

Jackson, Andrew

From: Cottam, Rachel
Sent: Friday, 26 May 2023 11:07 am
To: tim@novogroup.co.nz
Cc: Ben Owen; Higgins, John; Richard Peebles; Jorgensen, Craig; Lowe, Paul
Subject: RMA/2022/3611 - Request for further information 320A Cumnor Terrace

Hi Tim,

The noise report and tree assessment have been assessed by our relevant specialist and I note a further request for further information is required. This is discussed further below.

Acoustic

Our acoustic engineer has reviewed the application and has further questions about the report and modelling – see below:

1. *The introduction section mentions noise from refrigerated containers as a source from the site. It does not re-appear in the modelling section. Will many refrigerated containers be operating from the site, and if so how will this impact on the predicted noise levels (including at night-time)? If there will be a number of these operating from the site they should be accounted for, and the assumptions made clear as it could contribute appreciably to overall noise emissions.*
2. *We have been provided with a summary of nearby resident complaints which mentions that container impacts (with each other and the ground) along with reversing beepers are a particularly distinctive part of noise from the site. This type of noise may not be well captured by the District Plan L_{Aeq} noise limit. Can maximum noise levels from these type of events on the site be provided (including if they occur at height), along with commentary on the character of the noise and whether it warrants a penalty for impulsiveness or tonality. We note that as a discretionary activity, wider noise effects can be considered, not just compliance with the Plan limits.*
3. *Residents also mention that variation in noise levels can occur depending on how gentle operators are with the placement of containers. Can PFC provide comment on whether this may have any impact on their assumptions and predicted noise levels?*
4. *The contour in figure 5.1 does not appear to be a complete representation of the proposal (for example it shows noise contours extending to the south-west, where figure 1.1 shows a barrier). Can PFC provide a complete set of contours which represents overall noise emissions from the site, including all proposed mitigation? Ideally this would show contours down to 45 dB L_{Aeq} , and be zoomed out so noise emissions towards Ferry Road can be seen.*
5. *We have several other questions about the detail of the modelling as follows:*
 - a. *What gap size has been allowed between containers, and how does this relate to the grid size used to generate the contours? Figure 5.1 also shows a large gap in the north-east corner of the barrier. Is this intended?*
 - b. *Is there any “at height” contribution in the modelling, for example from containers being stacked at height?*

- c. *Hoists are shown operating close to the barrier. Have PFC investigated whether there is any difference in the amount of screening and therefore predicted noise levels if they operate further back on the site?*
 - d. *The PFC report notes that “modelled reflections from other container stacks within the yard (in from the perimeter) and found that they do not significantly impact calculated noise levels at residential properties.” Can PFC provide more detail on what level of increase “not significant” means, and how they have modelled this. In our experience SoundPlan modelling using ISO 9613 has limitations in the way it accounts for complex reflections in “semi-reverberant” spaces.*
6. *There appears to be another container yard operating from the same site, which operates 24/7. Can PFC provide comment whether there may be cumulative noise implications from similar activities operating on the same site? It may not be easy for residents to make distinction between these separate operations from a noise effects perspective.*
 7. *Residents have raised concerns that traffic noise levels have increased since container walls have been installed due to reflections off the barrier. Can PFC provide an assessment which quantifies any likely change in level or character?*
 8. *Residents mention that vibration from containers being moved can be felt. Can PFC provide commentary on this aspect of the proposed activity?*

The specialist are also potentially going onsite to complete their assessment. It may be beneficial for a meeting between the acoustic specialists to discuss aspects of the proposal further if needed.

Arborist

The arborist has got back to me last week and have requested the following information:

While I acknowledge that an arborist has provided some details, we would generally require advice to come from a technician arborist, especially when it comes to decisions around removal.

A list of technician arborists can be found on our website:

<https://ccc.govt.nz/consents-and-licences/resource-consents/resource-consent-activities/general-rules-and-information/protected-trees-and-guidelines>

I understand that there is some urgency for this and I will ensure it is prioritised once we receive feedback from their technician arborist.

It would be good to get this sorted as part of the RFI response however I note that this is not likely to affect the notification process.

Ecology

I have met with the ecologists on discussing whether the south bund is acceptable. Their comments are summarised below:

“The specialists consider that a bund located within Esplanade Reserve land, particularly on the south west creates adverse effects for ecology and ecological habitat and should be removed for the following reasons:

- *It will make it difficult to create a viable or successful riparian buffer in this area with the bund present in any form;*
- *Landscape vegetation planted at ground level (as per the original and natural ground level for the site) are likely to establish, and be more successful/reach suitable heights, as opposed to being planted at an elevated height on an artificial bund;*
- *While the bund material may not be contaminated, if it is cleanfill, it may be unlikely to contain a suitable proportion of natural topsoil for establishing vegetation to its full potential/scale;*

- *While the northern bund is not ideal, it is noted that ecology effects need to be balanced with visual and acoustic impacts;*
- *If the south west bund remains it creates an unacceptable effect in terms of ecology”*

The herpetologist has noted that salvage could occur along the northern boundary which may resolve the issue with re-establishing the area with less dense vegetation in this area. I would recommend that the herpetologists meet to discuss this further.

I note that if the soil material in the south west area is confirmed to be suitable for growing plants, it could be used along the northern boundary bund.

If you would like to discuss anything further, let me know and I will give you a call.

Thanks,

Rachel Cottam

Senior Planner

Planning Team 5



03 941 8650



Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz



Te Hononga Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch



PO Box 73013, Christchurch 8154



ccc.govt.nz



From: Tim Walsh - Novo Group <tim@novogroup.co.nz>

Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2023 11:53 AM

To: Cottam, Rachel <Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz>

Cc: Lowe, Paul <Paul.Lowe@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: TRIM: RE: RMA/2022/3611 - Request for further information 320A Cumnor Terrace

Hi Rachel

In response to item 5, please find attached the as-built plans for the haul road. As per the application, some minor earthworks are required in the area shown in this plan “to bury the haul road, to provide a bed of topsoil for planting, and regrade towards the river”.

As of now, the applicant has responded to items 1 (via Pinnacle Group), 3 and 5. I’ll give you an update on item 2 ASAP. As discussed previously, item 4 will be best resolved following a site meeting. Rob (surveyor) and Ben (applicant rep) can meet you at the site next Wednesday or Thursday morning anytime between 9.30am and 12pm. Does that suit?

Best regards

Tim Walsh

M: 027 267 0000

From: Tim Walsh - Novo Group
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 2:55 PM
To: Cottam, Rachel <Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: RMA/2022/3611 - Request for further information 320A Cumnor Terrace

Hi Rachel

In response to item 3, I've attached an aerial showing the three trees that were removed in accordance with the arborist report (Tree A = Blue, Tree B = yellow, Tree C = red). Work is underway to respond to the other further information items.

Best regards

Tim Walsh

M: 027 267 0000

From: Cottam, Rachel <Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2023 12:05 PM
To: Tim Walsh - Novo Group <tim@novogroup.co.nz>
Cc: Lowe, Paul <Paul.Lowe@ccc.govt.nz>; Higgins, John <John.Higgins@ccc.govt.nz>; Weston, Tracey <Tracey.Weston@ccc.govt.nz>; Ward, Sean <Sean.Ward@ccc.govt.nz>; Jorgensen, Craig <Craig.Jorgensen@ccc.govt.nz>; Ben Owen <ben@peeblesgroup.co.nz>; richard@peeblesgroup.co.nz; Rob Howe <rob.howe@woods.co.nz>; Chris Greenshields <chris@dcmurban.com>
Subject: RMA/2022/3611 - Request for further information 320A Cumnor Terrace

Hi Tim,

Hope you are well and had a good break. I have spoken to most of the specialists in terms of the RFI response. We do require some further information which I have listed below. I have also provided some feedback and required changes needed to application to allow some components to be considered acceptable from the specialists. If the applicant does not agree to this, please can you outline this and detail the reasoning as we can provide this to the commissioner for the notification/substantial decisions.

My understanding is that there is no further information required from Jeremy Head and he is currently writing up his assessment.

Further information

1. As acknowledged previously, a noise assessment will be provided later this month;
2. Council officers still require a detailed site investigation to be provided for haulage routes and bund material. The environmental officer has provided the following comments:

“Although CCL have undertaken sampling of crushed material they cannot be considered fully independent as they are developing the site and they are not contaminated land experts. We cannot be sure of the location that sampling has been taken from to give us confidence in any particular area. I also note their lack of information regarding the ACM stockpile and what happened to it. Given the ACM discovery last year there is a concern that material containing asbestos has been included in the concrete crushing and I would still like to see a DSI completed by a contaminated land expert, for the land to be vested in Council.”

3. In terms of the arborist report provided, it is unclear where the location of the trees are. Please can this be identified on a hand annotated aerial map. Once I have this, I can sent this through to the arborist for comment.
4. We require a finished levels plan for Lot 305. The channel you have mentioned in your RFI response at 75/81 Kennaway Road is illegal and all industrial lots should be draining directly to Kennaway Road. We need to obtain confirmation that Lot 305 is not draining into 75/85 Kennaway Road to determine the next compliance steps.
5. We need a further as-built of the remainder of the haulage route fill highlighted in pink below. The current as built only shows levels up to the first flush wetland and not the start of the haulage route. Please ensure the landscaping plan also starts at the start of the haulage route entrance.



Further comments and amendments required

Landscaping



The ecologists are relatively happy with the proposed landscaping plan subject to the comments below. There may be some detailed conditions in terms of landscaping. The bird habitat needs to be extended to the H in the Heathcote river as shown above however the lizard habitat can remain as proposed on the plans. In terms of the haulage route, the area will be sheet/shaped to flow gently to the river (sloped 2% to the top of the bank) and will require the illegal channel to be filled as part of these works.

The main concern is the south west bund. The Parks Team do not accept the south west bund due to the crushed concrete material and the uncertainty of the contamination are the reasons. They will be recommending that this is removed as it a liability to Council. It is noted the northern bund is required for mitigation and the acceptance of this bund will depend on the contamination levels found in this area. This bund may also need to be replaced with topsoil to ensure it is suitable for planting. It is considered that 300mm topsoil is not suitable for larger vegetation establishment. If the applicant were to accept the removal of the south west bund, this would resolve the footpath issue in this area. It is recommended that a 2m crusher dust footpath is setback 2-3 metres from the internal boundary along the south western reserve’s length.

I anticipate that the applicant may not agree to all the recommendations or viewpoints of Council therefore if you could provide commentary of what the applicant agrees with and does not, it will assist with my recommendation report.

Consent notice

We propose that instead of the consent notice being cancelled, that it is changed to include the following:
Stormwater runoff from roofs (not including shipping containers) in a 10% ARI storm shall discharge directly to the Heathcote River via a conveyance system separated from roading and hardstand runoff.
All roof flows in excess of the 10% ARI will discharge to the vegetated swales

Council stormwater officers do not want untreated water from shipping containers going directly into the waterway. This is due to the material of the shipping containers (including the paint and any other coating required for the maintenance of the containers). In the event industrial buildings are established onsite, the consent notice is still required. Happy to discuss this further. The remainder of the consent notices I am happy for them to be removed.

Happy to discuss these points further with you.


Thanks,

Rachel Cottam

Senior Planner

Planning Team 5




 03 941 8650

 Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz

 Te Hononga Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

 PO Box 73013, Christchurch 8154

 ccc.govt.nz



From: Tim Walsh - Novo Group <tim@novogroup.co.nz>

Sent: Friday, 24 March 2023 9:14 am

To: Cottam, Rachel <Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz>

Cc: Lowe, Paul <Paul.Lowe@ccc.govt.nz>; Higgins, John <John.Higgins@ccc.govt.nz>; Weston, Tracey <Tracey.Weston@ccc.govt.nz>; Ward, Sean <Sean.Ward@ccc.govt.nz>; Jorgensen, Craig <Craig.Jorgensen@ccc.govt.nz>; Ben Owen <ben@peeblesgroup.co.nz>; richard@peeblesgroup.co.nz; Rob Howe <rob.howe@woods.co.nz>; Chris Greenshields <chris@dcmurban.com>

Subject: TRIM: RE: RMA/2022/3611 - Request for further information 320A Cumnor Terrace

Morning Rachel

The Esplanade Ecological Principles Plan in Appendix 1 had the bird habitat and visual mitigation planting areas mixed up in the version I sent last night. Follow the [link](#) to download the correct version.

Best regards

Tim Walsh

M: 027 267 0000

From: Tim Walsh - Novo Group
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2023 8:59 PM
To: Cottam, Rachel <Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz>
Cc: Lowe, Paul <Paul.Lowe@ccc.govt.nz>; Higgins, John <John.Higgins@ccc.govt.nz>; Weston, Tracey <Tracey.Weston@ccc.govt.nz>; Ward, Sean <Sean.Ward@ccc.govt.nz>; Jorgensen, Craig <Craig.Jorgensen@ccc.govt.nz>; Ben Owen <ben@peeblesgroup.co.nz>; richard@peeblesgroup.co.nz; Rob Howe <rob.howe@woods.co.nz>; Chris Greenshields <chris@dcmurban.com>
Subject: RE: RMA/2022/3611 - Request for further information 320A Cumnor Terrace

Hi Rachel

Please follow the [link](#) to download the RFI response. Let me know if you have any trouble accessing the document.

I'll give you a call to discuss.

Best regards

Tim Walsh

M: 027 267 0000

From: Cottam, Rachel <Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 18 January 2023 9:28 am
To: Tim Walsh - Novo Group <tim@novogroup.co.nz>
Cc: Lowe, Paul <Paul.Lowe@ccc.govt.nz>; Higgins, John <John.Higgins@ccc.govt.nz>; Weston, Tracey <Tracey.Weston@ccc.govt.nz>; Ward, Sean <Sean.Ward@ccc.govt.nz>; Jorgensen, Craig <Craig.Jorgensen@ccc.govt.nz>; Ben Owen <ben@peeblesgroup.co.nz>; richard@peeblesgroup.co.nz
Subject: RMA/2022/3611 - Request for further information 320A Cumnor Terrace

Hi Tim,

I just left you a voice message. Please find attached the request for further information for the application at 320A Cumnor Terrace. The RFI points are in terms of the visual assessment, subdivision matters (consent notices, reserves), cultural values, noise, environmental health and ecology.


Once you have had a read through, happy to have a face to face, teams meeting or a phone call to go through the points in detail. It may be beneficial for a round table meeting with all specialists at some point also.

Attached is an addendum which should be read alongside the RFI, this contains preliminary advice from the specialists. A previous ornithology assessment have also been attached for your reference.

Thanks,

Rachel Cottam

Senior Planner
Planning Team 5

 03 941 8650

-  Rachel.Cottam@ccc.govt.nz
 -  Te Hononga Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
 -  PO Box 73013, Christchurch 8154
 -  ccc.govt.nz
-



This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete the email.



This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete the email.

