

ref: Thornton/23333

8 November 2024

Megan Barr  
Consultant Planner  
Kāpiti Coast District Council

By Email to: [megan.barr@kapiticoast.govt.nz](mailto:megan.barr@kapiticoast.govt.nz)

Dear Megan,

## **RM240112 – RESPONSE TO SECTION 92(2) PEER REVIEW COMMENTS FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST**

In response to your letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> November 2024 requesting amendments and further information following from the peer review comments from reports commissioned under section 92(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) we would like to submit the following further information and comments:

### Landscape Assessment

The peer review of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) focused on natural character, landscape character and visual effects.

With regards to natural character, both Ms Gardiner of Boffa Miskell and DGSE have confirmed that the site has very low levels of natural character and consequently, adverse effects are very low. When considering the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architecture's (NZILA) Best Practice Note, the correspondence natural character effects are less than minor.

With regards to landscape character, Ms Gardiner also agrees with the DGSE assessment in that the resulting effects would be low, reducing to negligible as planting gets established. The corresponding landscape character effects are also less than minor.

With regards to visual effects, Ms Gardiner also agrees with the DGSE assessment in that visual effects would be no greater than low, and therefore the corresponding visual effects are less than minor. However, she has requested further assessment of the immediate views from the neighbouring sites.

Ms. Cook of DGSE has provided an addendum to the LVIA that addresses the visual effects as viewed from the neighbouring sites. In her assessment, she has considered the areas identified in the Urban Design Assessment as having higher amenity and visual values such as indoor and outdoor living spaces. She also considered the visual effects of the permitted baseline described in the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE).

Ms Cook has concluded that for the northern neighbours, the visual effect would be very low, and for the western neighbours, no more than low to low-moderate, and that in both

instances, having similar visual effect of the permitted baseline.

When disregarding the effects of the permitted baseline, the residual visual effect is considered very low, or less than minor and therefore the persons residing to the north and west are not considered to be affected persons.

Ms Cook has concluded that for the southern neighbours, the visual effect would be moderate, largely due to a visual or perceived change in density from that of the permitted baseline. She has concluded that the visual effect of the permitted baseline to be low-moderate and the view from the southern neighbours not to be fundamentally different from the permitted baseline. Therefore, when disregarding the effects of the permitted baseline, the residual visual effects are no more than very low to low, or less than minor and therefore the persons residing to the south are not considered to be affected persons.

I also note that the visual effects of the development are entirely consistent with or of a lesser scale than the intended built form outcomes for the General Residential Zone which as outlined in the AEE is:

*to provide for a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments (GRZ-P20).*

It is also acknowledged in the pre-amble for the General Residential Zone of the District Plan that

*the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the zone will change over time.*

This is consistent with Policy 6 of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) which also acknowledges that:

*the planning urban built form may involve significant changes to an area, which may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by other people, communities and future generations, including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types.*

Policy 6 goes on to direct that these *changes are not, of themselves, an adverse effect.*

In considering the peer review of the LVIA, addendum from Ms Cook, and the relevant objectives and policies, it remains our view that when disregarding the effects of the permitted baseline, the effects on natural character, landscape character and visual effects are less than minor and acceptable with no affected persons.

Please refer to Appendix 1 of this letter for a copy of Ms. Cook's addendum to the LVIA.

## Urban Design Assessment

The peer review of the Urban Design Assessment focused on the matters outlined in the Residential Design Guide.

It is noted that Ms Moore of Boffa Miskell considered the proposal to be *largely of high quality, with a well-considered design response.* She also notes that the typology and intensity is a change in character of the existing area, which as noted in my comments



In considering the peer review of the proposal and Urban Design Assessment, response from Ms. White, and comments in the peer review from Ms. Moore, the proposal is considered to align well with the Residential Design Guide, and a high-quality urban design outcome.

It remains our view that consent can be granted on a non-notified basis.

Please refer to Appendix 2 of this letter for a copy of Ms. Whites response to the Urban Design Peer Review, and Appendix 3 of this letter for a copy of the revised architectural and landscape drawings from DGSE

We trust the above information addresses the comments from the peer reviews. If any further clarification is required, please don't hesitate to get in touch.

We would appreciate consideration of draft conditions prior to the decision being issued.

Yours faithfully,



Elliott Thornton  
Principal Planner, BUrbEnvPlan, MNZPI  
**CUTTRISS CONSULTANTS LTD**

**Attachments:**

1. LVIA Addendum
2. Urban Design Response
3. Revised Architectural and Landscape Plans