

Matters for applicant

1. The maximum cut height and fill depth should be confirmed by the applicant as the Tonkin + Taylor report¹ suggests the maximum cut will be around 5.5m but there is no cross section to confirm the exact excavation height. Tonkin and Taylor also say that “the maximum fill heights are expected to be in the order of 3m” but this looks like it will be circa 4.5m.
2. The applicant is invited to advise whether the intention is for the pocket park is intended to be used after-dark and if yes, then provide lighting details.
3. The applicant should confirm if Sheet 3 of the landscape plan set, dated 07/02/2020 is the latest version and is to be included as part of the RC plan set (as it was not included the July 2021 set)
4. The applicant needs to confirm how site coverage has been calculated. Page 39 of the AEE says it will be 47.1% but this has not been included on the plans. RCO3 says the total building footprint will be 14,533.15m², which, if the total footprint has been used to calculate the site coverage across the 30,575m² site, the site coverage would be 47.5%. It is also not known if the total footprint includes eaves greater than 1m – this should also be confirmed.
5. Building heights need to be confirmed. For example:
 - a. Pages 40 and 41 of the AEE list the building height exceedances and the sections in the RC plan set show the exceedances. Drawing AO-041 also includes the RLs for the buildings. It is noted there are some discrepancies between the maximum exceedances between the ones listed on pages 40 and 41, the sections, when working through the RLs. This is particularly the case with BO1B (both buildings) and BO7. The exceedance in building heights for BO2-BO6 are consistent between what is listed in the AEE and with the RLs, however, there are some differences shown in the sections (refer to Long Section 5 on RC16).
 - b. BO1B (building 6): The AEE says the exceedance will be 17.58m, the difference in RL says 23.51m so an exceedance of 15.51m, and the section (refer to Long Section 1 on RC16) shows the exceedance to be 16m.
 - c. BO1B (building 7): The AEE says the exceedance is 14.54m, the difference in RL is 14.49m, and the section (refer to Long Section 6 on RC15) shows the exceedance to be 14.783m
 - d. BO7: the AEE says the exceedance will be 3.13m, the difference is RL is 2.32m, and there is no section in the RC set for BO1, however, the elevations on RC37 show the maximum height at 10.45m, so based on this the exceedance would be 2.45m.
6. This recession plane (for the building to the west of the Oldershaw Block) needs to be confirmed by the applicant as RP07 on RC14 shows this to be 2.979m whereas section 2 on RC14 shows this to be 4.022m and the ground level is the same as is the 181.52 RL. This will determine whether condition 5.3.4.19 is met or not.
7. The shading diagrams do not separately show shading from a 2m high permitted boundary fence, which is a relevant consideration in disregarding shading effects from a 2m high solid boundary fence which could be constructed on the site’s boundaries as a permitted activity. The applicant may wish to show shading from a 2m high solid boundary fence during the winter solstice at selected times (not all the 15min intervals) to illustrate the extent of the shadow cast on the properties adjoining the site to the south (49 Campbell Street, even numbered Scapa Terrace, and 42 Donald Street).
8. Boundary fencing will be conditioned be aerodynamically designed. Some areas of landscaping will be conditioned to mitigate wind effects.
9. Comment from the applicant or further discussions with experts may be beneficial to determine whether landscaping along the western boundary shared with Karori Kids

¹ Refer to Appendix H of the application.

and the northern boundary (to where the Karori Pool is) can include wind-suitable trees that can grow up to 5m in height and whether there is any ability to include trees along this part of the northern boundary as the landscape master plan does not presently include any. This would be to further mitigate wind effects.

10. I recommend that further discussions are had with parties to determine the necessity of having an aerodynamic wind shelter fence along the southern boundary to address southerly winds.
11. As for the terrace/courtyard area and the pocket park, further comment from the applicant and/or wind experts should be had to determine wind effects on these two spaces can be mitigated by a change to the fence design. As for the pocket park, CPTED principles would need to be considered here too so input from urban designers should be sought.
12. As for the wind effects between B01A and B01B and design of the building, I consider it would be beneficial to have comment from the applicant on this as part of their evidence and/or have the wind experts discussion this further in more detail.
13. It is not clear whether the 36-40 month construction period includes the earthworks stage of the development as well as construction, so this should be confirmed by the applicant in their evidence.
14. The applicant is invited to comment on their intention for working on public holidays.
15. 2.4m noise barrier fence Marshall Day have adopted in their noise predictions. The applicant is invited to respond to in this fence matter in their evidence and provide further information on its location in relation to the site's legal external boundaries. If it is on or within 1m of the site's external boundaries then it will not comply with 5.6.2.10. If it is set back at least 1m from the boundaries then it will, but it is not known if a set back would alter the acoustic performance.
16. It is noted that the Council is not supporting the 9m wide crossing until there is justification from the applicant as to why it needs to be this wide i.e., tracking paths. The applicant is invited to comment on this in their evidence.
17. Internal road layout must be reassessed to permit emergency service vehicle access and manoeuvring as required in the Designers' guide to firefighting operations – Emergency vehicle access F5-02 GD. The applicant is invited to provide a response to this in their evidence.
18. The applicant may wish to provide comment on the feasibility of complying with clearance heights for emergency service vehicles.
19. FENZ's operational needs to attend emergencies in the basements and undercroft areas is not known – the applicant or FENZ may want to comment on this.
20. A condition requires confirmation that emergency service vehicle access and manoeuvring is catered for in the detailed construction plans. It is suggested that the applicant provides a response to this in their evidence.
21. The applicant may wish to comment on how noise from the garage door and an associated warning device can be suitably designed, specified, and operated so as to comply with the District Plan noise limits.
22. Section 2.1.11 of the AEE states that there will be no direct access to the public pathway along the northern boundary, yet the plans show these will be a pathway directly to the fence. Please clarify.