

CODC request/question ¹	Response	
<p>4. Rooding A walk over of the site was undertaken by Richie Ford (Landpro), Peter Greenwood and Neville Jelley in December 2017 to discuss aspects of the likely subdivision, particularly in respect to the impact of/on historic land features. The walk over was in response to an email from Richie Ford dated 30 November 2017 outlining a number of departures from Council's engineering standards. Following that walkover Council outlined several matters requiring particular attention in any application for subdivision consent. These matters included:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Specialised & intensive geometric design to ensure that the low operating speed is achieved as a result of the actual street operating environment & not reliant on speed restriction signage.</i> • <i>Close collaboration with Council's Rooding Engineer to ensure that design criteria/assumptions/decisions are acceptable to Council</i> • <i>Additional work on the proposed ROW's & accessways which are not favoured at oblique angles to the street (note Pg 96 of Councils Rooding Policies January 2015 requires accessways to intersect with property boundary</i> • <i>Available corridor for services off carriageway & not to disturb races</i> • <i>Safe corridor for cyclists & pedestrians</i> • <i>Defining method for stormwater disposal – are races to be used in whole or part, disposal to natural water courses etc</i> • <i>Positive one way directing of traffic around head of cul de sac to prevent short cutting/entry along incorrect leg.</i> 	<p>The applicant proposes that this be dealt with at engineering approval.</p> <p>The applicant (via Landpro) have been in contact with Council's Rooding Engineer on the draft scheme completed and expect there to be ongoing collaboration throughout the process.</p> <p>See amended scheme plan (Appendix A at page 4) for additional details. The applicant (via Landpro) is happy to talk the Rooding Engineer through the designed scheme created.</p> <p>The applicant proposes that this be dealt with at engineering approval stage.</p> <p>A specific walking/cycling track is being proposed as part of this proposal.</p> <p>Any water collected through natural topography will travel down the race as a normal flow path as it currently does. Further details are expected to be dealt with at engineering approval stage.</p> <p>The applicant proposes that this be dealt with at engineering approval stage.</p>
<p>Further information is required to address the concerns outlined above. In addition to the matters listed above, Council notes that the section of road proposed to loop off the Terrace Street extension to the south appears to narrow considerably adjoining Lots 2-4. Further information is requested to clarify;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Why this section of road is of reduced width,</i> • <i>what the reduced width is, and</i> • <i>whether the road width it is adequate to contain the necessary carriageway and services.</i> 	<p>Regarding Lot 101 – the 12 metres road width reduces the shoulder requirement on one side due the existing underlying formation.</p> <p>12 metres.</p> <p>It is expected the road width will be adequate to contain the necessary carriageway and services.</p>
<p>Furthermore, you are requested to provide concept rooding detail including:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Carriageway layout including turning areas</i> • <i>Typical cross sections for road & ROW's showing impact on water races & drainage provisions</i> 	<p>Refer to scheme plan design information provided and the road type sheet produced (Appendix A at page 4).</p> <p>Refer to the road type sheet produced (Appendix A at page 4).</p>

¹ From their section 92/Request for Further Information letter sent to the Trusts on 20 May 2019

<p>5. Reserves (Lot 200) <i>Further details are requested addressing the intended walkway & viewing platforms (alignment, linkage with Terrace Street, width, surfacing etc).</i></p>	<p>The topography of Lot 200 leading down to the bottom of the terrace will not allow a NZ cycle trail standard path. However it is envisaged that a track will be created similar to what exists on other parts of the property already (and at the Bannockburn sluicings) to encourage informal use. This track is not envisaged to need any formal maintenance, but can be used by pedestrians/cyclists and dog walkers.</p>
<p>6. Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provide indicative layout of the water & wastewater reticulation.</i> • <i>Services to be located within road or ROW's wherever possible (not through sections).</i> • <i>Confirm all lots can be gravity fed to wastewater reticulation (show any lots requiring pumping)</i> 	<p>The initial servicing plans have been sketched up for Council's reference, see plans provided (at Appendix A, page 3). A final plan on servicing will only be completed after consent is granted, the initial plans are just to show that the design can be serviced.</p> <p>Unfortunately, a number of services will need to be located within private property, but these are largely located in Right of Way corridors. The key consideration when establishing functional services in this area is to avoid interfering with the historic features present on site.</p> <p>All lots are able to be serviced for wastewater. Lots 1 – 20 are serviced by gravity (with the exception of Lot 18 if significant excavation is undertaken to construct a dwelling). Lots 21 – 38 will all require a private pumping system. This is again a desirable outcome as it allows the use of flexible pipe and avoidance of historic features. The same trench (with appropriate separation) will be utilised for wastewater, water, electricity and telecommunications.</p>