
Friday, 21 July 2023

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga

Hastings District Council

Commissioner Hearing

Kaupapataka

Attachments Volume 2

**LIMITED NOTIFIED RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT
AND OPERATE A CHURCH HALL AND CONSTRUCT A CARPARK AT 32
REYNOLDS ROAD, HAVELOCK NORTH – HASTINGS GOSPEL TRUST INC
(RMA20220170)**

Te Rā Hui:
Meeting date: **Friday, 21 July 2023**

Te Wā:
Time: **9.00am**

Te Wāhi:
Venue: **Council Chamber
Ground Floor
Civic Administration Building
Lyndon Road East
Hastings**

**Watch Council meetings
streamed live on our website
www.hastingsdc.govt.nz**

HASTINGS DISTRICT COUNCIL
207 Lyndon Road East, Hastings 4122 | Private Bag 9002, Hastings 4156
Phone **06 871 5000** | www.hastingsdc.govt.nz
TE KAUNIHERA Ā-ROHE O HERETAUNGA

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
2.	LIMITED NOTIFIED RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE A CHURCH HALL AND CONSTRUCT A CARPARK AT 32 REYNOLDS ROAD, HAVELOCK NORTH – HASTINGS GOSPEL TRUST INC (RMA20220170)	
	<u>Document 3</u> Containing this attachment	
	Attachment 7 s92 Further information Required Letter - 5 May 2022	Pg 3
	Attachment 8 s92 Response - 18 May 2022	Pg 5
	Attachment 9 Further s92 response - dated 20 May 2022 - Covering email and attachments - Landscape Design document (Greenleaf Nurseries) and LHT letter with Updated Stormwater Assessment)	Pg 11
	Attachment 10 Section 92 response dated 23 May 2022	Pg 23
	Attachment 11 Update from neighbours regarding noise generation - 7 June 2022	Pg 25
	Attachment 12 Further information provided on areas for landscaping and SW front bdy fence - 15 June 2022	Pg 29
	Attachment 13 Further response received 30 June 2022 - revised building siting for HRB compliance and details of construction materials - Includes Updated Development Plans)	Pg 31
	Attachment 14 P and E Morrison submission - 51 Reynolds Road	Pg 41
	Attachment 15 M and D August submission - 43 Reynolds Road	Pg 45
	Attachment 16 A Janes C Thomas submission - 38 Reynolds Road	Pg 53
	Attachment 17 B Robertson Submission - 45 Reynolds Road	Pg 59
	Attachment 18 Acoustic Report - Hegley Acoustic Consultants	Pg 65
	Attachment 19 Email from Applicant (agreeable to noise conditions) - 31 May 2023	Pg 77



If calling ask for Brian Rickard
File Ref 72055#00100

5 May 2022

Mitchell Daysh Limited
PO Box 300673
Via email: ellen.robotham@mitchelldaysh.co.nz

Dear Ellen

Application for Resource Consent: 32 Reynolds Road HAVELOCK NORTH 4130, RMA20220170

A Section 95 assessment of your application has now been completed and the Application is required to provide information on the following:

- Comments from a qualified person that the species proposed for the landscaping is appropriate for its intended function and that it does not have adverse effects on the adjacent neighbours nor the road side, in terms of shadowing, leaf drop, root damage and included comment as to general maintenance required to ensure its purpose is sustainable.
- Comments from a qualified person(s) that the "rock filled soakage trench" (1m by 1m) and the proposed screen planting along the two side boundaries can co-exist. The comments must be specific to the species described in the Application (or propose alternatives) and also deal with the performance of the rain garden and its ongoing maintenance.
- Comment on the nature and function of the two narrow yards on north and west sides at the rear and side of the proposed building (shown as brown and no colour respectively).
- Describe the neighbourhood character (the general pattern in Reynolds Road will suffice) in order to show that the proposal is consistent with (or at least not inconsistent with) it. I note that the AEE comments on 8.2.5I- Landscaping Outcome and states:
 'proposed landscaping plan compliments the landscaping of neighbouring sites' and
 'planting towards the front of the property is more cohesive with neighbouring landscaping as observed in Figure 5'.

These comments are not sufficient to provide a conclusion about an Assessment of Criteria 8.2.8E1.

In regard to the Assessment of Criteria 8.2.8E2- how the Design and Appearance integrates with the surrounding area, the AEE's comment "*that the proposal fits well within the surrounding area. The single story building is of a scale, form and height comparable to neighbouring sites*" is not considered adequate nor convincing. This aspect of neighbourhood character needs description in terms of general building form, scale and location as well as the extent, location and type of open space (namely but not exclusively landscaping). The AEE does not have an analysis to support its conclusion.

- Comments from a qualified person that the noise generated by the activity is not adverse to the amenity values of neighbours. This requires quantitative (i.e. ref to section 25.1.6C) and qualitative assessment based on typical church hall activities that exist in other comparable residential environments. While I acknowledge that the 1-hour meetings (Sunday morning and on Monday evening), for approximately 45 people, comprising of family groups, will not likely have a significant disturbance effect, I consider that people arriving at 6am and leaving at 8pm are likely to have a level of effect on neighbours' amenity, that is not less than minor. The characteristics of these arrival and departure events therefore require an assessment which is

HASTINGS DISTRICT COUNCIL
207 Lyndon Road East, Hastings 4122 | Private Bag 9002, Hastings 4156
Phone **06 871 5000** | www.hastingsdc.govt.nz
TE KAUNIHERA Ā ROHE O HERETAUNGA

separate from the noise effects arising from within the building, having accounted for its design and construction material, in order to make an assessment of Criteria 8.2.8E3 and 8.

- Quantify the traffic volume and pattern of movement generated by the proposal based on the congregation's size and its demographic composition. (in part this is to support the AEE's statement that 9 vehicles on average, and a maximum of 12 vehicles, are estimated to travel to the site).
- Provide tracking curves on the site plan to shown manoeuvrability for all car parks. Confirm if there is a gate for the new drive and if so, how it functions.
- For determining the proposed Stormwater mitigation the Code of Practice now requires consideration of the 1 in 100 event (the application only addressed the 1 in 10 and the 1 in 50 year event). The Please provide an assessment of a 1 in 100 year event.

Until the further information requested has been provided I will not be able to assess whether the application should be publicly or limited notified. Depending on the amendments to the Application and my assessment of amenity effects on the neighbours, it may be necessary to commission a peer review of any specialists' Reports that are provided.

In the meantime processing of the application will not continue until you reply to this request within 15 working days as of today (in accordance with section 92A) by either informing the Council that you agree to provide the information and specify a reasonable timeframe for doing so, or you give a written notice that you refuse to provide the information.

Yours sincerely



Brian Rickard
Senior Environmental Planner (Consents)
brianr@hdc.govt.nz



PO Box 149, Napier 4140
New Zealand
+64 6 834 4098

Reference: MDL001967

18 May 2022

Brian Rickard
Hastings District Council
Private Bag 9002
HASTINGS 4156

By E-mail: brianr@hdc.govt.nz

Dear Brian

RE: RESPONSE TO S92 REQUEST – RMA20220170, HASTINGS GOSPEL HALL TRUST, 32 REYNOLDS ROAD, HAVELOCK NORTH

I refer to your section 92 request dated 5 May 2022. The following letter provides a response to some of the items of information requested. The remaining items are to be discussed at a meeting presently organised for Friday 20 May 2022.

S92 Response

Item 1 – Appropriateness of landscaping species

Comments from a qualified person that the species proposed for the landscaping is appropriate for its intended function and that it does not have adverse effects on the adjacent neighbours nor the road side, in terms of shadowing, leaf drop, root damage and included comment as to general maintenance required to ensure its purpose is sustainable.

Response:

A letter is provided by Dan Sankey of Greenleaf Nurseries which specifies the plant selection criteria and provides a summary of the type of vegetation to be used at the site. This letter is attached.

Item 2, 3 and 8 – Stormwater

Comments from a qualified person(s) that the "rock filled soakage trench" (1m by 1m) and the proposed screen planting along the two side boundaries can co-exist. The comments must be specific to the species described in the Application (or propose alternatives) and also deal with the performance of the rain garden and its ongoing maintenance.

Comment on the nature and function of the two narrow yards on north and west sides at the rear and side of the proposed building (shown as brown and no colour respectively).

For determining the proposed Stormwater mitigation the Code of Practice now requires consideration of the 1 in 100 event (the application only addressed the 1 in 10 and the 1 in 50 year event. The Please provide an assessment of a 1 in 100 year event.

Mitchell Daysh Limited

Auckland | Hamilton | Tauranga | Taupo | Napier | Wellington | Dunedin

www.mitchelldaysh.co.nz

Response:

LHT Design Ltd has provided a letter and updated stormwater assessment which are attached. The letter confirms that the soakage trench is to be set at a depth appropriate for the selected plant species described in the Greenleaf Nurseries letter.

The updated stormwater assessment includes consideration of a 1 in 100 year event. It confirms that the proposed system provides sufficient capacity for a 1 in 100 year event.

Regarding the function of the narrow yards to the north and west of the proposed building, the area shown in brown is unvegetated soakage trench as shown on page 9 of the updated stormwater assessment. The strip to the north is proposed impervious surface which has been incorporated into the stormwater assessment. These areas are not proposed to be vegetated given the difficulty in accessing these areas for landscaping maintenance and shading from the close proximity of the proposed building and fence. This is not considered to adversely affect the character of the Havelock North Residential Character Zone, or the amenity of neighbours because the fencing which is visible to neighbours is of a design appropriate for the zone and residential character of the neighbourhood, and because these areas are not visible to the public from any other location.

Item 3 – Neighbourhood Character

Describe the neighbourhood character (the general pattern in Reynolds Road will suffice) in order to show that the proposal is consistent with (or at least not inconsistent with) it. I note that the AEE comments on 8.2.5I- Landscaping Outcome and states:

'proposed landscaping plan compliments the landscaping of neighbouring sites' and 'planting towards the front of the property is more cohesive with neighbouring landscaping as observed in Figure 5'.

These comments are not sufficient to provide a conclusion about an Assessment of Criteria 8.2.8E1.

In regard to the Assessment of Criteria 8.2.8E2- how the Design and Appearance integrates with the surrounding area, the AEE's comment "that the proposal fits well within the surrounding area. The single story building is of a scale, form and height comparable to neighbouring sites" is not considered adequate nor convincing. This aspect of neighbourhood character needs description in terms of general building form, scale and location as well as the extent, location and type of open space (namely but not exclusively landscaping). The AEE does not have an analysis to support its conclusion.

Response:

The Havelock North Residential Environment is described in Section 4.3.4.2 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE). This description includes a description of the landscape character and the architectural character of the Havelock North Residential Character Zone, within which the site is located. Figure 5 of the AEE demonstrates that the character of Reynolds Road is as described in Section 4.3.4.2. In particular, Reynolds Road is characterised by:

- › Trees and landscaping are the dominant visual elements with plantings typically located at the front of properties;
- › Buildings are broken up by and in some cases screened behind hedges, fences and mature exotic trees;
- › Varied fence heights and landscaping means that the streetscape changes as the observer's viewpoint changes;

- › The use of exotic specimens means that the streetscape changes with the seasons;
- › Architecture is mixed without a high concentration of any one style representative of an era in building style;
- › The majority of buildings are single story and are set towards the middle or back of the property; and
- › The majority of sites have a primary residential building and some sites have smaller ancillary buildings such as garages and/or garden sheds.

The proposal is consistent with this character by ensuring greenery, in the form of tree species, is planted towards the front of the property, screening the buildings and carparking in a manner consistent with neighbouring properties. It is considered that the proposed planting will actually improve the coherency of the site within this character zone as it will provide an increased level of screening and higher level of vegetation at the front of the property than is the case with the previous residential use of the property. The use of exotic and a mix of deciduous and evergreen varieties is similar to the landscaping of surrounding properties and maintains the interest and seasonal change of the streetscape.

The proposal is for a single, one-story building of approximately 88m², which equates to approximately 12% of the site and is well within permitted standards for the zone. The proposed building design has a gabled roof and weatherboard cladding. This design, scale and height is similar to the existing dwelling on the property, and with neighbouring buildings which have weatherboard cladding, gabled roofs and planting which obscures the visibility of buildings but does not necessarily completely hide them. Additional images are included below to demonstrate the similarity of proposed planting and building design between the proposal and neighbouring properties. Note that one of these images is from 2015 and plantings have now grown to further obscure the buildings in a manner similar to that intended by the proposed landscaping at 32 Reynolds Road.



