

[EXTERNAL] RE: RC245697 Site Visit

From Christian McDean <Christian@kineticenv.co.nz>

Date Wed 16/10/2024 2:45 PM

To Hegarty, Tim <Tim.Hegarty@jacobs.com>

Cc Kristine Rutten <ekrutten24@gmail.com>; Chris Campbell <chris@greenwoodassociates.co.nz>

 5 attachments (16 MB)

Lifestyle Chickens - Concept Earthworks Plan.pdf; Notional Bounday Plan.pdf; Lifestyle Chickens - Appendix D Landscaping Plan (Updated).pdf; 2410_HUNTERS_RD_227_MEMO_S92_FINAL_R00.pdf; Example Bridge Crossing.jpg;

Hi Tim,

Please find attached and below a partial (less the Flood Cert) s.92 response.

Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment

1-14 **have been responded to within the attached memo from Greenwood & Associates.**

15. *The 'proposed screen planting' on the Landscape Plan overlaps several labels. Please adjust so the labels can be read. Also, Hunters Road, should read 'Sharlands Road'. The landscape plan attached has been updated to show the correct road name. Should you or Jeremy wish to read the labels these are available on Sheet 1 of Appendix B – Plans. They have no relevance to the landscaping proposed.*

General Planning Matters

16. *Please confirm if the building coverage figures provided in the AEE include the existing dwelling and associated accessory structures. The **proposed** building coverage figures within section 3 and 3.2 (new dwellings) do not include the existing dwelling and accessory buildings. However, the total building coverage which determined the 5.3% site coverage did include total existing and proposed buildings. To further break this down for you, total new build (including the dwellings) is approximately 15,680m², while the approximate total of existing building is 585m².*

17. *Please amend the site plans to show the distances between the proposed Intensive Primary Production and the notional boundaries of sensitive land uses, including the dwellings at the application site, 319 and 375 Sharlands Road. This distance identification has **already been completed** within Section 5.1 of the PDP Air Quality Assessment. However, for ease of reference I have provided this information in the attached PDF (Notional Boundary Plan). I have also confirmed that these measurements are taken from the notional boundary of the identified sensitive receptors.*

18. *Please provide a site plan showing the depth, volumes and locations of the proposed earthworks, **Attached (Concept Earthworks Plan)***

19. *Please provide details of artificial lighting to demonstrate compliance and/or non-compliance with the Partially Operative Plan's lighting standards. **No external artificial lighting has been selected and it is impractical to specify a model of external light and determine its particular light spill until such time as construction for this project has been approved by both Councils and the applicant, construction doesn't have to start for up to 5 years before the consent lapses. That said, any lights mounted on the sheds will be directed at the ground around the sheds and will be screened by the proposed landscaping. We would expect a condition requiring that the Light Spill, Glare and Sky Glow PA standards within the POSDP be met.***

20. *As new dwellings and other principal buildings are proposed within the Plains Flood Management Overlay please obtain a Flood Assessment Certificate from Selwyn District Council. This is to demonstrate compliance with Rule NH-R2.3c of the Partially Operative Plan. **Still to be provided***

Additional s.92 queries:

- *Can the applicant provide the proposed details of the proposed access on Sharlands Road? In particular how the crossing will cross the water race. Please see the photo attached (Example Bridge Crossing) for the type of design being proposed, this is typical of vehicle crossings on Sharlands Road. The bridge will be designed in accordance with the Selwyn District Engineering Code of Practice, specifically Section 9.5.6 and Section 11 to accommodate heavy vehicles. This is expected to be a condition of consent.*
- *Please provide an assessment of the adequacy of the water supply to meet fire flow requirements. It is proposed that a fire fighting connection be placed on the water irrigation water line, which can provide a constant flow of ground water for a fire emergency.*

We hope to have the Flood Assessment Certificate issued within the next week, but in the meantime would like these other issues closed out or any follow up questions raised.

Regards

Christian McDean

Principal Planner & Director

021 383 404

christian@kineticenv.co.nz

KINETIC
ENVIRONMENTAL

**Kinetic Environmental Consulting
Limited**

Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton
3204

PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240

kineticenvironmental.co.nz



Figure 3: Map of Sensitive Receptors

Table 4: Locations of Sensitive Receptors within 1 km of the Sheds			
Receptor name	Address	Distance from the nearest shed (m)	Direction relative to the site
R1	319 Sharlands Road	220	East
R2	282 Sharlands Road	700	East
R3	269 Parkins Road	695	South
R4	179 Hunters Road	255	South
R5	375 Sharlands Road	245	North
R6	391 Sharlands Road	385	North
R7	394 Sharlands Road	295	North
R8	394 Sharlands Road ¹	790	North
Notes:			
1. R7 and R8 are on the same property.			

227 Hunters Road, Dunsandel, Canterbury – Proposed Chicken Sheds – Response to S92 Queries

Date: 16/10/2024

Prepared for: Lifestyle Chickens Ltd.

Site Location: 227 Hunters Road, Dunsandel, Canterbury

Report Number: 2410_HUNTERS_RD_227_MEMO_S92_DRAFT_R01

Status: FINAL

Revision: 00

Report Author: Chris Campbell

QA/QC Check: Richard Greenwood

Overview

This purpose of this memorandum is to provide a response to the 'landscape and visual effects assessment' section of the document 'S92 – Request for Further Information and Affected Part Approval' ('the S92 document') dated 4th October 2024 prepared by Tim Hegarty – Principal Planner – Jacobs on behalf of the Selwyn District Council.

I will respond to each item in the order laid out in the S92 document, where a response requires a graphic supplement I will provide this as an in-line image and as an attachment

Response to comments

This section will lay out the comment as received with my response following;

1.- 'The landscape assessment places most weight on the visibility and visual effects of the proposal. Please provide further assessment on the broader landscape effects of the proposal. Of note, section 6 includes an assessment of landscape effects, however this appears to be limited to the physical effects on the topography of the site and vegetation changes only. The landscape (or effects on the landscape character) arising from the proposed change from a traditional open rural land use to an intensive shed-based operation need to also be considered. Paragraphs 3.13 – 3.23 provide somewhat of an introduction to a landscape assessment beyond the purely visual realm which could be expanded upon.'

Through sections 3.13–3.17 I have identified the surrounding character of the landscape as having a rural character and amenity, this was based upon the presence of natural and cultural elements which were inclusive of;

- Shelter belts arranged at internal and common boundaries (these were viewed as both natural and cultural elements within the landscape),
- Views towards the southern alps, taking into account the interruption of this view by shelter belts,

In addition the presence of activity and built-form elements that could be associated/ readily identified as being associated with rural activity contributed to the identification of the landscape character as being 'rural'.

These activities / elements included;

- Dairy farming sheds
- Large grass field irrigation booms
- Post and wire fences
- Ancillary buildings (sheds) located near dwellings or standalone structures within open fields
- Variance of road types, for example Hunters Road is a narrower gravel road intersecting a wider sealed road (Sharlands Road)

Through paragraphs 3.21 – 3.23 I have stated;

"3.21. Shelter belts are constituent landscape character elements across both the site and the surrounding landscape and are used as both a wind break and screening device. The latter function being used to screen both residential and agricultural ancillary buildings from view from within the public realm (which consists exclusively of road corridors within the surrounding landscape).

3.22. Whilst it is desirable in most situations to be able to absorb built form (and other cultural intrusions into the landscape) into the landscape through use of natural contours and mounding combined with an 'organic' planting style (reminiscent of naturally occurring native forest) such an approach within this landscape would be in contrast to the prevailing landscape character.

3.23. Whilst providing screening through rectilinear planting can often appear out of context and can be considered a blunt instrument in absorbing built form, within the context of the surrounding landscape these can be considered appropriate as they will complement the prevailing local landscape character and will be an effective instrument in absorbing the proposed built-form (refer section 5 for further detail) into the landscape."

This analysis was intended to reflect the applicant's proposal to place shelter belts at the boundary of the site.

When providing my final conclusion on the assessment of landscape effects of the proposal on the prevailing landscape character, I do not consider that the presence of the two (2) chicken farming operations (comprising of 8 sheds in 2 groups of 4) within a paddock degenerates from the prevailing rural character as ancillary buildings form a part of the rural landscape and serve a key function in serving rural activities.

Additionally, chicken breeding / farming is a rural activity and as such an activity occurring in concert (in the perspective of the wider landscape) with activities such as dairy farming can, again, be considered an expectant outcome within a rural area and will not degenerate from the prevailing rural character.

The proposed chicken farm and dwellings do not form the entire proposal, therefore the proposed shelter belts also need to be considered and as outlined in sections 3.21–3.23 these can be considered an appropriate response within the current environment and again would be consistent with expected landscape outcomes within a rural area.

2. – 'The proposal includes several non-compliances from the standards in the Operative and Partially Operative Selwyn District Plans. Please provide comment on the cumulative effects of these non-compliances.'

The cumulative effect of these non-compliances (as outlined in tables 3 and 4) was considered in assigning the level of effects reached in the conclusion of the landscape assessment report.

As outlined in my response to point 1, I do not consider that the presence of the proposed chicken farm and dwellings within the landscape will degenerate from the prevailing rural character.

In terms of the non-compliance identified in regards to rule 3.10.1.1, I do not consider that the addition of two additional dwellings on the site leads to urban outcomes as they are situated in close proximity to the proposed chicken sheds, and such patterning / arrangements are consistent with those currently encountered across the surrounding landscape and thus I do not consider that adding these two dwellings to the landscape will lead to any feelings of 'urbaness' and, hence, adverse effects on the wider rural character.

In terms of the non-compliance with rules 3.11.1 and 3.11.2 please refer to my response in the preceding paragraph and in my response to item 1 on the effects of the proposal upon the prevailing rural character.

In terms of the non-compliance with GRUZ-R5 please refer to my response in the preceding paragraph addressing rule 3.10.1.1 and in my response to item 1 on the effects of the proposal upon the prevailing rural character.

Therefore, I consider that cumulative effects of the non-compliances listed above do not have any adverse effect on the prevailing rural character.

3. - 'Under Section 1 'Introduction', a comment is made that: "Greenwood Associates Landscape Architects has been engaged by the applicant to assess the potential landscape effects introduced from the future built form." The landscape effects will be generated by aspects of the proposal in addition to the new built form/s such as the on-site and off-site activities that will be generated (such as vehicle movements). Please provide further information on the landscape effects suggested at points 1 and 2 above in this RFI.'

Refer responses to points 1 and 2 above in terms of the effects of the proposal on the wider landscape character.

In terms of servicing activities (such as traffic and deliveries) these would occur on Sharlands Road and would consist of feed deliveries for the breeding sheds and staff commuting to/from work. This can be expected to be 47 trips (CEM) per day.

Sharlands Road, being a sealed road feeding directly to SH1 is already utilised by traffic serving the parts of the landscape that function as traditional farms, and as such the additional vehicle movements to service a rural activity can be considered an expectant outcome within the landscape. In terms of vehicle movements generated by the two additional dwellings on site, these

would be akin to those generated by the various rural-residential properties within the landscape , Noting that at least one of the residents of each dwelling will work on site, reducing the usual movements that could be expected.

4. - 'With regards to rural landscape character, please provide further information regarding the effects of the overall reduction in the productive soil asset at the site following the proposal which exceeds site coverage. Of note, site coverage does not account for hard surfacing.'

Please refer to my response to point 1, wherein the proposed transition from open field/paddock to chicken farm has been considered with regard to the effects on the prevailing landscape character.

5. - 'Directly adjacent neighbours have been considered in terms of changes to their views only ('visual' effects) following the proposal. Please provide further information on the non-visual effects of the proposal on the occupants at 282, 319, 375 and 391 Sharlands Road, 179 Hunters Road and 269 Parkins Road with regards to the physical, associative and perceptual dimensions (page 135 in TTatM will be helpful in this instance).'

Please refer to my commentary on the reply to point 1.

The presence of the two chicken farms and the proposed shelter belts can be considered consistent with the prevailing rural character thus the presence of the proposal will not detract from the perception that the surrounding environment is rural in character.

Furthermore, the proposed elements of sheds and shelter belts and dwellings sitting in close proximity to the sheds are all elements that can be associated with the wider rural character.

In terms of vehicle movements (wherein additional vehicle movements on rural roads could lead to a perception for those in the identified properties that such movement (and the noises generated by them) are more akin to a rural environment) the additional vehicular movements are minimal and it should be noted that rural communities do experience vehicle movements of larger vehicles, particularly communities residing near dairy farms. There can also be a seasonal increases in vehicular movements dependent on the nearby rural activity (i.e.: crop farms have designated harvest times, sheep farms experience more activity during spring and summer times and also require additional heavy vehicle movements in winter time to bring in additional feed).

6. - The viewpoint 2 locations in Appendix 3.4 – 3.6 do not include a 'fourth' image looking into the site immediately after passing the vegetation cover

associated with 319 Sharlands Road / site. A 'fourth' view looking westwards from Sharlands Road would demonstrate the 'sudden' openness of the site. Please comment on the visual effects from this viewing location.

I consider that the visual effects of the 'sudden' openness of the site as commented above would be very low, for the reasons outlined in my response to point 1, in that a view of chicken sheds and/or a shelter belt is considered an expectant outcome within the existing rural environment and is consistent with the patterning of the surrounding environment.

7.- 'Please confirm if the wording at paragraph 3.13 should read 'cognitive'.

Yes

8. – 'The wording at paragraph 3.18 appears contradictory and is somewhat difficult to follow. A statement is made that the rating system in 2.2 will be utilised, then later states it won't be. Please clarify.'

This paragraph is stating that the rating system given in paragraph 2.2 will be used in the assessment of landscape effects and not used to provide a rating level of the 'Landscape sensitivity to absorb change'

9. – 'The 'comment' text in the table following paragraph 4.10 appears incomplete (see response to GRUZ- R35). Please clarify/complete.'

The text for EI-REQ24 should read 'All screen planting will be setback at least 5m from the centreline of any road'

10. – 'The various sheds proposed are assumed to have roof-mounted plant. Please confirm if this will be the case or not, and if so, how this would appear (locations, form, colour) and confirm if this aspect has been considered in the landscape effects assessment with regards to cumulative effects of the built form and site coverage exceedance. It may be helpful to provide photographic images of similar operations elsewhere.'

The sheds will not have any roof mounted plant, please see images of similar operations below;





11. – 'Please confirm how the driveways and vehicle parking/manoeuvring areas will be surfaced (shown as a dark grey colour on plans).'

Will be gravelled with GAP20 surfacing (as shown in preceding images)

12. – 'At paragraph 6.3, it states "...no structural required." Please clarify what this refers to.'

This should read 'no structural retaining'

13. – 'A comment is made at paragraph 6.21 that: "When travelling northwards on Sharlands Road the proposed chicken sheds will not be visible from within a vehicle as the angle from the western verge (i.e.: left side of the road) does not provide sufficient angle to the site to be able to observe the Chicken Sheds or dwelling, Figure 6 below shows a typical view from the western verge of Sharlands Road when travelling northwards towards the site."

The two images provided below (the first unnamed) are from points south of Hunters Road and the site. However, the site is highly visible from this road further north (see point 6 above). Please clarify the point being made in the italicized text above.'

The highlighted commentary is intended to explain that when approaching the site that the area of the proposal is largely obscured from view when approaching on the left-side of the road (i.e.: where a vehicle would be travelling), however it is partially visible on approach when located on the right side of the road. Therefore the supplied images at figure 6 show the view from the left side of the road and the supplied viewpoints show the view from the right side of the road.

Therefore, the viewing audience that would experience the view shown in the supplied viewpoint imagery would consist of pedestrians, who would be in the minority when compared to the vehicular based viewing audiences represented by the images provided for figure 6.

14. – 'Please locate the photographic viewpoints for Figures 5 – 13 on a map.'

Please see updated viewpoint location map (larger attachment provided)
note that all in-line figure images are prefixed with 'F'



15. – 'The 'proposed screen planting' on the Landscape Plan overlaps several labels. Please adjust so the labels can be read. Also, Hunters Road, should read 'Sharlands Road'.

See the Kinetic Environmental response.

Chris Campbell BLA(Hons.)
Senior Associate – Landscape Architect





Copyright of this design/image remains the property of **Novasteel International Limited**.

- 1) All dimensions and underground service locations to be checked on site prior to commencement of work.
- 2) Do not scale from drawings, if in doubt, ask the DESIGNER!!
- 3) Refer to the specification attached (where applicable).

KEY:

- *Proposed Screen Planting*
- Species:** Pine
- Mature Height:** 6m
- *Existing Screen Planting*



Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited
 Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204
 PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240
kineticenvironmental.co.nz

project
 Lifestyle Chickens
 227 Hunters Road, RD1, Dunsandel

drawing Landscape Plan		
design Danielle S	scale 1 : 2000	job no. --
drawn Danielle S	revision Rev 2	drawing no.
date 24 June 24	checked -	A00

SKETCH DESIGN - SK1



Copyright of this design/image remains the property of **Novasteel International Limited**.

- 1) All dimensions and underground service locations to be checked on site prior to commencement of work.
- 2) Do not scale from drawings, if in doubt, ask the DESIGNER!!
- 3) Refer to the specification attached (where applicable).

KEY:
■ Earthworks location

NOTES:
Approx. earthworks area = 7ha (70,000m²)

Expected topsoil stripping depth = 200mm

Total volume = Approx. 10,000m³



Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited
Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204
PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240
kineticenvironmental.co.nz

project
Lifestyle Chickens

227 Hunters Road, RD1, Dunsandel

drawing Earthworks Plan		
design Danielle S	scale 1 : 2000	job no. --
drawn Danielle S	revision Rev 1	drawing no.
date 24 June 24	checked -	A00



- Copyright of this design/image remains the property of **Novasteel International Limited**.
- 1) All dimensions and underground service locations to be checked on site prior to commencement of work.
 - 2) Do not scale from drawings, if in doubt, ask the DESIGNER!!
 - 3) Refer to the specification attached (where applicable).

Approx. earthworks area = 5ha (50,000m²)

- Building specific earthworks area (in yellow) = 32,000m²

- Car Parking, driveways etc earthworks area (in purple) = 18,000m²

Expected topsoil stripping depth = 200mm

Earthwork Volumes:

Building Specific = 6,400m³

Car Parking, driveways = 3,600m³

Total volume = Approx. 10,000m³

****ALL EARTHWORKS ARE ESTIMATES, TO BE CONFIRMED DURING DETAIL DESIGN OF THE SITE****

KINETIC
ENVIRONMENTAL

Kinetic Environmental Consulting Limited
Level 1, 71 London Street, Hamilton 3204
PO Box 9413, Hamilton 3240
kineticenvironmental.co.nz

project		
Lifestyle Chickens		
227 Hunters Road, RD1, Dunsandel		
drawing		
Earthworks Plan		
design	scale	job no.
Danielle S	1 : 2000	--
drawn	revision	drawing no.
Danielle S	Rev 1	A00
date	checked	
24 June 24	-	