



MITCHELL
DAYSH 


RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED

**26 DONALD STREET AND 27
CAMPBELL STREET, KARORI**

S92 Response Table

September 2020

LOCATION OF S92 RESPONSES WITHIN THE ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND TECHNICAL ASSESSMENTS

No. of Request	Information Requested	Location of Response
	URBAN DESIGN	
1.	A site plan that shows, at a closer scale, the path between Donald Street and Campbell Street, indicating the legal site boundary and the placement of the new proposed fence.	Drawing <i>RCA99 – Donald to Campbell Street Path</i> has been added to the Resource Consent Assessment Package, and is provided in Volume 3 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (“ AEE ”).
2.	<p>An additional visual simulation. The simulations included are a good, but are heavily weighted in favour of views from the south. More consideration needs to be given to the views from the north. The development will be visible from Karori Road which sees a high volume of both vehicle and pedestrian traffic every day. Please prepare a visual simulation from the following perspective, or thereabouts.</p> <p>The view is looking from north to south, from Karori Road at approximately the end of Reading Street, or slightly eastwards of there, as approximated by the following image (from Google, given the current movement restrictions). The viewpoint should not be at the point at which the cabbage tree obscures the Malcolm Block.</p> 	An additional visual simulation has been provided from the requested perspective on Karori Road and added to the Resource Consent Visual Simulations, and is provided in Volume 3 of the AEE.

3.	<p>Provide plans that show, at a closer scale, the shading impact on the Scapa Terrace properties. In particular, it should allow Urban Design to assess whether Guideline 2.7 of the Residential Design Guide can be met in terms of new development not unreasonably shading adjacent properties. The RDG requires broadly requires sunlight to access interior living spaces for 4 hours in mid-winter, ideally the shading information would confirm shading to the adjacent houses was made no worse and still met this standard. Clearer information is also needed that details the extent of the shading on the outdoor living areas of the neighbouring properties between 9am and 3pm for the period of 21 September to 21 March as this is the period when outdoor spaces receive much more use.</p>	<p>A new set of shading studies have been prepared for the Proposed Village, while the studies are not at a closer scale than those previously provided, digital copies of these studies are available in the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE. It is possible to zoom in on individual properties within this file. It is considered that there is sufficient information provided in the shading studies, and in the information provided in the 'Daily Hours Where Shading is Evident Within Properties Surrounding the Proposed Village' table in the Urban Design Review. The new shading studies are provided in the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE.</p>
4.	<p>An explanation to further elaborate on the statement that 'overland stormwater constraints' will restrict planting between buildings and neighbours on the southern boundary, and the exact areas where this restriction comes into place.</p>	<p>Further details relating to the planting restrictions along 50 m of the southern boundary of the Site are provided in Sections 2.1.13 and 5.11.1 of the AEE, in the Indicative Landscape Plan (Drawing L0-010 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE), in Section 6.51 of the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (attached as Appendix L to the AEE), and in the Infrastructure Assessment Report (attached as Appendix D to the AEE).</p>
5.	<p>Confirm progress of discussions relating to onsite stormwater management, and whether this is likely to affect site layout and/or building use. This should include the extent of commitment to water sensitive urban design, which is a highly desirable principle of almost complete redevelopment of a site of this size. <i>(Note: the urban design assessment cannot reasonably be completed if the design or site layout might still alter due to stormwater management requirements.)</i></p>	<p>Details of the proposed onsite stormwater management are provided in Sections 2.2.3 and 5.5 of the AEE, and in Section 3 of the Infrastructure Assessment Report (attached as Appendix D to the AEE).</p>

6.	<p>Information about any other sustainability outcomes that have been included in the design and would also be considered a desirable approach for comprehensive redevelopment of a large site, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable waste management • Accommodating the requirements of alternative modes of transport to, from or around the site – end of trip facilities and bike/scooter parking (probably more relevant for staff), e-travel charging stations etc. <p>Any measures to support passive solar design or water recycling or that assists in any other way to reduce local infrastructure demand.</p>	<p>Details of the sustainable initiatives of the Proposed Village are provided in Section 2.1.16 of the AEE.</p>
7.	<p>Confirmation of the heights of Fence Types 'A' and 'B' and include details of any other structures within the fences such as gates, pillars and porticos particularly in locations where gate entries need to be visually highlighted.</p>	<p>Additional details of the fence heights, and structures within the fences have been integrated into Drawing RC12 of the Resource Consent Architectural Package in Volume 3 of the AEE.</p>
8.	<p>Confirm the fence or balustrade type for the first floor outdoor terraces between blocks B02-B06.</p>	<p>Additional details of the balustrade type for the first-floor terraces have been integrated into Drawing RC35 of the Resource Consent Architectural Package in Volume 3 of the AEE.</p>
9.	<p>Details of the type and design of fences around the 'interior' edges of the public garden in the south-east corner of the site.</p>	<p>Additional details of the type and design of fences around the 'interior' edges of the public garden in the south-east corner of the Site have been integrated into Drawing RC12 of the Resource Consent Architectural Package in Volume 3 of the AEE.</p>
10.	<p>Details of the proposed lighting particularly on parts of the site where there is direct interface with the neighbourhood, such as at driveway, gates and entries, and for the small public space on the south-eastern side of the site.</p>	<p>Lighting details of the Proposed Village are provided in Section 2.1.14 of the AEE, and on Drawing RCA06 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE. A concept drawing of the road lighting and walkway lighting is also provided on Drawing RCA06.</p>

11.	If these are above ground, details of the design of the exterior enclosure of the substations shown in Civil Plan 042-RCT_401_CO-041. This is requested because it will form part of the main entry/arrival condition to the facility.	Details of the design of the exterior enclosure of the substations are provided in Drawing <i>RCA100 – Transformer Screen</i> , which has been added to the Resource Consent Assessment Package, and is provided in Volume 3 of the AEE.
	LANDSCAPING	
12.	The Landscape and Visual Assessment Report prepared by RA Skidmore Urban Design Ltd relies on Visual Simulation for Viewpoints 1 – 12 and this is not considered to be sufficient to assess the visual effects of the proposal. Additional Visual Simulations are required showing likely visual effects for Scapa Terrace residents within north side of street where the primary living area may overlook the proposed development. Suggested locations are from the upper level of houses at 16 & 24 Scapa Terrace. Viewpoint 06 provided in the application is from the street view and does not adequately show effects for residents overlooking the site at a close-range distance. Please also include the visual simulation (Campbell Street vantage to the north) as requested by Sarah Duffell under point 2 above.	Further to discussions that have taken place between Laura Brownlie (WCC) and Richard Turner (Mitchell Daysh Limited), it is understood that the Council have accepted that it is not possible to provide visual simulations from private properties located along Scapa Terrace. As an alternative, a selection of cross sections at key points along the Site’s southern boundary have been prepared, detailing the relationship of the Proposed Village with neighbouring properties. These cross sections are provided as Drawings RCA13 – RCA17 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package and are provided in Volume 3 of the AEE.
13.	Five individual trees have been identified in the Arborists Report within the tree retention areas G1, G2, G3, G4. These trees are shown on the Indicative Landscape Plan prepared by Sullivan and Wall. Six large Kowhai trees within the general location of edges of existing driveway and proposed Building Bo7 are recommended in the Arborists Report for relocation. Confirm if any of the trees can be relocated and will be included in site landscaping.	Relocation of the six large kowhai trees is not proposed as set out in Section 4.7 of the Arborist Report (attached as Appendix F to the AEE).
	<u>Proposed Planting</u>	

14.	Planting is proposed between the southern end of Buildings B02 to B06 and the boundary with Scapa Terrace properties. The existing boundary fences will remain. The Indicative Landscape Plans shows a large section, (approximately 60m in length x 6m wide) where planting is not included due to 'overland stormwater constraints'. Please provide updated mitigation planting details along this boundary.	As detailed in the response to Point 4, further details relating to the planting restrictions along a 50 m section of the southern boundary of the Site are provided in Sections 2.1.13 and 5.11.1 of the AEE, in the Indicative Landscape Plan (Drawing L0-010 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE), in Section 6.51 of the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (attached as Appendix L to the AEE), and in the Infrastructure Assessment Report (attached as Appendix D to the AEE).
15.	The existing open space area within the south east corner of the site currently acts as a stormwater detention pond. (See Proposed Waste-Water Management Network Plan, Beca Drawing 042-RCT 401_CO-031 App A). No specific reference is made to stormwater within the area shown in the Indicative Landscape Plan. Further details must be supplied in relation to design of the onsite stormwater network, detention ponds and related planting where this will impact on landscaping within the development.	Further details of the stormwater provisions for the open space area within the southeast corner of the Site are provided in Section 2.1.13 of the AEE, the Indicative Landscape Plan (Drawing L0-010 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE), and in Section 3.2.2 of the Infrastructure Assessment Report (attached as Appendix D to the AEE).
16.	Generally, the extent of likely tree protection, retention and relocation recommended in the Arborist's Report is not consistent with the level shown in the Indicative Landscape Plan which is vague. A note in the Indicate Landscape Plan referring to tree retention areas G3, G4 between Buildings B01A and B01B states that it is likely trees will be removed within this area due to demolition and replanting will be a mix of native and exotic trees. Please provide confirmation of the likelihood of retaining trees as recommended in the Arborist's report beyond 4m of buildings.	Further details of likely tree protection, retention and relocation have been integrated into Section 5.8 of the AEE, in the Arboriculture Assessment (attached as Appendix F to the AEE), and in the Indicative Landscape Plan (Drawing L0-010 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE).
17.	The Indicative Landscape Plans shows the general location of specimen trees proposed around the site. The plan is indicative only and of a scale not useful to provide planting details appropriate for all situations including close to buildings, vehicle	Additional information about the landscaping details of the Proposed Village have been provided in Section 5.11.1 of the AEE, in the Indicative Landscape Plan (Drawing L0-010 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in

	<p>and pedestrian accessways and courtyard spaces around the site. Please provide further planting details showing the location of trees and shrubs that will ensure that visual interest, shelter from wind, identification of entranceways, robust way finding around the pedestrian areas and amenity within garden areas, including proposed public garden areas, courtyard spaces and at street edges is required. The planting plans must show all plant names, locations, spacings and numbers proposed. Shrubs plantings located next to roads should be low maintenance and be robust native species no higher than 800mm in height to ensure sightlines are maintained. Street and open space trees should be selected as large grade trees with a 50mm girth or greater.</p>	<p>Volume 3 of the AEE), and in the draft landscaping consent condition being proffered by Ryman (also provided in Section 5.11.1 of the AEE).</p>
18.	<p>Provide details for all surface treatments including for hard and pervious paving.</p>	<p>Details of the landscaping treatment for the Site are provided in Section 5.11.1 of the AEE, and in the draft landscaping consent condition being proffered by Ryman (also provided in Section 5.11.1 of the AEE).</p>
19.	<p>Provide details of street tree planting that includes large scale evergreen trees for year- round visual interest and screening to help reduce visual impact of buildings close to the Donald and Campbell street edge. Suggested hardy species tolerant to Wellington conditions are Totara, Rewerewa, Plagianthus, Hoheria, Pseudopanax and Pohutukawa in limited numbers. An updated landscape plan is required to reflect this.</p>	<p>Details of planting along the boundaries of the Site shared with Donald Street and Campbell Street are provided in Section 5.11.1 of the AEE and on the Indicative Landscape Plan (Drawing L0-010 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE).</p>
20.	<p>Provide details for large scale mitigation planting between proposed buildings and site boundaries in relation to adjoining properties at Scapa Terrace and 29, 33, 33A, 49 Campbell Street. Suggested species are Plagianthus, Hoheria, Pittosporum, Sophora. An updated landscape plan is required to reflect this.</p>	<p>Details of the proposed planting along the boundaries of the Site shared with Scapa Terrace and 29, 33, 33A and 49 Campbell Street are provided in Section 5.11.1 of the AEE, and in the Indicative Landscape Plan (Drawing L0-010 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE).</p>

	<u>Open Space and Recreation</u>	
21.	Please provide details of the additional demand the proposed development will have on the Council's open spaces and recreational facilities, including Ben Burn Park and the Karori Pool.	Details of the demand that the Proposed Village will have on Open Space and Recreation facilities are provided in Section 5.15 of the AEE.
	<u>External Circulation</u>	
22.	The plans show a gate in the northern boundary linking to an existing WCC pathway that provides a connection between Donald Street and Campbell Street. Based on the plans provided, it appears to be a pedestrian gate as opposed to a gate to be used for fire egress only. The current WCC pathway is not built or maintained to accessibility standards. If it is intended to provide general access to the path such that it would be used by residents on a frequent basis, and based on it not currently being built to the level of service required to provide access for people with lower or limited mobility, there is an expectation that this path will need to be modified by the consent holder. Please provide confirmation of the intention for the use of the access to this pathway and a plan that details the proposed changes to the WCC path, including any level modifications as it is likely that a landing adjacent to the gate will be required and lighting (it is not currently lit).	<p>The pedestrian gate in the northern boundary is no longer part of the proposal, and has been removed from the assessment, plans and drawings accordingly.</p> <p>However, details relating to lighting along the existing pedestrian pathway (that is located to the north of the Site) are provided in Section 2.1.11 of the AEE, an urban design assessment of the impact of the Proposed Village on the pathway is provided in Section 5.9.1.5 of the AEE (and in Section 8.86 – 8.99) of the Urban Design Assessment provided as Appendix B to the AEE), and an assessment of the effects of the Proposed Village on Open Space and Recreation areas is provided in Section 5.15 of the AEE.</p>
23.	It is anticipated that the proposed development will increase demand for a safe crossing and kerb modification at Campbell Street by both future residents and their visitors to get to Ben Burn Park. Please provide information on how the development will ensure that future residents will have a safe crossing to get over Campbell Street to Ben Burn Park.	An assessment of the effects of the Proposed Village on Open Space and Recreation areas surrounding the Site is provided in Section 5.15 of the AEE.

	<u>Disruption to Power, Water and Other Services to Karori Pool</u>	
24.	Please provide information outlining what consultation and processes will be in place in the event there is power supply, water supply or wastewater disruptions during construction that affect the Karori Pool. This information is requested as any disruption to the above services may mean the facility would need to be closed down for a period of time.	Details of the potential disruption of service provisions throughout the construction of the Proposed Village are provided in Section 5.3 of the AEE.
	<u>Reverse Sensitivity</u>	
25.	Karori Pool operates from 6am to 9pm with noise emanating from internal and external use of the pool and carparks. There are few options available to the pool to mitigate this noise without limiting the hours of operation which would affect the availability of the service and viability of the operation. What design considerations to the apartments has been undertaken to mitigate potential noise effects from the operation of the Karori Pool on future occupiers of the apartments to prevent reverse sensitivity effects on the pool operation? Please provide details of design considerations and proposed mitigation.	An assessment of the operational noise effects of the Karori Pool on the Proposed Village is provided in Section 5.13.2 of the AEE. This assessment also details design considerations that have been made for those apartments located in close proximity to the Karori Pool.
	<u>Fire Egress over WCC (24 Donald Street)</u>	
26.	Fire egress is proposed over WCC land (WCC's proposed carpark at 24 Donald Street). Please address the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm and provide details that the fire escape gate in the northeast boundary fence and associated fire evacuation pathway through the carpark has been assessed as compliant by the Fire Engineer with the knowledge that this area will be developed as a carpark with no provision for kerb treatment 	Details of Ryman's proposed utilisation of the WCC carpark at 24 Donald Street as a fire evacuation pathway are provided in Section 5.15 of the AEE, with correspondence with the WCC Parks and Recreation team that confirms the utilisation of this land provided as Appendix O to the AEE.



	<p>or that a clear area for the fire evacuation pathway has been set;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm that the gate will not block the adjacent planned footpath when open and that the gate will not be able to be opened unless triggered by the fire alert system or for maintenance of the gate; and <p>Confirm that the route from the gate across the planned footpath and carpark does not require kerb modifications and/or areas of the carpark to be kept clear.</p>	
	<u>Stormwater</u>	
27.	<p>As part of the proposed stormwater infrastructure and mitigation that is yet to be provided, please include information detailing that whether there will be an increase/no increase in stormwater runoff from the development that may impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stream volume as a result of the proposal that may have a detrimental impact on in- stream ecology and/or streambank erosion; - Structures on WCC land such as culverts and bridges; and <p>Potential for water infiltration of the closed landfill at Ben Burn Park, which could contribute to increased risk of land and waterway contamination.</p>	<p>Details of the anticipated stormwater runoff from the Proposed Village are provided in Section 5.5.2 of the AEE, and in Section 3 of the Infrastructure Assessment Report.</p>
	TRAFFIC	
28.	<p>In addition to the WCC District Plan, the application refers to the Australian RTA guidelines and the NZ research report TR453. Please clarify why they have used both documents since the NZ</p>	<p>An explanation as to why both the Australian RTA guidelines and the NZ research report TR453 have been referenced in the application is provided in Section 5.1 of the Transportation Assessment provided as Appendix E to the AEE.</p>

	report could be considered to be more relevant to the NZ situation (although it has some limitations).	
	<u>Parking for Staff</u>	
29.	Useful information has been provided on parking provision and adequacy using data from two existing Ryman villages and the proposed parking provision for this site includes staff parking. Please provide information on and confirm whether the staff parking provision is expected to fully satisfy the demand without any overspill on to either Donald Street or Campbell Street.	Details of the proposed staff parking provisions are provided in Section 5.14.4 of the AEE, and in Sections 6.2 and 7 of the Transportation Assessment provided as Appendix E to the AEE.
	<u>Staff Travel Plan</u>	
30.	Please provide information on and confirm whether they have put in place a staff travel plan at any of their other Ryman villages and whether they are considering a plan for the Karori site. Such a plan would be in line with the Council's sustainable transport policies and be potentially applicable to a large site such as this with substantial numbers of staff employed and routinely travelling to and from the site.	Details of staff travel requirements for the Proposed Village are provided in Section 5.14.4 of the AEE, and in Section 7 of the Transportation Assessment provided as Appendix E to the AEE.
31.	Please indicate the approximate number of staff they expect to be employed and details of where they will park.	Details of the anticipated number of staff are provided in Section 5.2 of the AEE, with their parking provisions indicated in Section 6.2 of the Transportation Assessment provided as Appendix E to the AEE.
	<u>Intersection Modelling</u>	
32.	Was the modelling was done with SIDRA? No reference to this has been found so please confirm.	Details of the transportation modelling that has been utilised are provided in Section 5.4 of the Transportation Assessment provided as Appendix E to the AEE.

	<u>Internal Road Layout</u>	
33.	No sections/elevations are provided presumably because the design is at concept stage. It is stated that the main access road through the site will have an approximate width of 5.5m providing for two-way access while also moderating vehicle speeds. They provide tracking diagrams to show the design vehicles can navigate the various roadways. They also state that pedestrian footpaths will be provided throughout the village. Please provide cross section and elevation details in order to allow an accurate vehicle access assessment to be carried out. The plans also need to show how pedestrians can safely and conveniently navigate the large proposed parking areas as this is not shown on the concept plan.	Proposed roading plans (inclusive of elevations and cross sections) have been prepared and are provided as Drawings 042-RCT_401_C0-200, 042-RCT_401_C3-220, 042-RCT_401_C3-250 and 042-RCT_401_C3-251 in the Infrastructure Assessment Report provided as Appendix D to the AEE. Details of the provisions for pedestrian movements throughout the Site are provided in Drawing RCA06 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE.
	SERVICING AND INFRASTRUCTURE	
34.	The following further information is required in order to assess this application from a three water point of view: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feasible flood mitigation options that will insure the surrounding flood risk is not made significantly worse as a result of the development and that the proposed buildings in the development are not at risk of flooding; and A revised water layout that reflects supply from at least two points.	Details of the Proposed Village's flood mitigation options are provided in Section 5.5.3 of the AEE, and in Section 3.4.2.4 of the Infrastructure Assessment Report provided as Appendix D to this AEE. Details of the water layout for the Proposed Village, and supply from 2 points are provided in Section 2.2.1 of the AEE, and in Section 5.2 of the Infrastructure Assessment Report.
	NOISE	
35.	Please provide an acoustic report prepared by a suitable expert that assesses the noise effects associated with the development including the operation of the fixed plant, the waste compactor and deliveries.	An assessment of the operational noise of the Proposed Village and a discussion of the potential noise effects that may be generated from the Karori Pool are provided in Section 5.13 of the AEE, and an Operational Noise Assessment is provided as Appendix K to the AEE.

	Note: You may wish to include information on reverse sensitivity in here depending on what mitigation is proposed – refer to point 25 above.	
	HERITAGE	
	<u>Allen Ward VC Hall</u>	
36.	Please provide additional plans and elevations that show the existing building and proposed works at a scale that is readable at A3. A suggestion is 1:100 scale @ A3.	Due to the detail provided in the drawings (i.e. the layout of the Site and the size of buildings), they cannot be supplied at 1:100 scale @ A3. However, a series of Concept Drawings have been prepared that provide further detail of the original buildings and proposed buildings (at 1:200 @ A3), and are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
37.	Please provide joinery schedules and detailed drawings of the proposed replacement windows and external doors.	It is considered that joinery schedules and window drawings are not necessary at the resource consent stage of the application. However, a series of Concept Drawings provide further detail of the proposed buildings and are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
	<u>Tennant Block</u>	
38.	Please provide elevations that show the existing and proposed joinery.	A series of Concept Drawings provide further detail of the original buildings and proposed buildings and are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
39.	Please provide joinery schedules and detailed drawings of the proposed replacement windows and external doors.	It is considered that joinery schedules and window drawings are not necessary at the resource consent stage of the application. However, a series of Concept Drawings provide further detail of the proposed buildings and are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
	<u>Links between Buildings and Covered Ways</u>	



40.	Please provide plans and elevations that show the existing structures/buildings and the proposed works at a readable scale at A3. A suggestion is 1:100 @ A3.	Due to the detail provided in the drawings (i.e. the layout of the Site and the size of buildings), they cannot be supplied at 1:100 scale @ A3. However, a series of Concept Drawings have been prepared that provide further detail of the original buildings and proposed buildings (at 1:200 @ A3), and are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
	<u>Oldershaw (Octagonal Building)</u>	
41.	There is no indication of possible works to the Oldershaw Building. Please provide plans and elevations as existing and proposed to show any proposed changes to the building at 1:100 @ A3 or 1:50 if possible.	Details of the proposed changes to the Oldershaw Block (Octagonal Section) are provided in Section 6.2 of the Heritage Technical Report provided as Appendix C to the AEE.
	<u>New Buildings in location of former buildings – particularly the Gray and Waghorn Buildings</u>	
42.	Please provide plans and elevations as existing of the Gray and Waghorn Buildings at 1:100 @ A3 that explains the conservation architect's input and compares the proposed design to the original buildings. See heritage technical report item 5.2	A series of Concept Drawings have been prepared that provide further detail of the original buildings and the proposed buildings (at 1:200 @ A3), and the architectural cues that have influenced the design of the Proposed Village. These drawings are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
	<u>New Buildings B01B & B07</u>	
43.	Please provide photographs and drawings of the elements of the existing buildings that provide cues for the new design.	A series of Concept Drawings have been prepared that provide further detail of the original buildings and the proposed buildings (at 1:200 @ A3), and the architectural cues that have influenced the design of the Proposed Village. These drawings are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
44.	Please provide elevations of the new buildings B01B and B07 at 1:100 @ A3.	Due to the detail provided in the drawings (i.e. the layout of the Site and the size of buildings), they cannot be supplied at 1:100 scale @ A3. However, a series of Concept Drawings have been prepared that provide further detail of

		the original buildings and proposed buildings (at 1:200 @ A3), and are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
45.	Please provide detailed drawings of B01B & B07 at 1:20 (or larger) @A3 with annotations to demonstrate how the cues from the existing buildings will be integrated into the new buildings.	A series of Concept Drawings have been prepared that provide further detail of the original buildings and the proposed buildings (at 1:200 @ A3), and the architectural cues that have influenced the design of the Proposed Village. These drawings are provided in Appendix C to the AEE.
	<u>Heritage Landscaping</u>	
46.	The areas of heritage landscaping identified in the heritage assessment of the application include the Lopdell Gardens, including the garden between the Tennant and octagonal Oldershaw Blocks and the gardens between the Waghorn and Panckhurst blocks and the Malcolm and Oldershaw blocks, bounded to the south by the Mackie Gym, and to the north by the site boundary. Please provide plans and sections through the existing and proposed areas of heritage landscaping at a scale that is readable at A3. A suggestion is 1:100 if possible.	<p>Details of the Heritage Landscaping features of the Site are discussed in Section 6.5 of the Heritage Technical Report provided as Appendix C to the AEE. Identification of the areas of the Lopdell Gardens that are being retained are detailed in the Arboricultural Report (attached as Appendix F to the AEE) and acknowledged on the Indicative Landscape Plan (Drawing L0-010 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE).</p> <p>Additional plans and sections of the existing and proposed areas of heritage landscaping will be provided as part of the finalised set of Landscape and Pavement plans proffered in relation to the draft landscaping consent condition detailed in Section 5.11.1 of the AEE.</p>
	<u>Mitigation Methods</u>	
47.	<p>Please provide details on what mitigation measures are proposed and how these have or will be carried out as part of the proposed development. It is recommended that the proposed mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Photographic record, including of interior spaces; - Re-use of heritage fabric on site, particularly in landscaping; 	Details of the heritage mitigation measures proposed by Ryman are detailed in Section 5.7.1 of the AEE and in the Heritage Technical Report (attached to the AEE as Appendix C).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interpretation of the history of the site for the benefit of residents and visitors; and <p>Retention of parts of the Lopdell Gardens.</p>	
	WASTE AND RECYCLING	
48.	<p>The proposal has been assessed by the Council’s Waste Operations Engineer, Robert Hon, who has requested for confirmation on the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That waste and recycling collections are managed and funded privately by the applicant; - That access to these collections will be provided to ALL residents (including independent living residents) in the development; - That all operations to remove waste or recycling will occur within the footprint of the site; and - That the frequency of collection or sizing of waste amalgamation sites within the footprint will be tailored to ensure there is no spill over occurs onto public land or no temptation for residents to use the Council’s kerbside waste and recycling collection service. <p>Note: The ‘sizing of waste amalgamation sites’, means that the facility operators can choose to adjust their waste amalgamation sites (e.g. size/room) to ensure that they can keep up with the supply of waste generated from the site considering the frequency of the collections. For example, if the operators want to just have one collection per week; then they need to make sure that they have allocated enough space, i.e. size the area right (be it a room or an outdoor space designated for waste) within the footprint of the development to hold that material so it does not spill out onto Council land and affect the public or neighbouring properties or other parts within the development that makes it unsightly for the</p>	<p>Details of the proposed waste and recycling systems for the Proposed Village are provided in Section 2.2.6 of the AEE.</p>

	residents living there. Alternatively, if the operators cannot find the space within the development then they can adjust the frequency of collection to match the expected waste demand. If the operator's predicts the space to hold waste will get full every 3 days, then they will need to clear the waste every 3 days.	
	PLANNING	
49.	<p>Please provide a wind tunnel test report and assessment that demonstrates the actual and potential wind effects of this development. This is required given the proposal involves a number of buildings greater than three storeys in height and a number of the buildings are higher than those prevailing in the locality, which could result in adverse wind effects. The report needs to assess the wind effects of the proposed buildings on all pedestrian areas open to the public (footpaths, Ben Burn Park, Karori pool and car park, Karori Normal School, and Karori Kids Preschool) as well as recreation and open areas within the development. It also needs to assess whether there would be vehicle traffic safety effects particularly on cyclists or motorcyclists.</p> <p>With regards to residential amenity, we don't typically consider wind effects as part of assessing effects on residential amenity as buildings are typically of a similar scale to those surrounding or will be over time. However, due to the scale of buildings proposed in this case we consider an assessment is required.</p> <p>Thus, in considering residential amenity effects, you should consider how the proposal affects wind and the usability or comfort of the outdoor open space of nearby residential properties. Comfort wind guidelines, duration and occurrence will need to be included in this assessment. The report will need to assess the wind effects the proposal will have on the outdoor areas of adjoining residential properties (including but not limited to Scapa Terrace, Donald</p>	A Wind Assessment completed by WSP is attached to the AEE as Appendix M , and details of the assessment are summarised in Section 5.12 of the AEE.

	<p>Street, and Campbell Street) and possibly residential properties beyond the site depending on the results of the wind tunnel test.</p> <p>With regards to the wind assessment that will accompany the wind tunnel test, the Outer Residential Area does not have any policy direction on wind effects, largely due to 5-7 storey buildings not being envisaged in an Outer Residential Area. In this regard, you may want to consider the Centres Area policies and objectives as they provide a good assessment framework to consider wind effects of building at the pedestrian level which primarily deals with wind effects above 3 storeys and you should also consider the Council's Design Guidelines for Wind as part of the assessment. There is limited policy guidance on how wind effects residential amenity which is why comfort wind guidelines, durations, and occurrences need to be addressed as part of the residential amenity effects assessment, detailed above.</p> <p>If the information is available, you may wish to compare the wind effects from the proposal with the wind effects that were generated by the existing environment in this assessment.</p>	
50.	Please remove the 'shadow of the structure built to the bulk and location envelope' layer on the shading diagrams. This is not helpful in assessing the actual and potential effects and it is misleading in that it does not accurately reflect what could be built on site as a permitted activity.	An explanation as to why the Residential Building Standards are included in the shading diagrams is provided in Section 5.9.1 of the AEE and in Section 7.5.4 of the Urban Design Review (attached as Appendix B to the AEE).
51.	Please show the property boundaries on the shading diagrams.	Boundaries of properties surrounding the Proposed Village have been added to the shading diagrams.
52.	Please show the existing ground level on the plans, particularly on the elevations as this will assist in determining the accuracy of the maximum building heights and building recession planes.	The existing ground level has been added to the plans provided in the Resource Consent Architectural & Assessment Packages.

53.	Please provide a table that shows the maximum heights (from existing ground level) of all the buildings on site. You will need to somehow differentiate between the buildings comprised in B01A and B01B as there are seven buildings.	A table detailing the Building Height Exceedances is provided in Section 4.2.1.2 of the AEE, and on Drawing RCA10 of the Resource Consent Assessment Package in Volume 3 of the AEE.
54.	Please provide details of the proposed fence treatment between this site and the site at 24 Donald Street (where the new Council car park is proposed). Please note: At this stage no information relating to earthworks and contamination is being requested, but this may change once the stormwater infrastructure information has been received.	Details of the proposed fence treatment are provided on Drawing RC12 of the Resource Consent Architectural Package in Volume 3 of the AEE.
	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED	
	Drawing No. RC13 shows that there is going to be a 9.6m building recession plane infringement in relation to B01A along the western boundary and I just wanted to check with you as in the AEE (page 38) there's no reference to a building recession plane infringement along the western boundary – just the northern and southern boundaries.	Details of the building recession plane infringements are provided in Table 9 of Section 4.2.1.2 of the AEE, and in the Resource Consent Assessment & Architectural Packages in Volume 3 of the AEE.