

18th January 2023

Tim Walsh
Novo Group Limited
PO Box 365
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

Dear Tim,

**APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT RMA/2022/3611
ADDRESS 320 AND 320A CUMNOR TERRACE**

Thank you for your application for resource consent for a combined land use and subdivision application on the above site, which we received on 29th November 2022.

I have assessed your proposal and found that the following additional information is required before your application can be considered further:

An addendum is included with this application, which outlines Council preliminary feedback on the application. Please read the RFI items in conjunction with the addendum.

Visual/Landscape assessment

1. To better understand the landscape concept, please amend the landscape concept plans to contain the following:

Landscape concept Plans 1 and 2

- Please add scale bar (to all plans). *Please note 1:1500 is not a commonly used scale;*
- Ensure the red dashed line on the site boundary is consistent with the Wood's subdivision and as-built plans.

Bund cross sections

- Please illustrate existing topographical levels and features, and finished levels on the cross section and confirm that it is to scale. The existing cross section implies a flat topography and gradients to the bund are inconsistent with the Woods survey and as-built plans. Key features include boundaries, fences, track, esplanade reserve, waterway setback, locations/levels of low flow/top of bank and relative slopes;
2. The northern face of the bund appears to be 1H:1V when on site. Please confirm if this is the case. Please confirm the fill material used to create the northern and southwest bund. Is the material and slope suitable for planting upon?
 3. In terms of the bund planting plan and methodology. Please confirm the following:
 - If plant protection sleeves are proposed and if not, why;
 - The proposed method of pest control;
 - What method of irrigation is proposed? *Note: This is critical for the successfulness of the plants establishing on the bund;*
 - If trees will be staked;
 - What size weed mats are proposed;
 - If the tree sizes will comply with Appendix 6.11.6(1) of the District Plan; and
 - If the plant replacement will be consistent with Appendix 6.11.6(3)

This aspect is important to ensure plant and tree species are successful on the proposed bunds. There are further comments concerning the bund in the addendum of this letter.

4. Please confirm whether all existing trees will be retained as per the ODP?

It appears that some of existing trees may have been removed in the stormwater facility area of the Outline Development Plan (ODP) but it is unclear in the aerial photos.

5. The northern bund in the extreme western corner of the site appears insufficient / narrows down and would provide a potential view shaft into the site for any occupants at 90 Barton Street. Please provide an assessment of visual effects along this view shaft.
6. The ground level shown on the north side of the river appears approximately 1.8 m below the site hardstand level. Please confirm the relative levels are correct?

The level influences the sightline angle.

7. Please provide a sightline diagram and analysis of the effects from further away, such as along parts of Gould Crescent. From here, the sightline will be 'flatter' where more of the proposed containers stacked 11.6 m – 18+ m high will be visible.
8. Please provide an analysis of the visual effects of the proposed height exceedances where parts of the backdrop crater rim/Mount Pleasant Spur/Montgomery Spur ridgelines will be obscured and how that loss of amenity would potentially affect permanent residents and the public.
9. Does the woody weed removal also include the removal of Tasmanian Ngaio?
10. How high could containers be safely stacked? Please refer to best practice industrial standards.

This is to understand whether the area south of 11m overlay is likely to be similar to the proposed 18m height.

11. In terms of the visual impact assessment, please clarify the following points:
 - 2.3 Under 'Moderate' please confirm what the 'main view qualities' are.
 - 2.3 Under 'Moderate-High' please confirm what the 'loss of views' are, and to what.
 - 3.1 last paragraph: It states, "*the site is considered to have low sensitivity to change.*" Given part of the site for the Proposal is within a Green Space area, please clarify what type of change is assumed in this comment.
 - 3.2 Permitted baseline, second to last paragraph: Please discuss the actual permitted baseline and demonstrate the effects (or lack of effects) on the visibility of skylines and the amenity these landscape features provide primarily for permanent residents of Gould Crescent, but also to the public within the area.
 - 3.3 Second paragraph, third to last sentence: This is unclear, please clarify what is meant here.
 - 3.3 Second paragraph, second to last sentence: Please clarify what "a similar level of screening is achieved" refers to.

Subdivision

12. Does the applicant wish to vary or cancel any of the existing consent notices on the existing titles? If so any changes proposed under s221(3) should be formally added to the application.

Stormwater

13. Please outline the finished (proposed) and original ground levels for the haulage route.

This is to understand whether the proposal discharges stormwater appropriately and the whether there are impacts on the drainage patterns of the area and any effects on neighbouring properties. The levels need to be provided by a licenced surveyor.

Cultural Values

14. Rule 8.7.4 requires an assessment of the matters of discretion in Rule 9.5.5 (sub-chapter 9.5 Ngāi Tahu Values) of the District Plan. I note that your application does not address these provisions. In order to address the matters of discretion, which among other things, requires an assessment of any effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, it will be necessary to consult with the relevant papatipu rūnanga, i.e. the rūnanga having guardianship (kaitiaki) for the area within which the site is located. We have initiated consultation on behalf of the applicant

The application will be placed on hold while this consultation takes place, and will not be reactivated until such time as we have provided you with the comments from the Rūnanga and you have responded to them.

Noise

15. An assessment of noise is required in terms of the final earthworks for the site and the proposed industrial activity in terms of compliance of the rules and assessment of amenity effects including along the river corridor and residential properties. The noise assessment shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experience practitioner.
16. Does the experience and skill of the operator affect the noise generation in terms of the container operation. If so, how is this to be managed?

Note: Please refer to the comments attached in the addendum.

NZexpress

17. The operation by NZexpress is partially located within the 11m height limit. Does this application include this operation as well? If so, please identify all relevant non-compliances and relevant effects including noise.

Reserves

18. Please identify the required 20m width of the esplanade reserve requirement on the subdivision site plan. The width measurement commences from the edge of the bed of the river or the landward boundary of the coastal marine area, as defined in terms of Section 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

This is to confirm the proposed esplanade reserve is of the required width of 20m in total. This to be confirmed by the applicant's surveyor. Any landscape plans should be consistent with these widths and measurements.

19. Is a footpath proposed within the stormwater facility, which will connect Kennaway Road to the esplanade reserve?

It is a requirement of the ODP and will also require protection with a right of way easement in gross.

20. Are any earthworks proposed within existing Council reserve land?

21. How will CPTED principles be managed in the location where the weir and southwest bund are to be located?

Clarification is required as to whether the area where the bund is proposed will create adverse effects in terms of safety and CPTED effects greater than the existing scenario within Council land.

Land Contamination

22. Please provide a detailed site investigation from a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner to address the following:

- Evidence that any bunding onsite, as well as the haulage route, are free of any contaminants;
- If there are contaminants present, please advise of their location;
- If any contaminated material was removed off site, please provide evidence of its disposal; and
- Confirm whether it is likely land contamination is elsewhere on the site.

It has been identified that contaminated material has been found onsite (containing asbestos materials) and may have remained onsite. It is noted any land vested to Council will not be accepted if there is contamination present.

Ecology

23. Please provide an assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist, which assesses the suitability of the works in, and landscape plans of, the proposed reserves to:

- Retain and protect lizard habitat and populations as per the report attached in the application;
- Provide habitat, protect existing habitat and nesting/breeding areas for avifauna (this will require an updated bird assessment to that referred to below) and a bird management plan;
- Provide robust riparian margins to protect both aquatic and terrestrial ecology

This report will need to be prepared by an ecologist who has experience with assessing the above topics in a cohesive manner. This assessment shall take into account the bird report produced by Dr Peter Harper for the previous private plan change (attached).

24. If the above assessment results in changes to the landscaping, how do those changes impact on the visual assessment?

25. Does the application comply with 6.6.4.1 P5 concerning the proposed sealed areas within the 30m setback?

Please note that your application will be placed on hold until the all of the requested information has been received.

Please respond in writing within 15 working days of the date of this letter (i.e. 9th February 2023) with one of the following:

- (a) The information requested above; or
- (b) Confirmation that you agree to provide the information, and the date by which you intend to provide it; or
- (c) Advice that you refuse to provide the requested information.

The Resource Management Act requires the Council to **publicly notify** your application if you do not provide the requested information before the date mentioned above (or an alternative date agreed with the Council), or if you refuse to provide the information. It is therefore important that you contact me promptly to discuss an alternative timeframe if you are unable to provide the information within 15 working days of the date of this letter.

The provision of the further information requested above may reveal the need for you to obtain written approvals from affected parties in order for the application to be processed on a non-notified basis. If that is the case, I will contact you again after I have received the information to confirm which, if any, written approvals will be required.

Please also note that if the provision of the information requested above raises any additional areas of uncertainty or matters requiring further clarification, your application will remain on hold until sufficient information has been provided to enable processing to continue.

If you are submitting amended plans as part of the further information requirements for this resource consent and you also have a current building consent application lodged with the Council, the amended plans should also be forwarded to the relevant building consent officer.

If you have any queries regarding this letter or your application please contact me.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Rachel Cottam'.

Rachel Cottam
Senior Planner
18/01/2023