

---

**RC230328 - Response to Peer Review**

---

**Rachael Annan** <rachael.annan@slrconsulting.com>  
To: Kirstyn Royce <kirstyn@planningsouth.nz>

Wed, Dec 4, 2024 at 3:21 PM

Hi Kirstyn,

It would be good to catch up by phone at a time that suits. I've provided a response to feedback received below.

**In response to Algin comments:**

1. I accept that the assessment has discussed the distinct local landscape setting. However, findings draw more on generalised matters of rural landscape character, not the distinct capacity of place/ to absorb the level of landscape change proposed. This is a concern of how the assessment's methodology is applied to reach conclusions made.
2. The proposed built form arrangement reads as linear, acknowledging the slight gaps along the row. The linear nature of the arrangement outweighs any clustering intent. Describing the proposed built form arrangement as 'just back from the escarpment' (detailed in response as less than 20m) is appropriate and in context for the scale of the rural application site and relevant landscape issues.
3. As set out in the peer review, I consider that the proposed built form placement remains a matter of concern as a sensitive location within the site.

**In response to Pattersons planning feedback:**

- Errors noted do not diminish or alter peer review findings.
- The scheme plan is straight forward to follow. Project information I brought to the site was on an iPad. To speak to the same matters as the applicant, we referenced the paper copy they held which they offered for me to take away at the conclusion of the site visit. The application landscape rationale of the assessment is understood. A response to the effectiveness of this is provided in the peer review.
- On-site I openly talked through my concerns of the proposal siting to provide a no surprises outcome to the applicant.

My response on contents of (peer review) report:

- Landscape assessment (and peer review of) addresses both the physical context and the policy context. A peer review by nature will typically be more succinct than the work it provides review of. Identifying landscape matters of concern is not restricted to policy matters or phrasing.
- The planting mitigation proposed is not considered to resolve the issue of appropriate building location.
- The terrace is not referenced as an ONF. Terraces form part to the distinctive local landscape setting and the terrace crossing the site contributes to this pattern. Landscape matters relating to this are set out in the peer review.
- It is considered that the proposed built form arrangement reads as a row. Proposed gaps in the row, planting set out (and intended variation of dwelling arrangement/orientation) are not considered to demonstrate effective mitigation measures resolving built form placement concerns.

Response to further comments:

- Unless sought by a decision maker, further detail on matters above is not considered to provide greater value.
- The peer review work included 10 hours travel (some of which time was spent reviewing the application – as a vehicle passenger, as a measure to help reduce costs to the applicant). The remainder of project hours were spent reviewing material and preparing the peer review, coming in just under budget. This has enabled capacity for small amount of further communications (as per this email) without exceeding the fee estimate.

Regards,

Rachael

**Rachael Annan**

BLA (Hons), NZILA Registered Landscape Architect  
Technical Director - Landscape Planning

**O** +64 3 390 0088

**M** +64 275 350 720

**E** rachael.annan@slrconsulting.com

SLR Consulting New Zealand Limited

214 Durham Street South, Christchurch, New Zealand 8011



This e-mail is intended only for the addressee. Its use is limited to that intended by the author at the time and it is not to be distributed without the author's consent. Unless otherwise stated, SLR accepts no liability for the contents of this e-mail except where subsequently confirmed in writing. The opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of SLR. This e-mail may be subject to a claim of legal privilege.

SLR is committed to the responsible and ethical use of relevant technologies including artificial intelligence (AI). If you have any questions or concerns, please contact us directly.

If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the author and delete this message immediately.

---

**From:** Kirstyn Royce <kirstyn@planningsouth.nz>

**Sent:** Tuesday, 3 December 2024 3:18 pm

**To:** Rachael Annan <rachael.annan@slrconsulting.com>

**Cc:** Kirstyn Royce <kirstyn.royce@codc.govt.nz>; Planning Manager <planning.manager@codc.govt.nz>

**Subject:** Fwd: RC230328 - Response to Peer Review

Kia ora Rachael

I Hope this finds you well?

We have received some feedback on the peer review you undertook for RC230328 - Maori Point Road. Could you please review this and provide any further comments.

Apologies for the delay in circulating these comments to you but I was off on planned medical leave which was then compounded by my husband having a significant medical event of his own the week before my scheduled surgery.

Happy to discuss tomorrow if you want.

Kā Mihi

Kirstyn Royce

Resource Management Planner

Southern Planning Solutions Limited

kirstyn@planningsouth.nz | 027 308 8950

**Please note that my office hours are typically 8.30am - 3.00pm Monday to Friday.**



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Maddy Albertson** <[Maddy.Albertson@patersons.co.nz](mailto:Maddy.Albertson@patersons.co.nz)>

Date: Thu, Oct 31, 2024 at 3:04 PM

Subject: RC230328 - Response to Peer Review

To: Kirstyn Royce <[kirstyn@planningsouth.nz](mailto:kirstyn@planningsouth.nz)>

Cc: Julie Greenslade <[jgreenslade@align.net.nz](mailto:jgreenslade@align.net.nz)>, Rod Baxter <[rod.baxter@patersons.co.nz](mailto:rod.baxter@patersons.co.nz)>, Jonny <[jonnyt@xtra.co.nz](mailto:jonnyt@xtra.co.nz)>

Hi Kirstyn

Please see the attached response letters to the landscape peer review provided by SLR. Response has been provided by Julie Greenslade, the landscape architect of the applicant. Duncan White, principal planner at Patersons has also provided written response.

The applicant would like to request for the Council Planning Department to review the responses attached and provide comments and clarifications on the matters raised.

We would request that the application remain on hold with our intention to provide updated information within the next week, prior to the issuing of a s95 assessment on the application.

Please contact me if you need to discuss any of the above or attached information.

Kind Regards

**Maddy Albertson**

Planner

**Alexandra Office**

**Cromwell Office**

03 448 8775

03 445 1826

[6-8 Skird Street](#)

30 The Mall

Alexandra 9320

Cromwell 9310

The logo for Patersons Land Professionals is displayed on a dark green background with a light green diagonal stripe. The word "patersons." is written in a white, lowercase, sans-serif font, with a period at the end. Below it, the words "Land Professionals" are written in a smaller, white, uppercase, sans-serif font.

**patersons.**  
Land Professionals

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

**Notice of Confidential Information**

The information contained in this email message is CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION and may also be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED intended only for the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If you have received this document in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (call collect to the person and number above) and destroy the original message.

You must scan this email and any attached files for viruses. PATERSON PITTS LP, trading as PATERSONS disclaims all liability and responsibility for any direct or indirect loss or damage which may be suffered by any recipient of this email.