

19 December 2021

Selwyn District Council
Attention: Jocelyn Lewes

Novo Group Limited
Level 1, 279 Montreal Street
PO Box 365, Christchurch 8140
0 - 03 365 5570
info@novogroup.co.nz

By email: Jocelyn.Lewes@selwyn.govt.nz

Dear Jocelyn,

**PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE REQUEST TO THE OPERATIVE
SELWYN DISTRICT PLAN- RFI
PC210081: DUNNS CROSSING ROAD, ROLLESTON**

1. Further to your request for further information on 8 December 2021 relating to the application above, we set out below a response to each of your specific requests and include an amended ODP in **Attachment 1** and amended ODP Text in **Attachment 2**.

RFI Matters

Reserves

RFI 1. Please clarify if the "landscape strip" (3.0 metres in width) along the Selwyn Road frontage would be on public land (a reserve) or on private land (e.g. via a covenant on properties)

Response:

2. The landscape strip has been removed from the ODP. In addition, the ODP text removes reference to this landscape strip and avoiding direct access to Selwyn Road.

RFI 2. Please provide an assessment of reserve provision in terms of indicated size based on the standard of 1.2 ha per 1,000 population and the distribution criteria of "easy walking distance (500m).

Response:

3. The ODP has been updated to include additional east-west connections - as a result the layout has been slightly reconfigured and the main reserve is now located in a more central location, maximum distance from any dwelling to the reserve is less than 500m. Refer to the revised ODP for the illustration of walkability.
4. The central green space will be a local neighbourhood park of approx. 1.5 - 2ha in size to cater for 350+ dwellings. The exact size will be determined at subdivision design stage to ensure it meets the standard of 1.2 ha per 1,000 population. Wherever possible and suitable planting of native species within the greenways and in reserves will be provided for, in particular adjacent to waterways and within stormwater utility reserves.



Water and Wastewater

RFI 3. Please confirm what consented water consents could be transferred to Council to service this proposed plan change

Response:

5. The Environment Canterbury (ECan) GIS database shows no bores (wells) within the Skellerup South block (as stated in Section 2.3 of our report) and therefore there are no water take consents associated with this land parcel that can be transferred. Additional consented water take will be required to supply the Skellerup South Block (350 lots).
6. Considering the wider context, there are water take consents associated with other plan change areas PC73 and PC82 that could be transferred. The existing water take consents for the Holmes (1150 lots) + Skellerup Blocks (950 lots) can supply approx. 70% of demand for these blocks, and the 3 existing water take consents for PC82 can supply approx. 110% of demand for the estimated 1320 lots. So, there is a shortfall in consented water take after transferring existing consents from PC73 and PC82 sites. As the site is outside of the Rolleston Structure Plan Area, it is anticipated that any shortfall of consented water allocation will be met by the developer at that stage.

RFI 4. Please advise if development staging is proposed and if so how will this proceed?

Response:

7. The 350 households could be delivered in any number of stages (i.e. 50 to 100 lots), or all at once depending on the market demand. If the development is to be staged, the first stage may be larger to off-set the up-front infrastructure costs.
8. Up-front infrastructure that needs to be developed regardless of staging includes a new wastewater pump station to service the site, and extension of water mains in Dunns Crossing Road. A wastewater pump station will need to be constructed at the down-slope end of the site (ie. adjacent to Selwyn Road), but there is no reason why gravity sewer can't be extended to any stage starting further north / upslope.
9. In the proponent's view, the logical progression is to develop from north to south as services and roading upgrades are extended from the neighbouring plan change sites to the north. It is assumed that new water supply headworks to augment water supply will be developed as part of neighbouring Plan Change sites (PC73 or PC82). Notably, the Dunns Crossing/Goulds/Selwyn Roads intersection will be upgraded prior to the occupation of the site, although these works do not preclude the simultaneous development of the other ODP intersections to the subject site.

Transportation

RFI 5. Please confirm how the plan change will affect the timing of third-party intersection upgrades identified in paragraph 42 of the ITA. Further, please confirm how the plan change can respond in the instance that the timing of these upgrades is not brought forward.



Response:

10. Please refer to the transportation response included in **Attachment 4**.

RFI 6. Please confirm how the proposed upgrade for the Goulds Road/Dunns Crossing Road/Selwyn Road intersection will be funded and delivered, noting that it is not funded or programmed in Council's Long Term Plan. Further, please provide an indicative design for the upgrade.

Response:

11. Please refer to the transportation response (and indicative design) included in **Attachment 4**.

RFI 7. Please confirm how development within the plan change will be delayed until the third party intersection upgrades identified in the ITA are undertaken. Please consider if it appropriate that this be identified in the text accompanying the Outline Development Plan (ODP), or if it is more appropriate that a bespoke rule be incorporated into the Operative District Plan.

Response:

12. Please refer to the transportation response included in **Attachment 4**.
13. A table has been inserted in the proposed ODP text confirming the upgrade required, timing, and anticipated funding mechanism. In addition, should more than 350 households be sought at subdivision stage, the ODP text specifically requires that a separate ITA would be required at this time.
14. Notably, Rule 12.1.3.58 requires that “any subdivision within a Living Z or 3 Zone that is subject to an Operative Outline Development Plan within the District Plan shall be in general compliance with that Outline Development Plan and shall comply with any standards referred to in that Outline Development Plan”.
15. This includes the relevant ODP text. Failure to comply with the relevant ODP results in a non-complying activity status, per Rule 12.1.7.10. No additional rules are considered necessary.

RFI 8. Please confirm how development within the plan change area will be integrated with the upgrade of the Dunns Crossing Road/Newmans Road and Dunns Crossing Road/Lowes Road intersections, to ensure that effects of the plan change on these intersections will be adequately managed. It is noted that these upgrades are proposed by other parties, however the ITA does not address how the potential safety and efficiency effects will be managed should development precede these upgrades.

Response:

16. Please refer to the transportation response included in **Attachment 4**.

RFI 9. Please comment on whether Selwyn Road, along the site frontage, requires upgrading to support this request, referring to Council standards and guidelines where relevant.



Response:

17. Please refer to the transportation response included in **Attachment 4**.

RFI 10. Please confirm if the PC80 is represented in the Rolleston Paramics model used to support this plan change request (PC81) ITA. If it is not, please provide an updated modelling assessment which includes PC80. Further, please provide the Paramics model files for review.

Response:

18. Please refer to the transportation response included in **Attachment 4**.

RFI 11. Please provide the SIDRA model files for the State Highway 1/Dunns Crossing Road/Walkers Road intersection that have been used for the assessment included in the ITA. Further, please confirm that the SIDRA model includes traffic generated by PC80

Response:

19. Please refer to the transportation response included in **Attachment 4**.

RFI 12. Please provide further information on the form and functioning of the southern access onto Dunns Crossing Road, as represented in the Rolleston Paramics model, and how this plan change request will support the construction of an appropriate intersection form.

Response:

20. Please refer to the transportation response included in **Attachment 4**.

RFI 13. To assist Council to ensure that the transport network indicated in the plan change request aligns with adjacent future developments being proposed via other plan change requests, please provide an overlay of the OPDs for PC70, PC73 (as modified during the hearing) and this plan change. Please comment on the degree to which the transport network proposed by this plan change request aligns with adjacent future development

Response:

21. Please refer to the separate ODP Connectivity plan included in **Attachment 1**. This illustrates the alignment of the roading and pedestrian/cyclist linkages to the PC70 & PC73 sites (as modified by the hearing, or otherwise indicated by Council).

Urban Design

RFI 14. Please provide an urban design analysis of the proposed plan change in the context of Rolleston. This could be based on the Seven C's from the NZ Urban Design Protocol¹ or the design principles from 'People Places Spaces'. In particular please describe and show the existing context and the proposed plan changes nearby and how this plan change responds to both of these scenarios. To what extent does the proposed plan change rely on adjacent plan changes and is any sequencing proposed?



Response:

22. Please refer to the 'People, Places and Spaces' assessment included in **Attachment 5**, which was provided by Nicole Lauenstein of A + Urban Limited.

RFI 15. Are areas of higher density proposed as part of the Outline Development Plan and if so where would these be located?

Response:

23. Yes – they are not specifically identified on the ODP, as their exact location is determined by the final layout and detailed design at subdivision stage. However, the ODP allows for the integration of medium density environments co-located with either open space, reserves, local centres, along key road connections and in smaller pockets around high amenity, low traffic residential streets. For clarity and to provide certainty this approach has been added to the ODP narrative.

RFI 16. Why is no direct property access suggested onto Selwyn Road – if this plan change is approved is it possible that future urban development would take place south of Selwyn Road and what conditions would future proof this edge?

Response:

24. The ODP has been revised and direct access to individual properties off Selwyn Road has been proposed. This will include:
- road frontage upgrade along this part of Selwyn Road to bring it up to an urban standard, and
 - cohesive edge treatment through landscaping and open style rural fencing to address interface with the rural land across the road to the south.
25. Should a swale be required for stormwater collection and conveyance along the southern boundary this can be used as a vegetated buffer/screen to the rural land and integrated into the landscape treatment.

RFI 17. Please show how the cycle and pedestrian networks connect to the existing and proposed networks throughout Rolleston. What sort of street edge upgrade is proposed along Dunns Crossing Road?

Response:

26. Refer to **Attachment 2** – ODP Connectivity plan.
27. The key cycle and walkways are in direct alignment with those in the adjacent plan change areas to achieve a continuous network and a similar type and standard is provided (i.e. off road, shared, sufficient width etc). The lower/primary intersection across Dunns Crossing Road into PC70 will include a pedestrian crossing tying the proposed green east-west primary and associated pedestrian/cycle path directly into PC70 to meet up with the proposed realignment of Gould Road. This route allows easy access to the commercial

local centre in PC70 and will form a direct connection to Foster Park and on to the rest of the Rolleston Township.

28. The main north-south and east-west road connections within PC81 feature a separate, shared pedestrian and cycle path within the road reserve to facilitate safe cycling and walking. In addition, the local road network allows safe cycle movement on roads with lesser traffic flows and features at a minimum a single footpath. Wherever possible pedestrian/cycle network will align with green network and pathways are pulled into and through reserves to maximise passive surveillance and provide a high amenity for users.
29. Upgrades to the Dunns Crossing Road frontages will be in line with the required standards for residential/urban streets as per SDC requirements and feature footpaths to both sides. As part of PC73 and PC82 one of the footpaths along Dunns Crossing Road is to be designed as a shared pedestrian /cycle way. This is proposed to be extended along the full extent of the boundary for PC81 to ensure consistency for users.

RFI 18. Please provide three continuous east-west connections from Dunns Crossing Road to the western boundary of the plan change area. One of these should border the north edge of the proposed recreation reserve.

Response:

30. The revised ODP includes a second direct east-west connection and slightly adjusted overall layout with the open green space in a more central location and with two road interfaces (north and west).
31. The local road network will provide additional internal east-west distribution.
32. A pedestrian/cycle link onto Dunns Crossing Road will be added in the north-eastern corner and if a corresponding connection could be added to PC70, it will ensure a cohesive fine grain cycling and walking network is achieved between the PC areas. However, this may require a pedestrian priority crossing on Dunns Crossing Road and requires further investigation as to exact location connectivity into PC70 and impact on traffic flows on Dunns Crossing Road.

RFI 19. Please describe the proposed character of the combined primary road/green/pedestrian/cycle connections shown on the ODP

Response:

33. Refer to paragraphs 26-29 and to the Schematic Road Cross Section included in **Attachment 2**.
34. The main north-south and east-west road connections feature a separated shared pedestrian and cycle path within the road reserve to facilitate safe cycling and walking.

RFI 20. Please provide before and after photo simulations of typical Living Z development with any proposed boundary treatments from viewpoints 2 and 3.



Response:

35. Information regarding proposed boundary treatment along Dunns Crossing Road and Selwyn Roads can be provided in a simpler format either as schematic cross sections or through description in the ODP narrative and do not require photographic simulations. The production of accurate photo simulations of typical Living Z development with any proposed boundary treatments from viewpoints 2 and 3 requires a high level of resolution of architectural and landscape details. A level of detailed information that is normally not available at a Plan Change phase of a development proposal.

RFI 21. Are any blue networks proposed and how will storm water off the streets be treated?

Response:

36. A Blue network is detailed in the ODP text. In respect of stormwater treatment for roads, runoff from hardstand areas and roads will be collected and treated before discharging into ground via soak pits or infiltration trenches. In general, the first flush stormwater runoff will be generally treated through a swale or infiltration basin or proprietary stormwater treatment devices. Stormwater runoff from large rainfall events which exceed the first flush capacity can be discharged directly to ground using rapid infiltration trenches or soak pits. The detailed design of stormwater management will be determined by the developer in collaboration with Council at the subdivision stage and in accordance with Environment Canterbury requirements.
37. The proposed stormwater management strategy is also outlined in the Inovo infrastructure assessment (**Appendix A**) that was submitted with the Plan Change
38. Please refer to the ODP text included as **Attachment 2** for a complete description of the Blue network.

RFI 22. Are any urban ecological or low impact design initiatives proposed?

Response:

39. In addition to the possible stormwater management areas, the following urban ecological or low impact design initiatives are being considered:
- Low impact urban raingardens on private properties in comprehensive medium density areas to pre-treat roof water and surface water from hard stand areas.
 - Locally sourced indigenous planting will be implemented at subdivision stage, and encouraged on private property.

RFI 23. Please provide an assessment of the visual effects, if any, on the property at 984 Selwyn Road.

Response:

40. There is no existing residential unit or sensitive activity currently located on this property. It is anticipated that any future residential unit will be established in relatively close proximity to either Edwards Road or Selwyn Road, where services will be more easily available to



the boundary, and where direct vehicle access will be obtained from. Consequently, the likely location of a future residential unit would be some distance from the boundary of the site, with potential effects diminishing with increased distance from the subject site.

41. Potential visual effects on this property (including consideration of a future residential unit) will be mitigated to an extent by the proposed rural interface treatment. This treatment includes open-style rural fencing and pockets of planting, including trees. This treatment will soften the appearance of proposed urban development on the subject site.

Ecological Assessment

RFI 25. The Ecological Assessment provided with the application was peer reviewed on behalf of Council by Dr Greg Burrell, Instream Consulting Limited. While Dr Burrell agrees with the assessment that both the race and the ponds are artificial and have limited ecological value, he notes that these have been present on the site since at least the early 1980s, with their size fluctuating over time, so they are part of the current landscape. However, the request indicates that the water race is to be decommissioned, noting that this would be subjected to a separate approval process. Elsewhere in the Rolleston environs, some open water areas have been maintained for aesthetic and ecological reasons.

Response:

42. Please refer to the response included in **Attachment 4**.

RFI 26. Feedback received from Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited is referred to and attached as Appendix H to this request. Within this appendix, Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited recommends that the infilling of the Holmes block waterway is avoided and that a minimum 10m setback between all waterways and development is provided. While it is noted that this feedback relates to PC73, to the north of this plan change area, at paragraph 55 of the s32 evaluation, it is noted that "a number of their recommendations have been incorporated in the plan change proposal and/or would be imposed at the time of subdivision consent under the existing matters of control within the District Plan. This includes the management of waterways within the Plan Change area..." As the waterway is a continuation of the waterway on the Holmes Block, it appears that there is a conflict in the proposed treatment of the waterway. Please clarify how the waterway is to be treated and how any conflict with the feedback from Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited is to be addressed.

Response:

43. Please refer to the response included in **Attachment 4**.
44. Please note that the applicant has not received a response yet from Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited in relation to Plan Change 81. In the event that the Runanga recommend that the infilling of the water race on this site is minimised or avoided, the applicant can seek to accommodate that request.
45. On the basis that this site is the 'end of the line' and that the water race already terminates within the subject site, it is anticipated that the loss of values (ecological & aesthetic) will be minimal.



Operative District Plan and Outline Development Plan (ODP)

RFI 27. Please plan change request seeks to amend Policy B4.3.77 to identify various elements of the plan change area. The amendment proposed includes reference to the CRETS collector road, however as proposed in the Rolleston Structure Plan, this road does not align with the site. Please amend to remove reference to this within the proposed amendment to Policy B3.4.77.

Response:

46. The reference to the “CRETS Collector road” has been removed from the requested amendment to Policy B4.3.77, and the relevant amendment now refers to a Primary road only.
47. An updated Section 32 Evaluation is included as **Attachment 6**.

RFI 28. In Table 1 Assessment of relevant plan provisions, on page 23 of the s32 evaluation, there is a heading for Objective B2.1.5, but no text or analysis is provided. Please amend as appropriate

Response:

48. The complete text for Objective B2.1.5 and analysis is now provided in the updated Section 32 Evaluation (refer **Attachment 6**). Notably, there are no reverse sensitivity effects on CIAL anticipated from future residential development.

RFI 29. Although referenced in the request, no accompanying text to the Outline Development Plan has been provided with the request. Please provide this.

Response:

49. The ODP text is included as **Attachment 2**.

RFI 30. At paragraphs 48 and 92 of the s32 evaluation, the request identifies that native planting and the provision of locally sourced indigenous vegetation within the plan change site as it develops is a matter that will be addressed at the time of subdivision and development, and to support cultural values associated with the site. The request indicates that this will be a requirement of the proposed ODP, however this is not shown on the ODP and no accompanying text has been provided. Please identify if the existing framework within the Operative District Plan is sufficient to achieve the statement above. Please also advise what cultural values are associated with the plan change area.

Response:

50. The proposed Green network in the ODP text states that the proposed reserve network provides an opportunity to create ecological corridors. The plant selection in the new reserves will include native tree and shrub plantings. The Green network ODP text is amended to include direct reference to ‘locally sourced’ native tree and shrub plantings.
51. The Operative District Plan framework (specifically Rule 12.1.3.58) requires that any subdivision that is subject to an operative ODP shall be in general compliance with that

ODP and shall comply with any standards referred to within the ODP (inclusive of the ODP text). The proposed Green network within the ODP text provides clear direction for future planting to ensure that this will be implemented through subdivision approval. Consequently, the Operative District Plan is considered sufficient to achieve the statements from paragraphs 47 and 92 of the Section 32 Evaluation.

52. In respect of cultural values, the consultation with MKT for the directly adjacent plan change (PC73) recommended that a landscape plan be prepared utilising indigenous planting that is locally sourced, and that the proponents should incorporate recommendations from the Ngai Tahu Subdivision Development Guidelines in the development, particularly with regard to stormwater control and indigenous planting.
53. Whilst no feedback has been received to date from MKT for this plan change request, it is anticipated that the recommendations for PC73 may assist in providing mitigation on cultural values at subdivision stage. Detailed planting plans can be provided at this time and the developer will have regard to recommendations from the Ngai Tahu Subdivision Development Guidelines. The plan change proponents remain welcoming of feedback and recommendations from the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and Taumutu Runanga.

RFI 31. While no commercial areas are shown on the ODP "... given the inclusion of multiple neighbourhood centres in the surrounding area (PC70 & PC73)3", at paragraphs 106 and 121 of the s32 evaluation, the objective of the plan change request is expressed as "... to provide for an extension of the adjoining existing urban residential area of Rolleston (with provision for some associated local business services)...". Further, on page 52 in response to NPS-UD Policy 1, at (b) the request states "Local retail facilities are proposed for residents within the Plan Change site." Please clarify if, and where, any business zoning is proposed by the plan change request or amend the s32 evaluation as appropriate.

Response:

54. Paragraphs 106 and 121 of the Section 32 Evaluation are amended and remove reference to 'provision for some associated local business services' (within the plan change site). In addition, page 52 in the response to NPS-UD Policy 1, at (b) has been amended to state "Local retail facilities are proposed for residents within the adjacent Plan Change sites (PC70 & PC73)".
55. No business zoning is proposed by the plan change request, noting that business areas containing retailing activities and services are proposed within the broader locality (PC70 & PC73 sites) and will be conveniently accessible.

RFI 32. At paragraphs 38 (e) and 77 of the s32 evaluation and in sections 3.2 and 4 of the Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Impact assessment, mitigation measures are mentioned in relation to fencing. Noting that in section 4 of the aforementioned assessment it is identified that fencing is a matter than would be incorporated into developer covenants, please clarify if it is considered necessary to amend the existing provisions within the Operative District Plan, specifically Rules 4.13 and 4.17, by way of this plan change to respond to the mitigation proposed, or if this is to be included in any accompanying ODP text.



Response:

56. No changes are proposed, nor considered necessary in relation to fencing in the existing provisions of the Operative District Plan. The statements made in the Section 32 Evaluation and LVIA are consistent with the fencing provisions of the Operative District Plan, to the extent that Rule 4.13 effectively controls the height of fencing in the Living Z zone, both proximate to the road boundary and relative to the front façade of a residential unit. Furthermore, 12.1.4.47 enables assessment at subdivision stage and seeks to “avoid or mitigate the potential adverse visual effects of 1.8 metre high (or higher) solid fencing being erected along road boundaries where subdivisions “back onto” roads” (in respect of Selwyn Road).
57. Developer covenants may assist the Council with the initial establishment of fencing typologies to comply with the relevant Operative fencing rules, and will ensure that the materials and finishes used achieve a high standard of residential amenity. This type of approach would not be dissimilar (and is complementary) to the Council imposing consent notices on the titles of residential allotments, which advise of the relevant fencing rules to ensure that eventual fencing designs are compliant. No amendment to the ODP text is considered necessary.

RFI 33. At paragraph 76 of the s32 evaluation, in relation to landscape/visual effects and amenity values, reference is made to mitigation measures incorporated within the plan change that includes the adoption/location of different zones. However the plan change request seeks only to rezone the area to Living Z. Please confirm that any potential effects on landscape character, values and/or visual amenity can still be avoided, remedied or mitigated through only the one zone.

Response:

58. Paragraph 76 has been amended to remove reference to the ‘adoption / location of different zones’. The conclusion that potential effects on landscape character, values and/or visual amenity can still be avoided, remedied or mitigated based on solely the Living Z zone remains valid.

RFI 34. At paragraph 83 (f) of the s32 evaluation, it is identified that the plan change will be resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change by, among other things, providing the potential for building and landscape design to address increased mean temperatures or amplification of heat extremes. Please identify the specific provisions within the Operative District Plan that respond to this statement, or clarify if additional provisions, either specific rules or ODP text, are required to support this position.

Response:

59. No specific building design elements are identified, and no changes are proposed to the Operative District Plan in this respect. These statements were made on the basis of the inherent characteristics of the site, as it is not located within an arid environment whereby it would have potentially greater susceptibility to the effects of climate change, including extreme heat.
60. Notably, the proposal seeks to adopt the Living Z zoning (making up a large proportion of Rolleston) and if any changes to the provisions of the Plan were required in the future to

address potential effects of climate change, it is anticipated that these changes would also apply to the subject site. Additionally, it is anticipated that the New Zealand Building Code may also assist in addressing such effects.

61. In respect of landscape design, the specific planting and reserve materials will be determined at the time of subdivision. These will be resilient to the effects of increased temperatures, noting that the ODP anticipates a high standard of amenity and planting will need to be selected from appropriate species to ensure successful growth and long-term viability. Detailed planting concepts can be confirmed at subdivision stage in co-ordination with Council.

RFI 35. In section 4 of the Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Impact assessment, MM3 (mitigation measure) proposes that direct vehicle access be avoided onto Selwyn Road and that this corridor be landscaped, by way of a condition of consent. At this is a plan change request, please consider if it is necessary that a specific rule be included in the Operative District Plan or amend as appropriate having regard to Points 10 and 17 of this letter.

Response:

62. The ODP now provides for direct access from the subject site to Selwyn Road, which will be upgraded along the frontage of the site to an urban standard. A rural boundary interface treatment, comprising of open style fencing is proposed and is marked on the revised ODP. The detailed fence design and treatment will be confirmed at subdivision stage.
63. As previously discussed, Rule 12.1.3.58 requires that “any subdivision within a Living Z or 3 Zone that is subject to an Operative Outline Development Plan within the District Plan shall be in general compliance with that Outline Development Plan and shall comply with any standards referred to in that Outline Development Plan”.
64. This includes the relevant ODP diagram. Failure to comply with the relevant ODP results in a non-complying activity status, per Rule 12.1.7.10. No additional rules are considered necessary.

RFI 36. The ODP should also be amended to reflect any matters raised in the points in this letter, particularly regarding roading, reserves and reverse sensitivity matters.

Response:

65. The ODP has been updated accordingly, and is included as **Attachment 1**.

Consultation

RFI 37. It is noted that the plan change request has been provided to Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited for their comment. Please provide a copy of any feedback received

Response:

66. The plan change application was sent to Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited on the 1st November 2021 for their comment, and a follow up request was sent on the 10th December 2021. No response has been received to date.



RFI 38. Please provide evidence of any consultation with the land owners affected by this request

Response:

67. The application site has two owners (Alison Smith And Derek Tyson), and the subject land is under contract to be purchased by the plan change proponents from the owners.
68. We trust that this satisfies your further information request. Should further clarification or information be required, please don't hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely,

Novo Group Limited

Richard Bigsby

Planner

D: 03 365 5570 | **M:** 020 424 4729

E: richard@novogroup.co.nz | **W:** www.novogroup.co.nz

021038



Attachment 1: Amended ODP



Attachment 2: Amended ODP Text



Attachment 3: Transport Response – Novo Group



Attachment 4: Ecology Response - AEL



Attachment 5: Addendum Urban Design Assessment – A + Urban Limited



Attachment 6: Updated Section 32 Evaluation