

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER APPOINTED  
BY THE NEW PLYMOUTH DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**            an application under s221(3) of the RMA to vary  
a consent notice condition applying to the  
property at 263 Weld Road Lower, Oakura

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD ALEXANDER BAIN  
(LANDSCAPE)**

**15 July 2025**

---

## INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Richard Alexander Bain, principal of Bluemarble Landscape Architects.
2. I prepared landscape character and visual amenity evidence, which was filed on 30 June 2025. This statement provides the following:
  - (a) A summary of my primary statement of evidence;
  - (b) Comments regarding proposed consent conditions.

## SUMMARY OF STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE

3. The applicants seek to vary a consent notice condition to reposition the prescribed habitable dwelling location within the site. The revised proposed 216m<sup>2</sup> maximum building footprint location corresponds with an existing building, and is a material reduction from the approximately 500m<sup>2</sup> maximum footprint originally proposed by the application.
4. I have undertaken multiple site visits, most recently on 3 June 2025. My assessment focuses on the effects of the proposal on rural character and visual amenity, including openness and spaciousness. I conclude that the adverse effects of the proposal, including on all nearby neighbours, will be very low and acceptable within the context of the surrounding environment and the applicable planning framework.
5. Among other matters, I have considered the comparative effects between the “Proposed Dwelling”<sup>1</sup> versus the “Consented Dwelling”, being a realistic dwelling<sup>2</sup> within the large<sup>3</sup> footprint prescribed in the existing consent notice and its associated residential use.<sup>4</sup> A summary table of my assessment of adverse visual amenity effects on this basis from neighbouring properties is attached to my primary evidence as **Annexure A**. For some neighbours, the effects of the proposal are lower than those that would arise if a dwelling was located within the currently consented footprint and the existing buildings remained as sheds.

## CONDITIONS

6. I have reviewed the conditions attached to Ms Hooper’s evidence in her Appendix 4.
7. Concerning conditions related to the Detailed Landscape Plan (DLP), in item 3(a)(i) Ms Hooper proposes that the entire western/southwestern boundary is planted with a 25m wide native

---

<sup>1</sup> Being the constructed northern building within the 216m<sup>2</sup> dwelling footprint now sought to be authorised, and associated residential use (or, for completeness, any replacement). This scenario includes the existing southern building and adopts the relevant existing consent notice conditions.

<sup>2</sup> Of 400m<sup>2</sup> footprint.

<sup>3</sup> 2,834m<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> This scenario includes the existing constructed buildings, and assumes a dwelling that complies with the other consent notice conditions and the permitted standards in the Proposed District Plan.

area planting and that this planting cannot exceed 3m in height (measured at the top of the embankment). Ms Hooper also proposes 25m wide planting for 50m of the southern boundary. In my view this is an excessively large area (approximately 8,750m<sup>2</sup>) of planting that is disproportionate to the effects identified in my evidence or Mr Dobson's evidence. Further, in my experience, limiting the height of vegetation is problematic to monitor and enforce. I note that the proposed council conditions do not recommend such an extensive area of planting and or limitations on height.

8. Concerning condition 3(d), Ms Hooper proposes maintenance requirements during establishment and ongoing in perpetuity. Based on my experience with establishing vegetation and ensuring long term plant health, I consider that the focus should be on plant establishment over the first three years (36 month) of planting. The ongoing maintenance thereafter is not necessary as native vegetation planted at appropriate spacings will 'self-support' and require negligible managed input. The monitoring of a long term or never-ending maintenance period also creates unnecessary administration by both Council and landowners.
9. I have no issues with the proposed conditions accepted by the Applicant as provided in Ms Carvill's supplementary evidence. While I do not consider these conditions are necessary to appropriately manage effects, the changes accepted by the Applicant will further reduce effects.

**Richard Bain**  
Bluemarble Landscape Architects

15 July 2025