

15 July 2019

Our reference: RC195281

Selwyn District Council
C/- Resource Management Group Ltd
PO BOX 908
Christchurch Box Lobby
Christchurch 8140
Attention: John Scheele

Dear John

Request for Further Information RC195281 – Tennyson Street Public Car Park 2

We have undertaken a preliminary review of your resource consent application that seeks approval to carry out earthworks to install services and form landscaping for a public carpark consisting of 40 spaces associated with the Rolleston Town Centre development.

Your application has been circulated to a transportation engineer from Harrison Grierson and acoustic specialist from Marshall Day Acoustics (MDA) and their advice has been received.

Further information

Based on this advice and my assessment of the application, in accordance with section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991, the following information is required before your application can be considered further:

Transportation

The following information is sought in response to feedback received from the transport consultants.

1. The Integrated Transportation Assessment prepared by Stantec has stated that 70-90 vph at peak times will be generated from 57-61 Tennyson Street (consented development) and an additional 90 vph at peak times (short stay) from Proposed Car Park 2 on the proposed right of way (ROW). The total number of turning movements on the proposed ROW will be increased significantly for turning in and out of the car park onto Tennyson Street. Please provide a queuing analysis on Tennyson Street at the right of way location. Specifically, the right turn queuing into the site during peak times.

2. The future roadside planters incorporate spacing for a pram crossing facility to be formed on Tennyson Street that is to be located to the south of the proposed ROW. Please assess whether the estimated turning movements and the findings of queuing analysis required above present a risk to people using the proposed pram crossing in the future.

Acoustic

The following information is sought in response to feedback received from the acoustic consultant:

3. The AES assessment does not adequately analyse the existing District Plan noise standards or appropriately justify the effects arising from non-compliance with the applicable standards. While the District Plan is under review (MDA note that AES have prepared discussion papers regarding potential new standards for Council), that does not remove the need for application to evaluate the proposal against the current compliance criteria. In particular, MDA advise that the AES should comment on:
 - a. The justification for describing the 12-13 dB exceedance of the existing permitted night-time noise standard as 'moderate';
 - b. The relationship between the existing residual noise anticipated at the rear of Markham Way properties adjoining the proposed car park and the current District Plan Limits; and
 - c. The amount the proposed activity may exceed both the permitted activity standard and the residual noise level.

The AES acoustic assessment should have regard to the MDA comments below when addressing these matters.

4. AES are relying on residual noise measurements from a location that does not appear to be an adequate representation of the rear of the Markham Way properties closest to the proposed car park. Data gathered during the late-night period (after 2200) from a more applicable location, together with an explanation for any adjustment on this data, should be provided.
5. In Section 5.1 of the AES report, it is assumed that every car park will turn over once within a 15-minute period during the daytime and that at night-time (after 2000 hours) there will be half that number of movements. MDA consider this an appropriately conservative approach. However, for the period post-2200 hours, the AES assessment methodology changes and assumes that no more than five vehicles will use the car park in any 15-minute period. The report does not explain why this change has been made, nor does it clarify whether they have considered if all vehicles park near the same dwelling or if they are distributed evenly around the car park for the purposes of the assessment.

6. In Section 6 of the Acoustic report, AES state that they expect that the difference between the L_{A10} and L_{Aeq} would be in the order of 2 dB. MDA disagree that this is likely to be the case for noise sources such as traffic, music from car stereos and conversation, all of which we would allow a typical increase of 3-4 dB, in the absence of a specific relevant example. The predicted cumulative noise level of 45 dB L_{Aeq} , MDA estimates the noise translate to 48 – 49 dB L_{A10} .
7. The acoustic assessment should explain the rationale for a +2dB increase for traffic (we note that the industry norm is +3dB) and also for music/speech which may warrant a greater increase.

You must respond in writing to this request. I have put your application on hold until we receive your complete response. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Yours faithfully



Shravan Miryala
Consultant Planner on behalf of Selwyn District Council

24 June 2019

Sofia Mailau
Selwyn District Council
Resource Consents Planning Administrator
PO Box 90
ROLLESTON

By Email: sofia.mailau@selwyn.govt.nz

Dear Sofia

RE: Resource consent application RC195281

The above resource consent (RC195281) was lodged with the Council on 28 May 2019 and sought to establish and operate 42 sealed parking spaces located at 53 and 55 Tennyson Street, Rolleston. The parking spaces will be available for public use and are primarily anticipated to accommodate demand generated by the adjacent town centre redevelopment and nearby activities.

On 29 May 2019, the applicant requested the processing of the resource consent be placed on hold to enable further consideration of the car park design and the possibility of retaining as many mature trees on site as practical. This has now occurred resulting in:

- a reduction of sealed parking spaces from 42 to 39 (reduction of 3 spaces); and
- retention of 10 mature trees on site (previously no trees were proposed to be retained).

The amended plans form **Appendix One** of this letter and should be substituted for those submitted as part of the original application (contained in Appendix One). As the number of parking spaces proposed are reduced, and mature trees will be retained, the assessment of effects that accompanied the original application represents a worst-case and overly conservative scenario. On that basis, the conclusions reached in the assessment of effects remain unchanged.

Following the submission of the new plans, we request Council allocate the application to a Planner for processing.

If you have any questions regarding the amendment, or the application in general, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Resource Management Group Limited

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'J. Scheele', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

John Scheele
Consultant Planner

DDI (03) 943 4112
Email: john@rmgroup.co.nz

APPENDIX ONE:

Application plans