

Reply Statement	
Requester's Evidence	
From:	Angela McArthur - Eco-Landscapes & Design Ltd Landscape Architect, Registered NZILA Member
Subject:	Peer Review of Landscape and Visual Effects for the Proposed Private Plan Change Application (PC4) by Welhom Developments Ltd to Rezone 12.65 Hectares at 65 and 73 Ratanui Road, Paraparaumu
Date:	16 February 2026

Legal Submission

1. In paragraph 5.9 Mr Minhinnick refers to Ms. Gardiner's evidence *'that while substantive vegetative buffering will assist in reducing visual effects, the design must also avoid creating an isolated, inward-looking development and ensure integration with the wider neighbourhood'*. I don't agree entirely. Many older people opt for retirement villages because they want a safe and sheltered setting, separated from the typical open urban environment. Also, I would like to reiterate that the buffer area is about ensuring a greater building setback from the boundary than the MRDS allows for, as well as providing planting and landscape treatment within the interface with the RLZ.
2. In 5.12 Mr Minhinnick asserts that *'the Plan Change Area is surrounded by areas of urban/residential development and is already zoned for residential development'*. While this may be true in parts of the wider area, most of the immediate area surrounding the PC site is Rural Lifestyle Zone. The PC anticipates a change in landscape character over the Site however managing adverse visual amenity effects on the Rural Lifestyle Zone needs to be adequately addressed and reflected in the Structure Plan and provisions.

Landscape and Visual – Hearing Summary Statement

3. In 2.3 (b) Ms Gardiner refers to the *'modified dune landforms'* and in (c) states that *'Effects on natural character are very low'*. I disagree as this could imply that natural character values are negligible and that effects due to new elements or earthworks will be barely discernible. I would like to reiterate that in my opinion, the dune landforms at the northern end of the site are largely unmodified and worthy of some degree of avoidance or preservation in terms of protection.



4. In 2.3 (e) Ms Gardiner refers to managing visual effects on adjacent dwellings targeting highly sensitive interface areas. I question whether identifying highly sensitive interface areas will be done prior to any design for earthworks or location of buildings on the site. In my view it will be difficult to manage where these highly sensitive interface areas are located without some prior identification. In my view, a revised Structure Plan should show the buffer extended to the entire site perimeter to address perimeter constraints on all adjacent sites. This will ensure the buffer provides a vegetated transition area to avoid future residents within the PC site overlooking into the RLZ where residents should be able to move around their properties and not be overlooked.
5. In 2.4 Ms Gardiner refers to her s92 response where the 5m wide buffer was proposed and was what she considered at the time a meaningful width. I agreed that a 5m wide buffer was suitable as this would also guarantee a transition area and building setback of at least 5 meters which would be consistent with the building setbacks anticipated within properties in the RLZ. In Ms Gardiner's primary evidence the buffer width will now be determined at the RC stage to reflect the situation and necessity for screening. I find this problematic as there is no certainty that the buffer will be greater than a 1m width if single level buildings are proposed at the boundary and the location is not considered a 'highly sensitive interface'.
6. In 3.7 Ms Gardiner disagrees that a 5m wide buffer is required the entire site perimeter suggesting 'this would risk an artificial edge and segregation from an area anticipated to urbanise over time'. The purpose or concept of a retirement village is to establish a distinct community, typically enclosed by fencing and landscaping, with open views into the site generally restricted to the street entrance. I reiterate that currently, most of the surrounding properties are located in the RLZ and have a pastoral, rural character, with several properties having open views into the PC site. I believe it is important to focus on the present environment and the potential impacts resulting from a change to GRZ within the PC site, rather than speculating about possible future developments in the neighbouring area.

Angela McArthur (Consultant Landscape Architect for Kapiti Coast District Council)
Eco-Landscapes & Design Ltd
Registered Member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects

