Technical Memo

To: Mark Vinall

Planner Tattico

From: Rob Pryor

Director | Registered Landscape Architect

LA4 Landscape Architects Ltd

Date: 22 September 2025

Ambridge Rose Retirement Village – 147-152 Edgewater Drive, Pakuranga

Regarding Council's s92 Request for Further Information, I provide the following responses in relation to landscape matters.

5. Landscape Effects

Visual Amenity Effects/Landscape Character:

- 1. To fully assess the potential effect the proposal may have on the neighbourhood character and residential amenity values due to the building intensity, height, architectural form, and external appearance (H4.8. (3)), please provide:
 - a) Include within the LVEA assessment of the affected individual properties of 2 and 4 Susanne Place.
 - b) Where mitigation measures rely on planting, please provide assessment at 5 years (mid-term) and 10 years (long term) of plant growth.
 - c) Visuals/montages that clearly demonstrate the visibility of the proposal from the residents at 2 and 4 Susanne Place. Please note that the visual/montages should show the relationship between the sites (i.e. treatment of changes in level (if any), planting and fencing).

Response:

The dwellings within the adjoining properties to the west at 2 Susanne Place, and southwest at 4 Susanne Place will be affected to a degree by the proposal. Potential adverse landscape and visual amenity effects have been addressed by the following mitigation measures.

- Buffer planting is proposed along the boundary with a 3m high clipped evergreen titoki hedge behind a 1.8m close boarded fence. Specimen feature tree plantings of crepe myrtle are proposed between the boundary and the car park, and pohutukawa trees extend along the southern boundary which will form a vegetated setting of appropriate form and scale, reducing potential building dominance.
- The buildings have a minor HIRB infringement.
- The dwellings are unaffected by shading from the building during the spring and autumn equinoxes. During the winter solstice the dwelling at 2 Susanne Place will be affected by shading to varying degrees up to 12pm. The primary dwelling at 4 Susanne Place is largely unaffected by shading, while the minor dwelling along the boundary will be affected by shading from 12pm until 3pm.

I note that the outdoor living area within the property at 2 Susanne Place is to the northeast, away from the building. It appears that the property at 4 Susanne Place has no dedicated outdoor living area with a concrete drive extending along both the northern and southern sides of the dwelling.



Regarding the request for visual simulations from 2 and 4 Susanne Place, I consider that this is an onerous and unnecessary request. It is practically difficult to prepare visual simulations from such close proximity and would require access to the private properties. The proximity of the building and camera capabilities would result in a very truncated and inaccurate visualisation with only part of the building visible within the constraints of a 50mm single frame photograph.

From close views the height infringement would not be immediately noticeable, due to the close proximity of the viewer to the building with typical views being focussed more towards the lower levels of the development which are within the permitted height. The height infringement would be more visible at a greater distance as more of the overall bulk of the building and façade will be more visible.

Where visible from these more distant areas, the proposal would integrate sensitively into the landscape due to the scale of the proposal relative to the site context and surrounding environs. While the proposal may be visible from parts of the wider surrounding area, I consider that the adverse visual effects would be low and entirely acceptable within the context of the settlement pattern and existing and planned future urban environment.

I trust that this assists.

Rob J Pryor

Director | Tuia Pito Ora NZILA Registered Landscape Architect

