

Memorandum	
To Appendix 12 - Natural, Landscape Character and Visual Amenity	
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:	30 January 2026

Welhom Evidence 16/01/26, Appendix 1 - Proposed Changes to the District Plan

Landscaped and vegetated buffer

1. The Requester has deleted '**with an anticipated minimum width of 5m**' from DEV3-P1 Retirement Villages 4c(i) and 4e(i)); and DEV3-P2 Residential Activities and associated subdivision 5c(i) and 5e(i). These provisions relate to the width of the vegetated and landscape buffer areas shown on the proposed Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan.
2. The two types of buffer treatments have been discussed and described in my peer review evidence dated 7 October 2025 and the requester's Landscape Architect's RFI response from Alexandra Gardiner (Boffa Miskell) dated 13 February 2025.
3. A description of the landscaped and vegetated buffer and that the width would be 5m in both instances has been detailed in the Landscape Architects RFI response dated 13 February 2025¹
4. The Requester Planner's evidence in Paragraph 7.62 (a,b,c) disagrees with the minimum width of 5m buffer and proposes that the width of the buffer can be managed at the time of the RC. I recommend a 5m width for the vegetated and landscape buffer to ensure its effectiveness, since details on the placement of taller and larger scale buildings on the PC site have not been provided, however are anticipated by the Requester to be within the bulk and location standards for the GRZ.
5. Paragraph 7.63 refers to GRZ setbacks and consistency with the DP rules (1 and 1.5m setbacks for buildings). In my view this is contrary to DO-11 Character and Amenity Item 5, and recommendations of the requesters LA that addressing potential visual intrusion effects within the interface including neighbouring sites within the RLZ need to be carefully managed. This is also contrary to the rules the Requester has proposed

¹ See Boffa Miskell Memo response b) to Question 5, page 2)



in DEV3 R1 and DEV3-R2 note, where **no building shall be located within the landscaped or vegetated buffers**. The buffer area is about ensuring a greater building setback than the MDRS allows for, as well as providing planting and landscape treatments within the interface.

Viewing audience

6. Referring to Appendix 1 (Proposed changes to the DP), I question why in DEV3-P1 4c(iii) **'from adjacent dwelling where practicable'** has been added however, not in DEV3-P2 5c(iii). I recommend this be removed altogether or alternatively change 'adjacent dwellings' to 'adjacent properties' or 'adjacent sites' and remove 'where practicable'. This should also apply to DEV3-P2 5c(iii). This will provide for more consistent and continuous filtering of views into the site within vegetated buffer areas.

Placement of taller and larger scale buildings on the site

7. Referring the Appendix 1 (Proposed changes to the DP), the Requester has deleted DEV3-P1 4f and DEV3-P2 5f. I recommend keeping this provision for Retirement Villages (DEV3-P1) because taller buildings—up to 11m and larger structures, often 50m or more in length, are common in local retirement villages and may cause significant visual dominance issues.
8. This is not so important to keep for residential subdivision where the scale and density of future development will be less with greater space between buildings anticipated.

Controlled Activity versus Restricted Discretionary Activity Status – DEV3-R1

9. In my opinion RDA status should be adopted given the lack of certainty relating to how the site will be developed when no design model for earthworks and internal layout for buildings is proposed for the PC site.
10. It is also recommended that the 5m vegetated or landscaped buffer be extended to include the entire perimeter where the site adjoins the RLZ, the street frontage and the higher dunes within the north western edge of the site and indicated accordingly on a revised Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan.

LA Evidence – Alexandra Gardiner (Boffa Miskell)

11. The requester's Landscape Architect Ms. Gardiner does not consider that a landscaped or vegetated buffer is required the entire perimeter of the site. Ms Gardiner now considers a 5m buffer width is not necessary everywhere but should reflect varying levels of visibility into the site from neighbouring properties²

² Paragraph 6.16 Statement of Evidence – Alexandra Gardiner



12. Ms Gardiner also considers that an actual 5m minimum buffer width may risk isolating the development and be inconsistent with the evolving character for the wider area³.
13. Currently, most of the surrounding properties are located in the RLZ and have a pastoral, rural character, with some having views into the PC site from nearby dwellings. 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.
14. Due to the lack of details provided around extent of earthworks and placement of building of the site, a 5m wide buffer would ensure an effective level of planting and building setback to provide filtered views where necessary and for integration of buildings.

Angela McArthur

Eco-Landscapes & Design Ltd

Registered Member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects



³ Paragraph 6.12 Statement of Evidence – Alexandra Gardiner

