

ref: McLean/22930

25 May 2022

Sarah Banks  
Senior Resource Consents Planner  
Kāpiti Coast District Council

By Email to: [sarah.banks@kapiticoast.govt.nz](mailto:sarah.banks@kapiticoast.govt.nz)

Dear Sarah,

## **RM220070 – RESPONSE TO SECTION 92 FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST**

In response to your Section 92 Further Information Request dated 7 April 2022, we have reviewed the points raised (set out below) and would like to submit the following further information:

- 1. Please provide details to address the comments identified in the Mana Whenua Assessment dated 15 March 2022. This could include incorporating measures into the application or proffering conditions to address the remaining requirements.*

Please refer to the email correspondence dated 28 April 2022 attached to this letter.

- 2. Please provide scaled Elevations of the units, for the purposes of assessment perspective view is not sufficient. This should be per block/facade or other logical grouping.*

Refer to Sheets RC09 – RC15, of the revised Designgroup Stapleton Elliott plans, titled *Gresham Trust Residential Development*, Revision 4, dated 24 May 2021.

### Engineering

- 3. It is a Council requirement (INF-MENU-R35) that outdoor tap(s) cannot be connected to the council reticulated potable water supply system. Please clarify how this going to managed on site. And how the proposed units going to comply with building code regarding outdoor supply.*

The building code requires outdoor taps to give occupiers the ability of washing the buildings. The supply of water will be provided by communal tanks located adjacent to the park area. These tanks will be the responsibility of the Resident's Society and if there is insufficient water in the communal tanks, then water will be purchased and made available. Refer to the Reduction in Water Tanks letter prepared by Nicola Todd, Director Cuttriss Consultants, dated 24 May 2022.

- 4. Please provide an assessment from suitable qualified person that, development will permanently reduce water demand associated with the residential unit(s) by at least 30% from Household 2007 summer average water use. Also how will any outdoor water use will be managed for each units.*

Refer to the Reduction in Water Tanks letter prepared by Nicola Todd, Director Cuttriss Consultants, dated 24 May 2022.

- 5. There will be around 1 - 3 meter deep cut along the neighbouring boundary highlighted as below. The Engeo Geotechnical report supplied doesn't address the effects on the neighbouring land due to the proposed activities and no recommendation is supplied to mitigate these effects. Geo-professional shall review the final earthwork plans supplied with RC application and provide and recommendation/ mitigation measures.*

Refer to Section 2.1 of ENGEO's response letter, dated 24 May 2022 and attached to this letter.

- 6. Geo-tech report concludes that site sandy soil can only be used as fill as long as it meets the standards and requires lab testing prior to using it as fill on site. Please confirm for lab testing - provide evidence that the site cut soil can be used as fill as this might have impact on total material import/export to and from site and expected traffic movement.*

Refer to Section 2.2 of ENGEO's response letter, dated 24 May 2022 and attached to this letter.

- 7. No recommendation is provided for proposed retaining wall. Geo-professional/suitable qualified person to review the earthworks plan and provide construction methodology of proposed retaining wall (specially along the highlighted boundary below) to ensure there will be reduced impacts on the neighbouring land.*

*The statement "however lateral spreading poses a plausible hazard to the easternmost corner of the site under ULS Condition. It is likely that ground improvement works required to mitigate the vertical settlements described above will also control lateral displacements, but further assessment will be required at Building Consent stage".*

Refer to Section 2.3 of ENGEO's response letter, dated 24 May 2022 and attached to this letter.

- 8. Geo-professional needs to confirm the effects of lateral spreading will be no problem to the new build as well as neighbouring land due to proposed earthworks(cut) by reviewing the final earthworks and any field investigation if required.*

Refer to Section 2.4 of ENGEO's response letter, dated 24 May 2022 and attached to this letter.

## Three Waters

9. *Please clarify about the post-development time to concentration, this seems to be based on ~130m of flat, densely grassed flow path, but post development would have more roads, rooves and pipes along the way. The time to concentration is likely to be shorter. This may not affect the soakpit storage volume, but may have an impact on the pipe sizes used in the design.*

The post development storm duration has been selected as 60 minutes because this represents a higher volume of water compared with a 10 min duration storm. The post development time of concentration will be 10 minutes and the 10 minute intensity will be used at detailed design to check all pipe capacities for this peak flow rate. However, the 60 minute duration storm has a lower intensity but a higher overall volume, which has been selected to size the soak pit.

10. *Please clarify regarding the soakage base - the soakage pit will be taking road and surface run-off, so some means of ensuring the soakage base does not become clogged is required. This could be at network entry-point or as consolidated pretreatment at the soakage device. The precautions should include sediment and floatables removal to a suitable industry standard.*

*Note: The applicant is to submit a maintenance plan for the Soakpit at Engineering Approval stage.*

This matter can be addressed at detailed design stage but will likely require the installation of either enviropods or the manholes prior to the soakage cells having traps in them to collect sediment before stormwater enters the soakage system.

11. *Please provide confirmation of the outcome of the existing culvert at Cedar drive. Will there be a termination man-hole or will it be capped off?*

The culvert to Cedar Drive will be capped off.

12. *In relation to Water Re-use (pg39) - The applicant proposes to forego water reuse tanks as the lots are small and gardens minimal and introduction of meters will provide incentive to reduce water. Meters won't actively reduce consumption (and are required regardless), and the reduced garden area is replaced with increased occupancy density. The reuse tanks, or some other method of consumption reduction, is still required. Overall, the population of the site is increasing from 2.5 people to 3 plus, so there WILL be an impact on water supply consumption. Also, around 29% of the site will still be grass/garden so there will presumably be some tending to these. BUT the standard 10,000L tank may potentially be oversized for a ~40m<sup>2</sup> roof and concessions may be considered based on a supported hydrological argument.*

Refer to the Reduction in Water Tanks letter prepared by Nicola Todd, Director Cuttriss Consultants, dated 24 May 2022. This letter is supported by the applicant's hydraulic engineers, Fluid Engineering, and their memo is appended to Mrs. Todd's letter.

13. Please clarify regarding water supply compliance (the concept is acceptable) as the network will be private, care should be taken to comply with the firefighting access requirements from the NZBC which can be different from NZS4404, has this been taken into account?

Refer to the revised Cuttriss Consultants Ltd plans, drawing number 22930 SCH1, Rev. A, dated 02/22. Sheets 22 and 23 show additional fire hydrants to ensure they are provided with within 75m of a dwelling.

14. The drawings show WW mains running along the back of properties. Can the applicant confirm that there is enough access room for future maintenance and repair along the main?

The wastewater mains are no more than 1m deep and are located with easements that have a minimum width of 2.4m. There is sufficient room within the easement to access the mains for maintenance and repair.

15. Instead of having two WW pipes along Halsey Gr into manhole KWWN004687, is it possible to replace the existing pipe (KWWP004554) and have one inlet into manhole KWWN004687?

Yes, we can re-connect existing connections for #2 and #3 Halsey Grove to the new wastewater main and therefore abandon the existing wastewater main. This will ensure on inlet into manhole KWWN004687.

We trust the above information satisfies your queries in full. If any further clarification is required, please don't hesitate to get in touch. We would appreciate consideration of draft conditions prior to the decision being issued.

Yours faithfully,



Emma McLean  
Senior Planner  
**CUTTRISS CONSULTANTS LTD**

#### **Attachments:**

1. Email correspondence with Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, dated 28 April 2022
2. Designgroup Stapleton Elliott plans, titled Gresham Trust Residential Development, Revision 4, dated 24 May 2021.
3. Reduction in Water Tanks letter prepared by Nicola Todd, Director Cuttriss Consultants, dated 24 May 2022
4. ENGEO's response letter, dated 24 May 2022
5. Fluid Engineering memo, dated 23 May 2022
6. Cuttriss Consultants Ltd plans, drawing number 22930 SCH1, Rev. A, dated 02/22