

## Report / Decision on a Resource Consent Application

(Sections 95A, 95B and 104 / 104C)

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>RMA/2018/2230</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	St Andrew's College Board of Governors
<b>Site address:</b>	347 Papanui Road
<b>Legal Description:</b>	Pt RS 299 and Lots 1-2 DP 11943
<b>Zoning:</b>	Specific Purpose School Zone
<b>Overlays and map notations:</b>	A number of scheduled trees (none affected by this application), heritage item #434 (Stowan House) #436 (not affected by this application), Heritage setting #436 (not affected by this application), Liquefaction Management Area, Flood Management Area (not affected by this application), Environmental Asset Waterway (St Albans Creek) (not affected by this application). Collector Road (Normans Road), Minor Arterial (Papanui Road)
<b>Activity Status:</b>	Restricted Discretionary
<b>Application:</b>	Earthworks, removal of street trees, changing vehicle access, and road setback infringement.

### Proposed activity

The application describes the activity as follows:

*Consent is sought to remove 6 trees and 7 shrubs located within a garden bed in legal road and to enable excavation within the required 5m setback from street trees to provide for an extension of the College's off-street drop-off zone. The extension of the drop-off zone will increase the usage of the College's western most vehicle access. A waiting shelter is proposed to be established which will be within the 10m road boundary setback.*

The trees the applicant wishes to remove are:

- 4 Robinia psuedoacacia that are over 6m in height;
- 2 Cherry trees;
- 7 shrubs (1 rhododendron and 6 camellias)

Earthworks will need to be undertaken within 5m of the trunk of the remaining street trees.

The vehicle usage of the western most vehicle access on Normans Road would increase;

The bus shelter would be 8.75m back within the college site from the legal road boundary.

The applicant says that the catalyst for the application is that bus pick-ups and drop off compete with parent pick-ups and drop offs at the morning and afternoon pick-ups. A 5m parking area on the legal road is to be swapped for a dedicated bus park. To maintain the same number of drop off spaces the college wishes to extend the existing drop off area in front of the site. Most of the work is within the college grounds but some is within the legal road which requires the removal of 6 trees and 7 shrubs in a garden bed located in the legal road. A specific pedestrian entrance would be established directly beside a kea crossing on the legal road.

### Description of site and existing environment

The applicant describes the background to the planting as follows:

The garden bed is surrounded by a raised concrete edging and a fence on the roadside. From examining historical aerials, the raised garden bed including the trees and shrubs and fencing appear to have been installed at the

same time as the kerb extension and crossing were installed. This would appear to have occurred sometime between 1985 and 1992. Unfortunately, no records have been located to confirm this, as such it is unclear whether these structures were approved to be within legal road.

The applicant describes the site as follows:

The property involved is located at 347 Papanui Road, at the intersection with Normans Road. The specific area of the site that is subject to this application is located near Normans Road, between the road and the main grounds of the College. ...

The application site is zoned Special Purpose School within the District Plan. The property contains a listed Heritage Building and Setting (Strowan House), and several protected trees located around St Albans Creek and the Normans Road and Papanui Road frontages.

The applicant describes the surrounding environment as follows:

St Andrew's College sits at the intersection of Normans Road and Papanui Road. The surrounding environment consists primarily of residential activities to the north, east and west of the College. To the south of the College is a mix of residential properties and Heaton Intermediate School.

*The wider College site contains Heritage Item #434 (Strowan House) and its Heritage Setting #436, 36 individually listed Significant Trees, an environmental asset waterway (St Albans Creek) and is also subject to the Flood Management Area and Liquefaction Management Area overlays.*

*The specific part of the site in Normans Road that is subject to this application is located outside of the heritage setting and flood management area overlay and is not near the waterway.*

I agree with and adopt these descriptions.

#### Activity status

#### Christchurch District Plan

The site is zoned Specific Purpose School Zone (the college grounds) and Transport Zone (that part on the legal road).

The Specific Purpose School Zone seeks to enable education providers to efficiently use and develop their land and buildings for education activities and as hubs for a diverse range of community activities. It also seeks to mitigate significant adverse effects on the amenity values of adjoining sites and to recognise and enhance the contribution of education buildings and sites to the character of neighbourhoods.

The Transport Zone provides for a functioning transport network and transport modes and the management of the legal road.

The proposal requires resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under the following rules:

Activity status rule	Standard not met	Reason	Matters of control or discretion (if relevant)	Notification clause
7.4.2.3 RD1 states that High trip generators are a restricted discretionary activity.	7.4.3.10 High trip generator. Education activity with more than 150 students	The proposal is a high trip generator.	7.4.4.19 High trip generators	No.
7.4.2.3 RD1 states that activities that do not meet the standards in	7.4.3.7 Access design states that queuing spaces shall be provided in accordance with Appendix 7.5.8	Queuing space on the western access is not provided in accordance with Appendix 7.5.8.	7.4.4.11 Queuing spaces	No

Activity status rule	Standard not met	Reason	Matters of control or discretion (if relevant)	Notification clause
7.4.3 are a restricted discretionary activity.				
9.4.4.1.3 RD4 states that the felling of any tree that does not meet one or more of the permitted activity standards in 9.4.4.1.1 P6 is as restricted discretionary activity	Rule 9.4.4.1.1 P6 permits the felling of trees within road corridors if the work being undertaken by, or under the supervision of, a works arborist employed or contracted by the Council or a network utility operator, and the trees are not greater than 6m.	4 Robinia psuedoacacia are over 6m in height.	9.4.6 a. – o.	No
9.4.4.1.3 RD8 states that earthworks that do not meet the permitted activity standards in Rule 9.4.4.1.1 P12 are a restricted discretionary activity	9.4.4.1.1 P12 states that earthworks within 5m of a tree on legal road are a permitted activity if the tree is not more than 6m in height.	Earthworks will be within 5m of trees greater than 6m in height.	8.9.4 matters 1 and 3 Rule 9.4.6 a.- e., g., i.- o	No
13.6.4.1.3 RD3 states that any activity listed in 13.6.4.1.1 that does not meet the built form standard in Rule 13.6.4.2.3. is a restricted discretionary activity.	13.6.4.2.3(i) states that all buildings shall be setback from a road boundary by at least 10m.	Part of the canopy of the proposed shelter intrudes into this setback by 1.425m.	13.6.5.1 b., c., d., e., f., g. and h. 13.6.5.2 a.	No.

I note that the matter of separate (non Resource Management Act and District Plan related) consent from the Council to occupy the legal road with the existing retaining wall and fence are matters that are not relevant to the consideration of this consent. Consideration for the purposes of this consent is restricted to the matters of discretion as listed above and none of those matters extend to consideration of any conferred rights (or otherwise) by the Council to occupy the road.

#### Written approvals

No written approvals have been provided with the application.

#### Effects on the environment and adversely affected persons [Sections 95A, 95B, 95E(3), 95D and 104(1)(a)]

Integrated traffic assessment and queuing space

The rules are intended to ensure that the safety (at least in the case of the queuing space) and the efficiency of the road network are maintained.

The applicant provided an integrated transport assessment by Abley. That assessment concluded:

*... the proposal is not anticipated to negatively impact safety and efficiency or accessibility, there are no transport reasons why consent should not be granted.*

I asked Mr Mark Gregory, transportation planner for the Council, to review the integrated transport assessment and the Abley assessment of the queuing space non-compliance and provide me with expert comments. Mr Gregory asked clarifying questions which were responded to and the responses were, but one relating to the queuing space assessment, accepted by Mr Gregory. Mr Gregory asked for an updated assessment of the queuing space matters of discretion. That assessment was provided by the applicant and reviewed by Mr Gregory.

Mr Gregory provided me with the following final comments:

*I accept the assessment and based on available information anticipate the effects to be less than minor.*

The email record of this process is shown in Attachment 1 to this report.

I accept and adopt the conclusions of Mr Gregory and Abley for the purposes of this report.

#### Removal of the street trees and earthworks

The relevant matters of discretion state:

##### **9.4.6 Rules - Matters of discretion**

###### *Effects of activity/works on the tree(s)*

- a. *The character and degree of modification, damage, or destruction of the values that make the tree/s significant;*
- b. *The extent to which the works will or may adversely affect the health or structural integrity or visual appearance of the tree;*
- c. *Whether the works will be undertaken in a manner consistent with internationally accepted arboricultural standards, practices and procedures;*
- d. *The duration and frequency of the activity and the effect on the tree;*
- e. *Whether the tree is resilient, including structural soundness and health and the irreversibility of effect on the tree;*
- f. *The degree of impact on landscape character, and ecological, cultural, heritage and neighbourhood amenity values;*
- g. *In relation to a scheduled group of trees, the extent to which the works will or may adversely affect the health, structural integrity or amenity values of the wider group;*
- h. *Whether any proposed compensation for the loss of the significant tree/s fully mitigates the loss of landscape and environmental benefits within 15 – 20 years;*

###### *Extent of benefit or need for activity/works*

- i. *The need for the work to deal with an emergency situation, or to avoid significant risk of effects on human health and safety, or significant impacts on infrastructure, including the strategic transport network;*
- j. *The extent of benefits associated with the use and development of the site for activities anticipated by the zoning for the site, including the use of the site for residential development, taking into account the cumulative effect of multiple protection provisions (eg. setbacks from water bodies, heritage items);*
- k. *For proposed activities in connection with a recovery activity in the Flat Land Recovery Zone, the extent to which the proposal would maintain the contribution of any significant trees, and trees in road corridors, parks, reserves and public open space;*

###### *Extent of benefit or need for activity/works*

- m. *For utilities the extent of benefits associated with that utility, whether there is a functional or operational requirement for that location and whether there are any practical alternatives;*

- n. *The extent to which the works would result in improved community amenity that cannot otherwise be achieved by arboricultural or property management means; and*
- o. *The need for the works directly arising from damage incurred as a result of the Canterbury earthquakes, which if not otherwise undertaken would unreasonably restrict repair or rebuilding of the damaged buildings on the site.*

The applicant discusses these matters of discretion at section 6.1 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) submitted with the application. The 'Council staff' referred to as being in support of the removal of the trees is Mr Tony Armstrong, an arborist in the Road Amenity and Asset Protection Team. Mr Armstrong's email to the applicants agent (attached to the AEE) stated: '*I have no issue with the removal of the robinia trees*'. I also forwarded the application to Council landscape architect Ms Jennifer Dray and asked her to confirm, whether an assessment she has previously made by email response to the applicant concluding that the removal of the trees and the mitigating landscape planting were appropriate to the context and the environmental effects would be to an acceptable degree. The email record of this assessment is attached in Attachment 2 to this report.

I accept and adopt the assessments of both the applicant and Ms Dray. I recommend standard conditions in relation to installation and maintenance of replacement landscape planting. The applicant has accepted these conditions. I also conclude that any adverse amenity effects on the surrounding environment will be less than minor.

#### **8.9.4.1 Nuisance**

- a. *The extent to which any potential dust nuisance, sedimentation and water or wind erosion effects can be avoided or mitigated.*
- b. *The extent to which effects on neighbouring properties, and on the road network, of heavy vehicle and other vehicular traffic generated as a result of earthworks can be avoided or mitigated.*
- c. *The extent to which any potential changes to the patterns of surface drainage or subsoil drains can be avoided or mitigated if those changes would put the site or adjoining land at higher risk of drainage problems, inundation run-off, flooding, or raise that site's or adjoining land's water table.*
- d. *Whether any change in ground level would be likely to impact on trees in terms of access to water and drainage.*
- e. *The extent of any potential adverse effects on the quality of groundwater and whether any such can be avoided or mitigated.*
- f. *The extent to which any adverse effects from noise and vibration associated with earthworks and land improvement can be avoided or mitigated, and the effectiveness of any methods to mitigate such effects.*
- g. *The extent to which earthworks in the Open Space Avon River Precinct (Te Papa Ōtākaro) Zone have an adverse effect on the Avon River and its margins.*

#### **8.9.4.3 Land stability**

- a. *Whether the earthworks affect the stability of adjoining land and its susceptibility to subsidence or erosion upon excavation taking place.*
- b. *The extent of any alteration to natural ground levels in the vicinity and, consequently, to the height and bulk of buildings that may be erected on the site.*
- c. *Whether the earthworks affect the future development potential of land for permitted activities, taking account of the nature of filling material proposed and the degree of compaction.*

The applicant has provided an assessment of the earthworks at section 6.1 of the AEE. In regard to dust and sediment control I accept and adopt this assessment. I note this statement from the AEE:

The works will also be managed in accordance with best practice with regards to dust and sediment control.

I recommend conditions to ensure that this occurs.

In regard to traffic effects from construction operations I note that physical works on the road carriageway involve only changing on road parking areas to bus stops. Any disruption to the road network while this is being undertaken should be minor. In regard to construction vehicles arriving and leaving the site itself there is the potential for disruption to the efficient and safe operation of the road network at peak times (pick up and drop-off). I recommend a condition regarding production and acceptance of a traffic management plan. With this traffic management plan in place I conclude that any adverse effects on the road network will be less than minor. The applicants have accepted this condition.

#### Bus shelter roof and road set back amenity effects.

The relevant matters of discretion are:

##### **13.6.5.1 Amenity of the neighbourhood**

- b. *Any visual dominance over adjoining properties, or their outlook to the street; or visual dominance over the street or nearby public open space.*
- c. *Any loss of privacy for adjoining properties through overlooking.*
- d. *Alternative practical locations for the building on the site.*
- e. *Opportunities for landscaping and tree planting, as well as screening of buildings.*
- f. *Whether the nature and form of development on adjoining site(s) mitigates the potentially adverse effects of increased height or building scale.*
- g. *The compatibility of the building in terms of appearance, layout and scale of other buildings and sites in the surrounding area, including whether increased height would result in buildings which significantly contrast with the scale of surrounding development, both existing and permitted.*
- h. *The balance of open space and buildings on the site, in the context of:*
  - i. *The character of the surrounding zone(s); and*
  - ii. *The contribution of the buildings and grounds to local landscape character.*

The applicant discusses the amenity effects of the proposed bus shelter at section 6.3 of the AEE. I agree with and adopt this assessment. I conclude that any adverse effects on the environment and persons arising from the location of the roof of the bus shelter will be less than minor.

##### **13.6.5.2 Traffic issues**

- a. *Any potentially adverse effects on the surrounding environment and adjoining zones of traffic and parking associated with the proposed new development.*

The transport effects of the proposal have been commented on in the above assessment and found to be less than minor.

#### Overall conclusions on effects

Overall I consider that the adverse effects of the proposal on the environment and persons are less than minor.

#### **Notification assessment [Sections 95A and 95B]**

Sections 95A and 95B set out the steps that must be followed to determine whether public notified or limited notification of an application is required.

#### **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION TESTS – Section 95A**

Step 1: Mandatory notification – section 95A(3)	
Has the applicant requested that the application be publicly notified?	<b>No</b>

Is public notification required under s95C (following a request for further information or commissioning of report)?	<b>No</b>
Is the application made jointly with an application to exchange reserve land?	<b>No</b>
<i>Step 2: If not required by Step 1, notification is precluded if any of these apply – section 95A(5)</i>	
Does a rule or NES preclude public notification for all aspects of the application?	<b>No</b>
Is the application a controlled activity?	<b>No</b>
Is the application a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity for a subdivision?	<b>No</b>
Is the application a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity for residential activity?	<b>No</b>
Is the application a boundary activity (other than a controlled activity)?	<b>No</b>
<i>Step 3: Notification required in certain circumstances if not precluded by Step 2 – section 95A(8)</i>	
Does a rule or NES require public notification?	<b>No</b>
Will the activity have, or is it likely to have, adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor? (discussed above)	<b>No</b>
<i>Step 4: Relevant to all applications that don't already require notification – section 95A(9)</i>	
Do special circumstances exist that warrant the application being publicly notified?	<b>No</b>

**In accordance with the provisions of section 95A, the application must not be publicly notified.**

#### **LIMITED NOTIFICATION TESTS – Section 95B**

<i>Step 1: Certain affected groups/persons must be notified – sections 95B(2) and (3)</i>	
Are there any affected protected customary rights groups or customary marine title groups?	<b>No</b>
If the activity will be on, adjacent to, or might affect land subject to a statutory acknowledgement - is there an affected person in this regard?	<b>No</b>
<i>Step 2: If not required by Step 1, notification is precluded if any of the following apply – section 95B(6)</i>	
Does a rule or NES preclude limited notification for all aspects of the application?	<b>No</b>
Is this a land use consent application for a controlled activity?	<b>No</b>
<i>Step 3: Notification of other persons if not precluded by Step 2 – sections 95B(7) and (8)</i>	
Are there any affected persons under s95E, i.e. persons on whom the effects are minor or more than minor, and who have not given written approval? (discussed above).	<b>No</b>
<i>Step 4: Relevant to all applications – section 95B(10)</i>	
Do special circumstances exist that warrant notification to any other persons not identified above?	<b>No</b>

**In accordance with the provisions of section 95B, the application must not be limited notified.**

#### **Relevant objectives, policies, rules and other provisions of the Plan [Section 104(1)(b)(vi)]**

Regard must be had to the relevant objectives and policies in the Christchurch District Plan. The applicant discusses the relevant objectives and policies as follows:

The objectives and policies of the Christchurch District Plan of relevance to this proposal are contained within Chapter 7 Transport, Chapter 9.4 Significant and Other Trees, and Chapter 13.6 Specific Purpose (School) Zone. With regards to the objectives and policies within these chapters it is considered that as the proposal is likely to improve the on-street traffic environment and will maintain the existing amenity and character of this portion of Normans Road, that the proposal is generally consistent with the outcomes sought.

I agree with and adopt this assessment.

#### **Recovery Plans and Regeneration Plans**

There are no Recovery Plans or Regeneration Plans relevant to this application.

**Relevant provisions of a National Environmental Standard, National Policy Statement, Regional Plan, Regional Policy Statement or Coastal Policy Statement [Section 104(1)(b)]**

For completeness, I note that the District Plan gives effect to the relevant provisions of higher order instruments referred to in s104(1)(b) and that being the case I have not referred to them in my report.

**Part II of the Resource Management Act and any other relevant matters [Section 104(1) and 104(1)(c)]**

As noted above, I am satisfied that the District Plan gives effect to the relevant provisions of the higher order instruments. Accordingly, there is no need to comment further on Part II provisions in my consideration of this application.

**Section 104(3)(d) notification consideration**

Section 104(3)(d) states that consent must not be granted if an application should have been notified and was not. No matters have arisen in the assessment of this application which would indicate that the application ought to have been notified.

**Recommendations**

That, for the above reasons:

- A. The application be processed on a **non-notified** basis in accordance with Sections 95A - 95F of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- B. The application **be granted** pursuant to Sections 104, 104C, 108 and 108AA of the Resource Management Act 1991, subject to the following conditions:
  1. The development shall proceed in accordance with the information and plans submitted with the application. The Approved Consent Documentation has been entered into Council records as RMA/2018/2230 (131 pages).

**Silt, sediment and dust control**

2. No construction work shall commence on site until such time as:
  - a) An Erosion and sediment Control Plan (ESCP) in accordance with the ECAN Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury (<http://escscanterbury.co.nz/>) has been prepared by the applicant and accepted by Council; and
  - b) The approved ESC measures are in place.
3. All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP), referred to in Condition 2 above. These measures shall be effectively maintained until the soil/materials associated with the project works are reinstated to an erosion-free state.
4. Adequate dust control measures must be in place at all times so as to minimise any nuisance to neighbouring properties. Appropriate equipment (e.g. water hose, sprinkler system) shall be available on site at all times and used whenever required by adverse conditions (windy weather, etc) as well as to reduce dust emission from heavy traffic within the site.

**Traffic Management Plan**



5. All proposed works shall be carried out in accordance with an approved Traffic Management Plan (TMP). The consent holder shall prepare a TMP and submit this to Council through the TMP portal on <http://tmpforchch.co.nz/submit-a-tmp/>, at least 10 working days prior to the commencement of construction work associated with this consent. The TMP shall identify the nature and extent of temporary traffic management and how all road users will be managed by the use of temporary traffic management measures and comply with the NZTA Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management (CoPTTM). The TMP shall also identify the provision of on-site parking for construction staff. Activities on any public road should be planned so as to cause as little disruption, peak traffic delay or inconvenience to road users as possible without compromising safety.

### Landscaping

6. The proposed landscaping shall be established in accordance with the Landscape Plans labelled RMA/2018/2230 Pages 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, *and the tree management plan in the Arborlab report at pages 44 - 55 inclusive*, of the Approved Consent Document.
7. The proposed planting in the landscaping required by condition 6 shall be established on site within the first planting season (extending from 1 April to 30 September) following the final, passed building inspection.

### Advice Notes ([click to view standard conditions](#)):

- The Council will require payment of its administrative charges in relation to monitoring of conditions, as authorised by the provisions of section 36 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The current monitoring charges are:
  - (i) A monitoring fee of \$277.50 (*commercial*) to cover the cost of setting up a monitoring programme and carrying out one inspection to ensure compliance with the conditions of this consent; and
  - (ii) Time charged at an hourly rate if more than one inspection, certification of conditions or additional monitoring activities (including those relating to non-compliance with conditions), are required.

The monitoring programme administration fee and initial inspection fee will be charged to the applicant with the consent processing costs. Any additional monitoring time will be invoiced to the consent holder when the monitoring is carried out, at the hourly rate specified in the applicable Annual Plan Schedule of Fees and Charges.

- This consent relates to Resource Management Act 1991 consent matters only. It is not an authorisation to occupy the legal road. Consent under Christchurch City Council bylaws or policies may be required. Consultation with the applicable Community Board may also be required.
- This site may be an archaeological site as defined and protected under the provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Archaeological sites are defined in the HNZPTA as any place in New Zealand where there is physical evidence of pre-1900 occupation, regardless whether the site is known or not, recorded in the NZAA Site Recording Scheme or not, or listed with Heritage New Zealand or the local council. Authority from Heritage New Zealand is required for any work that affects or may affect an archaeological site. **Please contact the Heritage New Zealand regional archaeologist on 03 363 1880 or [archaeologistcw@heritage.org.nz](mailto:archaeologistcw@heritage.org.nz) before commencing work on the land.**

Reported and recommended by: Scott Blair

Date: 15/10/2018

<b>Decision</b>
-----------------

That the above recommendations be adopted for the reasons outlined in the report.

Commissioner: **(Conflict of Interest [Form P-426](#) also needs to be signed by commissioner)**

Name: David Mountfort

Signature: D-L Mountfort

Date: 15 October 2018

## Attachment 1:Transport comments

– I accept the assessment and based on available information anticipate the effects to be less than minor.

Many thanks,

Mark  
8618

**From:** Blair, Scott  
**Sent:** Thursday, 11 October 2018 3:36 PM  
**To:** Gregory, Mark <[Mark.Gregory@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Mark.Gregory@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** RMA/2018/2230 347 Papanui Road

Hi Mark  
You have asked about an assessment for queuing spaces on this application.  
Please see the response from the applicant.  
Can I have your final comments please?

Thanks  
Scott

**From:** Julie Comfort [<mailto:Julie.Comfort@dls.co.nz>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 10 October 2018 4:03 p.m.  
**To:** Blair, Scott <[Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** FW: StAC RFI

Hi Scott

Further to your email from Monday requesting additional comment on the matter of discretion 7.4.3.b, please see the comments below from Abley.

Kind regards

Julie Comfort

From: Bridget Southey-Jensen [<mailto:bridget.southey-jensen@abley.com>]  
Sent: Wednesday, 10 October 2018 3:10 p.m.  
To: Julie Comfort  
Cc: Adrian Taylor  
Subject: StAC RFI

Hi Julie,

Please find below an expanded assessment of non-compliances in response to council's RFI. Please feel free to get in touch if you have any changes or anything else you're after from me.

Regards,

Bridget

"The queuing space is currently non-compliant. The site provides queuing space for approximately one vehicle before the first point where conflict may occur between vehicles.

The following are matters of discretion for Rule 7.4.3.7 b.:

- i) Whether there would be any adverse effects on the safety, amenity values and/or efficient operation and functioning of the frontage road
- ii) The effect of queuing vehicles on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

No changes to the existing queuing space are proposed. A review of the crash history at this location has also shown no evidence of adverse effects related to queuing. As the proposal will only result in a redistribution of existing trips internal to the site, no additional trips are expected to be generated that would affect its operation. It is therefore anticipated that the existing queuing space will continue to operate effectively without causing adverse effects on the safety of the frontage road or for pedestrians and cyclists.

It is anticipated that the proposal should not have any adverse effects on the existing efficiency of the road. An increase in off-street capacity coupled with no additional trip generation is only expected to improve the efficiency of the frontage road.

Overall, the existing queuing space for one vehicle is not expected to adversely affect the frontage road or the safety of pedestrians and cyclists."

**Bridget Southey-Jensen** BEng(Hons) MEngNZ

Senior Transportation Engineer

P +64 3 367 9079

[abley.com](#) [LinkedIn](#) [Facebook](#)



[Communication terms and conditions](#)

Hi Scott,

Great – agree with all bar one point: queueing spaces NC.

This is because we are effectively taking traffic which drops off on street presently, and having it use the accesses, thus changing operations of the accesses.

It may be beneficial in the longer run to have them include an appropriate assessment, even if very brief, that shows that CCC staff have diligently considered the impact, if you follow. It is possible at this stage that there could be effects which result in CSRs to the Transport team, and would be helpful to be able to show that this has been assessed. Alternatively, the Applicant should tell us why it's not included.

Everything else stands to reason.

Many thanks,

Mark  
8618

**From:** Blair, Scott

**Sent:** Monday, 8 October 2018 10:31 AM

**To:** Gregory, Mark <[Mark.Gregory@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Mark.Gregory@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** RE: St Andrews College\_RMA/2018/2230

Hi Mark

Following our conversation on Friday here are some responses to your comments below.

**From:** Gregory, Mark  
**Sent:** Monday, 1 October 2018 12:27 p.m.  
**To:** Blair, Scott <[Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** St Andrews College\_RMA/2018/2230

Hi Scott,

I have reviewed the application, and have a number of questions. Some of these you may be able to answer, the others will for a Transportation RFI.

At this stage, questions pertain to process and scope of assessment, more than relating to anticipated environmental effects.

1. What is the process by which the Applicant has scoped 'relevant' rules? The Compliance assessment (included in ITA) does not include all Chapter 7 matters, but does not explain how or why Council's discretion is limited to the rules included in ITA section 6
2. Following the above, the compliance assessment appears to be incomplete at this stage, specifically:
  - a. That assessment relating to car parking and cycle parking space numbers are not included. Even if there are Existing Use Rights, the matter should be included within the Compliance assessment, or an explanation as to why discretion is limited in this regard.

*The applicant is not increasing floor area and therefore not generating a greater need for car parking and cycle parking. I am satisfied that an assessment as to numbers is not needed.*

- b. Notwithstanding part a, the dimensions of parking spaces as well, particularly given the need to assess the suitability of the proposed parallel space configuration for high turnover activity.

*Only the new parking - the parallel spaces is required. The others are existing.*

- c. Compliance status is not specified under Appendix 7.5.7 (regarding firefighting access)
    - d. The use of raised crossings technically does raise a question relating to access grade: it will be expected that the raised crossings are designed in accordance with maximum, grade changes (specified in Appendix 7.5.7) to prevent vehicles from scraping.

*Advice note.*

3. Following the above, the Assessment of Environmental effects gives regard to selected matters of discretion, namely that:
  - a. Queueing space non-compliance assessment excludes matter a, and

*a. The following are matters of discretion for Rule 7.4.3.7 b.:*

*i. Whether there would be any adverse effects on the safety, amenity values and/or efficient operation and functioning of the frontage road*

*No changes to the existing queuing space are proposed. Review of the crash history shows that there are no crashes that would support adverse effects of the non-complying queuing space. While the proposal results in a redistribution of trips across the site, it is not expected to generate any additional trips.*

This is sufficient in terms of an assessment for the purposes of a. I am satisfied that there is no need for a formal response to a.

- b. Assessment of any other non-compliance (not currently included in the ITA), or an explanation as to why Council's discretion is limited to the rules and matters included in the ITA.

Not needed for my purposes.

- 4. Can the Applicant please provide more information around the subsequent Resource Consent to occupy the road (as specified in paragraph 4), and the intentions to invoke / participate in any other supporting processes outside of the RMA?

4 is not relevant.

At this stage, I am working on the premise of a restricted discretionary assessment with effect to changes in traffic and parking activity resulting from the proposal.

The need to consider structures on streets should be handled separately (to avoid the risk of any ultra vires outcomes). The Application includes matters affecting land within the legal road boundary, without a known license to occupy. Assessment will not 'over ride' any other process requirements in this area, and Council will reserve normal rights as land owner.

In terms of the missing assessment, there is scope for specific effects of the queueing space matter, which we are required to request assessment of. Aside from this, there are no other identified concerns; more a matter of polishing up on process.

Many thanks,

Mark

Mark Gregory

Transport Network Planner

BA(Hons) MET MEngNZ

P: 03 941 8618

E: [Mark.Gregory@CCC.govt.nz](mailto:Mark.Gregory@CCC.govt.nz)

Asset and Network Planning – Transport  
L4 53 Hereford St  
Christchurch  
8013

## Attachment 2: Landscape comments

That shows the shelter as being within the school site, and not within the road reserve area. I thought I read in the application that it extended 1.4m or so into road reserve. In that case, I will not consider it further in terms of amenity effects on street scene...

Jennifer

Jennifer  
Senior Technical  
Christchurch  
53  
Christchurch  
T  
E  
M

Landscape Services & Design Team,  
City Hereford

(BSc, ASSETS AND NETWORK UNIT  
Reg.NZILA)  
Council  
Street  
8011  
8734

Dray  
941

[jennifer.dray@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:jennifer.dray@ccc.govt.nz)  
02108413421

**From:** Blair,  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 25 September 2018 2:24 p.m.  
**To:** Dray, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Dray@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Jennifer.Dray@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** RE: RMA/2018/2230 FW: StAC Normans Road - updated CCC information

Julie at DLS has directed me to the item 11 on the Plan LP-03 (student waiting shelter (indicative)).  
Page 16 of the application document.

Cheers  
Scott

**From:** Dray, Jennifer  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 25 September 2018 2:21 p.m.  
**To:** Blair, Scott <[Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** RE: RMA/2018/2230 FW: StAC Normans Road - updated CCC information

OK thanks. Yes, I couldn't find actual location either??

Jennifer  
Senior Technical  
Christchurch  
53  
Christchurch  
T  
E  
M

Landscape Services & Design Team,  
City Hereford

(BSc, ASSETS AND NETWORK UNIT  
Reg.NZILA)  
Council  
Street  
8011  
8734

Dray  
941

[jennifer.dray@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:jennifer.dray@ccc.govt.nz)  
02108413421

**From:** Blair,  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 25 September 2018 2:19 p.m.  
**To:** Dray, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Dray@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Jennifer.Dray@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** RE: RMA/2018/2230 FW: StAC Normans Road - updated CCC information

There are perspectives of the bus shelter on page 19 of the application documents, but I cant see where it is meant to be located on the road.

Have asked the agent to point out where it is to be located.

Cheers  
Scott

**From:** Dray, Jennifer  
**Sent:** Monday, 24 September 2018 10:02 a.m.

**To:** Blair, Scott <[Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** RE: RMA/2018/2230 FW: StAC Normans Road - updated CCC information

Hi Scott,

I am still comfortable with my comments below. I was also going to review the bus shelter structure as it is 1.4m into the road reserve, but could not actually find it on the drawings?! Could you direct me to it?

Other than that, are you happy to receive my comments in format below or do you require a more formal memo?

Regards

Jennifer

Jennifer

Jennifer  
Senior Technical Services & Design Team, City Hereford  
Christchurch 53 Christchurch T E M  
03 941  
[jennifer.dray@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:jennifer.dray@ccc.govt.nz)  
02108413421

Dray  
Reg.NZILA) UNIT  
Council Street 8011 8734

**From:** Blair, Scott  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 18 September 2018 1:51 p.m.  
**To:** Dray, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Dray@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Jennifer.Dray@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** RMA/2018/2230 FW: StAC Normans Road - updated CCC information

Hi Jennifer

It may save a bit of time if you confirm that you are still comfortable with the comments you have made below - subject to reviewing the visualisations provided with the application.

Thanks  
Scott

**From:** Dray, Jennifer  
**Sent:** Monday, 20 August 2018 2:57 p.m.  
**To:** 'Adrian Taylor' <[adrian.taylor@jasmax.com](mailto:adrian.taylor@jasmax.com)>; Armstrong, Tony <[Tony.Armstrong@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Tony.Armstrong@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Cc:** Blair, Scott <[Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Scott.Blair@ccc.govt.nz)>; Dejong, Steve <[Steve.Dejong@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Steve.Dejong@ccc.govt.nz)>; David Evans <[DEV@stac.school.nz](mailto:DEV@stac.school.nz)>; Mark McGregor <[MMC@stac.school.nz](mailto:MMC@stac.school.nz)>; Jonathan Bierwirth <[JBI@stac.school.nz](mailto:JBI@stac.school.nz)>; Julie Comfort <[Julie.Comfort@dls.co.nz](mailto:Julie.Comfort@dls.co.nz)>; Tucker, Neville <[Neville.Tucker@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:Neville.Tucker@ccc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** RE: StAC Normans Road - updated CCC information

Hi Adrian,

Further to our site meeting this afternoon, I noted the following aspects of the proposal;

- The retention of the existing 1.8m high timber paling fence, with the exception of 5.5m section to be opened up to provide pedestrian access to the existing kea crossing on Normans Road.
- The removal of 4 Robinia trees within the road reserve (Tony Armstrong has given his approval).
- The removal of 6 Camelia shrubs at the new fence opening and 1 Rhododendron shub for sightlines adjacent to the driveway.





**Jennifer** – this will give you some context to the project, which we can discuss on site on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> August

**Tony** – as you can't make this meeting, can you still make an assessment from our site meeting and the attached information, about removing the 4 Robinia's? Emailing any comments and/or confirmation of agreement should suffice and be useful when presenting to the Community Board for their approval.

For any further information or questions, don't hesitate to ask. Note that I am on holiday next week, so please contact Julie (cc'd) in my absence.

Thanks

**Adrian Taylor** | Landscape Architect | Registered Landscape Architect  
Jasmax, Level 3, 47 Riccarton Road, Riccarton, PO Box 8404, Christchurch, NZ  
**Tel:** +64 3 341 1853 **Ext:** 9080 | **DDI:** +64 3 974 9080 | **Mob:** +64 21 117 1121  
| [www.jasmax.com](http://www.jasmax.com)



**AUT Sir Paul Reeves Building**  
“A major gateway to the learning quarter.  
Designed for contemporary learning.”

With award-winning projects like the AUT Sir Paul Reeves Building, Jasmax has built a reputation for commitment to outstanding design.

---

NOTICE: This e-mail together with any attachments is confidential and may be the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient please email Jasmax and destroy this message. You are not permitted to copy, disclose or use the content in any way. The views expressed by the sender are not necessarily those of any legal entity within the Jasmax Group.

---

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail