

2022-02-25

Jane Anderson
Consultant Planner
Selwyn District Council
2 Norman Kirk Drive
ROLLESTON 7614

Via email: jane.anderson@selwyn.govt.nz

Dear Jane

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: RC216016, 157 LEVI ROAD, ROLLESTON

We refer to your Request for Further Information (RFI) dated 21 January 2022 regarding the above application to establish and operate a PAK'nSAVE at 157 Levi Road, Rolleston.

Foodstuffs' Design Team has reviewed the RFI and their specialist assessments have informed this RFI response. For clarity and ease of reference, we have responded to each RFI point in turn and present the additional information as follows:

- **Attachment A:** Response to RFI matters 1-2 (General Matters), 27-43 (Urban Design), 44-68 (Landscape) and 68 (Contaminated Land)
- **Attachment B:** Response to RFI matters 3-26 (Transport)
- **Attachment C:** Environment Canterbury Well Card for the existing bore on the Site
- **Attachment D:** Revised Landscape Plan and supplementary graphics (dated 22 February 2022), and Revised Landscape Assessment Report (dated 23 February 2022) prepared by Rough Milne Mitchell Landscape Architects. We ask that these replace the corresponding original Landscape Plan and Landscape Assessment Report (Appendix F of the application).
- **Attachment E:** Revised Architectural Drawings, Renders and Design Statement prepared by McCoy & Wixon Architects. We ask that these replace the corresponding original Architectural Drawings, Renders and Design Statement (Appendix A of the application). Those drawings that have been revised since the original set are:
 - Architectural Drawings RC01-RC11 (dated 22 February 2022)
 - Shadow Model RC12-RC14 (dated 24 February 2022)
 - Architectural Design Statement (dated 17 February 2022)
- **Attachment F:** Revised Geotechnical Desktop Report prepared by Aurecon (dated 14 February 2022). We ask that this replaces the corresponding original Geotechnical Design Report (Appendix C of the application).
- **Attachment G:** Revised Civil Design Advice Memorandum prepared by Powell Fenwick (dated 3 December 2021). We ask that this replaces the corresponding original Civil Design Advice Memorandum (Appendix G of the application).
- **Attachment H:** Revised Urban Design Assessment prepared by McIndoe Urban Limited (dated 24 February 2022). We ask that this replaces the corresponding original Urban Design Assessment (Appendix K of the application).

We trust the additional information enclosed adequately addresses the matters raised in the RFI, allowing the application to proceed to notification at the earliest convenience.

If you have any queries regarding this response to the RFI, please do not hesitate to contact the writer in the first instance.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kirsty Clement'.

Kirsty Clement
Senior Consultant, Environment and Planning

Encl.

Attachment A: Response to RFI matters 1-2 (General Matters), 27-43 (Urban Design), 44-68 (Landscape) and 68 (Contaminated Land)

Attachment B: Response to RFI matters 3-26 (Transport)

Attachment C: Environment Canterbury Well Card for the existing bore on the Site

Attachment D: Revised Landscape Plan and supplementary graphics (dated 22 February 2022), and Revised Landscape Assessment Report (dated 23 February 2022) prepared by Rough Milne Mitchell Landscape Architects

Attachment E: Revised Architectural Drawings, Renders and Design Statement prepared by McCoy Wixon Architects (dated February 2022)

Attachment F: Revised Geotechnical Desktop Report prepared by Aurecon (dated 14 February 2022)

Attachment G: Revised Civil Design Advice Memorandum prepared by Powell Fenwick (dated 3 December 2021)

Attachment H: Revised Urban Design Assessment prepared by McIndoe Urban Limited (dated 24 February 2022)

Attachment A: Response to RFI matters 1-2 (General Matters), 27-43 (Urban Design), 44-68 (Landscape) and 68 (Contaminated Land)

RFI matter	RFI Response
General Matters	
1. <i>Please can you advise if there is an intention to build and operate a petrol station on this site.</i>	<p>A fuel facility is not proposed. The following attachments have been updated to remove this error, and replace their corresponding originals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Attachment E: Revised Architectural Drawing RC01 ■ Attachment F: Revised Geotechnical Desktop Assessment ■ Attachment G: Revised Civil Design Advice Memorandum
2. <i>Please advise if the applicant has considered the implications of PC71 on the proposal.</i>	<p>Foodstuffs' Design Team has considered the implications of PC71 and is confident that the PAK'nSAVE would be compatible with residential activity on PC71 (Part A) (i.e. east of the Application Site) that may occur in the future, should PC71 be approved. PC71 (Part B) corresponds to the Application Site, and to this end will not be developed in accordance with PC71's proposed amendments to ODP Area 4.</p> <p>No decision on PC71 has been made. At the time of writing, a hearing has been held and remains adjourned pending the applicant's written Reply. There is therefore no greater certainty now, than there was when the Application was lodged, that PC71 will be approved, and PC71 (Part A) developed for residential purposes. It follows that PC71 does not form part of the existing environment against which effects are to be assessed. Irrespective, Foodstuffs' Design Team has taken into account operational requirements, neighbouring properties, current and potential development outcomes and zoning frameworks, and potential amenity effects (including noise and visual amenity) when forming a view as to the appropriate location and design of the PAK'nSAVE. This included the possibility of PC71 (Part A) enabling residential activity along the eastern boundary of the Application Site.</p> <p>The PAK'nSAVE provides generous road and internal boundary setbacks and landscaping, including a building setback of approximately 18m from the eastern boundary (common with PC71 (Part A)) that comprises a 10m-wide biodiversity planting strip contiguous with the boundary and fencing. Refer to responses to RFI matters 36 and 37 for further detail. Foodstuffs' Design Team have developed a built form outcome that is located appropriately for either a rural or residential outcome along its eastern boundary. There has also been consideration of the direct boundary interface (i.e. type of landscaping and style of fencing). The Applicant will advance alternative options for landscaping and fencing at the hearing if considered necessary (i.e. if PC71 has been approved and is not subject to appeal).</p>

RFI matter	RFI Response
Transport	
3-26	Attachment B contains a comprehensive RFI response to these matters from Abley.
Urban Design	
27. Please identify bore location on site	Attachment C contains the Environment Canterbury Well Card which shows the location of the bore near the existing dwelling within the Site.
28. Can you please provide labels on the landscape plan.	Attachment D contains a Revised Landscape Plan with labels and a more robust indicative plant list provided on a separate sheet.
29. With regard to the northwest elevation, please elaborate how the 'large band of glazing will...provide outlook from within' (page 6) and how the windows provided will provide activation and passive surveillance onto space occupied by the public.	The large band of glazing measures approximately 35m wide x 4m in height. At this scale, size, and location, the band will provide significant access to aerial vistas (and daylight) and broad perspectives beyond the Site from within the Food Hall. As shown in the Revised Architectural Drawing RC05 and explained in the Architectural Design Statement (Attachment E), an additional glazing band measuring 9m wide by 3m high (27m ²), has been added to the North West Elevation at ground level between the Click & Collect canopy and the vertical band of shade fins. This glazing band will add direct visual connection, outlook, and activation to and from the Food Hall interior. Additional passive surveillance will accordingly be attributed to this area. In addition, there is an internal access stair located within the north-western corner of the supermarket building. This glazed void, alongside adjacent offices will provide some areas of passive outlook and surveillance with staff to/from within. Further animation of the supermarket building will be provided through modulation of interior lighting, screened and visible from the exterior at window locations. Appearing as soft light, as seen from the boundary, in conjunction with the shade fins, screens, and landscaping will provide subtle shifts in appearance through various points in the day and year.
30. Please elaborate how 'finer grain materials and textures softened by integrated landscaped edges responds to the residential context ... at points of activation and customer interface, e.g. the 'click and collect area'.	<p>There is a general 'softening' of detail and increase in texture (finer grain) to the base of the supermarket building where building users predominantly circulate. These are strategically constructed by and/or reference residential and rural construction methods and materiality, therefore responding to the surrounding context. These elements consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Off-form concrete panels constructed with 100-150mm rough-sawn timber boards used as the form in both vertical and horizontal orientation. Such boards reference residential timber fence and weather board cladding through texture and appearance, format, and linearity; ■ Entry pergola structures, lining both the Main Entry approaches at 3m in height are residential in scale. The use of steel posts, fibre-cement sheet soffit lining, alongside the off-form board finish adjacent (as above) provide a residential response; and

RFI matter	RFI Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further off-form a concrete panel adjacent to the Click & Collect facility utilise a trapezoidal (corrugated) form – common in residential roofing, cladding, and fencing. <p>Delineated component parts of the supermarket building also reflect and relate to the size and scale of residential patterns and characteristics. Such aspects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The column and shade fin centres to the North West and South East glazing bands and canopies, and the South West Elevation entrance roofs and structure. Ranging between approximately 4.3m to 7.2m, mass and framed sections of supermarket building are further broken down into residential scale 'blocks;' While relatable to each other, the glazing bands, canopies, and entrance structures also vary in height to modulate the mass and façade, and as a relationship to the varied roof/building massing common to the Rolleston residential context; and A further less dominant overlay exists with cladding panel junctions and joins, which also reflect the widths and heights established by the column and shade fin structures detailed above. <p>The Click & Collect facility utilises all of these methods and materials.</p> <p>The predominant supermarket building edges integrated and softened with landscape are located adjacent to the Click & Collect facility on the North West Elevation at the base of the glazing band, between shade fins. Similarly, on the South East Elevation, planting that is residential in scale and selection lines the base of the glazing band, between the shade fins.</p>
<p>31. Please confirm and demonstrate, independent from landscaping measures, how sympathy with a residential context is achieved by the proposal's height, roof shape, materials used and façade modulation and how (visually) these have achieved that the building is visually integrated within the residential neighbourhood.</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to separate out landscape measures from an assessment of how the Proposal overall sits within its context. However, the siting of the supermarket building is central to the Site, with large setbacks combined with the north/south main roof gable form have been located specifically to reduce height at adjacent edges through sympathy and consideration for the residential context. The supermarket building height and roof shape is focussed internal to the Site, which minimises the Proposal's height at adjacent boundaries. This is achieved with a central ridge (high point) which then falls to the north-east and south-west (eaves, or low points), respectively. The Bulk Store set down (eastern building mass) follows this same intent, further minimising height and bulk to the north-east boundary, whilst also breaking down the visual bulk of the North West Elevation. This reduces the Bulk Store roof height by approximately 1m when compared with a simple projection of the main roof which is typical of a building of this nature.</p>

RFI matter	RFI Response
	<p>Sympathy and reference to the residential context has been considered through the proposed materiality as discussed in response to RFI matter 30 above.</p> <p>Façade modulation has been a key driver to the supermarket building design, aimed at both reducing bulk as much as possible, and to visually respond to the residential neighbourhood. To drive this, the building mass and façade has been broken down into smaller component parts from the main building roof form. This is illustrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Defined Entry foyer with varied volumes and articulation (central to the site) to define point of entry and provide daylight to the building; ■ Low-level entrance canopies, projecting from the entrance volume; ■ North-west and south-east facing 'glazing bands' projecting from the gable form as separate structures, defined by shade fins and alternating cladding; ■ Projecting Click & Collect canopy to the north-west; ■ Drop to Bulk Store to the north-east; and ■ Canopy to the North East Yard area, enclosing some building setback area. <p>Structural details are expressed and overlaid throughout in order to provide interest and a rhythm to the supermarket building. For example, the shade fins located on the North West and South East Elevations project the primary structural grid for the building. This is echoed in the expressed Click & Collect canopy structure, which at a lower height shares the same frequency of column placement. This design concept is further applied to the main South West Elevation, with the entrance colonnade structures tying into the Entry void structure, with articulated shade fins and screens. Varied transparency, depth and shadow lines of the above component parts all reduce the bulk of the supermarket building as much as possible, which combined with the proposed materiality, visually integrate as much as possible with the residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>The relationship of the Proposal to the residential context has been addressed in the Revised Urban Design Assessment (Attachment H). This assessment acknowledges the difference in scale and activity type between the PAK'nSAVE and its finer grain residential context, and considers the proposed setback and landscape treatment offer a valid and effective integration technique, in conjunction with recommended adjustments to the two main facades (Lincoln Rolleston Road/South West Elevation and Levi Road/North West Elevation). Structural stability and weathertightness are fundamental and ultimately dictate the roofline and cladding design. Due to the nature of the supermarket building structure, greater steps in the roofline and cladding joins tend to increase the risk of</p>

RFI matter	RFI Response
	<p>weathertightness issues, and for these reasons no changes are proposed to the roofline. Further glazing has been added at the Click & Collect facility to provide even greater visual integration and sympathy within the residential neighbourhood to the north-west.</p>
<p>32. <i>Please advise whether the applicant has considered alternative design concepts where the click and collect area is positioned closer to the Levi Road interface.</i></p>	<p>The location of the building within the Site is dictated by operational and functional requirements necessary to operate a supermarket. The building has been located central to the Site to minimise bulk to nearby dwellings and road boundaries, onto which the Click & Collect facility integrates. Given the immediate adjacency required with the 'back of house' (where goods are stored and kept refrigerated for collection), it would be impractical from an operational perspective to move the Click & Collect facility closer to Levi Road, or to separate the facility from the main supermarket building. It is also considered inappropriate to move the Click & Collect facility closer to Levi Road due to the potential adverse effects on residential amenity. Car parking and safe circulation of vehicles are also key considerations in the placement of the Click & Collect facility, and the proposed car parking and servicing layout is considered optimal for the operation of the supermarket (including Click & Collect facility).</p>
<p>33. <i>Please advise whether pedestrian routes have been aligned with desire lines.</i></p>	<p>Page 10 of Attachment B contains a comprehensive RFI response to this matter from Abley.</p>
<p>34. <i>It is noted that the pedestrian entry close to the north-east boundary has not been identified as a pedestrian route (figure 11, page 21). Please provide further information</i></p>	<p>The pedestrian entry, originally close to the north-east boundary of the Site, has been relocated by removing four parking spaces, as shown on page 11 of Attachment B. This removes potential pedestrian and delivery vehicle conflict at the corner of the supermarket building whilst also better connecting the north-east car parking area to the PAK'nSAVE supermarket. The removal of four parking spaces is inconsequential given the ample capacity of the car parking area. The total number of car parks provided on-site will decrease from 517 to 513 (including 10 accessible parking spaces, 14 staff parking spaces and eight Click & Collect).</p>
<p>35. <i>Please address the pedestrian connection in the North-East corner within landscape buffer for potential safety and legibility issues (CPTED)</i></p>	<p>As noted above, the pedestrian connection close to the north-east boundary of the Site has been relocated by removing four parking spaces, as shown on page 11 of Attachment B. This removes potential safety and legibility issues.</p>
<p>36. <i>Please provide shadow models to confirm the effects from the built form on adjoining sites</i></p>	<p>Shadow models have been prepared by McCoy Wixon Architects and are attached at Attachment E (Drawings RC12-RC14). The shadow models are based on the following scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Supermarket, east boundary planting at full maturity, 2.5m high acoustic fence inset 6m in from east boundary and 2m high fence on east boundary

RFI matter	RFI Response
	McIndoe Urban Limited have assessed the shadow models and state in the Revised Urban Design Assessment (Attachment H) that any shading effects on all neighbouring properties will be <i>less than minor</i> (page 25).
<p>37. Please provide commentary on whether the buffer landscaping/interface treatment along the eastern boundary be still considered appropriate when developed to residential in accordance with PC71</p>	<p>A decision on PC71 has not been made, and therefore there is no certainty that land to the east of the Site will be developed for residential purposes. Irrespective of this, the façade specific to this boundary will be screened by the 10m wide landscape buffer, and as illustrated on Revised Architectural Drawing RC06 (Attachment E), will not result in a continuous 84-100m mass. From north to south, the north-east facade is broken down into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Modulated façade 37m in length, set back into the Site approximately 18m from the boundary; ■ Canopy beam/fascia (aligns with building), projecting approximately 22m; ■ Modulated building, including mezzanine and store (recessive in elevation), 44m in length set back into the Site approximately 47m from the boundary; and ■ Ancillary single-level extension at 9m, aligns with adjacent. <p>The buffer landscaping/interface treatment along the eastern boundary of the Site has been updated as illustrated in the Revised Landscape Plan and supplementary graphics, and assessed in the Revised Landscape Assessment Report contained in Attachment D. Two interface treatment options are proposed, dependent on the future zoning of adjoining land to the east of the Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Option A: implemented if PC71 is declined and the land retains its rural zoning. This option includes a denser planting arrangement and an acoustic fence on top of the retaining wall on the eastern boundary (2.6m high); or ■ Option B: implemented if PC71 is approved and the land is rezoned to General Residential. This option includes a sparser planting arrangement (e.g. shrub planting limited to no more than 2m high), an acoustic fence set back 6m from the eastern boundary and nestled within planting, and a paling fence integrated with the retaining wall (2m high total). This option has been carefully designed to provide visual screening of the supermarket building, while avoiding shading effects beyond what could be reasonably anticipated by permitted residential development on the Site. The tallest trees will be columnar species (mountain beech and ribbonwood) rather than wider species (such as totara) and will be planted in a more open arrangement. This will allow more sunlight to pass between the trees, while still providing sufficient visual screening of the building. We have assessed the potential shading effects of this planting treatment at different times throughout the year and are comfortable that the planting will not cause significant shading issues for potential residences should PC71 be granted. In addition, the boundary fence will be 2m high instead of 2.6m high, which is what could be anticipated within the Living Z zoning of the Site.

RFI matter	RFI Response
	<p>As noted above, the supermarket building will result in a modulated façade 37m in length, set back into the Site approximately 18m from the boundary. To further soften this façade, a slightly more concentrated tree planting arrangement is proposed in front of it without causing significant shading effects on land to the east. This interface treatment along the eastern boundary of the Site is considered appropriate in response to the surrounding environment (including potential residential zoning under by PC71).</p>
<p>38. <i>Please provide further commentary on how the scale of the building integrates with the current and future surrounding environment and what alternatives have been considered to improve visual variety more in line with a residential context, including architectural modulation and roofline variation, and how the proposed development meets the SDC's Commercial Design Guide principals</i></p>	<p>As demonstrated in the Revised Architectural Design Statement (Attachment E) and in this RFI response, the scale of the supermarket building integrates with the current and future surrounding environment and responds to the SDC's Commercial Design Guide principles. Out of respect for the scale and character of adjacent buildings and the surrounding area, the proposed supermarket building is well set back within the Site. As illustrated in the perspectives provided in Revised Drawings RC09 and RC10 (Attachment E), open but articulated and composed landscaping surrounds the supermarket building as a transition, with screened building views and vistas. This has been a key driver for managing the transition in scale for both current and future proposed residential environments.</p> <p>Landscape also forms a key aspect of the supermarket building and its integrated response both now and in the future, as discussed in the Revised Landscape Plan and Assessment Report (Attachment D).</p> <p>In terms of architectural modulation, as discussed in response to RFI matter 31 above, smaller modules break up the building mass, with changes in height, roof form, steps in plan and variation in the selection and palette of materials. Window placements and cladding compositions (including profiled metal, natural and oxide precast concrete panels, and their articulation within) were all explored. The current design reflects this process and balance between achieving interest and modulation and responding to functional building requirements. As a critical lifeline service, a well-functioning and designed supermarket is very important for community wellbeing.</p> <p>The roofline variation is focussed on integrating but delineating the component parts of the building (as noted above) whilst maintaining a relatively simple gable roof structure beyond. This maintains an easily readable building for customers orientating themselves on site, and from a pragmatic weathertightness perspective reduces complex roof lines prone to leaking and flashing details.</p> <p>Consideration was given to running the roofline (ridge) at 90° to the proposed north/south orientation, however this would create more bulk and height adjacent to the north-east boundary and entrance facade, along with more complex roofing junctions, and was seen as a negative from a weathertightness perspective. The north-east store and yard area best integrate with the proposed roof orientation and form.</p>

RFI matter	RFI Response
<p>39. Please provide further information to confirm how the north-east building frontage is an active frontage.</p>	<p>Supermarket activity on the north-east building frontage is provided through three key areas/functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Adjacent north-east Click & Collect facility and car parking, immediately to the north; ■ Staff parking area located to the south-east corner from the supermarket building, immediately to the south; and ■ Screened 'back of house' yard area. <p>Associated passive surveillance along this frontage is achieved from the activity areas noted above. During operating hours, staff and/or customers will frequent these areas. The screened 'back of house' area provides opportunity for staff, both within the building/yard and on delivery, to provide passive surveillance to this part of the Site. The entirety of the accessible areas aligning the north-east frontage (being road) have clear visible sightlines from the north-east and south-east approaches and will be appropriately illuminated. It is noted pedestrian circulation is not provided to this part of the Site, with footpaths limited to the north and south adjacencies.</p>
<p>40. Please provide additional commentary addressing CPTED matters, including opportunities for passive surveillance both into and from the site.</p>	<p>As outlined in the Revised Urban Design Assessment (Attachment H), the South West elevation will offer a high degree of surveillance over the associated car parking area, but effectiveness of overlooking onto Lincoln Rolleston Road will be limited due to the 80-120m setback. Future housing intensification opposite the Site (as provided by current zoning) will create overlooking of the street as is the case further south and along Levi Road. We note that the open nature of the car parking area off Lincoln Rolleston Road, with intermittent boundary planting, will ensure views in from the street can occur. Along Levi Road, the assessment notes that the north-west frontage offers no surveillance of Levi Road and is an area of concern especially after hours. McIndoe Urban Limited recommend the tall pleached hedge is adjusted to allow intermittent views into the Site, and that activation of the North East Elevation is desirable, including glazed areas allowing views in/out and a more generous Click & Collect entry point.</p> <p>In response, the Levi Road frontage has been redesigned (refer to the Revised Landscape Plan and Assessment Report, and supplementary graphics at Attachment D). The pleached hedge has been replaced with a line of 10m tall specimen trees at 8m spacings. The clipped hedge will remain in its present alignment and the balance of the road frontage garden will be planted with a mix of shrub planting and groundcovers. The new landscape treatment along this frontage will provide a good balance between enabling views into the supermarket car parking area and providing visual screening of the supermarket building and will provide passive surveillance in accordance with CPTED best practices through all planting establishment stages. Additional glazing has been added at the Click & Collect facility along the North East Elevation to provide greater activation, noting that the supermarket activity itself, including in the area of the Click & Collect facility, will provide a significant amount of activation within the Site.</p>

RFI matter	RFI Response																								
41. Please confirm hierarchy of pedestrian routes within car park (as mentioned on page 24). Please confirm how safety in public spaces is addressed?	<p>There are five main pedestrian routes that provide direct and logical pedestrian access between the PAK'nSAVE, Levi Road and/or Lincoln Rolleston Road, while also functioning as collectors that channel pedestrian movements from the car parking areas to the closest respective pedestrian route. Levi Road has three interspersed pedestrian routes extending to the street, while Lincoln Rolleston Road has two routes that provide this role. The pedestrian arbor route, centrally located within the customer carparking area, is clearly the primary pedestrian collector route, providing direct access to the supermarket building entrance from the north-west open space area. All pedestrian routes are considered important as they need to be wide enough for accessibility, mobility, and trolley design. A CPTED review is covered in the Revised Urban Design Assessment (Attachment H) and concludes that the Proposal provides a suitable response to the seven CPTED criterion. The CPTED review included an examination of public streets, internal roads, car parking areas, and the north-eastern corner of open space.</p> <p>Pages 11-12 of Attachment B also provides a response to this RFM matter from Abley.</p>																								
Signage																									
42. Please provide percentages of the corporate colours and signage for the elevations of the building	<p>Attachment F contains Revised Architectural Plans RC02, RC04, RC05 and RC07 to include percentages of the corporate colours and signage for the elevations of the supermarket building, which are summarised as follows:</p> <div><p>BUILDING SIGNAGE AREAS:</p><table><tr><td>South West Building Elevation Sign 1</td><td>39.75m²</td><td>3.8%</td></tr><tr><td>North West Building Elevation Sign 2</td><td>22.00m²</td><td>2.8%</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>61.75m²</td><td></td></tr></table><p>CORPORATE COLOUR AREA: Pak'n Save Yellow</p><table><tr><td>South West Building Entry:</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>South West face</td><td>84.45m²</td><td>10.9%</td></tr><tr><td>North West face</td><td>34.00m²</td><td>3.2%</td></tr><tr><td>South East face</td><td>34.00m²</td><td>3.2%</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>152.45m²</td><td></td></tr></table></div>	South West Building Elevation Sign 1	39.75m²	3.8%	North West Building Elevation Sign 2	22.00m²	2.8%	TOTAL	61.75m²		South West Building Entry:			South West face	84.45m²	10.9%	North West face	34.00m²	3.2%	South East face	34.00m²	3.2%	TOTAL	152.45m²	
South West Building Elevation Sign 1	39.75m²	3.8%																							
North West Building Elevation Sign 2	22.00m²	2.8%																							
TOTAL	61.75m²																								
South West Building Entry:																									
South West face	84.45m²	10.9%																							
North West face	34.00m²	3.2%																							
South East face	34.00m²	3.2%																							
TOTAL	152.45m²																								

RFI matter	RFI Response
<p>43. <i>In the context of the surrounding residential and semi-rural environment, please provide comment on the potential effects of the extent of signage and corporate colours and the height of the pylon sign on the character and amenity of this environment</i></p>	<p>In general, the building material palette is integrated with the surrounding residential and semi-rural environment through the use of earthy neutral tones. In addition, the proposed landscaping provides further screening and accentuates a visually recessive supermarket building. In keeping with the intent of the supermarket building's location, mass and form, both façade signage and corporate colours (PAK'nSAVE yellow) have been located central to the Site. The PAK'nSAVE yellow is the only corporate colour, and accordingly resides over and defines the main building entry as part of the modulated Entry sequence. This façade signage is located approximately 90-100m from the closest neighbouring properties on the opposite sides of Levi Road and Lincoln Rolleston Road. Façade signage along the North West Elevation is located approximately 65m from the nearest adjacent residential property on Levi Road and any potential effects on this property are considered to be <i>less than minor</i>.</p> <p>The signs will be located within open space inside the landscape strip, lining the two road frontages. Limited to the two main points of entry only, these are necessary for safe vehicle wayfinding and approach, in particular as the supermarket building is well set back from the main approaches on both Levi Road and Lincoln Rolleston Road, as illustrated in the perspectives provided in Revised Drawings RC09 and RC10 (Attachment E). Signage has been assessed in the Revised Urban Design Assessment (Attachment H), where the 10m-highpylon signs are considered to be out-of-scale with the residential streetscape context, and a reduction in height is recommended to mitigate these effects. In response, the height of the pylon signs has been reduced from 10m to 8m, which is consistent with Foodstuffs' standard pylon sign design in residential settings. The height of these signs will respond to the speed limits imposed on each road frontage, further aiding safe vehicle wayfinding and approach. Given the solar orientation, there will be no/negligible shadow cast outside of the Site (akin to a small tree trunk). The effects on amenity and character are therefore considered to be <i>less than minor</i>.</p>
Landscape	
<p>44. <i>In the RMM LVA the author states 'the existing landscape and visual amenity values form the baseline' along with the policy provisions, for an assessment of effects.' The proposal must therefore be assessed against a baseline of Living Z (ODP) and General Residential Zone (PSDP) rather than the existing predominantly rural character landscape. In addition to the B1 assessment can the</i></p>	<p>The Revised Landscape Assessment Report (Attachment D) contains a comparison of the Proposal against the anticipated outcome under the Living Z Zone (Rolleston ODP Area 4) and the General Residential Zone (pSDP). This acknowledges that the zoning enables low to medium-density residential activity, with a mixture of detached, semi-attached and attached units. It also shows how the proposed supermarket building setback and 10m landscape buffering relates to the low-density residential development along the eastern boundary with the neighbouring rural land.</p>

RFI matter	RFI Response
<i>applicant provide specific comment on the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development against the baseline residential typologies provided for in the existing and proposed zoning?</i>	
45. <i>Can the applicant provide a specific assessment of the LVA effects of proposed signage and lightning?</i>	As noted in response to RFI matter 43, the height of the proposed pylon signs have been reduced to 8m, and the corresponding assessment is included in the Revised Landscape Assessment Report (Attachment D). In summary, the 8m-high pylon signs are considered to better integrate with the proposed road frontage landscaping. The proposed lighting will be similar to other recently constructed PAK'nSAVEs, where the light poles will be positioned on the centre line between the car park spaces and will not impact on the regular arrangement of trees in diamond planters in the car parking areas. Other exterior lighting, such as entrances, landscape features, etc. will be resolved at detailed design stage.
46. <i>Will the applicant be making any design changes based on the McIndoe Urban Design report – e.g. the recommendations to revise the northern boundary landscaping to 'allow more balanced views to the building'?</i>	As discussed in response to other RFI matters, the height of the pylon signs has been reduced to 8m, an additional glazing band has been introduced to the North West Elevation at ground level, and the pleached hedge along the Levi Road frontage has been removed to achieve a more balanced approach with intermittent views in the Site, as recommended by McIndoe Urban Limited.
47. <i>Please confirm what specimen tree species are proposed for the parking lot and boundary planting.</i>	Attachment D contains a Revised Landscape Plan with an indicative plant list based on several key areas of the proposed development. This includes the tree planting in the car parking area and along road frontages.
48. <i>Can the applicant clarify proposed soil volumes in soil cells per tree to ensure there is sufficient volumes to support long term tree growth and health.</i>	This level of detail will be resolved at detailed design stage. However, it is noted that the trees will be planted into root cells backfilled with premium topsoil, rather than in structural soil pits. The root cells will be a minimum of two units high. These root cells will ensure the trees develop a large, healthy canopy, enabling the tree to grow to its natural mature form.
49. <i>Please advise whether the applicant would consider additional biodiversity introduced into the scheme – particularly within the Tussock/Grass areas.</i>	Attachment D contains a Revised Landscape Plan with an indicative plant list based on several key areas of the proposed development to help demonstrate the biodiversity of the landscaping. The Applicant is open to consider any further plant species, however it is considered important not to over-complicate or weaken the strong and refined proposed planting design.

RFI matter	RFI Response
50. Please advise what / where the soil volumes for the proposed climbing plants on the trellis are.	A conceptual detail is provided on page 16 of the Landscape Plan and supplementary graphics (Attachment D) showing the location of the small garden beds for the climbers. The garden beds are flush with the ground and will be 1600mm (L) x 500mm (W) x 400mm (D), which is 0.32m ³ of soil volume per climbing plant.
51. Please advise if the applicant can accommodate additional large trees in the south-eastern portion of the parking area and SW pond to help buffer this area further. The proposed Kouki/cabbage trees and lancewood planting will not afford a great deal of visual screening.	The amount of visual screening that will be provided by the cabbage trees and lancewoods is considered appropriate, particularly as these will be densely planted, and there are other trees nearby. The landscape design provides an appropriate balance between providing screening of the supermarket building and enabling views of the landscaped attenuation basin.
52. Screen planting along the southern boundary appears to be relatively light, please advise if the applicant would consider additional specimen tree plantings both north and south of the southern access road to help visually integrate views of the building from locations to the south of the site?	There appears to have been a layering error in the Landscape Plan attached at Appendix F of the resource consent application. Please refer to the Revised Landscape Plan at Attachment D . A pleached hedge, hedgerow and underplanting is proposed along the southern boundary, similar to the formerly proposed landscape treatment along the Site's frontage with Levi Road. The pleached hedge will provide appropriate visual screening of the supermarket building from the south.
53. Please elaborate why the existing shelterbelts, described as 'monotonous' have been used as a baseline for treatment along Levi Road (page 9) and considered as an appropriate mitigation measure. Please refer also to page 10 and 22, where the shelterbelt planting is described as 'uninteresting'/'not particularly interesting'. Has there been a strategic reason for trying to replicate a 'status quo' with the hedge planting, rather than responding to the proposal's overall effects and constraints?	The landscape treatment along the Levi Road frontage has been revised to a line of specimen trees, set behind a clipped hedge with low groundcover planting on the northern side between the footpath and hedge, and a mix of low shrub planting on the southern side of the hedge, adjacent to the car parking area. Attachment D contains a Revised Landscape Plan and Assessment Report, and supplementary graphics illustrating and assessing these changes. The proposed landscaping is not trying to replicate the status quo by planting a pleached hedge. The existing shelterbelt, described as "monotonous" and 'uninteresting', is essentially a solid wall of evergreen vegetation standing some 6m tall. The pleached hedge that was originally proposed, together with the other proposed planting, would have been an interesting planting composition, particularly as the pleached hedge was deciduous and echoed large rural garden practices. Nevertheless, the revised landscape treatment along the Levi Road frontage will be consistent with other supermarket landscape frontages and will be easier to maintain, given the pleached hedge would have required regular clipping and shaping. The revised landscape planting will provide visual interest and amenity and will be an appropriate transition from the existing environment for residential activity across the road.

RFI matter	RFI Response
54. <i>Have there been alternative designs considered (as mentioned in the Urban Design Assessment)?</i>	Yes, alternative designs were considered by the Applicant's Design Team, and following a lengthy design process, the current and preferred design of the PAK'nSAVE supermarket has been chosen as best delivering on functional and operational requirements while presenting an appropriate response for the receiving environment. The consideration of alternatives is only required where an activity will have significant adverse effects (Schedule 4, RMA). That is not the case with the Proposal.
55. <i>Please confirm that the existing vegetation and mature trees on site are not suitable to a commercial context. The report refers to 'urbanisation and residential living' (page 9). See also in this context 2.4 where trees are mentioned as the 'most prominent landscape feature on site.'</i>	The existing line of large gum trees on the Site is not considered suitable for the Proposal's commercial context. These large gum trees are located in the centre of the Site, which would make it difficult to incorporate them into any supermarket design. Gum trees also tend to drop branches from a height, which could cause injury to people or damage to property (buildings, vehicles).
56. <i>Please confirm source for statements made under header 'associative'. The site most likely will have a history and value to the people that lived on it.</i>	Page 9 of the Revised Landscape Assessment Report (Attachment D) states the Site does not have any widely known Tangata Whenua associations and experiences. This statement is based on a desktop assessment of the Ngāi Tahu archive of tribal significance website (www.kahurumanu.co.nz), which illustrates the main cultural mapping of the Ngāi Tahu territory that includes the Site. There are no areas of significance identified in the Rolleston area. Nevertheless, it is recognised that the Site likely has a history and value to the people that lived on it and the Design Team has sought to understand these values in order to incorporate them into the Proposal. However, to the wider community, the Site is not a place of significance and its identity is typical of other modified rural landscapes in the area.
57. <i>Please confirm at what approximate point in time the pleated hedge will have reached 5.5m to achieve outcome as shown on artist's impression. What will the outcome look like in the meantime? Please also advise whether passive surveillance and views into the site will be available</i>	As described in response to RFI matters 40 and 53, the pleached hedge originally proposed along the Levi Road frontage has been replaced with a line of specimen trees. These trees will be set out at 8m spacings and reach approximately 10m tall at maturity. This landscape treatment will provide a good balance between enabling views into the supermarket car parking area and providing visual screening of the supermarket building. The new landscape treatment will provide passive surveillance in accordance with CPTED best practices through all planting establishment stages.

RFI matter	RFI Response
<p>58. Please confirm at what approximate point in time the landscape buffer on the Eastern boundary will have reached maturity and the outcome, as shown on artist's impression. Will the mix of tree and low-level species be able to visually buffer the 12.3m high building? Please label on the landscape plan the type of trees that are used to be able to visualize the effects from deciduous and non-deciduous trees, except for the landscaping buffer to the East.</p>	<p>The tallest trees within the 10m wide landscape buffer along the eastern boundary of the Site include mountain beech, totara, and ribbonwood, which have mature heights of 20m, 15m and 12m, respectively. Based on plant growths (by Southernwoods Limited), the trees are expected to reach maturity within approximately 30 years. The supermarket building will be 12.3m at its apex and set back approximately 60m into the Site. The nearest building facades to the eastern boundary are 4.5m and 7.4m high, set back approximately 48m and 18m from the boundary, respectively. The taller of the two facades is approximately 37m long and the total eastern boundary length is approximately 180m in length. The earliest mitigation benefits from the landscape buffer along the eastern boundary are expected after 10 years, when the abovementioned trees will be 6m, 5m and 8m tall, respectively. It is noted that ribbonwood have a more rapid growth rate. The Revised Landscape Plan at Attachment D includes an indicative plant list for the landscape buffer along the eastern buffer.</p>
<p>59. Please label on the landscape plan the type of trees that are used to be able to visualize the effects from deciduous and non-deciduous trees, except for the landscaping buffer to the East.</p>	<p>Attachment D contains a Revised Landscape Plan with an indicative plant list.</p>
<p>60. Please provide a percentage of the amount of landscaping and tree planting areas in relation to the amount of proposed car parking.</p>	<p>A landscaping area of 11,314m² is proposed, which is approximately 27% of the overall development site and 33% of the overall carparking and landscaping area. The landscaping includes paths and tree pits. It is noted that the total development site is 41,400m², the supermarket building footprint is 7,232m² and the car parking area (excluding landscaping) is 22,854m².</p>
<p>61. Please confirm the 'informal arrangement of cabbage trees and lancewood' will provide visual amenity for adjacent sites with open street frontages. In this context, please explain lack of deciduous specimen trees along Lincoln Rolleston Road – see Rule 17.7 to mitigate effects from large areas of hardstand /car parking</p>	<p>The informal tree planting, comprising of groups of concentrated cabbage trees and lancewoods, together with a ribbonwood (added to the Revised Landscape Plan attached at Attachment D), will provide appropriate visual amenity for future adjacent sites with open road frontages.</p> <p>With regard to Rule 17.7 of the SDP, the proposed landscape treatment along the Site's frontage with Lincoln Rolleston Road is comparable to the Business Zone rules. While the Site is not zoned Business under the SDP, it does provides useful guidance for landscaping within a 3m and 1.5m wide continuous landscape strip, with taller species required for a narrower strip. The proposal has a 5m wide landscape strip and the tussock/grass planting, which exceeds the 0.6m height requirement for a 3m wide strip under the rules. The rules also require a minimum of one tree per 10m of road frontage (note: the rules do not specify how the trees are arranged nor that they must be deciduous species). The</p>

RFI matter	RFI Response
	<p>Proposal exceeds the minimum number of trees required when the cabbage trees and lancewoods are included. Deciduous trees will be planted along the road frontage within the stormwater overflow area ('pocket park').</p>
<p>62. <i>Please confirm that should PC71 be granted that the landscape buffer proposed will not create any (shading) issues for adjacent residential sites. The reference to existing shelterbelt within adjoining property might be removed and can be no longer relied on as an interim visual mitigation</i></p>	<p>The 10m wide landscape buffer planting and interface treatment on the eastern boundary of the Site has been updated in the Revised Landscape Plan and Assessment Report and illustrated in the supplementary graphics (Attachment D). As outlined in response to RFI matter 30, there are now two options proposed, which are dependent on the future zoning of the neighbouring land to the east:</p> <p>If PC71 is approved and the land is rezoned to General Residential, Option B will be implemented which will include a sparser planting arrangement to Option A (no more than 2m high), an acoustic fence set back 6m from the eastern boundary and nestled within planting, and a paling fence integrated with the retaining wall (2m high total). The tallest trees will be columnar species rather than wider species and will be planted in a more open arrangement. This will allow more sunlight to pass between the trees, while still providing sufficient visual screening of the building. The potential shading effects of this planting treatment has been assessed at different times throughout the year, and we are comfortable that the planting will not cause significant shading issues for potential residences should PC71 be granted. In addition, the boundary fence will be 2m high instead of 2.6m high, which is what could be anticipated within the Living Z zoning of the Site.</p> <p>The existing shelterbelt within the neighbouring property is not relied on for visual mitigation.</p>
<p>63. <i>Please provide explanation why maintaining open views takes precedence over mitigating adverse visual effects of development. Please confirm how an informal array of cabbage and lancewood trees provides a definition to the edge of LRR (16.10.2.6) and how the use of two species only provides visual interest and amenity?</i></p>	<p>The Proposal has been designed to maintain open views while mitigating adverse visual effects of development, with both working together in a fine balance without either taking precedence over the other. Rule 16.10.2.6 of the Business Zone provides useful guidance as to how the landscaping should be assessed, but this rule is not a specific requirement. While the Site is not located within the Business Zone, and most people utilising the PAK'nSAVE will drive to access it rather than walk in from the surrounding streets, the road frontage landscape treatment is considered appropriate for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ It assists with wayfinding and legibility (i.e. Levi Road has a formal planting arrangement, and Lincoln Rolleston Road an informal arrangement); and ■ The 5m wide landscape treatment strikes a good balance between open views and screening. The cabbage trees and lancewoods will be densely planted in groupings (noting that a single ribbonwood in each of these tree groups is now proposed) to provide partial screening and the area between will be planted with mixed tussock/grass planting, with some grass species exceeding 1m in height. This will allow for open views into the Site to provide

RFI matter	RFI Response
	<p>legibility, including sightlines to key signage along the road frontage. The tussock/grass planting will also be densely planted to provide a strong edge to the pedestrian footpath.</p> <p>The landscape treatment provides appropriate mitigation of any visual effects of the supermarket building and car parking area, and delivers visual interest and amenity for the pedestrian streetscape experience.</p>
64. <i>Please confirm species planted around attenuation basin, which is assisting in screening of supermarket building (page 29)?</i>	Attachment D contains a Revised Landscape Plan with an indicative plant list based on the several key areas of the proposed development, including the attenuation basin. Planting around the attenuation basin includes interspersed trees, flax and grasses/sedges. The ribbonwood, cabbage trees, lancewoods and flax will provide screening of the development from Lincoln Rolleston Road, while also providing views into the planted attenuation basin area.
65. <i>Please clarify what further tree planting is proposed, as referred to on the first paragraph of page 30.</i>	No further tree planting is proposed. The Revised Landscape Assessment Report (Attachment D) removes reference to further tree planting.
The Neighbourhood Park	
66. <i>Please confirm what uses are anticipated for the Neighbourhood Park (NHP), other than visual mitigation, and how future expansion of the roundabout could impact its future size and use. Please confirm how the NHP will be retained and maintained once the supermarket is operating – in other words what weight can be given to this green space if it might be changed in the immediate future?</i>	The north-west space is not a Neighbourhood Park. It essentially provides visual relief from the surrounding proposed supermarket building and car parking, and given its prominent location on the corner of two arterial roads (Levi Road and Lincoln Rolleston Road), will be enjoyed by many people traveling past or visiting the Site. While it is noted that the Rolleston ODP Area 4 includes a Neighbourhood Park internalised within the anticipated residential development of the Site, the intention is not to provide a Neighbourhood Park within the context of a commercial development.
67. <i>The 'pocket park' on the residual space seems to be a bit of an after-thought and in our opinion will be unlikely to have a high level of use given its location on the intersection of a busy road. Has the applicant considered alternative developments to help activate this space?</i>	While the Revised Landscape Assessment Report (Attachment D) refers to the north-west area of the Site as a 'pocket park', the primary underlying function is as a stormwater overflow and infiltration area. This area is only suitable for passive recreational activities that do not compromise its primary stormwater function.

RFI matter	RFI Response
<p>68. <i>If the 'pocket park' is to be retained as proposed could the planting areas be increased with specific design for improved biodiversity values? A sculptural feature and other furniture elements to help draw people into the space may also be useful to help increase the use of this space.</i></p>	<p>As noted in response to RFI matter 67, the main purpose of the space is for managing stormwater overflow. The tussock planting area contained within the 'pocket park' includes several different plant species that provide biodiversity and visual interest. While the addition of a sculptural feature to this area has been considered by the Applicant, preference is to provide low-key furniture elements (such as seating) that provide for community wellbeing by enabling people to rest a while within the space.</p>
Contaminated Land	
<p>69. <i>The Contaminated Land Officer at Environment Canterbury has reviewed the application and the PSI. The Officer notes that a site inspection has not been included in the investigation. It is noted that the PSI states that "it would be prudent to undertake a physical site inspection to confirm the findings of the desk based assessment" provided with the application. Further the report states that the applicability of the NESCS "can be confirmed following the recommended site inspection". Please advise whether the applicant is planning on completing a full DSI, or whether they will supplement the PSI with soil sampling and a site walkover?</i></p>	<p>Based on the currently reviewed information there has been no information to suggest that any HAIL activity has occurred at the Site (as stated in the PSI attached at Appendix D of the resource consent application). Resource consent is only being sought as a precaution. The Applicant is accepting of appropriate conditions of consent relating to managing contaminated land, such as the requirement to undertake a full DSI or to supplement the existing PSI with soil sampling and a site walkover prior to works commencing.</p>

Aurecon New Zealand Limited
Level 2, Iwikau Building
93 Cambridge Terrace
Christchurch 8013
New Zealand

T +64 3 366 0821
F +64 3 379 6955
E christchurch@aurecongroup.com
W aurecongroup.com



Attachment B: Response to RFI matters 3-26 (Transport)