

File ref: FTC000020

28 May 2021

Matt Norwell / Evita Key

Barker & Associates

PO Box 1986

Shortland Street

Auckland 1140

**By email:** [mattn@barker.co.nz](mailto:mattn@barker.co.nz) and [evitak@barker.co.nz](mailto:evitak@barker.co.nz)

Private Bag 63002  
Wellington 6140, New Zealand

Level 10, Grant Thornton House  
215 Lambton Quay  
Wellington 6011, New Zealand

[epa.govt.nz](http://epa.govt.nz)  
+64 4 916 2426

Dear Evita

**Request for information from Silk Road Management Limited, Pudong Housing Development Company Limited and Foodstuffs North Island Limited (the applicants) in relation to Dominion Road Mixed-use Development application under COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020**

The Dominion Road Mixed-use Development expert consenting panel has directed the EPA to request further information from you under clause 25(1)(a)(i) of Schedule 6 of the COVID-19 Recovery Act 2020 (the Act), relating to the Dominion Road Mixed-use Development resource consent application.

The EPA is seeking the further information listed in Appendix 1.

The EPA considers this information to be necessary and relevant to the Dominion Road Mixed-use Development resource consent application.

In accordance with clause 25 of Schedule 6 of the Act the applicants must

- a) Provide electronic copies of the information or report requested; or
- b) Advise the EPA, with reasons that you decline to provide the information or report requested.

Please provide the further information to the EPA by Monday 14 June 2021.

Please note, the information will be provided to the panel and every person who provided comments on the application under clause 17(2) of the Act. The information will also be made available on the EPA website.

If you have any questions or further queries please don't hesitate to contact Gen Hewett, by email [gen.hewett@epa.govt.nz](mailto:gen.hewett@epa.govt.nz) or phone (04) 474 5523 or 027 839 3760.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'GH', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Gen Hewett  
Senior Advisor

## Appendix 1: List of further information requested

1. The AEE refers to discussions with the owners of 86A Prospect Terrace and 111 Grange Rd in relation to the planting in the 3m yard setback. Given the various roles being performed by this space, the Panel requests further information on the planting plan to reduce the flood hazard while also screening the building from the neighbours. In particular, the Panel requests clarification of any changes made to the proposal in response to discussions with the adjacent owners.
2. Appendix 2 provides the Record of Title and interests. The proposal is to extinguish the existing easements on the titles as part of the subdivision. Please confirm whether the party wall easement is being transferred across to the new interface with Lot 1, or is no longer required. If the latter, please provide written confirmation from the Grantee and Grantor who benefit from the easement.
3. Appendix 5 are the draft conditions proposed. Proposed conditions 77 and 79 require the consent holder to identify 125 long-term and 14 short-term bicycle parking spaces, as well as a shower and change area as end-of-trip facilities. The plans provided in various places in the application material conflict in terms of bicycle parking, and all appear to fall short of the intended requirement. It is unclear why there is inconsistency in the plans in terms of this provision. Please clarify:
  - a. The potential locations for these facilities, and confirm the timing of identifying such.
  - b. Whether electric sockets within resident's bike storage room will also be provided to allow charging of e-bikes; and
  - c. The provision of a change room/shower facility for the retail and "co-working" staff in the development.
4. Please provide a word version of Appendix 5.
5. Appendix 9 (Architectural Plans) shows a new retail premise at ground level on Prospect Terrace and two commercial premises at ground level on Grange Road. Please confirm whether access to these premises is direct from the street and if any controls are proposed to ensure a certain level of glazing to achieve "activation" with the street.
6. Appendix 9 includes the Shading Study. This appears to assess the shading of the Northern and Southern Courtyards. Please clarify whether the height differential between these two amenity spaces is reflected in the Shading Study.
7. Page 31 of Appendix 9 illustrates the variation in colours and cladding designed to address the effects arising from the mass of the proposed structure. Please confirm whether it is practicable given the construction methodology of the apartments for additional modulation, materiality or other treatment to be utilised to further break up the linear form of the Dominion Road frontage.
8. Appendix 14 (Geotechnical report) advises that up to 1.2m of basalt is to be excavated from the site, with an expected volume of 2,000m<sup>3</sup>. Appendix 20 (Acoustic Report) refers to rock breaking but identifies the piling rig as the noisiest activity and anticipates rock breaking is only expected for 3-6 days. Please clarify whether the proposal is to break and remove 2,000m<sup>3</sup> of basalt within 3-6

days and confirm whether that is expected to generate less noise or vibration than the operation of a piling rig.

9. Appendix 15 (Flood Report), page 30 states the increased rainfall expected with climate change has been modelled as a “professional courtesy” with the “increases [in rainfall] beyond the regulatory requirement.” Please clarify given “the effects of climate change” are an other matter in section 7 of Part 2 of the RMA 1991 which is referenced in Clause 31 of Schedule 6 of the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020.
10. Appendix 16 (Integrated Transport Assessment) does not assess the construction traffic effects. Draft conditions 20-22 propose to address the construction traffic effects with a construction traffic management plan. The Panel must have regard to the actual and potential traffic effects during construction when considering the application. Accordingly, please provide an assessment of the construction traffic effects.
11. Appendix 20 (Acoustic Report) advises that the apartments are of modular construction that will be built offsite, delivered by truck and craned into place. There is no mention of this construction methodology in the AEE or ITA. Beyond an acknowledgement the construction work on the “apartments” will only be 8 weeks, there seems to be no description of works or assessment of effects for this period. Please provide an example or indicative delivery schedule / installation programme with confirmation of truck movements, proposed loading areas, crane numbers and hours of operation for this aspect of the works – with this reflected in the assessment of construction traffic effects requested above.
12. Page 47 of Appendix 20 (Acoustic Report) suggest delivery trucks will be limited to daytime only. This limitation does not appear in the draft conditions. Please confirm if the limitation is offered by the applicant.
13. Appendix 20 places a high degree of reliance on the use of a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CVNMP). The mitigation measures offered appear somewhat vague and rely on the CNVMP to address all these effects on adjoining neighbours. Please provide more detail on the specific mitigation measures that may be adopted or offered to the neighbours to address the noise and vibration effects.
14. Appendix 22 (Arborist) recommends a number of conditions regarding Trees 2 and 4 despite the fact consent is not required to remove the trees. These conditions are not included in the draft conditions. Please clarify whether the conditions recommended by Gerard Mostert in Appendix 22 are offered by the applicant.
15. Appendix 23 (Stakeholder Engagement Report) has been prepared by “Anthem”, but the detail of the author has not been provided. Please confirm the author of this particular report.
16. Appendix 23 refers to the potential installation of a pedestrian crossing on Prospect Terrace to provide a safer pedestrian environment. This is not mentioned in the ITA. Please clarify the situation in relation to the potential installation of a pedestrian crossing on Prospect Terrace.