Saw Mill where distance is a factor in reducing sensitivity. A building in this location should be dug down below the ridge and leave standing to the rear a landform higher than the building platform. That will ensure the building has a landform backdrop and will not break the skyline. It will also prevent the building from intruding on the view of the neighbouring property to the southwest. It is likely a stand of Plopars presently affecting the view from the building site will be felled. To counter opening up the view from Area A in this way tree planting, generally in accordance with the Plant List in Appendix B should be undertaken to address the issues and outcomes listed in b) to e) above. The replacement trees will be selected to provide appropriate screening but not grow as tall as the plopars (Fig. 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Recommended Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All structures to be located with Building Location Area indicated on Fig. 7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development including driveways to be undertaken generally in accordance with Fig. 7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All water tanks associated with new activity to be buried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initially, grass to be established on all earth works followed by vegetation in general accordance with the Plant List attached in Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree planting in general accordance Fig. 7 &amp; 8 and the Plant List attached in Appendix B to be established and maintained in perpetuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No urban style fences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 TRMP 5.2.30 & 5.2.3.1
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Conclusion

34. The controls **will** ensure that new buildings are in locations with capacity to absorb visual change without undue consequences. Controls are recommended to mitigate any potential cumulative loss of rural character and ensure that the proposed buildings and roads are subservient to the extent that rural character attributes the TRMP identifies are promoted. Managing the visual effects of the proposal to an acceptable level will maintain rural character attributes including, openness and a high ratio of open space to built features, greenness involving appropriately large areas of vegetation and maintenance of low-key productivity. Finally, controls will ensure there is separation between structures consistent with the existing rural residential pattern and which is not considered detrimental to TRMP aim of retaining rural character.

Tasman Carter Ltd

7 December 2016.
Appendix A – Analysis Plans
### Appendix B – Recommended Plant List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Cornus kousa</em></td>
<td>Japanese dogwood</td>
<td>4 - 8m</td>
<td>Broadly spreading, deciduous. White flower bracts turn reddish as they age. The leaves smaller and tinged bronze. Red compound fruits in March - food for birds. Autumn colours purplish to red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Fagus sylvatica</em></td>
<td>European beech</td>
<td>30 – 40m</td>
<td>Entryway hedge (2 panels); Broadly spreading, deciduous. Grown for timber on calcareous soil and widely used for hedging. Clips well. Light green in spring, golden copper in autumn and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Height Range</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanus orientalis x digitata</td>
<td>Oriental plane</td>
<td>15 – 25m</td>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus cerris</td>
<td>Turkey oak</td>
<td>25 - 35m</td>
<td>Vigorous when established. Broadly spreading, open form, deciduous. Tolerates exposure and dry conditions. Ducks cope with the long acorns. Timber not as highly regarded as other oaks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus coccinea</td>
<td>Scarlet oak</td>
<td>20 - 25m</td>
<td>E USA. Upright, broadly spreading, deciduous. Foliage dark glossy green turning to the best brilliant scarlet autumn colour. Less vigorous and shy seeder in colder areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus petraea x robur</td>
<td>Hybrid English oak</td>
<td>25 – 35m</td>
<td>Best clay oak: 2nd generation hybrids. Broadly spreading crown with strong central leader, a feature coming from the Q. petraea parent. Thrives in a wide range of conditions. Heavy acorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement species</td>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Carex comans</td>
<td>maurea</td>
<td>0.3m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hebe stricta var. atkinsonii</td>
<td>koromiko</td>
<td>2m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myoporum laetum</td>
<td>ngaio</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittosporum eugenioides</td>
<td>tarata</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poa aff. cita</td>
<td>Coastal silver tussock</td>
<td>0.5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Griselinia littoralis</td>
<td></td>
<td>12m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phormium cookianum</td>
<td>wharaiki</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
<td>production for domestic stock and wildlife. Recommended for timber.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C - Table of Reflectivity Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour Group</th>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Roots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>A05 to A14 and reflectance value &lt; 50%</td>
<td>A09 to A14 and reflectance value &lt; 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>B19 to B29 and reflectance value &lt; 50%</td>
<td>B23 to B29 and reflectance value &lt; 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>C35 to C40 and reflectance value &lt; 50%, and hue range 06-18</td>
<td>C38 to C40 and reflectance value &lt; 25%, and hue range 06-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D</td>
<td>D43 to D45 and reflectance value &lt; 50%, and hue range 06-12</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group E</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish</td>
<td>Matt or Low-Gloss</td>
<td>Matt or Low-Gloss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 855252:1976 (British Standard Framework for Colour Co-ordination for Building Purposes). Where a BS5252 descriptor code is not available, a sample colour chip equivalent to acceptable 855252 colours is satisfactory.

The consent holder shall engage the services of a professional to ensure the exterior cladding and colour selection are compatible with the long term durability of the building material in the subject environment and in accordance with the requirements under the Building Act 2004.