

Section 92 Request for Further Information: BUN60419132 – HND HMB Limited	Applicant Response	Council Response
10. Please update the ESCP to demonstrate that the SRP spillway will be directed to a location that will avoid erosion of batters, and nuisance to traffic / roading / pedestrians as practicable as possible.	Eighty 6	
11. Please provide a plan and long-section of the proposed SRP to identify the RL levels of the design features, including the RL of the inlets, forebays (where applicable), device base, outlets (decants and spillways) and any connections to existing infrastructure. Please include the RL of the stormwater manhole that the SRP will discharge to, and the batter that the spillway will be directed.	Eighty 6	
12. Please include details within the Earthworks Memo and on the ESCP for the management of runoff from construction of the footpath, individual pedestrian accessways and underground infrastructure that are located outside of the catchments directed to the primary sediment treatment device.	Eighty 6	
13. Please clarify the purpose of the runoff diversion bunds (shown on the ESCP in red).	Eighty 6	
14. Please update the notes section to reflect the proposed sediment controls.	Eighty 6	
15. Please discuss whether a 3% SRP will be more suitable given the slope of the site.	Eighty 6	
16. Please update the SRP size details to clarify the length and width of the pond when measured at the primary spillway (to demonstrate it will meet the 3:1 L:W ratio). Please update the SRP on the drawing to reflect any change in dimensions.	Eighty 6	
Tree works		
17. The path to and deck of Unit 10 are located within the [redacted] in the open space between the site and Ara Tai. Please provide an assessment against E16 of the AUP, which may require an arborist report to be prepared.	Works within the vicinity of the pohutukawa trees has been revised. Please also refer attached arboriculture report by Tree3, confirming the works are within the permitted thresholds.	Commented [YG3]: Root zones
18. Please clarify whether any earthworks will be located within the protected root zone of trees that are to be retained.		
19. In the EMP, please clarify what works are proposed within the protected root zone of those trees, and provide a methodology of works to demonstrate works will not adversely affect those trees.		
Groundwater Diversion		
20. The date of the Total Ground Engineering report appears to be incorrect. Should this instead be 7 May 2025? Please correct or clarify	Please refer to the updated report.	
21. Table 3 of the TGE report is titled “Western Boundary Existing Timber Retaining Wall Information” however the header on the table states “Proposed Retaining Wall Analysed Section Summary up-dated in May 2025.” Please provide clarification.	The table shows the information on adopted levels of top/toe of existing Western boundary timber walls from Envivo surveys, with adopted finished floor levels from Shape Architects for Plaxis analysis. Please refer to Q22 responses for further details.	
22. There appears to be discrepancies between the levels shown in Table 3 of the TGE report and the levels shown on the drawing titled “Earthworks Cross-section Sheet 1 of 3” prepared by Eighty6 Civil Engineering, Drawing FP326-215, rev A, dated 28 February 2025. In addition, cut levels shown in close proximity to the western boundary on the drawing titled “Earthworks Cut and fill Plan,” prepared by Eighty6 Civil Engineering, Drawing FP326-210, rev A, dated 28 February 2025 do not appear to be the	Table 3 indicates the adopted levels for Plaxis analysis on 3 sections. The levels of the existing wall “Top Level” and “Toe Level” are adopted from Topographic surveys 1-9 Pigeon Mountain Road, project reference 34948, Aerial Site Plan revision A by Envivo, dated 12 December 2025. Table 3 also conservatively considers of a 550mm sub-excavation.	

Section 92 Request for Further Information: BUN60419132 – HND HMB Limited	Applicant Response	Council Response
<p>same as those given in Table 3. Please check all of the information given in Table 3 for consistency with these two drawings and annotate the platform levels on “zoomed in” snippets of Section 1 to 3 on the Drawing FP326-215, rev A to allow comparison of the information provided. For example, Table 3 indicates that the proposed maximum excavation depth at upper platform is 2.34m and the proposed maximum excavation depth at the lower platform is 3.9m. This does not appear to be the case on Earthworks Cross- section 3.</p>	<p>The Floor Finished Levels of the upper platform are adopted from Architecture Design drawing A2.8”Proposed Deck Levels” by Shape Architects Ltd, project reference 207, dated 27 January 2026.</p> <p>The Floor Finished Levels of the lower platform are adopted from Architecture Design drawing A2.4”Proposed Floor Basement Floor Plan” by Shape Architects Ltd, project reference 207, dated 27 January 2026.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix C in the updated report.</p> <p>We model our analysed sections in Plaxis with inputs from the surveys and proposed levels in the architectural drawings which show the permanent finished levels with the most critical/maximum retained heights for each of the Wall Types (Type A,B and C). The earthwork cross sections are not adopted for analyses because they do not represent the permanent retained heights, but a temporary condition.</p>	
<p>23. The drawing titled “Retaining wall Layout Plan” prepared by Eighty6 Civil Engineering, Drawing FP326-260, rev A, dated 28 February 2025 indicates six proposed retaining walls RW1 to RW6 in close proximity to the western boundary of the site. However, the TGE report provides details of only two retaining walls as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 1 & 2: 250UC-89.5 1m c/c spacing an 9m long piles Section 3: 310UC-89.5 1m c/c spacing an 12m long piles <p>It is noted that the drawing titled “New Retaining Wall Face Elevation 1 of 2” prepared by TGE drawing No. 101, issue 4, dated 1 May 2025 and the drawing titled” New Retaining Wall Face Elevation 2 of 2” prepared by TGE drawing No. 102 issue 4, dated 1 May 2025,” indicates three retaining wall types – Type A, Type B and Type C.</p> <p>Please update the report with the correct number of proposed retaining walls / types and details and confirm that the analyses that have been undertaken to date are appropriate. In addition, please annotate the Retaining Wall Layout Plan with cross-sections 1 to 3 and the extent of each proposed retaining wall type. Justification is required for any proposed retaining walls shown on the plan or drawing Nos 101 and 102 which have not been analysed.</p>	<p>Please refer to the updated drawings. TGE drawings New Retaining Wall Face Elevation 1 of 2 and 2 of 2 clearly indicating the layout and the extent of the 3 “types” of retaining walls (Type A, Type B and Type C) which have been analysed and will cover all of the possible retaining walls to be built at this site as followed:</p> <p>Type A: 0.0m – 2.0m: Plaxis analysed Section 2</p> <p>Type B: 2.0m – 3.0m: Plaxis analysed Section 1</p> <p>Type A: 3.0m – 4.0m: Plaxis analysed Section 3</p> <p>This is detailed design for resource consent and the level of detail being requested is unusual. During detailed design, the civil engineer can nominate specify the wall type (design) to be applied to each individual wall. This is the normal process.</p>	
<p>24. It is noted that the proposed alert and alarm trigger levels given in Table 13 of the TGE report for the existing timber pole wall i.e. DM8 & DM9 are the same the trigger levels for the proposed steel post wall at Section 3. These trigger levels are not considered to be appropriate for the existing timber pole wall and should be revised and based on predicted deflections. Please address.</p>	<p>We disagree and believe that the number of DM points and alert levels are appropriate. However, please refer to the Plaxis outputs of the existing timber wall deflection. More DM points have been added, please refer to the updated report and drawings.</p>	
<p>25. It is noted that only two retaining wall deflection markers D8 & D9 are proposed on the existing retaining wall. Please provide additional retaining wall markers for the full length of the existing retaining wall at appropriate spacing or provide justification as to why no other additional retaining wall markers are proposed. Appropriate alert and alarm trigger levels should be provided for the additional markers and the monitoring plan and Table 13 and Figure 17 and TGE drawing No. 300, updated accordingly</p>	<p>We disagree; the new wall is being built in front of the existing wall and is well covered by DM points. The DM points of the existing wall will augment the DM points on the new wall. It is unusual for Council to be determining the details of a monitoring scheme designed by others and raises the question of who is liable.</p> <p>However, more DM points have been added, please refer to the updated report and drawings.</p>	

Section 92 Request for Further Information: BUN60419132 – HND HMB Limited	Applicant Response	Council Response
26. Settlement alert and alarm trigger levels given in Table 13 should be whole numbers – Please update Table 13 accordingly.	The report has been updated accordingly.	
27. Please provide justification for the proposed alert and alarm trigger levels given in Table 13 for DM1-3, DM4-5 and DM6-7. Please provide annotated Plaxis outputs by way of justification.	<p>The deflections for each wall were documented in the Plaxis analyses results. However, refer to the updated report/ PLaxis outputs of the proposed wall deflections, existing timber wall deflections, and ground settlement in neighbouring properties in the updated report.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alert/Alarm levels for DM1-7 (Deflection Monitoring): Based on Proposed wall deflection Alert/Alarm levels for DM8-13: Based on Existing wall deflection Alert/Alarm levels for BS1-20: Based on Maximum differential settlements under existing dwellings footprint Alert/Alarm levels for GS1-9: Based on ground settlements between existing dwellings and existing timber wall 	
28. The dwellings at 76 to 84 Compass Point Way for pre-and-post construction detailed condition surveys should be labelled on Figure 17 the “Updated Monitoring Plan” and on the drawing titled “Monitoring Plan” prepared by TGE, drawing No. 300, issue 3, together with the proposed extent of the 300mm diameter concrete stormwater pipe for pre-and-post construction CCTV survey. Please update or clarify.	Notes about “Existing dwellings and stormwater pipes to be pre-construction condition surveyed as a baseline report” has been labelled. Please refer to the updated drawings.	
29. At least two ground settlement (GS) markers are required between the existing wall and the dwellings at 76 to 84 Compass Point Way. The markers are to be positioned in alignment with the retaining wall deflection markers and the building settlement pins. The alert and alarm trigger levels for these ground settlement markers must reflect the predicted ground settlements at these locations with justification and Table 13 and Figure 17 and TGE drawing No. 300. Please update accordingly.	<p>GS makers added, please refer to the updated report and drawings.</p> <p>Again, we note that Council specifying monitoring details raises questions of liability.</p>	
30. The building pins labelled BS01, BS04, BS05, BS08, BS09, BS12, BS13, BS16, BS18 & BS20 should all be positioned at locations to allow the measurement of the predicted maximum differential settlement of the dwelling and Figure 17 and TGE drawing No. 300. Please update accordingly.	Predicted maximum differential ground settlements are located underneath the existing dwellings. It is impossible to put monitoring points under existing foundations, on the internal floors or on the roof at those exact locations. Current BS monitoring points have already been placed in all possible locations. The current locations are the most practical way to estimate the differential settlement.	
31. In Table 6 of the TGE report, “310UC-89.5 1m c/c spacing an 12m long piles” are proposed – this appears to be a typo and should read “310UC -158 1m c/c spacing an 12m long piles”. Please update or clarify.	Please refer to the updated report.	
Residential zone provisions		
32. Please confirm the [redacted] (rolling height method) when using the average height method.	SHAPE	Commented [YG4]: Building height
33. Please confirm if any of the stairs within the front yard of Pigeon Mountain Road and the northern yard have heights exceeding 1.5 m and therefore will be buildings intruding the front yard.	SHAPE.	
34. Please provide details of the retaining wall in Lot 24 in order to confirm if this is a front yard intrusion.	SHAPE.	