APPENDIX 3:
COUNCIL OFFICER EVIDENCE

DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL

Memorandum

TO:	Robert Buxton - Planning Consultant
FROM:	Luke McKinlay – landscape Architect
DATE:	06 October 2021
SUBJECT:	**140 THREE MILE HILL RD** **SUB-2021-75 LUC-2021-247. LA COMMENTS**

Hi Robert,

The following is in response to your request for comment on the above subdivision application. As you note, the site consists of Lot 1 DP 26149 (containing two existing farm sheds) held in Record of Title OT18A/1019 and has an area of 3.87ha.

This subdivision will result in two sites:

1. Lot 1 being 2.00 ha with a Right of Way (ROW) over the leg-in. Note the ROW also services the dwelling at 138 Three Mile Hill Road.
2. Lot 2 being 1.87ha including the ROW.

In the Proposed 2GP the site is zoned **Rural Residential 1**. The site includes Wāhi Tūpūna Mapped Area 50 – Whakaehu (Silverstream catchment). Three Mile Hill Road is a Strategic Road.

The application identifies the subdivision and land use as a **non-complying activity**. The application includes suggested conditions on scanned page 9 of the AEE, which have been adopted from the visual and landscape assessment prepared by Mike Moore.

Comments

I have visited the subject site prior to providing these comments.

As identified in the AEE, the subject site is located within an existing cluster of rural residential properties, with sites that range in size from 1.6ha to 3.87ha. As identified above, the proposed lots will have areas of 2.0ha and 1.87ha. As such, the proposed subdivision will be broadly consistent with the existing grain of development in this rural residential enclave. If the volunteered conditions are adopted, it is considered that this development can integrate well in this setting and effects on existing visual and landscape amenity values can be kept to low levels.

A thorough assessment of potential landscape and visual effects has been undertaken by landscape architect, Mike Moore. He recommends several mitigation measures to ensure that this development integrates with the existing rural residential landscape character and avoids and mitigates potential adverse visual amenity effects on neighbours. The key measures proposed include the following:

- identifying building platforms;
- limits to building height and cladding colours;
- protection of existing trees, and;
- establishment of new screen plantings.

Mr Moore assesses visual amenity effects on users of the adjacent Three Mile Hill Road and on adjacent residents. Specifically, he considers visual effects from 136 & 138 Three Mile Hill Road and 63 & 65 Whare Flat Road. In general, he finds that if gaps in existing shelter vegetation are bolstered with additional planting and controls on building cladding colours and overall building height are imposed, effects can be kept to low levels.

Overall, Mr Moore concludes that considering the permitted baseline and the proposed development controls, effects of the proposed development will be no more than adverse / very low (less than minor), and will in some cases, be positive. In terms of landscape character, he finds that the development will have effects that are no more than adverse / very low (less than minor) and will integrate readily.

Submissions Received

This application was limited notified. Submissions were received from the following potentially affected parties:

MW Rietveld and NE Hannah-Rietveld - 136 Three Mile Hill Road

Principle visual amenity and character concerns are as follows:

1. Lot 1 building platform is within their outlook. A dwelling on Lot 1 will intrude on existing rural views.
2. Mitigation planting will not be able to screen views from their property and they are concerned about the 7m height of a dwelling on Lot 1 and the fact that there are no building plans.
3. Lot 2 is less than 2ha, includes a long leg-in, and will be no more than a large lawn and garden;
4. The current driveway to applicant's site is poorly formed and maintained, and any upgrade could affect the stonework, drainage and the root zone of the submitter's trees, and there should be an up-to-date survey of boundaries;
5. Concerned about reliance on trees on 63 Flagstaff-Whare Flat Road, to provide screening of Lot 2 from the submitter's site.

Comments

As noted above, surrounding property sizes vary, however, there are two under-sized sites directly to the east of the subject site (53 Flagstaff-Whare Flat Road (1.6046 ha) and 63 Flagstaff-Whare Flat Road (1.6352 ha), each of which contain a residential dwelling. In this context, the proposed grain of development is broadly consistent with that of this rural-residential enclave and will not lead to unacceptable adverse effects on existing rural-residential character values, particularly given the suite of mitigation measures proposed and the proposed retention of existing mature native trees on site.

The applicant is proposing to plant screening vegetation between this property and the site, including where there is currently a gap in existing screening vegetation. Planting will also extend along the boundary with 63 Flagstaff Whare Flat Road so that if this existing vegetation is removed, screening of proposed Lot 2 will still be provided. It is considered that the proposed vegetative screening in combination with the suite of proposed mitigation measures will be capable of reducing potential adverse visual amenity effects to low levels.

It is agreed with the submitters that all proposed mitigation planting will need to be well maintained. It is noted that the Mitigation Planting Specification (Appendix A of the Landscape and Visual Assessment report) sets out an appropriate planting maintenance and management regime.

JC and HA Moody - 138 Three Mile Hill Road

Principle visual amenity and character concerns are as follows:

1. The subdivision would affect the integrity of the district plan
2. The long driveway and building platform results in Lot 2 being approximately 1.5ha, which has limited land use due to weather, shading from commercial forestry, too rocky to cultivate, and rabbits;
3. The shape of Lot 1 is unusual, being narrow, close to commercial forestry and is, limited by a wetland;
4. The proposed building platform on Lot 1 will intrude into their view, even if limited to 7m height, and the existing screening trees are on the submitter's land and proposed for firewood;
5. Effect on views of 63 Flagstaff-Whare Flat Road;

Comments

With regards to the visual effects of the proposed dwelling on Lot 1 from the submitters house, it is considered that existing vegetation along the submitter's boundary with Proposed Lot 1 provides good screening of the proposed building platform. It is acknowledged, however, that as this planting is located within the submitter's property, it cannot be relied upon to provide on-going visual mitigation. However, the applicant is proposing to provide an additional row of screen planting along this boundary (Pittosporum tenuifolium - Kohuhu), which will be capable of either augmenting the existing screen planting or providing a replacement if the submitters choose to remove the existing row of blue gums.

When the screening effects of this vegetation (existing and/or proposed) is combined with the other mitigation measures proposed, which include a 7m height limit for the principle dwelling and 4m height limit for any ancillary buildings, controls on cladding colours and light reflectivity etc, it is considered that effects on visual amenity can be kept to low levels.

It is noted that the proposed building platform location on Lot 1 is on lower-lying land than the dwelling at 138 Three Mile Hill Road, which, in combination with the proposed height restriction and screening vegetation, will limit the prominence of any future dwelling within the proposed building platform from the vicinity of the submitter's dwelling.

Conclusion

I generally concur with the findings of the landscape and visual amenity report that supports this application. If all the proposed mitigation measures are adopted as conditions, potential adverse visual amenity and landscape character effects of this development on surrounding potentially affected parties, including the above submitters, can be kept to low levels.

Regards,

Luke McKinlay
Landscape Architect

DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL | kaunihera a-rohe o Ōtepoti

Memorandum

TO:	Robert Buxton, Consultant Planner
FROM:	Logan Copland, Planner – Transport
DATE:	06 October 2021
SUBJECT:	**SUB-2021-75 & LUC-2021-247**
	140 THREE MILE HILL ROAD, DUNEDIN

APPLICATION:

Consent is sought to subdivide the above rear site into two lots. Lot 1 will be 2ha with access via Rights of Way over the existing leg-in to Three Mile Hill Road. Lot 2 of 1.87ha will own the leg-in.

The site is zoned Rural Residential 1. Access is via an existing vehicle crossing to Three Mile Hill Road which is classified as a Strategic Road in the 2GP's Road Classification Hierarchy. The application is a non-complying activity.

Note that this memorandum supersedes that provided to the Council's Consultant Planner on 3rd June 2021 and includes a further review in conjunction with the Council's Senior Transportation and Road Safety Engineer.

ROAD SAFETY:

Transport staff have reviewed the reported crash history within a 50m radius of the vehicle access over the most recent 10-year period. The NZTA Crash Analysis System (CAS) was used for this purpose. Two crashes were reported in the past 10 years. Neither of these crashes can be attributed to the operation of the vehicle access itself. Both crashes were loss of control crashes due to the curvature of the road.

Following concerns raised by submitters, for completeness, the search term was extended from 10 years to 40 years. When assessing the crash trends over this 40-year period, all of the crashes were as a result of loss of control.

Transport's Senior Transportation and Road Safety Engineer concludes that there is no evidence to suggest the existing access contributed to any of the reported crashes. Further, it is considered that the likelihood of a rear end or side impact collision is very unlikely. This is primarily due to the stopping sight distance that is available which is discussed in further detail below.

ACCESS:

Scope of assessment

The application states that access will be via the existing vehicle crossing to Three Mile Hill Road. It is noted that in the application that this vehicle crossing currently serves five properties, these being 132, 134, 136, 138 and 140 Three Mile Hill Road. Four of these properties currently contain established dwellings.

There is currently no dwelling located on the site, though Transport has been advised by the Council's Consultant Planner that a dwelling could be established on the site as a permitted activity. Hence, it is understood that this forms part of the permitted baseline and the assessment of this subdivision relates to the development potential that would be created, rather than what may or may not already be established on the site. On that basis, it is the effects beyond those that are currently permitted under the District Plan that have been assessed by Transport.

Should consent be granted, the existing vehicle access will be required to serve a total of six rural-residential properties, which is an increase of one property when compared to the existing baseline situation.

Sight distances:
Following concerns raised by submitters, Transport has undertaken a further assessment of the available sight distances at the vehicle access. This assessment was undertaken in conjunction with the Council's Senior Transportation and Road Safety Engineer and included a second site visit.

The 2GP sets a minimum sight distance requirement for a new vehicle access located within a posted speed limit of 80km/h at 111m as per below. Note that this is not a new vehicle access and the safety of the existing vehicle access can therefore be assessed with a reasonable level of certainty. However, for completeness, sight distances are evaluated in more detail below.

Transport determined that site distance for westbound vehicles is in the order of 120m and 108m for eastbound vehicles. Therefore, it is noted that for westbound vehicles the available sight distance exceeds the Plan requirement however for eastbound vehicles the sight distance is in the order of 3 meters short. Note that since the sight distance toward Dunedin is assessed as exceeding the minimum requirement (by 9m), no further assessment of this sight line is considered necessary.

Noting that the sightline toward Mosgiel falls slightly short of the minimum requirement, a first principles approach was used to determine the level of risk to road users that might result due to the reduced sight distance. The safe stopping distance (SSD) calculation in Austroads was utilised for this purpose. Utilising the recorded 85th percentile operating speed (the speed at or below which 85 percent of all vehicles are observed to travel under free-flowing conditions past a monitored point) on Three Mile Hill Road of 78km/h, it has been determined that an SSD of 101.8m is required to allow a normally alert driver travelling at the design speed (on wet pavement) from Mosgiel to Dunedin to perceive, react and brake to a stop before reaching a hazard on the road ahead. Hence, the available sight distance for a driver waiting to leave the vehicle access is assessed as being acceptable. This is not unexpected when taking account of the reported crash history discussed above, which reveals no safety issues with the operation of the vehicle access. Transport also considers this to be a conservative assessment and expects that drivers travelling toward Dunedin around the out of context curve will likely be travelling slightly slower than the 85th percentile speed.

In light of the concerns raised by submitters with respect to intervisibility between a driver waiting to turn right into the vehicle access and a driver travelling toward Dunedin, a further review has been undertaken in conjunction with the Council's Senior Transportation and Road Safety Engineer. The intervisibility was assessed as being in the order of 83m. While this is less than the SSD requirement discussed above, Transport considers that (as noted above) the likely approach speed for vehicles exiting the out of context curve is likely to be slightly lower than the 85th percentile operating speed due to both the horizontal geometry and superelevation.

Furthermore, this inter-visibility value can be increased by very minor cutting/benching of the existing embankment located on the inside of the out of context curve. Transport considers that this is an existing issue and the safety record at the vehicle access, as evidenced by the above crash analysis, indicates that the reduced sight distance is not resulting in any significant safety issues. Additionally, Transport considers such issues are unlikely to be exacerbated by the proposed subdivision due to the anticipated minimal increase in use of the vehicle access and the level of gap acceptance as discussed below.

Transport staff undertook all possible movements at the vehicle access to determine the level of gap acceptance. At no point did members of Transport staff present on the site visit feel pressured or concerned whilst turning onto or off Three Mile Hill Road in this location. The level of service provided at the vehicle access was therefore deemed to be acceptable.

Based on the above assessment, Transport staff, including the Council's Senior Transportation and Road Safety Engineer, are comfortable with the available sight visibility at the vehicle access as originally assessed. We also note that there is an opportunity to increase intervisibility for vehicles turning right into the access by undertaking benching of the western embankment; however, as above, this is an existing issue and is not considered to be necessary, but we acknowledge it would have safety benefits.

It is however, advised that in the event of future development on the site, Transport would undertake a reassessment of the access based on the level of development being considered at any stage, and more significant increases in use would not be encouraged.

Vehicle access design
The application states that the vehicle crossing is currently 6.0m wide, enabling adequate space for two vehicles to safely pass one-another at the site entrance. Transport staff have confirmed that the width of the vehicle access is about 6.0m. Note that the vehicle access width exceeds that required by the 2GP for a residential vehicle access serving 4 or more units, which requires a formation width of 5.0m (the vehicle access already sits within this threshold and will therefore not be changed by the proposed subdivision). However, we acknowledge the concerns raised by submitters, which note that the drivers tend to migrate toward the centre of the vehicle access because of the drop-off to the side drainage ditch either side of the culvert crossing. In practice, this may reduce the overall lane width.

While there is no evidence to suggest that the above situation has resulted in any noticeable operational problems, the following minor improvements could be implemented to reduce the potential conflict:

- Minor widening of the vehicle access / extension of the culvert to allow additional space for incoming /outgoing vehicles to pass one another (note: this would likely require resource consent due to a breach of Rule 6.6.3.3.a.i because the maximum

width of a residential vehicle access is 6.0m. However, from a transportation perspective, the adverse effects of an over-width vehicle access in this situation would be assessed as being de-minimis due to the absence of any pedestrian facilities and noting there would only be benefits from a road safety perspective).

- Install new edge-lines and a centreline (with limit line) to delineate the directional lanes and edge of the vehicle crossing; and
- Relocate or remove the existing edge marker post and replace with 2-3 red Reflective Raised Pavement Markers (RRPM/'cats' eyes').

The above solutions would assist with ensuring that vehicles use the available space more efficiently. Noting that the concerns noted are existing, Transport recommends the above matters be incorporated as advice notes only. However, Transport considers that there would be safety benefits and Transport would therefore be amenable if the Council's Consultant Planner was of a mind to require these changes as a condition of consent. Since these changes would result in benefits to the other users of the access, it would appear reasonable for any associated costs of works to be apportioned accordingly.

The vehicle crossing is sealed for a short distance, only about 3m. Some submitters have raised concerns about the level of loose material entering the road reserve. Note that Transport concurs with this concern, and that it has already been recommended that the length of seal be extended to a distance of not less than 5.0m. This requirement is consistent with Rule 6.6.3.6.a. The reporting officer may wish to consider whether the required sealing distance of 5.0m could be extended to further address associated concerns raised by submitters. A distance of about 8.0m from the edge of the formed carriageway of Three Mile Hill Road would appear to be workable and an increased sealing distance would be supported by DCC Transport.

Within the site, Rights of Way A and B will be created over the leg-in to Lot 2, in favour of Lot 1. There is also an existing Right of Way over this leg-in in favour of 138 Three Mile Hill Road. Upon Subdivision, Right of A will serve three rural residential sites. As per the Rule 6.6.3.9.a.iv, Rights of Way A and B are each required to be a minimum 3.5m formed width, comprise an adequate all-weather surface and be adequately drained for their full duration. A condition is recommended to that effect.

It is advised that a formal agreement be drawn up between the owners/users of all private accesses in order to clarify their maintenance responsibilities.

Subject to the above, the vehicle access provisions are assessed as being acceptable from a transport perspective.

PARKING AND MANOEUVRING:

There is considered to be sufficient space on each new site to accommodate appropriate manoeuvring provisions, such that no vehicle will be required to reverse onto Three Mile Hill Road.

TRAFFIC GENERATION:

The DCC Code of Subdivision and Development 2010 states that for design purposes, eight (8) vehicle movements per day per residential unit on Rural or Rural Residential lots shall be used. Assuming a peak hour traffic generation rate of 1.4 vehicle movements per hour, the potential peak hour volumes at the vehicle access as a result of the subdivision would increase from

7vph to 8.4vph. This is based on an increase of the number of properties using the vehicle access from 5 to 6. Over the peak hour, this would see an increase from about 1 vehicle every 8.5 minutes to about 1 vehicle every 7.15 minutes. From a transport perspective, such an increase in traffic volumes is considered to be minor and can easily be accommodated by the existing transport network without any capacity or safety concerns, based on the assessment above.

Transport is cognisant that submitters have queried the methodology used to assess traffic generation. This is primarily because there is currently no existing dwelling on 140 Three Mile Hill Road. The reasons for this approach have been explained above and have been confirmed by the Council's Consultant Planner, however, for completeness this scenario has also been considered.

Based on traffic generation rates above, the 4 dwellings currently using the vehicle access are expected to generate in the order 32vpd and 5.6vph in the peak hour. An increase of two residential units using the vehicle access is anticipated to increase those figures to 48vpd and 8.4vph, respectively. These volumes are still considered to be very low and are therefore considered acceptable.

Overall, Transport confirms its original assessment that the effects of traffic generated by the proposed subdivision, on the transportation network, will be no more than minor.

CONCLUSION

Transport considers the effects of the proposed development on the transportation network to be no more than minor, subject to the following condition(s) and advice note(s):

CONDITIONS:

(i) The existing vehicle crossing must be hard surfaced from the edge of Three Mile Hill Road for a distance of not less than 5.0m and be adequately drained (see advice note (i).

(ii) Rights of Way A and B are each required to be a minimum 3.5m formed width, comprise an adequate all-weather surface and be adequately drained for their full duration.

ADVICE NOTES:

(i) It is advised that an increased sealing distance to of 8.0m from the edge of Three Mile Hill Road would also be supported by DCC Transport.

(ii) It is advised that in the event of future development on the site, Transport would assess provisions for access, parking and manoeuvring at the time resource consent/building consent application.

(iii) It is advised that a formal agreement be drawn up between the owners/users of all private accesses in order to clarify their maintenance responsibilities.

(iv) The vehicle crossing, between the road carriageway and the property boundary, is within legal road and is therefore required to be upgraded in accordance with the Dunedin City Council Vehicle Entrance Specification (available from DCC Transport).

(v) It is advised that any work within legal road is required to be done by a DCC approved contractor and will require an approved corridor access request.

(vi) It is advised that consideration is given to the following changes to the existing vehicle access / vehicle crossing

a. Minor widening of the vehicle access / extension of the culvert to allow additional space for incoming /outgoing vehicles to pass one another
   (Note: this would likely require resource consent due to a breach of Rule 6.6.3.3.a.i because the maximum width of a residential vehicle access is 6.0m.)
b. Install new edge-lines and a centreline (with limit line) to delineate the directional lanes and edge of the vehicle crossing; and
c. Relocate or remove the existing edge marker post and replace with 2-3 red Reflective Raised Pavement Markers (RRPM/'cats' eyes').

DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL | kaunihera a-rohe o Ōtepoti

Memorandum

TO:	City Planning	
FROM:	Development Support Officer, 3 Waters	
DATE:	19/05/2021	
SUBJECT:	**SUB-2021-75**	**2 LOT SUBDIVISION**
	LUC-2021-247	**140 THREE MILE HILL ROAD**
	3 WATERS COMMENTS 19/05/2021	

1. The proposed activity

Subdivision consent is sought from DCC to undertake a 2-lot subdivision at 140 three Mile Hill Road. The site is within the rural residential 1 zone

2. Infrastructure requirements

Dunedin Code of Subdivision and Development 2010.
All aspects of this development shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Dunedin Code of Subdivision and Development 2010

DCC owned infrastructure within this property
There is a 335mm diameter water main which runs east to north within the property. An easement in gross is required for this as outlined below.
Any earthworks or construction on this lot must meet the requirements of the Dunedin Code of Subdivision and Development (2010) in relation to building in close proximity to Council infrastructure, unless otherwise approved by 3 Waters. The Code prohibits any building within 1.5 metres of a pipeline. If any building is proposed within 2.5 metres of a pipe or manhole, 3 Waters must be notified to discuss options and whether an encumbrance on the title is required. 'Building' includes decks, fences, garages, sheds, retaining walls and so on.

Water services
The proposed subdivision is located within the Rural Residential zone and located outside the Rural Water Supply Areas as shown in Appendix B of the *Dunedin City Council Water Bylaw 2011*. Consequently, no reticulated water supply is available to the proposed subdivision.

Stormwater collected from roof surfaces may be used for domestic water supply and stored in suitably sized tank(s), with a minimum of 25,000L storage per lot.

Firefighting requirements
All aspects relating to the availability of the water for firefighting should be in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008, being the Fire Service Code of Practice for Fire Fighting Water Supplies.

Wastewater services
As the proposed subdivision is located within the Rural Residential zone, there are no reticulated wastewater services available for connection. Any effluent disposal shall be to a

septic tank and effluent disposal system which is to be designed by an approved septic tank and effluent disposal system designer.

Stormwater services
As the proposed subdivision is located within the Rural Residential zone, there is no stormwater infrastructure or kerb and channel discharge points. Disposal of stormwater is to water tables and/or watercourses onsite, or to suitably designed onsite soak-away infiltration system or rainwater harvesting system. Stormwater is not to cause a nuisance to neighbouring properties or cause any downstream effects.

To allow adequate pervious area for natural stormwater drainage, the maximum site coverage specified in the District Plan must be complied with. Please note that there are new site coverage rules in the 2GP for both building coverage and maximum site imperviousness.

Easements
An easement in gross in favour of the Dunedin City Council is required over the Council owned water supply main located within the property. The easement must be made in accordance with Section 6.3.10.3 of the Dunedin Code of Subdivision and Development 2010.

3. Consent conditions

The following conditions should be imposed on any resource consent granted

Easements
An easement in gross in favour of the Dunedin City Council is required over the Council owned water supply main located within the property. The easement must be made in accordance with Section 6.3.10.3 of the Dunedin Code of Subdivision and Development 2010.

1. Advice notes

The following advice notes may be helpful for any resource consent granted:

Code of Subdivision & Development

- All aspects of this development shall be compliant with Parts 4, 5 and 6 of the Dunedin Code of Subdivision and Development 2010.

- Private drainage issues and requirements (including any necessary works) are to be addressed via the Building Consent process.

- Certain requirements for building on this site may be stipulated via the building consent process and are likely to include the following points:
  - Stormwater from driveways, sealed areas and drain coils is not to create a nuisance on any adjoining properties.
  - Surface water is not to create a nuisance on any adjoining properties.
  - For secondary flow paths, the finished floor level shall be set at the height of the secondary flow plus an allowance for free board.
  - As required by the New Zealand Building Code E1.3.2, surface water resulting from an event having a 2% probability of occurring annually, shall not enter dwellings. The finished floor level shall be set accordingly.

DCC owned infrastructure within this property

- Any earthworks or construction on this lot must meet the requirements of the Dunedin Code of Subdivision and Development (2010) in relation to building in close proximity to Council infrastructure, unless otherwise approved by 3 Waters. The Code prohibits any building within 1.5 metres of a pipeline. If any building is proposed within 2.5 metres of a pipe or manhole, 3 Waters must be notified to discuss options and whether an encumbrance on the title is required. 'Building' includes decks, fences, garages, sheds, retaining walls and so on.

Alyssa Henderson
Subdivision Support Officer
3 Waters
Dunedin City Council

DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL
Kaunihera-a-rohe o Otepoti

Memorandum

TO: Laura Mulder

FROM: Seepage Control Unit

DATE: 20 May 2021

SUBJECT: SUB-2021-75, LUC 2021-247
140 Three Mile Hill Road
Dunedin

This application deals with the creation of 2 new residential Lots from 1 certificate of title.

There are no marked watercourses, or Dunedin City Council reticulated services available to this property.

New Lot 1

New lot 1 has existing farm buildings. Stormwater from these building is to be contained within this proposed lot. For foul and stormwater services from further development of this site, the effluent disposal shall be to a septic tank and effluent disposal system which is to be designed by a DCC-approved septic tank and effluent disposal system designer.
The stormwater concentrated by the roof can be collected in storage tanks (recommended 25,000 liters) and use for the domestic water supply.
Stormwater from right of ways, roads, drives, drain coils and water tank overflows are not to create a nuisance on any adjoining properties.

New Lot 2

For foul and stormwater services from future development of this site, effluent disposal shall be to a septic tank and effluent disposal system which is to be designed by a DCC-approved septic tank and effluent disposal system designer.
The stormwater concentrated by the roof can be collected in storage tanks (recommended 25,000 liters) and use for the domestic water supply.
Stormwater from right of ways, roads, drives, drain coils and water tank overflows are not to create a nuisance on any adjoining properties.

New Note: 2 GP rule 9.3.7 requires that all services are laid at least 600mm into resultant sites, therefore this is provided as a condition of consent for both the wastewater and stormwater connections. This work would require a Building Consent under Section 40 of the NZBC 2004.

Note: These services may require pumping.

- Storm water from driveways, sealed areas and drain coils is not to cause nuisance on and adjoining properties.
- For sites level with or above the road, the finished floor level of any building is to be a minimum of 150mm above the crown of the road.
- For sites below the road, the finished floor level is to be no less than 150mm above the lowest point on the site boundary. Surface water is not to create a nuisance on any adjoining properties.
- For secondary flow paths, the finished floor level shall be set at the height of the secondary flow plus an allowance for free board.
- As required by The New Zealand Building Code E1.3.2 surface water resulting from an event having a 2% probability of occurring annually, shall not enter dwellings, The finished floor level shall be set accordingly.

Technical Support Officer
Neville Mackay

Robert Buxton

From: MWH Hazards Team <MWHHazardsTeam@stantec.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 1 June 2021 11:06 AM
To: Laura Mulder; MWH Hazards Team
Cc: Robert Buxton
Subject: RE: SUB-2021-75 & LUC-2021-247 - Memo request for department comment - 140 Three Mile Hill Road

Hello Laura,

We have assessed the application in relation to the hazard register, street files and available aerial photography. We have not visited the site.
We have the following comments to make regarding the application.

Proposal
The proposed activity is to subdivide the above lot into two.
Site investigation reports have not been provided.
Plans for the proposal are provided within the application.

Hazards
There are no hazards identified within the hazards register for this lot or adjacent lots.

Global Setting
The underlying geology consists of second and third main eruptive phase volcanics and is sloping by less than 12 degrees.

Earthworks / Excavations / Retaining Structures
There are no proposed earthworks as part of this application.

Discussion
There are no natural hazards or stability hazards associated with the geology or slope angle.
There are no proposed earthworks, however the proposed building platforms are reasonably close to the existing DCC watermain through the site.
The boundary adjustment will have no effects on the hazards of the site, however future development of the new lot should follow the provided conditions.
We recommend that the application not be declined on the ground of known natural hazards.
There are no general potential instabilities of concern.
The proposal will not create or exacerbate instabilities on this or adjacent properties.

Conditions
The following conditions are standard conditions, some of which are generic in order to address a potential of work that whilst not indicated, could conceivable occur at the site. We recommend that the following conditions be required for future development on lot 2:-

- All walls retaining over 1.5m, or supporting a surcharge / slope, including terracing, require design, specification and supervision by appropriately qualified person/s
- Where the long-term stability of other's land or structures may rely upon the continued stability of retaining works, the designer must confirm that the retaining structure can be safely demolished following a complete design life without creating hazards for neighbouring properties.
- Any earth fill over 0.6m thick supporting foundations must be specified and supervised by a suitably qualified person in accordance with NZS 4431-1989 Code of Practice for Earthfill for Residential Development
- Slopes may not be cut steeper than 1:1 (45°) or two metres high without specific engineering design and construction

- Slopes may not be filled steeper than 2h:1v (27°) or two metres high without specific engineering design and construction
- As-built records of the final extent and thickness of any un-engineered fill should be recorded
- Any modifications to stormwater flow or new culverts shall be designed by appropriately qualified person/s and ensure that overland stormwater flows are not interrupted and not increase any adverse effects from local ponding during storm rainfall events.
- Any modification to the site shall not increase any adverse ponding effects on neighbouring lots as a result of the work

Regards,

Edward Guerreiro
BEng Civil
Civil Engineer

Mobile: +64 21 866 028
Email: edward.guerreiro@stantec.com

Stantec New Zealand
134a Gorge Road,
Queenstown 9300, New Zealand

PO Box 13052,
Christchurch 8141, New Zealand