



RM230019 – S92(1) & S92(2) Request

Please find below a s.92(1) and s.92(2) request. The consent will be placed on hold to allow for the following information to be provided.

s.92(1) – Request for Further Information

1. Purpose of the proposed canopy covered area
 - a. The district plan allows for accessory or non-habitable buildings in the fault study area. Please confirm that there will be no staff centred under this canopy area and the purpose of this space.
2. Signage on site – this can include proposed signs and an additional allowance if deemed necessary as the proposal is likely to breach the 3m² allowance per site.
 - a. As per the meeting the signage on site is considered likely to exceed the permitted standards.
3. Lighting plan
 - a. Including orientation, wattage, timing/duration, any proposed security lighting, trip sensor vs constant illumination, height of the lighting, and any proposed mitigation measures.
4. Hours of Operation
 - a. During the meeting you confirmed that the proposal could be a 24-hour operation with only staff movement during the night. Please confirm if this is correct. And if so please include the approximate level of activity during these hours e.g. anticipated number of vehicle movements.
5. Vibrations
 - a. Confirmation that the proposed vehicle movements will not result in offsite vibrations and if so will these be discernible at the adjacent residential activities. It is noted in section 6.5 of the report that the acoustic effects did not assess for vibrations.
 - b. Vibrations may also be a failed standard pending the construction of the site, and this non-compliance can be included in the consent if deemed necessary as it would be non-compliant with 8B 2.1.1I.

- 6. Number of staff onsite**
 - a. The traffic management plan identifies that there will be 145 staff working from the site including truck drivers and onsite staff. Please confirm if this is correct.

- 7. Updated landscaping plan**
 - a. During the meeting an updated landscaping plan was proposed to include the proposed railway to establish the visual effects on Mary Huse Grove, which the current report identifies as moderate. Please provide this updated landscaping plan.

- 8. Odour control plan**
 - a. As per our discussion please provide further clarification with regard to the proposed odour control methods.

- 9. Dust suppression**
 - a. The application identifies that water will be implemented for dust suppression. Please confirm if the site will have ongoing dust effects or whether the management plan will include provisions for dust. Please also confirm if dust standards of the district plan are anticipated to be breached during the construction of the site.

- 10. The applicant has indicated that a wayfinding strategy will be developed for the proposed Resource Recovery Park to manage all vehicle and people movements. Can the applicant please provide this in draft as part of the RC application. RM230019 - S92(1) & S92(2) requests**

- 11. Traffic generation rates for the proposed resource recovery centre have been based off the existing Seaview site; however, no assessment has been provided around what the shift in location may mean for traffic generation rates (i.e., the site will likely pick up parts of Upper Hutt and Porirua now too) so this will no doubt result in different demands. Can the applicant please provide a revised assessment with respect to this matter.**

- 12. Applicant has expressed that the facility will operate 7 days a week (6am to 7pm) with only a small number of trucks accessing the site at night. Can the applicant please expand on this (i.e., will there be truck movements after 7pm, if so, how many? And what parts of the site will they access? a. It is assumed that the site will**

contain onsite refuelling facilities. Applicant to confirm and whether these will be installed underground or above ground.

- 13.** Applicant has stated that all vehicles arriving and leaving the site will be weighed, however the proposed weighbridge location appears to be well within the site. Is the weighing only for commercial vehicles? Or does this include the general public too? I need to understand how this will function and how access will be managed in the public only areas.
- 14.** I am concerned that the traffic generation rates have been solely based on the Seaview site to inform the traffic modelling therefore I would expect to see a greater sample size gathered from other facilities around the country or a similar scale and size.
- 15.** There has been no mention of construction traffic and any assessment around this (would be anticipating significant truck movements).
- 16.** The assessment provided by Stantec regarding the existing transport environment fails to consider the crash history of the SH2/SH58 interchange. It is my assessment, that the Transportation Assessment Report needs to consider this as almost all traffic coming and going from the proposed development will travel through the interchange. This would then result in Waka Kotahi being an affected party.
- 17.** To ensure a clear understanding of the baseline traffic environment, it is not clear if there are other granted resource consents within the vicinity of the proposed development that should be taken into consideration particularly where this may result on higher traffic volumes along Manor Park Road.
- 18.** Based on the proposed changes to the rail level crossing and proposed intersection upgrade of the Benmore Crescent/ Manor Park Road intersection, this necessitates the need for a safe system audit to be carried out in line with Waka Kotahi's 2022 guidelines. The safe system audit should be carried out by a suitably qualified third party.
- 19.** As per the discussion please provide new stormwater management plans which show a swale flanking the main road of the site, and another plan in the southern lease area showing the swale for the truck parking area, in addition to the already proposed swale.

s.92(2) – Technical Review

- 1.** Traffic report review.
- 2.** Noise assessment review