1st May 2020

Mitchell Daysh

Attention: Karen Joubert

Email: karen.joubert@mitchelldaysh.co.nz

Dear Karen

Preliminary request for further information

Application number:	BUN60353138
Applicant:	Ryman Healthcare Limited
Proposed activity:	223 Kohimarama Road and 7 John Rymer Place
Site address:	Comprehensive care retirement village

Under section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), the following further information is requested to enable an appropriate understanding of the proposal and assessment of its effects:

HIRB measurements

1. Please show the HIRB infringement lengths. This is the length along the building where the infringement occurs, rather than the depth of the infringement (i.e. length along the west elevation).
   Please also update 044-ASM-S01-A0-005 to reflect corrections.

Response provided:

Please refer to the updated drawings included in Appendix B to this memorandum, which notes the HIRB infringement lengths for Buildings B02 and B04 (no other buildings infringement the HIRB standards for the Site). Drawing 044-ASM-S01-A0-005 has not been updated as a consequence of RMA Sections 95D(e) and 104(3)(a)(ii).

Please advise the specific plan reference which shows the lengths as I couldn't clearly identify this. The purpose of this request was just so that the infringements can be properly identified and listed within the reasons for consent.

Stormwater diversion/ discharge (Discussions between Council and applicant's specialist held 1/05)

Observational comments from specialist:

> *The site is located in the Pourewa Creek catchment. Highly modified Pourewa Creek tributary and associated side-branches are located within the site.*

There are three watercourses within the site, these watercourses discharges into a fourth watercourse via a stormwater outlet at the end of John Rymer Place which then flows into Pourewa Creek.

- *The existing gully and the watercourses on the site has been re-assessed by Freshwaters Solutions Environmental Consultants . The existing open drain along the eastern boundary had been classed as an intermittent stream.*
- *The site is located and authorised under the recently issued Region wide Auckland Stormwater Network Consent.*
- *Stormwater runoff from the site drains via a tributary on site to the Pourewa Creek and then into the Ōrākei Basin.*
- *The applicant assessed the proposed development as partly PA for the diversion and discharge of stormwater (under the Region wide NDC).*

My understanding during the site visit and reviewing the provided reports is that flows from small catchment of the Selwyn College site and from a part of Kohimarama Road are piped into the top of the open channel (stream) in the Ryman site.

The applicant is proposing the following stormwater management:

- *Construct a private reticulation network for runoff from road impervious areas, the roads will have a subsoil drainage layer lined with geotextile.*
- *Provide stormwater quality treatment for the road runoff by means of proprietary filtration devices (specifically, Stormwater360 StormFilter manhole chambers).*
- *Runoff from building roof and podium areas will discharged directly to the diverted stream onsite*
- *Construct six drop fall outlets in the stream.*
- *A storage tank would be constructed under the level 0 of Building B01. This would be controlled so that when flows approach the capacity of the outlet pipe water would spill over a weir into the tank controlling peak flows to the downstream network*

2. We acknowledge that the applicant has provided Proposed primary stormwater catchment plan Drawing No. 044-RCT_401_C0-SK085, however, we would require a separate plan, clearly showing break down catchment areas m2, for each outfall and separating the two catchments (one draining to the existing reticulated system and one draining into the stream directly). Runoff from the catchment draining into the public stormwater network needs to be discussed with Heahty Waters and is considered a permitted activity under Chapter E8.4.1(A1) of the AUP OP.

3. Runoff from the catchment that drains directly into the stream via the proposed six drop fall outlets will trigger a diversion and discharge of stormwater under Chapter E8.4.1 of the AUP OP because the stream will not be considered as part of the public network system. Please provide an assessment against the relevant standards for this activity.

4. Please provide a planting plan specific to the stream.

5. Provide sizing design calculations for the proposed stormwater quality treatment device.

6. Please demonstrate that the stormwater runoff into the stream complies with the Standard E8.6.3.1 requirements.

7. Provide sizing design calculations for the proposed hydrology mitigation device. The applicant demonstrated compliance for the catchment that drains into the stream. We will need more information for the catchment that will drain into the public system.

8. Provide operation and maintenance plan (this could be conditioned).

9. Need more information regarding the existing outlet from the stream into the public reticulated system (capacity and design).

Development Engineering (Jin still liaising with HW before providing formal response)

Infrastructure

10. Please provide a clear plan differentiating the proposed private and public lines proposed for stormwater (as per Section 6.2 in the SMP) and wastewater lines as described within the SMP.
Note: The SMP states the watercourse to the private however when asked about this, the applicant on site said that the watercourses were public so we require clarity on this.

Stormwater

11. What is the plan to ensure existing private SW connections from 245,247, 247a 249, 249a 251 Kohimarama Road draining to the existing stream will be incorporated in the re-alignment of the stream? Note - 3,5,7 John Rymer Place and 255, 257 Kohi Road appear to drain to the existing public SW network.

12. Confirm capacity of the Hynds Mega Pit structure.

13. Please provide additional comment and detail regarding the proposed 100m3 retained stormwater – will this be utilised for re-use?

14. Please provide additional detail on the design of SWMH 2.11 including driving head available, inlet capacity etc.
Note: We will be recommending a covenant for the maintenance and operation of the storage tank, plus a maintenance regime for cleaning the private catch pits/ mega pit/ private SW network plus maintenance and clearing the re-aligned stream.

15. Please provide a copy of the Operation and Maintenance Plan for the public assets within Rymans property so that we may progress with discussions with the Healthy Waters Operations Team
Note: This may overlap with question 22 under Stormwater diversion, however that would be for private assets rather than public.

16. Please provide the Priestley Spreadsheet utilised for modelling. We will be looking to organise an internal peer review of the model and assumptions.
Update: Rymans will be seeking peer review from Tetkus.

Wastewater and Water Supply

17. Given the size of the proposed development and distance from public hydrants, please provide a written confirmation from the NZ fire service that the site can be serviced for firefighting. If required, a private hydrant may need to be installed on site.

18. The Beca Civil report references 93 assisted living suites, 80 intensive care units and 123 apartments (1 bed to 3 bed). This does not align with the AEE which states 98 care rooms, 75 assisted living suites and 123 apartment units. Please address this discrepancy

Note: This may also impact on parking calculations – please also confirm whether this affects the parking assessment.

19. When the above is addressed, please complete the WS-WW Planning Assessment form which we will submit to Watercare as required for the scale of proposed works.

Flooding

20. Section 6.17 of the SMP discusses the downstream increase in flows for 100yr ARI. The section indicates that the 600 mm pipes are calculated to have 50% capacity. We have concerns regarding the potential for blockages as a result of the development proposal. Please provide an assessment with the 600 mm diameter downstream pipe with 100% blockage.

21. Please provide a plan showing the location and extent of the existing and proposed overland flow path.

22. Please provide clear plans showing the inlet and outlet design details.

23. Please provide confirmation of the capacity of the proposed re-aligned stream for 100yr ARI with supporting cross sections with water levels, freeboards, proposed structures and site boundaries shown.

24. Please provide comments addressing inlet protection and management to ensure no blockages enter the mechanics of the stormwater system (to the outlet and attenuation tank) as these pipes are below 600 mm dia and under the Stormwater Code of Practice, 100% blockage should be accounted for.

25. Please provide a flood risk assessment as required by E36.9(2). This should include but is not limited to:
    - The change in flow characteristics as a result works for the 1% AEP event to downstream properties (17 and 19 – 47 John Rymer Place) and accounting for pipe blockages as per the request above.
    - The effects of the overland flows on the Wastewater pump station downstream of the site
    - The change in the location and extent of overland flow path and the effects offsite

Geotech

26. Please provide geotechnical recommendations for the proposed earthworks including excavation and filling.

27. Please provide comment on the utilisation of proposed target factor of safety values.
    - These deviate from our Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Section 2 Earthworks and Geotechnical Requirements which stipulate higher factor of safety values for the transient (FoS 1.3) and seismic (FoS 1.2) conditions.

Urban design (Meeting was held with Ann O'Meagher to discuss on Thurs 30/04)

Detail Sections

28. Please provide additional detail sections as per the mark-ups in the attached to clearly understand the levels and interface outcomes.

    The sections requested are detail sections and not general arrangement sections (section F and G are fine as is). Hence should be at a large scale to clearly read the proposed retaining heights, adjoining levels of buildings / roads / footpaths, fencing and planting.

    Acknowledge the high-quality response in general however these specific locations relate to public and semi public realm of the proposal and should be clearly demonstrated.

29. Please provide cross sections at 1:100 or larger and include retaining heights range, fencing heights and proposed planting
    a. Section 5 – show the access way / road interface clearly in the cross section

b. Consider stepping the podium walls to create a cascading height / human scale along the main access way (Plans Vol.1: SK103)

As above.

Elevations

30. Update / provide elevations to show proposed ground / footpath including:
    a. B01 – south west Street elevation (Plan Vol.2: A2-010) – show the street / footpath line as the views are not clear to understand the extent of blank walls along the street and the associated landscape approach?
    b. B01 – south east street elevation (Plan Vol.2: A2-020) - show the street / footpath line as discussed in the point above.
    c. Podium – north east street elevation for the full extent from B03 to B02 - show the street / footpath line as discussed in the point above. The interface outcome along this entrance area is not clear in terms of levels and landscape approach.
    d. B06 & B05 – large scale east elevation from the shared boundary.

    B01 & Podium - The request is to see the adjoining street level in relation to the building elevations to understand how the building / levels relate to the street, and to assess the level of amenity / surveillance available to the adjoining street environs. Existing and proposed ground contours are nor relevant here. Instead please show the street as a continuous line against the elevations on 044-RCT-B01-A2-010.

    B06 & B05 – given the infringement, these buildings could potentially read imposing to the adjoining neighbours at 35 and 35A John Rymer Place. Agree elevation may not clearly show this, instead can a model perspective be included to understand this interface outcome?

3D Perspectives

31. Please provide additional perspectives from viewpoints noted in the attached sketch:
    a. View looking south along the accessway off Kohimarama Road and include both sides of the street looking down towards the B02 interface, retaining, and landscaping response.
    b. View looking down the southern section of this accessway looking east and include the Porte Cochere as well as the podium interface and landscaping response.
    c. View towards the eastern façade of B01 and include the street interface, retaining, and landscaping response.

    For a, keen to get landscape feedback from Ainsley regarding the proposed landscaping to mitigate high wall effect. (Still waiting for Ainsley to comment)
    For b & c, as per comments under 53 (28). Details sections needed to assess this outcome.

Shading Analysis

32. Clarify the shading analysis (Plans Vol.1: A4-010 to A4-015) in terms of the extent of bulk and location considered for height standard shown in blue outline.

    No clarification provided.

Servicing
Landscape

Visual simulations

33. Please include a red line on the visual simulations showing the complying height limit. This is to understand the potential adverse visual dominance effects of exceeding this height.

    The response from Mitchell Daysh suggests that Appendix L responds to this request however that is not the case. I have not seen updated visual simulations as part of the response.

Podium Planting

34. Please confirm the height anticipated for the palm trees within the podium, noting the 1m high raised planter, I consider the heights shown on SK103 to be unrealistic.

    Satisfied in part. I would like to know how long they anticipate it taking to reach 7m in height given the restricted growing conditions and being planted at a 45L grade.

Streamworks (Still under review)

35. The stream design plans lack sufficient design detail to support that fact that the stream will become a hard bottom with woody debris elements. Please provide further details around the stream design and habitat details.

36. The velocity does not appear to change in the SEV calculator in the daylighted channel even though the stream profile and structure is going to change. This should be captured as well – especially with the addition of multiple cascades along the channel.

37. Please provide a streamworks methodology and fish relocation plan.

Watercare (Still under review)

38. In terms of the design flow rate, 160L/s has been used instead of 180L/s as stated in WSL specification. Additionally, there is no allowance for staff contribution of 45L/h, this needs to be addressed please.

39. No allowance has been made for wet weather peaking factors. This is acceptable if the whole development is serviced through LPS, however section 5.3 (Beca infrastructure report) states that the site will be partially serviced by gravity, this needs to be clarified as to exactly what is being serviced by gravity and what is serviced by LPS and peaking factors on the design flows applied accordingly.

40. The proposal to service the site via a private pump station discharging to Allum St meets WSL requirements, however WSL needs to know what the proposed discharge rate of this pump station will be, as this is what will be seen by their network.

41. Please clarify what the proposed discharge rate from the site will be.

Noise and Vibration (New s92 questions)

42. Please estimate the range of construction noise levels at affected receivers during Stage 2 earthworks.

43. As the minimum setback distances of 14m and 38m from vibratory rolling during Stages 2 and 4 may not be met means that structure and amenity vibration standards will not be

met. If practicable, please indicate the sites which may be affected, the extent of vibration infringements in mm/s PPV and estimated infringement durations.

44. Please confirm that structural and amenity vibration permitted standards will be met at all adjacent buildings during vibratory sheet piling (Stage 3) (e.g. at the buildings adjacent to east and south sheet piling locations).

45. Noise infringements during vibratory rolling during stage 4 are predicted at the two nearest dwellings at 17 and 17A John Rymer Place with noise predicted up to 76 dB LAeq. Please estimate the duration of the noise infringement. (It is noted with mitigation in place compliance is expected).

46. Please provide comment about LAFmax levels and compliance with the permitted standard.

47. Please provide comments from a suitably qualified acoustic specialist that operational noise from the site (including cumulative noise effects) will comply with permitted noise standards in AUP (OP) E25.6.2 and, if specific noise management and/or mitigation measures are necessary to ensure compliance, please describe these measures.

You must provide this information within 15 working days. If you are unable to provide the information within 15 working days, then please contact the reporting planner named below so that an alternative timeframe can be mutually agreed.

If you do not respond within 15 working days, refuse to provide the information or do not meet an agreed alternative timeframe between Council and yourself, this application must be publicly notified as required by section 95C of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Under section 88C of the RMA, the processing of your application is suspended until the above matters have been addressed, or the 15 working day time limit has expired.

Please note that at this point, no detailed assessment in terms of the merits of the application have been undertaken, and no specialist assessment has been received. If at any point it is considered that the application may require notification or may not be supported overall, this will be indicated to you as early as possible.

If you have any queries, please contact me at sandy.hsiao@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or (09) 261 8222 and quote the application number above.

Yours sincerely

Sandy Hsiao
Senior Planner
Central Resource Consenting