

Date: 07/11/2024

Attention: Elliott Thornton, Principal Planner, Cuttriss

---

dgse.co.nz

Auckland  
Tauranga  
Napier  
Palmerston North  
Wellington  
Queenstown

## RE-LANDSCAPE & VISUAL ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW RESPONSE

### 160 Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu

The purpose of this addendum is to provide a response to the peer review prepared by Boffa Miskell (dated 24<sup>th</sup> October) and provided by Kāpiti Coast District Council in relation to the Resource Consent application for subdivision and development of 160 Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu.

This does not alter or revise the Landscape and Visual Assessment undertaken by DGSE, rather it is to provide comments for the further information requested around the boundary between the proposed development and existing neighbours.

---

dgse@dgse.co.nz

#### Comments to be addressed:

*"...no consideration of effects on private views are presented in the assessment. The views of these residents will be the most impacted by the proposed development as they are static, sensitive and in proximity to the development site. In my opinion, effects on these viewers would be moderate adverse. Therefore, further information on the boundary treatment between the proposed development and existing neighbours should be requested to understand how these effects would be mitigated."*

#### Response:

As stated in the peer review, there is general agreement in the findings and conclusions of the DGSE LVA in providing an understanding on the impact of the proposed residential development on both the landscape of the site, the wider area and on the visual amenity of the public viewers.

Therefore, I will focus my comments only on the requested further information by the peer review, to understand the visual effects on private views for the existing neighbours surrounding the site.

To identify the potential effects, I will categorise the existing neighbours into the below:

- Northern Neighbours (14, 8B, 6B College Drive, 150 Mazengarb Road)
- Western Neighbours (3, 9 & 11 Holcombe Drive)
- Southern Neighbours (6 Nilu Sila Way, and 3 vacant lots for future dwellings).

The existing site description has been well detailed in the Resource Consent application documents and will be forming the basis of my assessment of the existing situation. The consideration of a permitted baseline situation is based on the provided hypothetical situation in the architectural documentation - refer to Appendix B, *Architectural Plans* (prepared by Designgroup Stapleton Elliott dated 24/07/24).

I have also used Figure 4 of the Appendix K. *Urban Design Assessment* (prepared by Urban Acumen, dated 26/07/24) to assume the orientation and placement of these outdoor living areas when assessing the potential views of these neighbours.

*Northern Neighbours (14, 8B, 6B College Drive, 150 Mazengarb Road)*

As illustrated in fig. 4 of the Urban Design report, the indoor and outdoor living spaces of the northern neighbours are assumed to be predominantly north facing, with slight variations in eastern and western aspects. While there may be fleeting or direction views from windows or as one approaches the house or driveway, I do not believe these would constitute views experienced frequently by these residents.

With the proposed development site being located south of these dwellings, it is suggested that south-facing views or visual outlook onto this area do not contribute to the amenity levels that these living spaces provide and therefore any change due to either a proposed permitted baseline development or the current proposed development would not affect the amenity levels of these dwellings.

Consequently, although these residents are in close proximity to the development, I consider that little to no meaningful amenity provided from these views. As such, the proposed development will result in limited change to the existing situation, resulting in the visual effect to be very low.

*Western Neighbours (3, 9 & 11 Holcombe Drive)*

As demonstrated in Figure 4 of the *Urban Design Assessment*, the assumed orientation and placement of these outdoor living areas are predominantly north-facing, with either an eastern or western aspects. This would suggest that, while the existing main outlook from these areas could partially include the site in views from the indoor/outdoor living space, it is not necessarily the primary or dominant view. In the existing situation, the main dwelling and an ancillary building are positioned along the western boundary, and therefore, it is assumed that current views from these residents may feature varying frames of the existing dwelling and ancillary buildings, with varying vegetation in the background.

If a permitted baseline proposal was implemented, as demonstrated in the hypothetical scenario outlined in the architectural documentation, this proposal could result in an increased presence and visibility of built form, with larger mass and scale than what is currently existing on site. It is assumed that the visual effect of this change - from the existing situation to the permitted baseline scenario - although similar in nature as it would still contain buildings and subsequent vegetation, would create a visual effect that is no more than low to low-moderate.

Considering the direction of views towards the site, which contribute only partially to the outlook from these assumed indoor and outdoor living areas, each of these three neighbouring residences would have views of between two-four proposed dwellings. 10 Holcombe Drive, in particular, has the fewest adjoining new proposed buildings and is assumed to be predominantly orientated to the north-west for its indoor/outdoor living outlook, which faces away from the proposed development. A new 1800mm timber fence is proposed along all of the boundaries, with a compliant setback distance for the built form, although it is acknowledged that there is a small breach in the height recession planes along this boundary. The proposed buildings on the western side of the development are predominantly single-storey (with the exception of one dwelling) and have smaller mass compared to what would typically be found in the surrounding neighbourhood. It is common to see boundary fences, neighbouring dwellings overtop, and vegetation within neighbouring lots as part of this view. This represents a typical viewing experience within an urban context and is seen to be of a comparative visual effect to the permitted baseline scenario, which I consider to be no more than low for 10 Holcombe Drive, and no more than low to low-moderate for 3-9 Holcombe Drive.

Consequently, when disregarding the effects of the permitted baseline scenario, I consider the residual effect to be very low.

*Southern Neighbours (6 Nilu Sila Way, and 3 vacant lots for future dwellings)*

Currently, on the properties immediately adjoining the southern boundary, there is only one existing dwelling, with an additional three dwellings anticipated to be constructed in the future on the vacant lots. The assumed indoor and outdoor living of both the existing dwelling at 6 Nilu Sila Way and possible future buildings are predominantly north-facing, with a strong northward view outlook.

---

dgse.co.nz

Auckland  
Tauranga  
Napier  
Palmerston North  
Wellington  
Queenstown

---

dgse@dgse.co.nz



designgroup  
**stapleton elliot**

As a result, their current viewshaft from these indoor and outdoor living spaces is relatively clear, with small amount of various site vegetation and possibly glimpses of distant houses.

Regardless of whether a permitted baseline development or the proposed development was implemented on the site, there is going to be a change in the views from these residences due to the nature of the current view, as well as the direct orientation and outlook of these living spaces. If a permitted baseline proposal was implemented, it is assumed that views out towards the subject site would contain varying compositions of built form and associated landscaping or vegetation, while still offering some clear views between these elements. Therefore, I would consider this visually to be a change from what is existing, but one that retains some of the outlook and original view qualities. As a result, the visual effect of a permitted baseline development for the southern neighbours would be low-moderate.

The proposed development has a greater density along the southern boundary than that demonstrated in the permitted baseline scenario. Although the proposed buildings are of smaller bulk than what is typical in the area, each of the neighbouring residential lots would adjoin between three-four proposed dwellings. This would suggest that the views from these properties could experience a residual effect greater than what is provided under the permitted baseline, as the outlook will be increasingly occupied up by the proposed new built form.

While any development or change along this boundary will inevitably have an effect; this does not necessarily mean it will have a negative impact. It is acknowledged that the development will be visible from the neighbouring properties and is of a differing nature to the existing situation. However, I consider the outlook to not be fundamentally different from that of the permitted baseline, but rather an increased visual change. As such, the visual effects on the southern neighbours to be moderate.

Consequently, when disregarding the effects of the permitted baseline scenario, I consider the residual effect to be no more than very low to low.

Overall, when considering the immediate views from the neighbouring properties, I consider that the effects range from negligible to moderate. However, when disregarding the effects of the permitted baseline, the residual effects range from negligible to low, which when considering the NZILA Te Tangi a te Manu, is a less than minor effect.

Yours faithfully,



Caitlin Cook  
Senior Landscape Architect

---

Mobile: 022 047 9373  
Email: c.cook@dgse.co.nz

---

dgse.co.nz

Auckland  
Tauranga  
Napier  
Palmerston North  
Wellington  
Queenstown

---

dgse@dgse.co.nz



designgroup  
**stapleton elliott**