

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT PANEL
OF KAPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**")

AND

IN THE MATTER of Private Plan Change 4 ("**PC4**") to the Kāpiti Coast
District Plan ("**Plan**") - 65 and 73 Ratanui Road,
Otaihanga

**HEARING STATEMENT OF TORREY JAMES MCDONNELL
ON BEHALF OF WELHOM DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

(PLANNING)

12 FEBRUARY 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Torrey McDonnell. I am a planning expert engaged by Welhom Developments Limited in relation to PC4. My qualifications and experience are set out in my primary evidence dated 16 January 2026.
- 1.2 I confirm that I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence and will continue to comply with it while giving oral evidence before the Hearing Commissioners. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.
- 1.3 This Statement provides a brief summary of key aspects of my primary evidence and focuses on outstanding matters that remain between myself and the Reporting Officer, since the filing of my primary evidence.

2. SUMMARY OF PRIMARY EVIDENCE

- 2.1 My primary expert evidence¹ supports the plan change which seeks to rezone 65 and 73 Ratanui Road from Rural Lifestyle to General Residential Zone with an associated Development Area and Structure Plan.
- 2.2 The plan change is assessed as consistent with national, regional, and local planning instruments, including the National Policy Statement on Urban Development ("**NPS-UD**"), National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management ("**NPS-FM**"), Regional Policy Statement ("**RPS**") (including Change 1), and the District Plan. The Council's Section 42A report broadly supports the plan change and recommends approval subject to targeted amendments; areas of disagreement largely relate to the level of prescriptiveness around buffers, building placement, and the activity status for retirement villages. The evidence provided maintains that the applicant's proposed framework appropriately manages these matters.
- 2.3 Submissions raised matters relating to transport, stormwater and flooding, geotechnical stability, landscape effects, infrastructure capacity, and construction impacts. Expert evidence for both the Applicant and Council confirms that none of these issues preclude rezoning. Effects can be addressed

¹ Evidence of Mr McDonnell (Planning) on behalf of the Applicant dated 16 January 2026.

through resource consent engineering design, management plans, and the District Plan's existing policy and rule frameworks. Overall, PC4 enables orderly growth consistent with the Council's Growth Strategy and represents the most appropriate option under section 32 of the RMA.

3. RESPONSE TO SECTION 42A REPORT AND ADDENDUM REPORT

- 3.1 I have reviewed the s42A addendum report prepared by Ms Sweetman as well as addendum reports by Ms. Popova, Ms. McArthur and Dr. Dijkgraaf.
- 3.2 I met with Ms Sweetman on 5 February 2026 and 10 February 2026 as invited by the Panel². I am most grateful to Ms Sweetman for working with me through these matters. These meetings were useful to clarify our respective positions, and to try and achieve agreement where possible.
- 3.3 I set out in this summary statement areas where I agree with Ms Sweetman, and three discrete remaining matters of disagreement being:
- (a) Activity status for retirement villages under DEV3-R1, where I prefer controlled activity status as notified and Ms Sweetman prefers a restricted discretionary activity status;
 - (b) Recommended amendments to DEV3-P1(4) and DEV3-P2(5) regarding buffer widths and heights of buildings, where Ms Sweetman and I prefer different wording; and
 - (c) Amendments to DEV3-P1(4)(d) and DEV3-P2(5)(d) to include reference to natural landform, where again Ms Sweetman and I prefer different wording.
- 3.4 These matters are addressed below in turn. I respond to the points raised by Ms Sweetman using the headings in her s42A Addendum.

Activity status for retirement villages

- 3.5 In her s42A Addendum Report, Ms Sweetman maintains her position as set out in her s42A Report that a restricted discretionary activity status would be more appropriate than a controlled activity status for rule DEV3-R1.
- 3.6 Ms Sweetman does not agree with my position that a retirement village should not be able to be declined based on its merits as a land use. Ms Sweetman

² Refer Direction 3 from the Hearing Panel dated 27 January 2026.

states that she does "not understand how consistency with the structure plan would make it appropriate for development of a retirement village to be a controlled activity" and that a controlled activity status provides "little room for discretion for the Council to seek changes"³.

3.7 I consider that the Structure Plan, and evidence base supporting it, demonstrate that a retirement village is appropriate, and that the requirement to be in accordance with the Structure Plan under DEV3-R1 provides comfort to decision makers that effects can be addressed as a controlled activity.

3.8 Ms Sweetman considers that⁴:

In my view, what the above says is that controlled activity status should only be used where there is little room for discretion, a "check" is being performed through the use of the rule, and there is certainty of the effects arising and their ability to be managed through conditions of consent.

3.9 I agree with this, and I consider that in this instance a proposal would only require a "check" to ensure a proposed development complies with the Structure Plan. I consider the matters of control are, and should be, very narrow given the supporting evidence base.

3.10 That being said, Ms Sweetman raises a valid point with regard to the application of rule DEV3-R1. In particular, should a retirement village be proposed that did not comply with any of the bulk and location standards in GRZ-33, as notified DEV3-R1 would apply as a controlled activity. Ms Sweetman states that this would mean under DEV3-R1 as proposed, the Council would have to grant consent to 20m (or more) high buildings in the retirement village, with only limited ability to impose conditions to address any adverse effects in a manner that would not unduly restrict the exercise of the resource consent.

3.11 I agree with Ms Sweetman's planning assessment that the escalation in activity status where there was a non-compliance with bulk and location standards under GRZ-R33 would be to controlled activity under DEV3-R1. This is because the retirement villages are excluded from rule GRZ-R36 and GRZ-R37. A non-compliance would then escalate to GRZ-R41 which would not apply under DEV3-R1 under the exclusion that Ms Sweetman and I both agree with through our respective reports.

3.12 That was never my intention. I consider that a controlled activity status is inappropriate for a breach of bulk and location standards for a retirement village

³ Refer paragraphs 14 to 16 on page 4 of the Section 42A Addendum Report.

⁴ Refer paragraph 19 on page 4 of the Section 42A Addendum Report.

on this site, otherwise Council would not have discretion to decline a consent should there be buildings of 11m (or potentially much more) proposed.

- 3.13 To address this issue, I have proposed an amended rule DEV3-R1 in Appendix 1 that would ensure that the standards in GRZ-R33 would apply. I have also added a new Restricted Discretionary rule that would apply should a proposal not comply. This escalation is consistent with the approach in the General Residential Zone Chapter, and would provide the Council with the ability to consider declining a consent for a development that is larger in scale than would be appropriate.
- 3.14 When I met with Ms Sweetman we talked through the insertion of this additional rule and she confirms that the approach I have proposed in Appendix 1 works from a technical perspective. However, she maintains that she considers a restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate for DEV1-R1.
- 3.15 For these proposed changes, I rely on the same general scope referenced by Ms Sweetman for these amendments being submissions S7.2, S8.1 and S8.3. With regard to s32AA, I consider that the amendments I recommend in Appendix 1 more appropriately give effect to the provisions in the RPS and District Plan than the notified provisions as:
- (a) The amended provisions are more effective than the notified provisions with regard to the ability of decision-makers to consider visual and amenity effects associated with breaches of bulk and location standards; and
 - (b) The controlled activity status is retained which provides regulatory certainty that a retirement village is an appropriate land use on this Site subject to being in general accordance with a Structure Plan and bulk and location standards.
- 3.16 As noted in my Statement of Evidence and the Request,⁵ I reiterate that there are other technical matters that provide Council the ability to decline consent. The characteristics of the potential development scenarios and the characteristics of the Site itself mean that various consents would be required pursuant the District Plan, including:
- (a) Consent under Rule TR-R10 for a number of daily vehicle movement exceeding standards in TR-R2 (discretionary activity);

⁵ Refer page 56 of the Request.

- (b) Earthworks in a ponding area under NH-FLOOD-R11 (Restricted Discretionary Activity); and
- (c) Earthworks exceeding 50m³ per year under EW-R5 (Restricted Discretionary Activity).

3.17 I cannot envisage any adverse effects associated with the land use activity itself that Council would want to decline consent for based on the evidence base provided with the Request.

Recommended amendments to DEV3-P1(4) and DEV3-P2(5) regarding buffer widths and heights of buildings

3.18 I agree with Ms Sweetman's position in her s42A Addendum that the 5m vegetative buffer (initially recommended by her s42A Report) should not be referenced in these policies for the reasons outlined in my Statement of Evidence⁶.

(a) The width should be determined at a consenting level based on the nature and potential effects of the actual development including the bulk and location of any buildings;

(b) The approach is inconsistent with other properties zoned GRZ on the same rural / urban boundary which only have a 1 or 1.5m setback. This setback applies all along the area marked in red in Figure 1 below with no requirement for landscaped boundary treatment; and

(c) The area already has a relatively urban character due to being a pocket of RLZ zoned land bordered by urban development.

3.19 For these reasons, I agree with Ms Sweetman's recommend inclusion of clause 'iv' to provide some guidance on determination of width at a consenting level.

3.20 I agree with Ms Sweetman's analysis that the note in DEV3-R1 to DEV3-R3 "No buildings shall be located in landscaped or vegetated buffers"⁷ should be removed. I consider that the policies make it sufficiently clear that the function of buffers is for landscaping.

3.21 In regard to the wording of DEV3-P1.4.c.iii and DEV3-P2.5.c.ii, I prefer the wording as outlined in my statement of evidence as I consider that the effects associated with visual amenity largely occur at adjacent dwellings not across the entire adjacent sites. In my view, it is unreasonable to expect that an entire rural property needs to have its rural outlook protected. It is the nature of this pocket of Rural Lifestyle Zoning that many properties already view residential dwellings located within the General Residential Zone.

⁶ Refer paragraph 7.62 on page 28 of Evidence of Mr McDonnell (Planning) on behalf of the Applicant dated 16 January 2026

⁷ Refer paragraph 48 on page 10 of the Section 42A Addendum Report.

- 3.22 As outlined in my Statement of Evidence the qualifier "where practicable", provides some flexibility where there is a view into the site that cannot be filtered, such as through the site entrance, through the stream corridor, or where topographical constraints otherwise make it impractical to achieve a complete filtering. I consider that this wording should be retained not removed as recommended by Ms Sweetman.
- 3.23 With regard to the recommended insertion of the clause to these policies seeking that the Site "have a form of development where the tallest buildings are located towards the middle of the site, where practicable", my view has not changed from that which is outlined in my Statement of Evidence⁸. I consider that this policy direction is inconsistent with the approach applied to other properties zoned GRZ on the same rural / urban boundary in this area. I consider that the GRZ standards are sufficient to address potential adverse effects on nearby dwellings associated with tall buildings, like they are on any other site in this Zone.

Amendments to DEV3-P1(4)(d) and DEV3-P2(5)(d) to include reference to natural landform

- 3.24 I agree that natural landforms should be retained where practicable, particularly wetlands and the stream corridor. However, I consider that the following additional text proposed by Ms Sweetman in DEV3-P2.4.c and DEV3-P2.5.d does not add a lot of value:

d. development platforms that are sensitively and effectively integrated into the existing terrain along the edges of the Site, particularly at the northern and eastern edges (retaining walls will be minimised in favour of natural batters and natural landforms will be retained and enhanced including through the planting of indigenous species where practicable); ~~and~~

- 3.25 In my view, the direction that "development platforms that are sensitively and effectively integrated into the existing terrain along the edges of the Site" provides sufficient policy direction with regard to managing the effects of development on landform. As outlined in my statement of evidence, I consider that the low level of naturalness on the site as outlined by Ms Gardiner in her evidence does not justify the protection of existing features of the site from

⁸ Refer paragraph 7.66 on page 30 of Evidence of Mr McDonnell (Planning) on behalf of the Applicant dated 16 January 2026.

development including the northern dune feature⁹ (para 7.60). Further, the clause would be more concise and provide more regulatory certainty to plan users without the additional text.

- 3.26 For these reasons I recommend that the wording of the clause as notified be retained.

Wetlands and the indicative extent of central restoration wetland and stormwater management area

- 3.27 I agree with Ms Sweetman, Ms Dijkgraaf and Dr Keesing that the delineation of wetlands is a consenting matter. I do not consider that there are any matters in contention in this regard.

Torrey James McDonnell

12 February 2026

⁹ Evidence of Torrey McDonnell (Planning) on behalf of Welhom Developments Limited dated 16 January 2026 at [7.60].

APPENDIX 1 – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DISTRICT PLAN

Note:

- Changes originally proposed by Welhom Developments Ltd as part of the Request are shown underline and strikethrough.
- Changes proposed by officer recommendations in Council section 42A report (Appendix 4) are shown in blue underline and ~~blue strikethrough~~.
- Changes proposed by me in Expert Evidence in response to the Council section 42A report are shown in orange underline and ~~orange strikethrough~~.
- Changes proposed by officer recommendations in Council section 42A Addendum report (Appendix 1) are shown in green underline and ~~green strikethrough~~.
- Changes proposed by me in response to Council section 42A Addendum report are shown in purple underline and ~~purple strikethrough~~.

Maps

- Change the zoning of the Site from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone in the area outlined below.



Development Area

- Insert new section titled: 'DEV3 - Ratanui Development Area', with text as underlined below.

DEV3 - Ratanui Development Area

Introduction

The Development Area provides for either a retirement village or residential development at the Site identified in DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan.

This Section contains policies, rules and standards relating specifically to the Ratanui Development Area. The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the underlying General Residential Zone provisions and the provisions contained in the Part 2: District-Wide Matters chapters.

<u>DEV3- P1</u>	<u>Retirement Villages</u>
<u>Enable retirement villages in DEV3 – Ratanui Development Area where the development is generally consistent with DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan including:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>providing site access via a T-intersection with a right turn bay in the area indicated in the Structure Plan;</u> 	

2. creating a flood storage area in the general area indicated in the DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area that provides for compensatory flood storage for events up to a 1% AEP event (including allowing for sea level rise and increased rainfall intensity) to mitigate the impacts of the development from removing existing floodplain storage on the Site;
3. creating large-centralised wetland areas in locations indicated in the DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan to provide for stormwater management and for offsetting any loss of wetland habitat on the site. The wetland areas will:
 - a. provide flood storage for events up to a 1% AEP event (including allowing for sea level rise and increased rainfall intensity) to mitigate the stormwater impacts of the development on the downstream catchment;
 - b. provide stormwater treatment outcomes in accordance with Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements 2022;
 - c. provide for the offsetting of wetland loss elsewhere on the site by creating offset wetlands within the centralised wetland area(s) where:
 - i. the primary function of the offset areas is to create natural inland wetlands;
 - ii. the secondary function of offset areas is to provide flood storage and stormwater treatment functions;
 - iii. the offset areas are established and managed to ensure **at least a net gain in indigenous biodiversity outcomes; positive environmental gain;**
 - iv. the offset areas within the wetlands are clearly identified in plans and will exclude first flush areas designed to be cleaned out when sediment builds up;
4. ensure that development within the Site occurs in such a way that landscape and visual effects are managed, the development is sensitively integrated into the surrounding landscape, and an attractive and biodiverse planting structure is created for the Site including:
 - a. appropriate street tree and amenity planting, including riparian planting along the highly modified stream;
 - b. planting species and arrangements reflecting predominantly indigenous species which are typical of the coastal area **and naturally occurring in the local area,** as well as appropriate exotic amenity plantings;
 - c. vegetated buffers **on the southern extent of the Site in areas indicated in the DEV-3 – Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan** that;
 - i. **comprise predominantly indigenous species ranging from shrubs to mature trees; with an anticipated minimum width of 5m**
 - ii. reflect the **more 'wooded' parkland** character of the rural residential properties along Ratanui Road
 - iii. **provide filtering of views into the site from adjacent sites dwellings where practicable, and**
 - iv. **are of a sufficient width to achieve i to iii above, and**
 - v. **do not apply where a transport connection is provided to adjacent sites;**

- d. development platforms that are sensitively and effectively integrated into the existing terrain along the edges of the Site, particularly at the northern and eastern edges (retaining walls will be minimised in favour of natural batters and natural landforms will be retained and enhanced including through the planting of indigenous species where practicable); and
 - e. providing an appropriate landscaped and/or vegetated buffers in areas indicated in the DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan to that:
 - i. comprise treatments including landscaping, planting, fencing and/or earthbunds, as appropriate, with an anticipated minimum width of 5m;
 - ii. ensure integration between the new development and adjacent sites and the wider landform soften the transition from a residential to rural lifestyle land use; and
 - iii. are of a sufficient width to achieve i to iii above, and
 - iv. do not apply where a transport connection is provided to adjacent sites.; and
 - f. have a form of development where the tallest buildings are located towards the middle of the site, where practicable;
- 5. ensure building foundations are designed to resist liquefaction induced settlement; and
 - 6. ensure any increase in lateral spread hazard and/or effects to neighbouring properties is avoided, including through providing a minimum setback for buildings or other protection or mitigation measures for adjacent property boundaries.

DEV3- P2	<u>Residential Activities and associated subdivision</u>
	<p><u>Enable residential activities and associated subdivision in DEV3 – Ratanui Development area where the development is generally consistent with DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>providing primary site access via a T-intersection with a right turn bay in the area indicated in the Structure Plan as well as providing additional connectivity to adjacent sites;</u> 2. <u>considering the need for community facilities or reserves within the Site;</u> 3. <u>creating a flood storage area in the general area indicated in the DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area that provides for compensatory flood storage for events up to a 1% AEP event (including allowing for sea level rise and increased rainfall intensity) to mitigate the impacts of the development from removing existing floodplain storage on the Site;</u> 4. <u>creating large-centralised wetland areas in locations indicated in the DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan to provide for stormwater management and for offsetting any loss of wetland habitat on the site. The wetland areas will:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>provide flood storage for events up to a 1% AEP event (including allowing for sea level rise and increased rainfall intensity) to mitigate the stormwater impacts of the development on the downstream catchment;</u>

- b. provide stormwater treatment outcomes in accordance with Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements 2022;
 - c. provide for the offsetting of wetland loss elsewhere on the site by creating offset wetlands within the centralised wetland area(s) where:
 - i. the primary function of the offset areas is to create natural inland wetlands;
 - ii. the secondary function of offset areas is to provide flood storage and stormwater treatment functions;
 - iii. the offset areas are established and managed to ensure ~~at least a net gain in indigenous biodiversity outcomes positive environmental gain;~~
 - iv. the offset areas within the wetland areas are clearly identified in plans and will exclude first flush areas designed to be cleaned out when sediment builds up;
5. ensure that development within the Site occurs in such a way that landscape and visual effects are managed, the development is sensitively integrated into the surrounding landscape, and an attractive and biodiverse planting structure is created for the Site including:
- a. appropriate street tree and amenity planting, including riparian planting along the highly modified stream;
 - b. planting species and arrangements reflecting predominantly indigenous species which are typical of the coastal area ~~and naturally occurring in the local area,~~ as well as appropriate exotic amenity plantings;
 - c. vegetated buffers ~~on the southern extent of the Site in areas indicated in the DEV-3 – Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan~~ that:
 - i. ~~comprise predominantly indigenous species ranging from shrubs to mature trees; with an anticipated minimum width of 5m~~
 - ii. ~~reflect the more 'wooded' parkland character of the rural residential properties along Ratanui Road~~
 - iii. ~~provide filtering of views into the site from adjacent sites dwellings where practicable, and~~
 - iv. ~~are of a sufficient width to achieve i to iii above, and~~
 - v. ~~do not apply where a transport connection is provided to adjacent sites;~~
 - d. development platforms that are sensitively and effectively integrated into the existing terrain along the edges of the Site, particularly at the northern and eastern edges (retaining walls will be minimised in favour of natural batters ~~and natural landforms will be retained and enhanced including through the planting of indigenous species~~ where practicable); and
 - e. ~~providing an appropriate~~ landscaped ~~and/or vegetated~~ buffers in areas indicated in the DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan to soften the transition from a residential to rural lifestyle land use;

- i. comprise treatments including landscaping, planting, fencing and/or earthbunds, as appropriate, with an anticipated minimum width of 5m;
 - ii. ensure integration between the new development and adjacent sites and the wider landform soften the transition from a residential to rural lifestyle land use; and
 - iii. are of a sufficient width to achieve i and ii above,
 - iv. do not apply where a transport connection is provided to adjacent sites.; and
- 6. ensure building foundations are designed to resist liquefaction induced settlement; and
- 7. ensure any increase in lateral spread hazard and/or effects to neighbouring properties is avoided, including through providing a minimum setback for buildings or other protection or mitigation measures for adjacent property boundaries.

DEV3-R1	Retirement Villages within the Ratanui Development Area <u>GRZ-R41 does not apply in addition to this Rule.</u>	
<u>Controlled Activity</u> <u>Restricted discretionary activity</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Where the standards in GRZ-R33 are complied with (except for standard 1); and</u> 2. <u>Where a Landscape and Earthworks Plan is provided by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect addressing the matters listed in DEV3-P1.4 that contains the following information:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Details of plantings proposed for the vegetated buffer shown in DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan; and</u> b. <u>Details of design for the landscaped buffer (landscaping, fencing and/or planting) shown in DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan.</u> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>No buildings shall be located in landscaped or vegetated buffers.</u> 	Matters of control discretion <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The degree to which the development is in general accordance with DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan.</u> 2. <u>The matters in policy DEV3-P1.</u> 3. <u>The matters of discretion in GRZ-R41.</u>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the avoidance of doubt GRZ-R41 does not apply to retirement villages within DEV3 – Ratanui Development Area. 	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

DEV3-R2	Subdivision within the Ratanui Development Area	
<u><i>Restricted Discretionary Activity</i></u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where a Landscape and Earthworks Plan is provided by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect addressing the matters listed in DEV3-P2.5 that contains the following information: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Details of plantings proposed for the vegetated buffer shown in DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan; and Details of design for the landscaped buffer (landscaping, fencing and/or planting) shown in DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan. <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No buildings shall be located in landscaped or vegetated buffers. 	<p>Matters of discretion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The degree to which the development is in general accordance with DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan. The matters in policy DEV3-P2.

DEV3-R3	Residential Activities within the Ratanui Development Area where there are four or more residential units per site	
<u><i>Restricted Discretionary Activity</i></u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where a Landscape and Earthworks Plan is provided by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect addressing the matters listed in DEV3-P2.5 that contains the following information: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Details of plantings proposed for the vegetated buffer shown in DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan; and Details of design for the landscaped buffer 	<p>Matters of discretion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The degree to which the development is in general accordance with DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan. The matters in policy DEV3-P2.

	<p>(landscaping, fencing and/or planting) shown in DEV3-Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan.</p> <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No buildings shall be located in landscaped or vegetated buffers. 	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

DEV3-R4	<u>Retirement Villages within the Ratanui Development Area that do not comply with DEV3-R1.1</u>	
<u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u>		<p>Matters of Discretion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where any of the standards under rule GRZ-R33 are breached, consideration of the effects of the standard not met. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. The matters in GRZ-P28 and DEV3-P1.

<u>DEV3-R5</u>	<p><u>Any activity that is listed as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity that does not comply with one or more of the activity standards</u></p> <p><u>Any activity that does not comply with DEV3-R1.2; DEV3-R2.1 or DEV3-R3.1</u></p>
-----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<u>Non-complying Activity</u>	
-------------------------------	--

DEV3- Figure 1: Ratanui Development Area Structure Plan

