

From: Angela McArthur - Eco-Landscapes & Design Ltd
Landscape Architect
Registered NZILA Member

Subject: 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: Revised 7 October 2025

1. Introduction

1. My full name is Angela Mary McArthur. I am a consultant landscape architect and director of Eco-Landscapes and Design Ltd

Qualifications and Experience

2. I am a registered member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects and have worked in the field of landscape assessment and landscape design for over 25 years.
3. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree (Victoria University, Wellington) and a post graduate Diploma in Landscape Architecture (Lincoln College, Canterbury University). I have provided specialist advice and assessment in relation to landscape and visual effects, landscape and natural character and visual amenity for a range of resource consent applications and plan changes. I have provided evidence at hearings before Consent Authorities and the Environment Court.
4. I have worked on a range of projects in the lower North Island dealing with urban and rural development and subdivision, retirement villages and medium density housing.

Code of Conduct

5. I confirm I have read and complied with the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in preparing this evidence. I confirm that the issues addressed in this evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I have indicated that I am relying on others' opinions. I have not omitted material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my evidence.



2. Purpose of Report

6. I have been engaged by Kāpiti Coast District Council to review that landscape and visual effects have been accurately identified and assessed in relation to the proposed Private Plan Change (PPC) described in the Application by Welhom Ltd (the Requestor). The proposal is to rezone 12.65 hectares of 65 and 73 Ratanui Road (the Site), to General Residential Zone in a Plan Change to Kāpiti Coast District Council.
7. The proposed Plan Change includes:
 - Rezoning the Site at 65 and 73 Ratanui Road from Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) to General Residential Zone (GRZ).
 - New District Plan provisions including a Development Area Structure Plan (including new policies and rules).
8. Scope of my work is to provide an independent review of landscape and visual effects of the proposed plan change on zoning based on the information provided in the Application documents with respect to:
 - Statutory provisions proposed in the District Plan
 - Information provided in the Landscape Effects Assessment (LEA) prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd (Appendix D).
 - A visit to the site and its environs on 16 December 2024 to understand the character of the site and surrounding area.
 - Further information provided by Boffa Miskell Ltd, LA (13 February 2025) and Incite including revised DP Provisions and Structure Plan (25 February 2025)
 - Submissions received (June 2025) relevant to landscape and visual effects

3. Overview of Landscape and Visual Effects

9. Landscape and visual effects of the proposed Plan Change will include biophysical and natural character effects, effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Effects on visual amenity include views from public locations such as local roads, and views from private property.
10. The Requestor considers the 12.65 hectares site is appropriate and suitable for residential development; the location being within the RLZ and on the edge of existing residential zoning. The Plan Change site is situated between more urban and residential areas of Otaihanga to the north-east and Paraparaumu to the north and west.
11. Change in landscape character and management of potential loss of visual amenity and rural outlooks are key issues resulting from change in zoning from RLZ to GRZ.
12. Loss of natural character due to future earthworks to recontour the site for development is also a key consideration. Identification of natural features such as the high dunes straddling the northern boundary and ponding areas and how future



development will be avoided and/or managed in these areas needs to be adequately addressed through provisions in the district plan.

13. From observation the vegetation cover is pasture grasses and a mix of older exotic trees. Site visibility and potential visual impact of development due to removal of boundary trees must be taken in consideration when determining the overall scale of effects.

Assessment Methodology

14. I agree with the methodology, Section 2.1 Methodology Guidance, and full methodology outlined in Appendix 1 of the LEA report by Boffa Miskell Ltd. I agree with the adoption of the 7-point scale to describe and assess the magnitude of landscape and visual effects in accordance with the NZILA Guidelines¹.

							SIGNIFICANT
LESS THAN MINOR		MINOR			MORE THAN MINOR		
VERY LOW	LOW	LOW-MOD	MODERATE	MOD-HIGH	HIGH	VERY HIGH	

15. I consider that the potential viewing audiences have been identified and are accurately shown in the Graphic Supplement, Appendix 2 and the further information and photographs provided (13 February 2025)

Existing Environment

16. The site topography is undulating typical of the local dune landform, with ground levels across the rear of the site ranging from RL16m down to RL 4m. Close to the Ratanui Road frontage ground elevations range from RL12.5m down to RL 7m. The ground level rises sharply from the road level to dune crests set back approximately 15m from the front boundary. From Ratanui Road views into the site are limited due to high dunes close to the road.
17. A description of the wider character of the area is made in *Section 4.1 Site Location and Context*. I concur with the descriptions made. I agree 'Where unmodified by residential settlement, dune landforms predominate the area²' however in older residential areas along the Kāpiti Coast such as nearby Otaihanga, the dune landform remains.
18. A description of site character is found in *Section 4.1.1*; the undulating topography of the dunelands of the Kāpiti Coast, the rural pastoral character, the highly modified

¹ *Te Tangi a te Manu: Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines, Tuia Pito Ora*
New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects

² LEA Section 4.1 Site location and Context (last sentence)



stream crossing the site, ponding areas and surrounding rural lifestyle properties. I concur with the description of the site character.

19. I concur with the description of *Landscape Values, Section 4.2*. While brief, descriptions of physical and perceptual values including dune landform, existing vegetation and views from the site is made. Further reference to the existing environment is described in *Section 6.1 Natural Character Effects and 6.2 Landscape Effects*.
20. Associative Values such as the broader Kāpiti dunelands and cultural values associated with Māori settlement in the area have not been discussed. Modifications to drain the land and channel the stream are apparent, however the landform of the higher dunes and low-lying areas within the north and north-west end or rear of the site remains unmodified.

Site Visibility and Context

21. I generally agree with the terminology used to determine glimpses, partial and open views into the site in *Section 4.3 Baseline Visibility*. Extent of visibility is determined by views from the site and desktop analysis taking into account distance, elevation and foreground vegetation.
22. I agree that the *Graphic Supplement Appendix 2* has correctly and adequately portrayed site character, views out from the site to adjoining properties in Photographs A – J, and views from public locations in Viewpoints 1 - 3. Additional Photographs 1-7 provided as further information show additional views into or towards neighbouring residential properties in context with the site boundary.

4. Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects

Landscape Effects

23. I agree with the assessment that no vegetation of ecological value is found on the site and planting is proposed to mitigate and enhance future development. I agree that the site is located within an area of change and modification in the wider area.
24. The assessment does not address areas of the site more suitable for development and where development should be avoided such as the natural high dune straddling the rear boundary. The assessment considers the natural character of the site including the dunes to be of low value³ due to the level of modification across the site. I disagree as the dune landform going towards the rear of the site appears to be unmodified and part of the larger dune system that could be retained.

³ LEA Memorandum 13 February Response to RFI Question 4. Page1.



25. The updated DEV3 Ratanui Development Area Plan does show extended boundary planting and centralised constructed wetlands. I acknowledge that new provisions in the DP for retirement village and residential subdivision are proposed in DEV3-P1, DEV3-P2 and DEV3-R1, DEV3-R2, DEV3-R3. However more certainty around development areas of the site would assist in determining effects of the PC and potential retentions of more sensitive areas of the site.

Effects on Landscape Character

26. Landscape character changes will include loss of rural character and increased density due to residential scale development. Potentially there will be a reduction in visual amenity and loss of privacy, and reserve sensitivity and increased lighting levels effects.

27. Overall, I agree that the sensitivity of the site to land use change to residential could be acceptable, however would rate the scale of change Moderate given the uncertainty around retention of key landscape elements such as high dunes and the rural character of adjacent properties in the RLZ.

28. The Requestor has provided no indication where medium density housing, retirement village development and more sensitive areas of the site retained would occur. I anticipate adverse effects on landscape character would be Low-Moderate with the proposed DEV3 provisions and existing District Plan provisions to manage effects of earthworks. The vegetated buffer planting will mitigate for reduction in visual amenity, loss of privacy and reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent properties in the RLZ

Effects on Natural Character

RMA

Section 6(a) – the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Te Tangi a te Manu NZ Landscape Assessment Guidelines

Natural character has been interpreted as:

- The naturalness or degree of modification of an area*
- An area's distinct combination of natural characteristics and qualities*
- Naturalness being a measure of the actual and apparent modification from a fully natural state⁴*

⁴ Te Tangi a te Manu NZ Landscape Assessment Guidelines - Natural Character 9.02 (p 205)



29. I agree with the assessment that the site contains remnants of the Kāpiti dune landscape however I disagree that the site has very low levels of naturalness⁵. Modifications to drain the land and channel the stream are apparent, and loss of natural wetlands, however the dune landform largely remains unmodified. In my view the site has a moderate level of naturalness accounting for the modifications to wetlands, the stream and removal of indigenous vegetation.

30. I agree, the stream is highly modified with natural wetlands/swamps drained for farming use. The LEA 6.1 *Natural Character Effects assessment* identifies two man-made ponds that are not considered in the natural character assessment. From an old 1942 photograph⁶ much of the site was a swamp in the southern end. The 1942 photograph also shows the stream/drainage channel flowing through the open ditch as it is today.

31. In GWRC mapping the stream is labelled a drain or tributary of the Mazengarb Stream catchment which flows into the Waikanae River mouth.

32. I agree with the assessment that the site contains remnants of the Kāpiti dune landscape however disagree that the site has very low levels of naturalness. Naturalness being interpreted as the degree of modification from a fully natural state.

Effects on Visual Amenity

33. I agree with viewing audiences from public and private locations and the descriptions and conclusions made in *Section 6.3.2 Table 1, Visual Analysis from Private Locations*. Viewing audiences from private locations are limited to properties adjacent to the site, with the extent of visibility varying according to ground levels and foreground vegetation. From Ratanui Road views into the site are limited due to the high dunes close to the road.

34. Properties adjacent to the southeast corner of the site were determined to be most affected due to existing outlooks over the southern boundary, potential loss of privacy and reduction in visual amenity. For these properties at 81,85, 91 Ratanui Road I agree adverse visual effects would be low-moderate.

35. Properties adjoining the western boundary at 155 Mazengarb Road, 50 and 54 Wood Leigh had partial to open views over the site and dwellings located close to the shared boundary. Adverse visual effects on these properties would be low or low-moderate. Existing boundary trees of varying quality and ownership will most likely will be removed if the PC site was to be developed. Boundary treatments to assist integration and provide a visual buffer into future development is recommended for the entire site perimeter.

⁵ LEA Section 6.1 Natural Character Effects, pg 14 para 3

⁶ Appendix F, Archaeological Assessment, Fig 9, page 11



36. The property at 117 Ratanui Road, located adjacent to the eastern boundary, adverse effects were determined to be low-moderate where the dwelling was located close to the boundary and where recently felled trees allow open views into the PC site.
37. Adverse visual effects on all other properties surrounding the site perimeter were determined to be very low to neutral. Provisions to provide a vegetated or landscaped buffer planting around the parts of the perimeter is proposed; the entire perimeter adjacent to properties in the RLZ is recommended.

Effects on Reverse Sensitivity

38. Reverse sensitivity effects due to development of the site will include intensification of development and buildings on the site, not anticipated in the RLZ leading to potential reduction in visual amenity, loss of privacy and potential conflicts due to hobby farming activities.

Construction Effects

39. Construction effects would be anticipated over several years. Construction effects due to development and subdivision will include effects from noise, vibration, dust and traffic movements. It is anticipated these effects including hours of work will be managed by future resource consent conditions and a construction management plan.
40. Some of these effects can be reduced with inclusion of the 5 metres wide landscaped and vegetated buffer around the entire site perimeter. As no roads, development and open space areas are identified on the proposed Development Area Structure Plan it is difficult to anticipate the scale of effect.

5. Proposed Mitigation and District Plan Provisions

41. Overall, I agree with and support the two types of visual mitigation planting proposed and locations shown on the Development Area Structure Plan. The landscaped buffer and the vegetated buffer. The intention of the landscaped buffer is to assist integration of future development areas and may include a range of treatments including planting, fencing and earth bunds. The landscaped buffer is proposed to be 5 metres in width and adjacent to the site boundary.
42. The vegetated buffer will provide screening and privacy for residents in the RLZ. The vegetated buffer is proposed to be 5 metres in width and include a mix of indigenous shrubs and trees naturally found in the local region. The RFI response from the LEA (Boffa Miskell LA) has provided a list of suitable species. The vegetated buffer includes the boundary with 153 and 155 Mazengarb Road adjoining the western boundary.
43. *Section 7 of the LEA advises that 'sensitive earthworks designed to ensure that the development platforms are sensitively and effectively integrated into the existing terrain along the edges of the Site'*⁷.

⁷ LEA Section 7, Recommendations pg. 34



44. DEV3-P1 (4a) and DEV3-P2(5d) – The following provisions have been updated to enable protection of the high dunes within the northern and eastern edges of the site '*development platforms that are sensitively and effectively integrated into the existing terrain along the edges of the Site, particularly in the northern and eastern edges (retaining walls will minimised in favour of natural batters where practicable)*'⁸

45. Earthworks will need to be designed considering existing DP provisions specifically with respect to DO-11 and EW-P1, to ensure adverse effects on natural landforms, residential amenity values and rural character are remedied and mitigated.

46. Provisions DEV3-P1 (4e) and DEV3-P2 (5e) '*providing an appropriate landscaped and/or vegetated buffer in areas indicated in the DEV3 - Figure 1 Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan to soften the transition from a residential to a rural lifestyle land use*'.

47. In my view the buffer planting areas are designed to soften the transition from the RLZ to the proposed residential zone and not the other way around. To ensure effectiveness of the buffer areas a minimum width of 5 metres for both the landscaped and vegetated buffer must be including in the provision and labelled on DEV3-Figure 1.

48. I agree with and support the policy provisions to provide offset wetlands and stormwater management wetlands; street trees and amenity planting, and riparian planting to restore the highly modified stream [DEV3-P1 (3) & (4) and DEV3-P2 (4) & (5)]

49. DEV3-R1 Retirement Village within the Ratanui Development is proposed as a Controlled Activity for the proposed PC. Given the uncertainties regarding the development areas, the extent of earthworks, and the siting, form, and scale of the proposed retirement village, I believe that a discretionary activity status would be more suitable. Furthermore, there is insufficient information concerning whether the entire site is intended for use as a retirement village, residential housing, or a combination of both.

50. I note that Appendices for Ngārara and Waikanae North Development Areas include a conceptual masterplan showing the layout of proposed development areas including roads, neighbourhoods, wetlands, buffer planting and retirement village area. The proposed PC site is a smaller area with restricted access from the public road therefore this much detail may not be necessary.

⁸ Incite RFI updated draft Provisions dated 25 February 2025



6. Relevant Planning Matters

Referred to in Appendix 4 LEA include:

Resource Management Act - RMA

Section 6(a) – the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development

Section 7(c) – the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values.

Section 7(f) – the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment.

Coastal Environment

NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS)

Objective 2: To preserve the natural character of the coastal environment and protect natural features and landscape values through: • *recognising the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character;* • *natural features and landscape values and their location and distribution;* *identifying those areas where various forms of subdivision, use, and development would be inappropriate and protecting them from such activities; and encouraging restoration of the coastal environment.*

Policy 13 in relation to preserving natural character by avoiding significant adverse effects on the dune landforms.

Policy 14 in relation to promoting restoration of natural character

Policy 15 in relation to protecting natural features and natural landscapes of the coastal environment

DO-O4 Coastal Environment

To have a coastal environment where:

1. *areas of outstanding natural character and high natural character, outstanding natural features and landscapes, areas of significant indigenous vegetation, and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified and protected;*
2. *areas of outstanding natural character and high natural character are restored where degraded;*
3. *the effects of inappropriate subdivision, use and development are avoided, remedied, or mitigated;*
4. *public access to and along the coast to facilitate active and passive recreational use is maintained and enhanced while managing inappropriate vehicle access; and*
5. *Inappropriate development does not result in further loss of coastal dunes in the area mapped as the coastal environment*

Policy CE- P3 Preservation of Natural Character

Preserve natural character in the coastal environment, and protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, including by:

1. *avoiding adverse effects of activities on natural character in areas of outstanding natural character;*
2. *avoiding significant adverse effects, and avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects of activities on natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment;*
3. *reinstating dunes which function as natural buffers where practicable;*
4. *providing managed public access ways to the beach and foreshore and limiting damage to Coastal Environment Operative: 20/08/2025 Page 6 of 16 Print Date: 20/08/2025 dunes from unmanaged access;*



5. regulating encroachment of permanent structures and private uses onto the beach or public land;
6. removing existing unnecessary structures and associated waste materials from the beach; and
7. retaining a natural beach and foreshore including a dry sand beach where practicable

Policy CE- P4 Restore Natural Character

Promote restoration of the natural character of the coastal environment where practicable, by:

1. creating or enhancing indigenous habitats and ecosystems, using local genetic stock;
2. encouraging natural regeneration of indigenous species, while effectively managing weed and animal pests;
3. rehabilitating dunes and other natural coastal features or processes, including saline wetlands and intertidal saltmarshes;
4. restoring and protecting riparian and intertidal margins;
5. removing redundant coastal structures and materials that do not have heritage or amenity values; or
6. redesign of structures that interfere with ecosystem processes

Comments

51. I agree with the LEA in Section 6.1 Assessment of Natural Character Effects that the stream crossing the site has been highly modified. The natural wetlands identified are small and isolated and modified due to grazing over the site. I agree the dunes within the site are characteristic of the Kāpiti coastal region. I believe the dune landform within the site is integral to the wider dune system within properties adjacent to the site and local area. It is proposed that works to prepare the site for residential development would fully alter the site's topography. Ecological values are degraded due to removal of indigenous vegetation and longstanding farming activities. The site is not located within a Special Amenity Landscape or identified as an Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature in the DP.
52. The assessment that natural character values are low may not fully account for the landform; natural character values could be described as moderate relative to these features in my opinion.
53. Provisions DEV3-P1(4a) and DEV3-P2(5d) are proposed identifying for further protection higher dunes within the northern boundary and eastern edges of the site.

KCDC Objectives and Policies

Relevant to development in the Coastal Environment, Rural Lifestyle Zone and General Residential Zone

DO-O2 Ecology and Biodiversity

To improve indigenous biological diversity and ecological resilience through:

1. protecting areas of significant indigenous vegetation, and significant habitats of indigenous fauna;
2. encouraging restoration of the ecological integrity of indigenous ecosystems;
3. enhancing the health of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems; and
4. enhancing the mauri of waterbodies

DO-O4 Coastal Environment

To have a coastal environment where:



1. *areas of outstanding natural character and high natural character, outstanding natural features and landscapes, areas of significant indigenous vegetation, and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified and protected;*
2. *areas of outstanding natural character and high natural character are restored where degraded;*
3. *the effects of inappropriate subdivision, use and development are avoided, remedied, or mitigated;*
4. *public access to and along the coast to facilitate active and passive recreational use is maintained and enhanced while managing inappropriate vehicle access; and*
5. *Inappropriate development does not result in further loss of coastal dunes in the area mapped as the coastal environment*

DO-O11 Character and Amenity Values Amended

To recognise the unique character and amenity values of the District's distinct communities, while providing for character and amenity values to develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations, resulting in:

1. *residential areas characterised by the presence of mature vegetation, a variety of built forms and building densities, the retention of landforms, and the recognition of unique community identities;*
2. *vibrant, lively metropolitan and town centres supported by higher density residential and mixed use areas;*
3. *local centres, village communities and employment areas characterised by high levels of amenity, accessibility and convenience;*
4. *productive rural areas, characterised by openness, natural landforms, areas and corridors of indigenous vegetation, and primary production activities; and*
5. *well managed interfaces between different types of land use areas (e.g. between living, working and rural areas) and between potentially conflicting land uses, so as to minimise adverse effects*

Policy CE-P3 Preservation of Natural Character; Policy CE-P4 Restore Natural Character; Policy GRZ-P7 Development and Landforms;

Policy GRZ-10 Residential Amenity; Policy GRZ-11 Residential Streetscape

Policy GRZ-12 Landscaping;

Policy GRZ-P20 MDRS 1; Policy GRZ-P22 MDRS 2;

Policy GRZ-P28 Retirement Villages

Earthworks EW-P1

Earthworks activities excluding extractive industries, the removal and replacement of underground storage tanks, and earthworks defined in and regulated by the NESCF will:

1. *be managed to protect geological features identified in Schedule 6 from disturbance; and*
2. *be sympathetically located and of a scale that protects the values of outstanding natural features and landscapes identified in Schedule 4; and*
3. *avoid or mitigate erosion and off-site silt and sediment runoff to the Council's reticulated stormwater system and waterbodies; and*
4. *be managed to ensure adverse effects on natural landforms, residential amenity values and rural character values are remedied or mitigated.*

This policy does not apply to extractive industries, the removal and replacement of underground storage tanks, and earthworks defined in and regulated by the NESCF.

Comments

54. The site adjoins the GRZ in part, approximately 150m of the western boundary borders properties in the GRZ. Along Ratanui Road, the GRZ starts immediately west of the



driveway into 65 Ratanui Road at 53 Ratanui Road, continuing towards Mazengarb Road intersection.

55. Section 6.4 of the LEA assessment makes a comparison of the expected appearance of development due to residential and retirement village development with the overall character similar and predominantly urban. I agree with these findings and agree that residential scale development in this location would be appropriate with specific provisions.
56. I agree with the findings in the LEA *Section 6.4.1 KCDP Objectives and Policies* that the PC to GRZ would not significantly affect the natural character of the Coastal Environment if managed sensitively, that there are opportunities to enhance natural character values and that effects on surrounding rural lifestyle properties can be managed with sensitively located and integrated residential development.
57. Overall, I agree with the effects assessment in LEA *Section 6* due to residential subdivision and/or retirement village development, there will be change in landscape character over the site expected to be low-moderate (with minor effects) where there will be loss of open and pastoral character, changes to the topography and introduction of residential development.
58. I agree the site is within a transitional area between the RLZ and GRZ where expansion of residential development could be expected in this location and is identified in the Kapiti Growth Strategy for medium term growth. Recommendations are made to provide buffer planting to soften the transition between the existing RLZ and proposed residential.
59. I agree with the recommendations made in *Section 7, Recommendations* of the LEA, which have been adopted as DEV3 provisions proposed in the District Plan. Overall, I agree with the effects determined in the LEA *Section 9, Conclusion* where effects on natural character are assessed as Neutral given the sites low level of natural character.
60. I agree with the assessment of change in landscape character that over time adverse effects would reduce as the development areas are completed and landscaped.
61. I agree with the conclusions made that visibility and visual effects are limited from public areas, however once the site is developed and open to the street view the visual impact of residential development will be apparent however, not uncharacteristic of the GRZ.
62. I agree that visibility varies for adjacent properties surrounding the site, with effects of the PC determined to be Neutral or Very Low to Low – Moderate.

6. Review of Submitter Concerns

63. On 16 December 2024 I walked over the site including close to the Site boundary with adjoining properties potentially affected by the proposal. I also travelled around the area observing the site and neighbouring properties from public roads. I have since



undertaken another site visit considering again the location of submitters properties to assist further in providing an independent review of comments relevant to landscape and visual effects, landscape character and visual amenity effects raised by submitters.

64. Submitter 2 – Ian Lang (no address provided)

The submitter opposes the PPC raising concerns relating to:

- effects on adjoining properties, such as change in ground levels within site and effects on draining and additional flooding over their land. I note the large pond located close to the eastern boundary adjacent to 97 Ratanui Road.
- Reverse sensitivity effects due to rural lifestyle activities such as noise from animals and pest control.
- Requests a planted buffer zone inside the fence line of the Site.

65. Submitter 6 – Stephen Alexander and Linda Parsons – 81 Ratanui Road

The submitter supports in principle with amendments. Concerns related to loss of privacy, ecological effects on existing waterways and the cost of additional stormwater mitigation for their property.

- The 'low' scale of potential visual effects determined was questioned. The LEA report (*Table 1, Visibility Analysis from Private Locations, page 21*) has assessed the scale of adverse visual effects on this property as 'low-moderate'.
- Reverse sensitivity effects were also raised. The properties owners were concerned that existing property rights associated with the rural lifestyle zoning could be affected, and
- adverse effects due to earthworks close to their boundary. My recommendation is that no earthworks or ground disturbance is allowed within 5m of the boundary within this part of the site where the relative levels are similar.
- Also damage to fencing along driveway if old trees area removed as roots are now under their driveway

66. Submitter 7- Derek and Helen Foo – 85 Ratanui Road

The submitter supports the proposed plan change in principle however main concerns are:

- Loss of privacy, rural outlook and biodiversity.
- Requests that the 5m wide vegetated buffer be extended as shown on the marked-up aerial in 'yellow'. The submitter's property adjoins the southern boundary, with boundaries also shared with 81 and 91 Ratanui Road.
- Requests established native plants endemic to the Kāpiti region are used for the buffer (no karo).
- Requests only single level buildings within 100m of their boundary. I note that the RLZ permits farm buildings up to 10m and habitable buildings up to 8m set back 5m from the boundary.
- Scale of change and potential visual intrusion and loss of rural outlook as Low-Moderate is underestimated in the LEA (*Appendix 4, Section 4.1.1 and Table 1*)
- Requests appropriate stormwater mitigation during and after any development on the site
- Requests contours/ground levels be maintained around the shared boundary to mitigate potential additional flooding



67. Submitter 8 - Sarah Dane Coles- 91 Ratanui Road

The submitter opposes the proposed plan change. Concerns raised included:

- Loss of neighbourhood character and green space; the higher density incompatible with the existing character
- Biodiversity loss in particular bird life in the area and loss of habitats
- Buffer planting to be between 2m and 6m (in height), and undertaken by developer prior to construction commencing

68. Submitter 10 - Ellen Cohen C/-Montcalm Family Trust – 153 Mazengarb Road

The submitter supports in principle with amendments. The main concerns are:

- Views of multi storey buildings 5m from the boundary
- Requests building height reduction close to the boundary/perimeter of development area
- Effects on ponding at boundary with the PC site.
- Requests that old boundary trees be removed early with no risk to their property
- Requests temporary fencing to reduce noise, sand and dust during earthworks and construction.
- Requests developer funds pest control for rabbits during construction and ongoing
- Ensure that the landscaped buffer is planted post construction

69. Submitter 11- Alan Kelly – 54 Wood Leigh

The submitter was in support of the proposed PC with conditions (1,2) below ensuring:

- 1. *That the large sand dune which straddles the northern boundary of the Site (and which wraps around the boundary on the eastern side of the Site) is not removed, undercut, scraped, or otherwise developed so as to remove any sand whatsoever from the dune; and*
- 2. *That the large sand dune which straddles the northern boundary of the Site (and which wraps around the boundary on the eastern side of the Site) is planted out with indigenous species which are typical of this coastal area*
- Submitter also refers recommendations made regarding avoiding earthworks in the northern dunes⁹.

70. Submitter 14 – Hayden Milburn – 64 Killalea Place

The submitter opposes the proposed plan change. Concerns raised included:

- Disagrees with the predicted growth and need for additional GRZ land given the existing land zoned MDRZ available for development
- Visual impact of intensification and tall buildings on adjacent properties and public spaces
- Potential reverse sensitivity effects

71. Submitter 15 – Paul Coggan – 27A Ratanui Road

The submitter opposes the proposed plan change. Concerns raised included:

⁹ App H, Civil Eng Infrastructure Ass by Woods, Section 2.2 Finished Site Levels and Earthworks pg 8 and;
App F, Archaeological Ass, by Clough, Summary of Results pg. 33



- The LEA (*Appendix D*) did not adequately assess state of existing trees at boundaries with adjoining properties and change in outlook or visual impact on adjacent properties if these trees are removed. Trees are predominantly old and deciduous
- Requests that the landscaped and planted buffer be extended to include the entire boundary

72. Submitter 16 – John Phillip Le Harivel – 16 Otaihanga Road

The submitter supports the proposed plan change with amendments. Concerns raised included:

- Requests conditions to mitigate downstream effects from additional stormwater in the wider area due to under capacity drainage channel between the site and Mazengarb Stream.
- Requests conditions to ensure adequate planting for visual screening to adjoining properties

Summary of Submitters Concerns

73. In general concerns raised by several submitters relevant to landscape and visual effects, included loss of outlook and privacy, views of tall buildings and reverse sensitivity effects in relation to existing use rights associated with the RLZ.

74. Other concerns raised included:

- a) Earthworks close to boundary causing visual intrusion, loss of natural character, biodiversity and drainage problems (Submitters 2, 6, 7,8,11)
- b) Requesting vegetated buffer to be 5 metres in width, for planting to be within 3-4 metres or between 2-6 metres in height max; to use plant species occurring naturally in the Kapiti region, planting to be undertaken prior to any development work and for the vegetated buffer to include their entire property boundary (Submitters 2,6,7,8)
- c) Requested old trees at boundary to be removed prior to development work and temporary fencing installed to reduce construction effects (Submitter 10)
- d) Views of tall buildings, requests for a reduction in building heights close to boundary and adequate building set back (Submitters 7,10,14)
- e) Requested the northern dunes area to be avoided and restored with appropriate indigenous plant species (Submitter 11).

75. In response, some of these concerns have been addressed in the updated DEV3 provisions and will be managed at the time of a resource consent application. Further amendments to provisions (policies and rules) are recommended to provide clearer guidance for future development within the PC site that include the following:



- a) Specify that tree and shrub species used in the vegetated buffer are indigenous species naturally occurring in the local region,
- b) Further details to describe the landscaped buffer to including planting, fencing and earth bunds where appropriate,
- c) Appropriate planting to restore dunes outside development areas,
- d) Extend the 5m wide vegetated or landscape buffer to include the entire site perimeter.

7. Conclusions

76. I have reviewed the (LEA) and other supporting documents for the proposed PPC4 to the District Plan, to rezone the site from RLZ to GRZ with associated structure plan and development area provisions. I agree that the LEA has identified and considered effects of viewing audiences and identified the landscape values of the site.

77. The assessment considers loss of visual amenity on rural lifestyle properties adjacent will not be prominent in views and can be absorbed within the receiving environment. Adverse visual effects were determined as **low** to **low-moderate** depending on the level of unobstructed views and distance.

78. I believe that residential scale development subject to the GRZ will have a contrasting appearance however, provisions proposed will address the transition between the existing rural lifestyle zone and the proposed GRZ for the site.

79. In response to submitter's concerns future amendments to provisions should be considered with recommendation listed in paragraph 75, with further information and amendments to be provided by the Requestor.

80. The assessment proposes that topography will be fully altered to prepare the site for residential development. The predictions of landscape and landscape character effects remain uncertainty around how development will occur over the site. In my opinion proposed and existing DP policies and rules will adequately address these matters as a discretionary activity through resource consent.

81. I have reviewed updated DEV3 provisions (25 February,2025) proposed by the Requestor. I have provided further recommendations to be provided on the structure plan and in PPC4 provisions in paragraphs 47 and 75 including that the landscaped of vegetated buffer should have a minimum width of 5 metres.

82. With these added provisions, I believe the provisions are appropriate and sufficient to manage the potential landscape and visual effects of residential development on the receiving environment.



Angela McArthur

Eco-Landscapes & Design Ltd

Registered Member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Angela McArthur". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Angela" on the top line and "McArthur" on the bottom line.