

**From:** [Kim Sanders](#)  
**To:** [David Mountfort](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Cornerstone Church, Rolleston  
**Date:** Tuesday, 12 December 2023 10:46:38 PM  
**Attachments:** [CORNERSTONE CHURCH Siteworks Plans R3 20231121.pdf](#)  
[CORNERSTONE CHURCH PS1 and Siteworks Design Report 20230330.pdf](#)

---

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** kimsanders@xtra.co.nz  
**Date:** 29 November 2023 at 10:28:00 AM NZDT  
**To:** David Mountfort <david@mountfortplanning.co.nz>  
**Cc:** Vern Marais <vern@macon.net.nz>  
**Subject:** RE: Cornerstone Church, Rolleston

Hi David, in response to your email, I have assessed the project under Rules EW-R1 and EW-R2 and report the following. Please note any reference to plans should be the attached R(Release)3 plans. I have also attached the design report which includes earthworks volumes.

EW-R1. The project requires a building consent (BC), therefore any earthworks within 2m of the building are allowed. The point to note here is whether planners accept that the BC includes the external carparks (these are being assessed by the BC) "as the exterior wall of the building". Assuming they do not, I move on to EW-R2.

EW-R2. Assuming this rule needs to be assessed under EW-R1 (EW-R5A & GRUZ-R21 do not apply):

- EW-REQ1, the volume for this project exceeds the maximum volume for a Residential zone of 150m<sup>3</sup>. Whilst this rule requirement is exceeded, it is entirely normal for a project/building of this size and the proposed earthworks are all proposed to be in a controlled manner, similar to for example would occur on a subdivision (note this project is not a subdivision).
- EW-REQ2, the proposed earthworks are not on land with a slope of greater than 1 in 4.
- EW-REQ3.1, the only earthworks deeper than 0.5m when close to a neighbour or 2m when not close to the neighbours will be to install drainage or kerbs. This would conclude that provided the work is carried out and backfilled in accordance with plans and specifications there will be zero effect on the neighbours land.
- EW-REQ3.2, the very minor contaminated soil found on this site is allowed to be kept on this site and the location for its spreading is proposed to be a distance away from the boundary (see engineering plans).
- EW-REQ3.3, if 3.1 & 3.2 are deemed non complying, the following is my assessment:

- EW-REQ3.4:
  - a. there is minimal potential for adverse effects from the earthworks as the proposal has had regards carrying out the earthworks in a controlled manner;
  - b. there will be no stability or erosion issues to the adjacent land;
  - c. the land is not being altered majorly;
  - d. there is no potential for land contamination as any imported gravels and soils will be from certified suppliers (note, the minor contaminated existing soil is below guideline);
  - e. the proposed stormwater system uses best practice methods commonly adopted in Rolleston, and the drainage pattern for this proposal directs secondary storm water flows towards Goulds Road via internal kerbing (this is also a best practice method accepted under the SDC Engineering Code of Practice);
  - f & g. any fill will be compacted in accordance with standards appropriate to the material in use, which that material will be appropriate to it's specific use at the time (for example, earthfilling with silts or carpark construction with gravels).

I trust this assesses the rules correctly. Please contact me if you have any queries.  
Kim

## **Kim Sanders Consulting**

Engineer

**For Subdivision Planning, Engineering & Construction Services**

30 Clark Street  
Sumner  
Christchurch  
0272 342285  
[kimsanders@xtra.co.nz](mailto:kimsanders@xtra.co.nz)

---

**From:** David Mountfort <david@mountfortplanning.co.nz>

**Sent:** Monday, November 27, 2023 3:55 PM

**To:** Kim Sanders <kimsanders@xtra.co.nz>

**Subject:** Cornerstone Church, Rolleston

Hi Kim,

Previously you assisted with the site layout and design for this project, which was at that time being assessed under the then operative district plan.

The project has been held up for other reasons, and the operative district plan has now been largely replaced by the proposed Plan Review, most of which is now deemed to be operative, including the earthworks rules. We know that a resource consent will be required for several aspects, but we need to identify any other non-compliances. Would you be in a position to reassess the plans for compliance with

the new earthworks rules? This is purely for the purpose of identifying whether or not the proposal complies. I think we have a very satisfactory layout after the previous work, so if for any non-compliances are identified its likely that we would probably simply include that in the consent application, rather than modifying the design again, unless you identify any serious issues which would necessitate changing the design..

I've attached the link to the new proposed rules. The project should be assessed under Rules EW-R1 and EW-R2.

[District Plan - Partially Operative Selwyn District Plan \(Appeals Version\)](#)

The Church is now wishing to lodge the application by mid-December, so would you be in a position to deal with this promptly?

Regards,

David Mountfort