

1 November 2024

Sussex Trust
C/- Cuttriss Consultants
PO Box 386
Paraparaumu 5254
Attn: Emma Bean

By email (only) to: Emma.Bean@cuttriss.co.nz

Dear Emma

Reports commissioned under s92(2) RMA – Resource Consent Application

Application number(s):	RM240112
Applicant:	Sussex Trust
Location:	160 Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu
Proposed activity(s):	56-lot subdivision comprising 41 residential lots, 14 carparks and a private road/communal area lot; and for construction of 41 dwellings, a private loop road and associated earthworks not meeting permitted activity standards

Thank you for your application which we have received and accepted for processing.

Pursuant to Section 92(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), Council commissioned peer reviews of the following assessments provided in support of the application:

1. *Landscape and Visual Assessment* (prepared by DesignGroup Stapleton Elliot and dated 23 September 2024).
2. *160 Mazengarb Rd, Paraparaumu: Urban Design Assessment* (prepared by Urban Acumen and dated 26 July 2024).

These peer reviews were received by Council on Thursday 31 October 2024.

Recommendations of peer reviews

The peer reviews included a number of comments and recommendations, which are outlined below. Please consider and respond to the comments and recommendations made in the peer reviews.

Landscape Assessment Peer Review

1. Comment 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.”

(Paragraph 54, Section 11 Conclusions, Landscape Assessment Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

Relevant excerpts from review:

“...the LVEA does not provide any commentary or assessment on the nature and level of effect experienced by the immediate neighbours of the proposed development site. It is these viewers who I consider to be most impacted by the development given the high value and static nature of the view.

Currently, views for these residents extend across a largely open area of landscape, with a single dwelling and associated outbuildings located towards the rear of the site, set back from the boundary and surrounded by trees (see Photograph 1 and 2, below). Views from rear and side windows from neighbouring properties and garden spaces would be impacted by the proposed development as new dwellings would be built in proximity to the site boundary, and multiple dwellings would be visible in a single view. While views of neighbouring properties are to be expected when living in a residential area, the proposed density/ number of dwellings seen from an existing property would be different to views resulting from a permitted baseline scenario.”

(Paragraphs 47-48, Section 9 Visual Effects, Landscape Assessment Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

“...consideration of views from neighbouring properties should be undertaken to identify whether any further mitigation is required to reduce, remedy or avoid effects on these neighbours. Further information on the boundary treatment between the proposed development and existing neighbours is required to understand how these effects would be mitigated.”

(Paragraph 52, Section 10 Recommended Mitigation, Landscape Assessment Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

Urban Design Peer Review

2. Recommendation:

Introduce some semi-detached typologies to open up space for:

- *A pedestrian connection from Mazengarb Road to link to the pedestrian path between units 08 and 09.*
- *Larger pockets of land for landscape treatment which support planting of more specimen trees across the site.*

Relevant excerpts from review:

“While I agree that no through link can be provided due to the singular frontage, the finer grain of the development would benefit from a secondary pedestrian entrance along the frontage. This would reduce the number of internalised dead-end routes and improve the internal circulation of the site. This could be achieved without reducing yield by creating space through utilising a duplex typology along Mazengarb Road.”

(Page 2, Access and Bicycle Parking, Urban Design Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

“If a through link is created for the pedestrian pathway leading to Unit 08 as suggested in Guideline 16, this would help improve legibility to the front entrance by opening up the path network. If not, a clearer design solution may be to co-locate the front and back entrances like the A, B1, C, D and F typologies for consistent front entrance legibility across the site, and to maximise internal circulation and space inside the unit.”

(Page 3, Entrances, Urban Design Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

“...I consider a more consolidated design approach (duplexes typologies and co-locating driveways) could provide more opportunities for landscaping within the site to offset the hardscape.”

(Page 2, Access and Bicycle Parking, Urban Design Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

“While some specimen trees have been provided. I consider there to be a lack of robust planting across the site, as is evident by the shortfall in landscape treatment. There is limited opportunity to plant along the driveway due to the frequent breaks for car parks.

Much of the provided landscape treatment areas are small with limited ability to provide meaningful landscape amenity onsite. Given the significant increase in housing and change in typology, I consider more vertical planting (specimen trees) would help to offset the dominance of the hardscape, and integrate this type of development within the general residential zone.

I strongly encourage the applicant to reconsider the proposal to seek further opportunity to increase the landscaped area. This could be achieved by providing some duplex typologies to open up more space for more specimen trees and other planting opportunities.”

(Page 4, Amenity and Sustainability, Urban Design Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

3. Recommendation:

Reconsider the design of front entrances for units 19 and 08 to improve legibility.

Relevant excerpts from review:

“The front door entrances to units 08 and 19 are not clear as the front doors are off a secondary pathway. The applicant should consider changing the access to Unit 19’s side yard from the western side of the property, to avoid confusion and improve legibility to the front entrance (shown in Figure 1).

If a through link is created for the pedestrian pathway leading to Unit 08 as suggested in Guideline 16, this would help improve legibility to the front entrance by opening up the path network. If not, a clearer design solution may be to co-locate the front and back entrances like the A, B1, C, D and F typologies for consistent front entrance legibility across the site, and to maximise internal circulation and space inside the unit.”

(Page 3, Entrances, Urban Design Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

4. Recommendation:

Consider relocating the C typologies to the northern boundary.

Relevant excerpt from review:

“I consider a better design response would be to locate the two-storey C typologies on the northern border. Locating two-storey units here would avoid height-in-relation to boundary infringements and locate most of the shading on-site, over car-parking spaces, rather than the private outdoor space of 1216 Niu Sila Way.”

(Page 2, Building Mass and Height, Urban Design Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

5. Recommendation:

Increase the size of the storage space provided for waste receptacles.

Relevant excerpt from review:

“While the waste storage areas have been well integrated into the site design, I query whether the number of waste receptacles provided is adequate for the number of units, especially as they are intended to be free hold and require a residents group to efficiently manage waste collection.”

(Page 2, Storage, Waste and Service Areas, Urban Design Peer Review, Boffa Miskell, 24 October 2024)

If you are not sure how to respond or have any questions, please contact me by phone on 021 468 108 or email me at megan.barr@kapiticoast.govt.nz and quote the application number, RM240112.

Yours sincerely



Megan Barr
Consultant Planner - Contractor