

21 January 2022

Our reference: RC216016

Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited  
c/ Aurecon NZ Limited

Attention: Kirsty Clement

Sent via email: [Kirsty.clement@aurecongroup.com](mailto:Kirsty.clement@aurecongroup.com)

Dear Kirsty

## Request for Further Information

I have reviewed your resource consent application RC216016 to establish and operate a Pak'nSave supermarket. More information is needed so that I can better understand your proposal and its potential effects.

### Further information

In accordance with section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991, I request the following information:

#### General Matters

It is noted that there is a notation on the Location Plan (page 101 of the application) identifying "Fuel" within the car parking area. Similarly, the Geotechnical report includes reference to a fuel facility in page 1 of this report (page 124 of the application).

1. Please can you advise if there is an intention to build and operate a petrol station on this site.

The area of land subject to Plan Change 71 (PC71) is located immediately to the south of east of the application site. The hearing for PC71 is due to be held in February.

2. Please advise if the applicant has considered the implications of PC71 on the proposal.

#### Transport

The Council has engaged Mr Andy Carr of Carriageway Consulting to peer review the transport assessment. His comments and requests for further information are as follows:

##### *Traffic Generation / Modelling*

The report sets out traffic flows from 2019. However it is noted in the preceding paragraph that CSM2 opened in 2020, and the assessment of effects is largely based around a future year model of 2033.

3. Please confirm whether the 2019 traffic flows have been used in any analysis. If so, do they reflect the current environment post CSM2, or should they be updated?

It is stated that the supermarket is expected to generate 1,013 vehicle movements (two-way) in the peak hour. Of these, one third are pass-by trips, with the remainder being diverted or new trips, which equates to an additional 675 trips on the network adjacent to the site. Section 7.7 notes that the model has allowed for just 274 extra trips. That is, 60% of the expected increase in trips is apparently 'missing'. It is expected that this is because the model has reassigned those vehicles to use routes elsewhere on the network.

4. Please comment on whether this is realistic, given that Levi Road is stated in Section 3.1 as being "the main corridor between Rolleston town centre (and wider urban area) and the Weedons interchange". If indeed more than 400 vehicle movements have been reassigned to other routes, please indicate which roads experience an increase in traffic, what the increase is, and whether it is appropriate for those routes to accommodate longer-distance through traffic currently using an Arterial Road.

In the alternative to the matter above

5. Please provide a sensitivity test which assumes traffic signals at the adjacent intersection but with the supermarket traffic being additional to the expected traffic flows (that is, allowing for pass-by traffic accessing the supermarket, but not making any allowance for unrelated traffic to move onto alternative routes).

The report notes that the Lowes Road / Lincoln Rolleston Road intersection is to be upgraded to traffic signals in 2025-26.

6. Please advise whether funding for this has been confirmed, and hence the reliance that can be placed on this timing. In other words, if the upgrade was to be delayed for several years, what effects would arise at the intersection due to the supermarket?

Figure 7.3 shows an indicative layout for a scheme at the Levi Road / Lowes Road intersection. This layout has no clearance between the proposed kerbline and the northwestern corner of the site and so a footpath could not be provided within the road reserve here. It also shows a wide crossing on the southern approach, likely to be associated with a shared walking/cycling route, but the report states that the shared route should be on the north of Levi Road (not the south). It also appears that the indicated left-turn lane on Lowes Road means that the existing footpath would need to be removed, as the extent of land remaining between the kerbline and the road boundary is too narrow. While it is appreciated that it is a sketch design, it appears that this layout is at odds with statements made in the report.

7. Please can the layout (or the report) be updated so that they are consistent with one another. This issue is particularly relevant for the number of approach lanes, as if the three lanes currently assumed have to be decreased to two lanes, then the capacity of the intersection will change.
8. Please provide queue lengths from all modelling reported, and comment on whether queues at the Lowes Road / Lincoln Rolleston Road intersection will extend as far as the site accesses (and if so, what effects on road safety and efficiency may arise).

#### *Walking / Cycling*

It is set out that "Levi Road is proposed to be upgraded at some stage in the future" and this will include a shared path. However in Section 5.2 it is noted that "pedestrians and cyclists can access the site via the shared path planned by Council". In other words, mitigation is relied upon (in Section 5.2) where there is no confirmed scheme (as described in Section 4.2). The report also sets out that a footpath at the site frontage is "proposed" by the applicant.

9. Please confirm the location and extent of the footpath that is proposed by the applicant.

10. Please provide further details regarding the pedestrian phases at the proposed traffic signals. Are they called on each cycle? Is 'walk with traffic' assumed, or are the phases exclusive?
11. Please advise whether any additional formal pedestrian crossing facilities are justified on either of the frontage roads.

The footpath on Levi Road at Access D is shown as diverting southwards and across a refuge. This means that any pedestrians walking east-west (and not going to the supermarket) will walk outside the road reserve and through part of the site.

12. Please confirm that this is intended (from previous commissions it is understood that this is typically not an acceptable arrangement to developers).

#### *Site Accesses*

13. Please comment on the road safety effects of the weaving movement between the left-turn exit onto Levi Road and the right-turn lane into Masefield Drive, taking into account the limited distance available (the plans are not to scale, but it appears to be about 40m) and the expected queue lengths.
14. Please confirm the layout of the site accesses that have been tested.
15. Please undertake an assessment to identify whether auxiliary turning lanes are required for vehicles turning left or right into the site at each access.
16. Please advise how the left-in/left-out arrangement at Access B be enforced? Raised median or driver goodwill? Similarly please advise how drivers will be prevented from turning right into Access C.

Access E is noted as being for vehicle turning left into the site only.

17. Please advise how this is to be achieved, and the right-turn movement into the site, or exit movements prevented. This access is noted as being 7.4m wide, which is ample for two-way flow (and for drivers to perceive that two-way flow is anticipated).
18. Given that Access A leads to the service yard, please provide details of how the public will be directed to avoid them inadvertently entering the service yard
19. Please provide further details regarding the need for three vehicle accesses onto Levi Road, and comment on the benefits for a reduced potential for pedestrian/vehicle conflict by having only two accesses.

#### *Tracking Curves*

20. Please provide tracking diagrams that are to scale.
21. Given that truck+trailer units are expected, please provide tracking curves for these vehicles.
22. Please provide tracking curves for trucks exiting and exiting the site from both frontage roads. Please comment as to whether exiting turning trucks will result in them over-running the centreline of the frontage road, or whether entering turning trucks will over-run areas where cars might be waiting to exit. If so, please comment as to whether this leads to any adverse road safety effects.

It is stated that the car park accommodates a 99th percentile vehicle but no swept paths are provided to demonstrate this.

23. Please provide a swept path for a 99th percentile vehicle entering the site via Access D, and also for a vehicle entering/exiting several typical parking spaces.

The swept path for a semitrailer (at the southeastern corner) shows it over-running outside the proposed service lane (on the inside radius) and crossing well over the centreline of the service lane.

24. Please advise whether any design changes are proposed in this location, and comment on whether over-running in this manner will lead to adverse road safety effects.

#### *District Plan Matters*

Rule E13.1.10.1 (Queuing Space) allows queuing space to be apportioned "in accordance with their potential usage". The calculation shown in the ITA simply divides the queuing space by the number of accesses and therefore has been incorrectly.

25. Please revise the assessment of queuing space to take account of the usage of the accesses, as the wording of the Rule requires and comment on any non-compliance that arises.

There appears to be signage to the immediate east of Access D.

26. Please confirm that this does not adversely affect sight distances.

#### **Urban Design**

Ms Gabi Wolfer, Urban Designer SDC has reviewed the proposal and the urban design assessment. Her comments and requests for further information are as follows:

27. Please identify bore location on site;
28. Please provide labels on the landscape plan;
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.
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'
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
32. Please advise whether the applicant has considered alternative design concepts where the click and collect area is positioned closer to the Levi Road interface.
33. Please advise whether pedestrian routes have been aligned with desire lines
34. 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.
35. Please address the pedestrian connection in the North-East corner within landscape buffer for potential safety and legibility issues (CPTED)

It is noted that the application references sun shading studies as part of the assessment of the bulk and location of the building.

36. Please provide shadow models to confirm the effects from the built form on adjoining sites

As has been noted, the land east of the application site is subject to PC71,

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

It is noted that the scale of the proposed building will result in facades of 84 – 100 metres

38. 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

It is noted that the report states that the north-east building frontage has achieved being an "active frontage"

39. Please provide further information to confirm how the north-east building frontage is an active frontage.

Crime Prevention through Environmental Design is an important consideration for a large commercial site within the township

40. Please provide additional commentary addressing CPTED matters, including opportunities for passive surveillance both into and from the site.

41. Please confirm hierarchy of pedestrian routes within car park (as mentioned on page 24). Please confirm how safety in public spaces is addressed?

### *Signage*

42. Please provide percentages of the corporate colours and signage for the elevations of the building;

43. 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.

### **Landscape**

Boffa Miskell have been engaged to peer review the proposal on behalf of the Council. The proposal has also been peer reviewed internally by relevant experts. Their comments and requests for further information are as follows:

44. 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 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?

45. Can the applicant provide a specific assessment of the LVA effects of proposed signage and lightning?

46. 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'?

47. Please confirm what specimen tree species are proposed for the parking lot and boundary planting.

48. 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.

49. Please advise whether the applicant would consider additional biodiversity introduced into the scheme – particularly within the Tussock/Grass areas.

50. Please advise what / where the soil volumes for the proposed climbing plants on the trellis are.

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 Te Kōuka/cabbage trees and lancewood planting will not afford a great deal of visual screening.

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?

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?
54. Have there been alternative designs considered (as mentioned in the Urban Design Assessment)?
55. 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.'
56. 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.
57. 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
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?
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.
60. Please provide a percentage of the amount of landscaping and tree planting areas in relation to the amount of proposed car parking
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
62. 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
63. 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?
64. Please confirm species planted around attenuation basin, which is considered to be assisting in screening of supermarket building (page 29)?
65. Please clarify what further tree planting is proposed, as referred to on the first paragraph of page 30.

#### *The Neighbourhood Park*

66. 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?
67. 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?



68. 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.

### **Contaminated Land**

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”.

69. 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?

### **Additional Information**

Due to the time of the year, there are a number of experts away from the office, and therefore have not had an opportunity to review and comment on the application. Please be advised that there may be additional questions raised by these experts. I will endeavour to get any additional questions to you as soon as possible.

You must respond in writing to this request before Friday, 11 February 2022 and do one of the following:

- (a) Provide the information; or
- (b) Tell us that you agree to provide the information, but propose a reasonable alternative date; or
- (c) Tell us that you refuse to provide the information

Please note that if you do not respond in some way before Friday, 11 February 2022 or you refuse to provide the information requested, we are required to publicly notify your application. This will result in increased costs to you and take longer to process. It is important that you respond to this request, otherwise your application can be declined for lack of information.

I have placed the processing of this application on hold until we receive your complete response. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'Jane Anderson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

**Jane Anderson**

Consultant Planner