

22 March 2024

RC245088

Planz Consultants Limited  
PO Box 1845  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140  
Attention: Matt Bonis

*Sent via email: matt@planzconsultants.co.nz*

Dear Mr. Bonis

## s92 - Request for Further Information and Affected Party Approval

I have reviewed the resource consent application **RC245088** by Woolworths New Zealand Limited to establish and operate a supermarket and small-scale ancillary retail tenancies, including associated earthworks, access, carparking, signage and landscaping at 597 East Maddisons Road, Rolleston. 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:

#### Consent Notices

1. The Record of Title has two consent notices registered against it. Please provide copies of these consent notices to confirm whether they affect the current application.

#### Drawings

2. Please amend the drawings to clearly show the building in relation to boundary and setback infringements. At present it is difficult to identify those parts of the application that infringe those controls.
3. Please also confirm the length of these infringements, as only the height/depth of each has been provided.

#### Flood Assessment Certificate (FAC)

4. The application site is located within the Plains Flood Management Overlay. Rule NH-R2.3 of the Partially Operative Plan requires the application to demonstrate that the principal building's finished floor level is

equal to or higher than the minimum floor level in an issued FAC. Please either provide a copy of the FAC for the proposal or submit a FAC application to Selwyn District Council.

#### Water Race

5. Given the non-complying status of the application it has been referred to Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited (Mahaanui) for a Cultural Assessment Report. Mahaanui have requested further details on the application's relationship to the water race that runs along the site's road boundary with Goulds Road. Please confirm what works, if any, are proposed to the water race and the status of any application (under the RMA or Local Government Act) to close, culvert or otherwise modify it.

#### Signage Standards

6. Thank you for the detailed assessment of the proposal against relevant Partially Operative Plan (PODP) standards. However, the assessment provided for signage has been undertaken on a cumulative basis for the surface area of all signs. The PODP sign standards (both for free-standing and attached signs) is based on the surface area of each individual sign. As such, can you please provide an amended assessment that details the surface area for each sign.
7. In addition, please provide amend the assessment to include SIGN-R1/SIGN-REQ4 ( Built Form – Signs Projecting from the Face of a Building). This includes the maximum projection of each sign from building facades.
8. Lastly, please confirm the overall number of signs proposed. The figure given in the AEE and Appendix L (PODP assessment) currently differ.

#### Lighting

9. Please confirm whether resource is being sought for an infringement of lighting standards. Appendix L states that resource consent is required due to proposed lux levels, while the AEE states that this lighting will comply.

#### Transport

10. The proposed Shillingford Boulevard and Goulds Road accesses will lead to vehicles crossing shared paths. Please detail what measures have been considered to ensure drivers are aware of pedestrians and cyclists on these routes, including reference to:

- a) The recommendations of the NZTA “High-Use Driveway Treatment for Cycle Paths and Shared Paths”; and
- b) Pedestrian visibility splay requirements of the NZTA “Pedestrian planning and design guide”, or whether further visibility is required to account for higher speed cyclists.

11. Section 8.2 of the ITA states that limit lines are proposed within the site to highlight the need to give-way to shared path users. These do not appear to have been provided for the courier and pick-up exit points. Please confirm whether these will be provided.

12. The Shillingford Boulevard car park access has the proposed limit line illustrated within the road reserve, on the carriageway side of the shared path crossing. We assume this is an error, as it has vehicles stopped approximately 5m back from the carriageway. Please relocate this limit line to prior to the shared path for vehicles exiting the site.

13. Although not on the site plan in Appendix A, Figure 8-1 and Figure 8-7 of the ITA appear to show tactile paving on the shared path where the car park access crosses. At other points, the ITA states that the shared path will have priority over vehicles using the access, so we assume that there will be no tactile paving provided (as this implies pedestrians and cyclists would give-way). Please confirm that pedestrians and cyclists will have priority at this location and that no tactile paving is proposed.

14. The Goulds Road and Shillingford Boulevard car park accesses have been designed to accommodate two Medium Rigid Vehicles passing at the boundary, although there are no loading bays within the car park. The discussion of loading (Section 8.4) suggests that the loading of the complementary retail would be undertaken from within the car park by small delivery vehicles and is likely to occur outside of peak times. Our concern is that 8.8m long Medium Rigid Trucks are notably longer than the 5.0m parking spaces, so there is potential that these vehicles would block the aisle at the Shillingford Boulevard boundary, where the retail is located. Please confirm:

- a) What the 8.8m truck is the anticipated / potential loading vehicle for these activities is and (if so) please provide a Loading Management Plan (or similar). The objective of this management plan is to ensure that loading occurs outside of peak times and that space is made temporarily available within the car park for that loading; or
- b) If only small vehicles are proposed, please reduce the width of the Goulds Road access (in particular) to lessen the crossing distance for pedestrians and cyclists.

15. The queue space discussion for the Shillingford Boulevard access references the distance back to the carriageway. Please provide further comments regarding the potential for vehicles to queue across the shared path, given the conflicts with vehicles using the parking spaces closest to the access.
16. The Shillingford Boulevard access includes a break in the median to accommodate traffic turning right into and out of the site. Please confirm what the predicted queue length is for vehicles turning right into the site is. Furthermore please provide vehicle tracking to confirm that vehicles (turning right into the site) are able to satisfactorily enter this right turn bay and not block following vehicles on Shillingford Boulevard. The tracking must be based on:
- a) The number of cars anticipated to queue at the access (i.e. if the predicted queue length is two vehicles, then two cars should be able to wait clear of the through lane); and
  - b) The design vehicle being assumed for loading (currently an 8.8m truck at this location).
17. There are discrepancies in the description of loading frequencies between sections 9.1 and 11.3. Section 9.1 suggests there will be 20 to 30 loading movements per hour, with six of these being truck and trailers. Section 11.3 describes these as vehicle movements per day.
18. Comments are made that the recently constructed Shillingford Boulevard / Goulds Road roundabout will be able to accommodate the semi-trailer tracking. Please provide vehicle tracking to confirm that assessment.
19. Please confirm whether the road frontage upgrades proposed for the subdivision will be complete prior to the supermarket complex opening.
20. The labelling in Appendix B regarding the Goulds Road / Site Access volumes and delays appears to be incorrect. Please confirm that the Goulds Road west volumes are the Site access volumes.
21. Please confirm whether there will be any time or use restrictions on the proposed car park (i.e. will it be limited to P120 or visitor only)? This is to understand to what extent staff parking could occur on-street (if at all).
13. With regards to passenger transport, Council has requested that a bus bay be provided on Shillingford Boulevard. Please confirm whether this can be provided for within the proposed layout of Shillingford Boulevard (potentially linking to the footpath connection through the car park)?

You must respond in writing to this request before Wednesday 17 April 2024 or/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 Wednesday 17 April 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 put processing of your application on hold until we receive your complete response. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Yours faithfully



**Tim Hegarty**

**Principal Planner – Jacobs**