

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of Resource Consents and Notices of Requirement for the Central Interceptor main project works under the Auckland Council District Plan (Auckland City Isthmus and Manukau Sections), the Auckland Council Regional Plans: Air, Land and Water; Sediment Control; and Coastal, and the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF BELINDA PETERSEN ON BEHALF OF
WATERCARE SERVICES LIMITED**

CONSULTATION AND CONDITIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Belinda Petersen. I am the Resource Consents Manager at Watercare Services Limited ("**Watercare**").
- 1.2 I have a Bachelor of Planning Degree from the University of Auckland and a post-graduate Diploma in Business and Administration from Massey University. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
- 1.3 I have been employed by Watercare for five years, prior to which I was a Principal Planner at URS New Zealand Limited.
- 1.4 I have 23 years experience in a range of planning work, with an emphasis on infrastructure, including the management of statutory planning phases for roading, wastewater and water projects.

Experience

- 1.5 In my previous position as a planning consultant at URS, I was the consenting manager for a number of major projects which are relevant in location, scope or scale to the Central Interceptor Scheme. These included the consenting and detailed design phase of the State Highway ("SH") 20 Mount Roskill Extension, the detailed design and construction phase of the SH1 Northern Motorway Extension (Orewa to Puhoi), and the post-lodgement phase of the SH20 Manukau Harbour Crossing.
- 1.6 Since joining Watercare in April 2008, I have been involved in the preparation and management of resource consent applications for various water and wastewater projects. I managed the designation and consenting process for the \$325M Hunua 4 Watermain project ("**Hunua 4**"), which is now in construction. I have continued to be involved in the implementation of the Hunua 4 designation and consents, including preparation of the Outline Plan of Works and various applications for new consents and consent variations.
- 1.7 In my role as Resource Consents Manager, I am responsible for managing a team of consent planners who prepare or manage Watercare's Notices of Requirement and resource consent applications.

Involvement in the Central Interceptor Scheme

- 1.8 I have been involved in the Central Interceptor Scheme ("**Scheme**") since late 2010. My role is to manage the designation, consent and consultation processes on behalf of Watercare.
- 1.9 Initially my role was to provide an overview of the Scheme and route alignment development process from a consenting and environmental view point. I became more actively involved once the proposed Scheme had been confirmed and work commenced on the preparation of the Notices of Requirement ("**NoR**"), consent applications and supporting documentation. My main responsibilities have been:
- (a) management of all aspects of the designation and consent process;

- (b) review of the various Assessment of Effects on the Environment ("AEE") and supporting technical reports submitted to the Council in August 2012;
- (c) review of the NoRs, to designate land, and the resource consent applications;
- (d) review of subsequent section 92 Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA") responses and other documentation submitted as part of the statutory process;
- (e) management of the consultation process prior to and following lodgement; and
- (f) once the proposed alignment had been confirmed, active participation in decision making processes relating to the further assessment of various surface construction site options.

1.10 I have also had an active role in the day to day management of the project and Watercare's consultants, particularly since the NoRs and consent applications were lodged in August 2012.

1.11 I am familiar with the sites, having undertaken various site visits over the past two years, and have attended most of the consultation meetings which have taken place over the past 18 months.

1.12 I have read the Council's Pre-hearing Report and supporting information, along with the submissions on the NoRs and resource consent applications.

1.13 I am authorised to give evidence on behalf of Watercare.

Scope of evidence

1.14 The scope of my evidence includes the following matters:

- (a) an overview of the NoRs and resource consent packages for the Central Interceptor Scheme;
- (b) a description of the existing environment;
- (c) a summary of the consultation undertaken by Watercare;

- (d) responses to submissions;
- (e) responses to the Council's Pre-hearing Report;
- (f) an overview of Watercare's proposed designation and consent conditions; and
- (g) conclusions.

1.15 I note that although I am a qualified statutory planner, my evidence does not include any statutory analysis. This is addressed in the planning evidence of Ms Marjory Russ.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 Watercare has lodged three NoRs and a package of resource consent applications for the Central Interceptor main project works ("**the Project**"). This is the substantive part of the wider Scheme and includes the required RMA approvals for the Central Interceptor main tunnel, four link sewers, the proposed Mangere Pump Station and associated works.

2.2 The main tunnel and link sewers extend over a distance of around 18 kilometres in total. The main tunnel and three of the four link sewers will be constructed by tunnelling methods, thereby minimising the extent of potential disruption to the community. The temporary construction effects will be most apparent at the proposed 19 surface construction sites and (albeit for a shorter time period) the trenching of the fourth link sewer in Mangere Bridge.

2.3 Watercare initiated a targeted consultation process during development of the concept design. This was expanded during the lead-up to lodgement of the NoRs and consent applications in August 2012 and has continued to the current date.

2.4 A wide range of parties have been consulted, and in some instances proposed construction site locations have been changed or the layout refined to accommodate views raised.

2.5 There have been four sites in particular that have attracted strong interest during the consultation process. As a result, the site locations were changed at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve (two site locations now

proposed), Keith Hay Park and Kiwi Esplanade. The site options were also reviewed at Lyon Avenue, but the site location was not changed.

- 2.6 The assessment of site options at these sites (and at all other surface construction sites) has considered technical feasibility; constructability; cost; and social, environmental and cultural effects. Given the nature and scale of the proposed works, it is not possible to avoid adverse effects and disruption to the community during construction altogether, but the extent can be managed.
- 2.7 Consultation with directly affected and interested parties is an important component of this and will continue during the detailed design, pre-construction and construction phases. It is possible that further changes to the detail of the proposed works may occur as a result of consultation undertaken, and we would hope that for most parties, any such changes will be positive.
- 2.8 The concept design for the Project has been completed to a level which enables an assessment of potential effects and identification of the range of mitigation measures that may be required to address potential adverse effects, particularly during construction.
- 2.9 Appropriate designation and consent conditions should be imposed to ensure that potential adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. However, as the Project is only at a concept design level, these conditions should also provide sufficient flexibility to allow for optimisation during detailed design and development of the construction methodology, and for operational flexibility once the Project is commissioned. By enabling design optimisation in particular, we would hope that this would result in potential adverse effects at surface construction sites being further reduced compared to those assessed to date.
- 2.10 As the Project includes 19 surface construction sites, our preference is to establish conditions which are consistent between all of those sites. For example, construction management or mitigation conditions (such as those relating to noise, vibration, and traffic) should generally be the same for all sites to enable the most efficient approach to construction management and the most positive outcome for landowners and neighbours, whether or not they have been involved in consultation processes to date or have lodged submissions.

- 2.11 The unique requirements at each site (for example, proximity to residential dwellings, the extent of works, and construction methodology) can then be reflected in the management and reinstatement plans prepared for the Project or for each specific site as the detailed design is progressed and a contractor appointed.
- 2.12 As outlined by Mr Ford and Mr Munro, the completed Project will have significant positive effects for the community of Auckland and for the natural environment. Confirmation of the NoRs and grant of the consent applications will enable delivery of the Project so that these positive effects can be realised.

3. NOTICES OF REQUIREMENT AND RESOURCE CONSENTS

Overview of the NoRs and consent packages for the Scheme

- 3.1 As outlined in the evidence of Mr Munro, the overall Scheme has two key elements:
- (a) the main project works; and
 - (b) the Combined Sewer Overflow ("**CSO**") Collector Sewers.
- 3.2 The NORs and consent applications for the main project works are the subject of this hearing. The main project works includes the main tunnel, the four link sewers, the new Mangere Pump Station at the Mangere Wastewater Treatment Plant ("**Mangere WWTP**") and an Emergency Pressure Relief ("**EPR**") structure adjacent to the new Mangere Pump Station.
- 3.3 NORs and consent applications have also been lodged for the CSO Collector Sewers. Although an important part of the wider Scheme, particularly for the mitigation of overflows, the physical works required for the CSO Collector Sewers are on a completely different scale to the main project works. The CSO Collector Sewer works are similar to the nature and scale of many of Watercare's other projects throughout the network and are being processed as a separate NoR and consent package. Further, as the works will likely be implemented as a separate contract package, or packages, and not until around 2023, it is not necessary for them to also be considered with the main project works.

- 3.4 A further related consent process that is underway is for existing and ongoing overflows from the wastewater network within the Central Interceptor catchment area. A network discharge consent has been lodged for these activities, and that application is also being separately processed. A region-wide application is being prepared for the remainder of Auckland.
- 3.5 Information on these other consent packages is provided as background to the overall consenting requirements for the Scheme. The remainder of my evidence will address only the main project works. For simplicity, I will refer to these as the Project.

Overview of NoRs

- 3.6 Watercare has lodged three NoRs for the Project relating to 18 of the 19 surface construction sites. The nineteenth site, being the proposed Mangere Pump Station at the Mangere WWTP, is located within, and authorised by, an existing Watercare designation for "Wastewater Treatment Plant", referenced as designation number 144A in the Auckland Council District Plan (Manukau Section).
- 3.7 The three NoRs are:
- (a) NoR1: NoR to Auckland Council for works within the Auckland Council District Plan (Auckland City Isthmus Section) area – this NoR relates to 17 surface construction sites;
 - (b) NoR2: NoR to Auckland Council for works within the Auckland Council District Plan (Manukau Section) area – this NoR relates to one surface construction site, at Kiwi Esplanade, Mangere Bridge; and
 - (c) NoR3: NoR to Auckland Council for works within the Auckland Council District Plan (Auckland City Isthmus Section) area — this relates to the proposed surface construction site in the car park at the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve. The designated area partly overlaps with a site included in NoR1, but only one of the identified construction sites in this location will ultimately be used for the works.

The sites included within each of the NoRs are listed in **Appendix A** of my evidence.

- 3.8 The purpose of the proposed designations is for "the construction, operation, and maintenance of wastewater infrastructure". The activities to be authorised by the designations are described in more detail in the evidence of Mr Cantrell and Mr Cooper.
- 3.9 Both NoR1 and NoR3 designate land for surface construction sites at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve. Watercare's preferred site is now in the lower car park of the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, which is covered by NoR3. This site is supported by the Albert-Eden Local Board.
- 3.10 The two sites at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve are referred to in my evidence, and in the evidence of other witnesses, as:
- (a) Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve original site (NoR1) ("**Reserve Site**");
 - (b) Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve Car Park site (NoR3) ("**Car Park Site**").
- 3.11 NoR1 has not been amended to exclude the Reserve Site at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, as Watercare wishes to be certain of the outcome on NoR3 before doing so. Therefore both sites are being retained until there is complete certainty on the outcome of NoR3, including the ability to comply with any specific conditions which apply to that site, for example, the provision of alternative car parking.

Extent of the proposed designations

- 3.12 The physical extent of the proposed designations is shown on the designation plans included as Attachment 1 of the NoRs. The proposed designations include land required for surface construction activities, permanent works, and long-term operation, access, inspection and maintenance. The designation area at each of the sites allows for a range of activities as listed in section 2.2.2 of Part A of the AEE. Vertically, the proposed designations include works at the surface, above ground and below ground.

- 3.13 Consideration was also given to designating the whole corridor for the Central Interceptor tunnel alignment. Watercare decided not to designate the whole corridor for the following reasons:
- (a) the main tunnel is located between about 22 and 110 metres (current design) below ground level;
 - (b) apart from the surface construction sites, no access is required to land above the main tunnel;
 - (c) the presence of the completed tunnel will not impact on the current or future use of land above the main tunnel, including present and future use; and
 - (d) a permanent designation may appear as a restriction on property rights in the corridor, which need not be the case.
- 3.14 On completion of construction, the extent of the proposed designations at the 18 surface construction sites will be reviewed. Areas of the designations that are not required for permanent works, operation, access, inspection or maintenance activities will be removed under section 182 of the RMA where it is reasonable to do so. Condition DC.2 of Watercare's proposed designation conditions ("**Proposed Designation Conditions**") outlines this process.

Land impacted by the proposed designations

- 3.15 A schedule of properties directly affected by the proposed designations is included as Attachment 2 of the NoRs. Watercare has generally sought to minimise the requirement to use private residential properties for the Project.
- 3.16 The proposed designations at the 18 surface construction sites affect the following land types:
- (a) Nine of the sites are located solely or predominantly within park land, owned by Auckland Council or Regional Facilities Auckland;
 - (b) Two of the sites are located solely within road reserve (Dundale Avenue and Whitney Street);

- (c) One of the sites is located solely within business zoned land (May Road) and has recently been purchased by Watercare;
- (d) The remaining six sites are located in land with a mix of uses:
 - (i) Norgrove Avenue – road reserve and park land;
 - (ii) Lyon Avenue – park land (owned by the Crown) and residential land;
 - (iii) Haverstock Road – special purpose zoned land (The New Zealand Institute of Plant and Food Research) and residential land;
 - (iv) Keith Hay Park – park land and residential land;
 - (v) Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street) – Watercare-owned land; and
 - (vi) Haycock Avenue – road reserve and residential land.
- (e) The CSO site at the Western Springs Interchange (part of the Western Springs site) is partly business zoned land and partly special purpose zoned land (transport corridor).

3.17 The land proposed to be designated is owned by the following parties:

- (a) Auckland Council;
- (b) Auckland Transport;
- (c) Regional Facilities Auckland (Western Springs);
- (d) Crown – Ministry of Education ("**MoE**") (Lyon Ave), New Zealand Transport Agency ("**NZTA**") (Western Springs interchange), KiwiRail (Keith Hay Park);
- (e) Housing New Zealand Corporation ("**HNZC**") (Haverstock Road);
- (f) The New Zealand Institute of Plant and Food Research (Haverstock Road);
- (g) Watercare (May Road and Pump Station 23, Frederick Street);

- (h) A private business owner (Western Springs Interchange); and
- (i) Two private residential owners (Keith Hay Park, Haycock Avenue) and multiple residential owners (Lyon Ave).

Existing designations

- 3.18 Some of the land included within the proposed designations has already been designated by Watercare or by other Requiring Authorities.

Existing Watercare designations

- 3.19 The proposed designation in the Auckland isthmus area (NoR1) will partly overlie the existing Watercare designations for wastewater purposes at Lyon Ave, Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street) and Pump Station 25 (Miranda Reserve).¹
- 3.20 Watercare did consider altering those existing designations instead of proposing a new designation. It was decided that, as the works extend beyond the existing designations, a new designation was appropriate and enables the Project as a whole to be comprehensively assessed, and consistent conditions can be applied across the Project.
- 3.21 The proposed Mangere Pump Station is within the existing Watercare designation for "Wastewater Treatment Plant".² There are already numerous conditions applying to works at that site. Apart from some works in the Coastal Marine Area ("**CMA**") associated with the EPR structure, the proposed works at this site will occur within the boundaries and scope of the existing designation. Therefore no alterations are required to the existing designation to enable this work.
- 3.22 While the existing designation provides the necessary land use authorisation for the proposed Mangere Pump Station, regional resource consents are still required. For this reason the proposed works at the Mangere Pump Station are also included in the resource consent applications and are assessed in the evidence of Watercare's expert witnesses.

¹ Designation numbers E06-06, H08-02 and G03-03, respectively, in the Auckland Council District Plan (Auckland City Isthmus Section).

² Designation number 144A in the Auckland Council District Plan (Manukau Section).

- 3.23 The Project also includes works within existing designations at Ambury Park (where the main tunnel traverses Ambury Park below ground) and at Witla Court (associated with the construction of Link Sewer 4).³ The proposed works are within the scope of those existing designations.
- 3.24 Once the detailed design is completed, Watercare will submit an Outline Plan of Works under section 176A of the RMA for works within the new designations and the existing designations at Ambury Park, Witla Court and the Mangere WWTP.

Other designations

- 3.25 As noted, some of the land included within the proposed designations is already designated by other Requiring Authorities. Those other Requiring Authorities are Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, NZTA, KiwiRail, Minister of Education, Transpower New Zealand Limited, New Zealand Refining Company ("NZRC") and Vector. The designation references are included in section 2.6.2 of Part A of the AEE.
- 3.26 Watercare has not yet sought formal approvals from other Requiring Authorities under sections 176 or 177 of the RMA but will do so once detailed design is underway. In the meantime, Watercare is consulting with the Requiring Authorities and will continue to do so as the Project develops.

Overview of resource consents

- 3.27 Numerous resource consents are required due to the number of Auckland Council regional and district plans applying to the works, and the physical scope of the Project.
- 3.28 Our approach in the packaging of the various consent applications has been to group like activities within individual consents, rather than seeking the consents on a site by site basis. For example, a single earthworks consent is sought under the Auckland Council Regional Plan (Sediment Control) rather than individual earthworks consents for each site. This approach ensures that conditions are consistent across the entire Project and minimises the number of consents to be managed.

³ Designation numbers 153 and 145, respectively, in the Auckland Council District Plan (Manukau Section).

- 3.29 The resource consents sought by Watercare are listed in the table included as **Appendix B** of my evidence and the reasons why the resource consents are required are summarised in sections 5.4 – 5.7 of the Council's Pre-hearing Report.

Lapse dates

- 3.30 Construction of the Project is expected to begin around 2017 and finish in 2023. However, given the size, cost and complexity of the Project, flexibility is required for its delivery. As a precaution, an extended lapse period of fifteen years is proposed for both the designations and the resource consents, either from the date of inclusion of the designations in the district plans (refer to section 184 of the RMA) or from the date of the commencement of the resource consents (refer to section 125 of the RMA), whichever is the later.

Other approvals

- 3.31 Various other statutory approvals or processes are required for the Project and these will be pursued by Watercare in due course. These include:
- (a) a general authority under section 12 of the Historic Places Act 1993 to destroy, damage or modify archaeological sites – this will be a precautionary authority as no known archaeological sites are affected by the proposed works;
 - (b) building consents for any building works subject to the Building Act 2004;
 - (c) entry agreements or easements under the Reserves Act 1977 – nine of the sites include land parcels which are gazetted reserves;
 - (d) easement or purchase agreements under the Public Works Act 1981;
 - (e) notification processes under section 181 of the Local Government Act 2002 for undertaking works on private land;⁴

⁴ Watercare has these powers pursuant to section 64 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009.

- (f) Corridor Access Request approvals under the National Code of Practice for Utility Operator's Access to Transport Corridors from Auckland Transport, NZTA and KiwiRail for works in roads, motorways and rail corridors.

4. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

- 4.1 The environment in which the Project is to be constructed is generally described in the following sections of my evidence. I have set this out here to provide a context for the consultation undertaken and also for the subsequent briefs of evidence to be presented by Watercare's expert witnesses.

Land use overview

- 4.2 The sites and the surrounding land use types at each of the surface construction sites are evident on Drawing Numbers AEE-MAIN-26 to AEE-MAIN-33 included on pages 10 and 17 of the Hearing Drawing Set.
- 4.3 The main tunnel and Link Sewers 1, 2 and 3 pass under the urban environment of the Auckland isthmus. The land use above these tunnels and in the vicinity of the surface construction sites is predominantly suburban residential (with some higher density residential around the Lyon Avenue site in particular), commercial and retail activity and urban parks.
- 4.4 After crossing under the Manukau Harbour, the main tunnel passes under the residential area of Mangere Bridge and then under Ambury Park and Watercare land to the Mangere WWTP. The proposed surface construction site at Kiwi Esplanade is located within park land, with the harbour to the north and residential development to the south. The proposed Link Sewer 4 (to be constructed by open trenching between Witla Court and Kiwi Esplanade) will pass through this residential area and then across the Kiwi Esplanade park land to the proposed surface construction site.
- 4.5 The proposed Mangere Pump Station is to be located within Watercare land and the existing Watercare designation at the Mangere WWTP. The Mangere Lagoon is located immediately to the north of the proposed construction site and the Manukau Harbour is located to the west.

- 4.6 The location of the proposed EPR structure is shown on Drawing Numbers AEE-MAIN-10.1 and AEE-MAIN-32 included on pages 137 and 16 of the Hearing Drawing Set. The proposed EPR structure is to be located on the coastal edge that was restored by Watercare when it removed the former oxidation ponds in 2002.

Watercourses and harbours

Watercourses

- 4.7 The four streams within the Central Interceptor catchment area are Motions Creek, Oakley Creek, Meola Creek and Whau Creek. The location of these streams is shown on Figure 1 included on page 5 of the Hearing Drawing Set.
- 4.8 Some minor works may be required within these streams or their tributaries as part of the Project. For example, this may include temporary bridge structures (e.g. at Walmsley Park) and minor works on overflow structures (e.g. at Motions Road, Rawalpindi Reserve and Norgrove Ave). The extent of these works has not yet been detailed but our assessment to date is that the scale of the physical works would be within the Permitted Activity status of the Auckland Council Regional Plan (Air, Land and Water).
- 4.9 A key benefit of the Project, as outlined by Mr Munro and Mr Cantrell, is that existing overflows from the transmission network into streams, particularly Meola Creek, will be significantly reduced once the new infrastructure is commissioned. With the implementation of the associated CSO Collector Sewers, these benefits will also extend to the Motions, Oakley and Whau Creeks.

Manukau Harbour

- 4.10 Works will occur in the CMA of Manukau Harbour. These proposed works are the temporary construction platform and permanent seawall at Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street), the main tunnel crossing at a minimum depth of approximately 15 metres below the seabed, and the EPR structure at the Mangere Pump Station. Resource consents have been sought for these works.

- 4.11 A discharge consent has also been sought for infrequent discharges from the EPR structure to the Manukau Harbour. Discharges at this location would only occur in an emergency event such as failure of the Mangere Pump Station over an extended period coinciding with a significant storm event. The likelihood of these events coinciding is extremely small and it is considered that the EPR is unlikely to activate more than once in every 50 years. Mr Cantrell will provide more information on the need for, and potential use of, this structure in his evidence, and Mr Roan will address the potential effects if it was used.

Waitemata Harbour

- 4.12 The Waitemata Harbour is located to the north and west of the Central Interceptor catchment area. The coastal receiving environments located nearest to the physical works are the Whau River Estuary, Waterview Embayment, Point Chevalier Beach, Meola Creek estuary and Te Tokaroa (Meola) Reef, and Motions Creek estuary.
- 4.13 No physical works are proposed in the Waitemata Harbour as part of the Project.

5. CONSULTATION

Statutory context

- 5.1 Although it is not mandatory to do so, best practice approaches normally incorporate consultation processes as an integral component of major infrastructure projects.
- 5.2 Watercare has an excellent record of consultation with various parties in the development and delivery of its major projects. The Hobson tunnel project ("**Project Hobson**"), the Puketutu Island Rehabilitation Project and Hunua 4 watermain are previous examples where extensive consultation has been undertaken well beyond requirements of the statutory process under the RMA, and has continued successfully during the pre-construction and construction phases of the projects.
- 5.3 Stakeholder engagement on major projects is strongly supported by Watercare's Statement of Intent⁵ which outlines the company's strategic direction, activities and intentions and objectives. Watercare is

⁵ Watercare Services Limited, Statement of Intent for the period: 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2015

committed to engaging with affected and interested parties in an open manner to address concerns of those parties where feasible.

Consultation overview

- 5.4 A broad consultation process was undertaken by Watercare during development of the Three Waters Strategic Plan 2008 ("**Three Waters Plan**") referred to in the evidence of Mr Munro. The Project is a key outcome of that process.
- 5.5 Targeted consultation then took place with key parties during the concept design phase of the Project to early 2011, and this was broadened during 2011 and 2012 to include a wider range of parties and directly affected landowners.
- 5.6 The main objectives of the consultation process have been to:
- (a) provide information on the Project to external parties;
 - (b) seek information from external parties to inform development of the Project;
 - (c) canvas views on construction site layouts, and incorporate changes where possible to respond to matters raised; and
 - (d) assist in the development of mitigation measures.
- 5.7 Watercare has led this consultation process with assistance from our consultants. As noted earlier in my evidence, I have attended most of the meetings that have occurred over the past 18 months.
- 5.8 While the proposed tunnelling method for the Project has significant benefits in being able to minimise construction effects on the wider community, temporary adverse effects will occur within local communities during works at the surface construction sites. Accordingly, the initiation of a consultation process to provide information, seek feedback, and respond to issues raised by submitters, has been an important component of the Project to date.
- 5.9 Consultation is ongoing, and Watercare will continue consultation throughout the detailed design, pre-construction and construction phases of the Project. I will now outline some of the consultation undertaken

prior to lodgement in August 2012. Following that, I will provide detail of the consultation that myself and other Watercare personnel and consultants have been involved with since lodgement.

Consultation prior to lodgement (to June 2012)

- 5.10 The consultation undertaken during the development of the Project to June 2012 and the key outcomes are set out in section 8 of Part A of the AEE.
- 5.11 In summary, that consultation process involved various contacts, meetings, correspondence and exchange of information with:
- (a) Local boards (Waitemata, Albert-Eden, Whau, Puketapapa and Mangere-Otahuhu);
 - (b) Auckland Council staff – particularly the Auckland Council Parks, Sports and Recreation ("**Auckland Council Parks**"), stormwater and regulatory groups;
 - (c) Mana Whenua;
 - (d) transport authorities – Auckland Transport, NZTA and KiwiRail;
 - (e) network utilities;
 - (f) directly affected landowners;
 - (g) landowners adjacent to construction sites;
 - (h) other agencies, the wider community and interest groups; and
 - (i) Watercare Advisory Groups – the (former) Maori Advisory Group, Environmental Advisory Group, and Mangere Community Liaison Group.
- 5.12 Opportunity was provided for involvement of the wider community via the distribution of a Project newsletter in May 2012 and information days in local venues.
- 5.13 The main outcome of the consultation process prior to lodgement of the NoRs and consent applications in August 2012 was the changes and refinements that could be made at some of the proposed construction

sites. Those changes and refinements are noted in section 8.12 (on pages 84 and 85) of Part A of the AEE.

- 5.14 The key changes made on a site specific basis prior to lodgement are summarised in the table below:

Table 1: Changes made prior to lodgement in response to consultation undertaken

Site	Changes made in response to consultation undertaken
Western Springs	Revised construction exit arrangement via Stadium Road to minimise potential traffic conflicts.
Western Springs Depot	Site location shifted west to reduce impact on "back of house" activities during stadium events.
Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve	<p>Alternatives were considered in response to residents' concerns; however, the Reserve Site was retained (at that time) as this was considered to have lower overall impact on the community. The designation area was increased to provide greater flexibility during detailed design to incorporate measures minimising potential impacts on residents.</p> <p>[Note that since lodging NoR1, the site location at Albert War Memorial Reserve was further reviewed, with the revised Car Park Site reflected in the subsequent NoR3.]</p>
Lyon Avenue	Revised construction access road layout to minimise impact on significant trees within the site.
Keith Hay Park	<p>Site location was changed in response to strong concerns from Auckland Council staff and the Puketapapa Local Board regarding the potential effects on Keith Hay Park. This is an extensively used park for a wide range of sports and leisure activities. The Draft Keith Hay Park Concept Plan was the subject of a community consultation process during 2012. Works envisaged by the concept plan are now being implemented.</p> <p>The site location changed from within Keith Hay Park north of the swimming pool to private land at 22 Gregory Place and Auckland Council properties at 49 – 51 Arundel Street to minimise impact on park usage.</p> <p>A further change in response to discussions with a neighbour was that the connection point and drop shaft were relocated further from the northern residential boundary.</p>
Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street)	Revised permanent works layout to avoid permanent reclamation and enable removal of existing pump station building.

Site	Changes made in response to consultation undertaken
Kiwi Esplanade	Revised site location to reduce visibility of permanent works and impact on open space – previous location at western end of Kiwi Esplanade replaced with site further east on Kiwi Esplanade (toilet block). Decision to proceed with Kiwi Esplanade option rather than Ambury Park.
Whitney Street	Site location shifted to road reserve to avoid impact on private residential property.

Consultation undertaken following lodgement (post August 2012)

- 5.15 Watercare has continued discussions with various parties since the NoRs and consent applications were lodged in August 2012.
- 5.16 The number of submissions received following notification in October 2012 and notification of NoR3 in March 2013 are summarised in section 7.1 of the Council's Pre-hearing Report.
- 5.17 As recorded by the Council, 676 of the submissions received following notification in October 2012 were signed copies of a proforma submission (two versions) originating from the Mangere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers Association ("**MBRRA**") and Manukau Harbour Restoration Society ("**MHRS**"). The remaining 70 are individual submissions which I refer to as the "non-proforma" submissions.
- 5.18 Since receipt of the submissions we have met with or contacted many of the non-proforma submitters, along with some other parties who lodged a pro-forma submission. In a few cases, the submitters had specifically requested a meeting; in other cases, the meetings were initiated by Watercare. Further information has been provided to submitters, including information on alternatives to the Project, alternatives considered at specific surface construction sites, and information on the Mangere WWTP and condition of the Manukau Harbour.
- 5.19 Consultation with various parties between 1 July 2012 and 8 July 2013 is listed in the table in **Appendix C** of my evidence. The consultation undertaken during this period (and some of the earlier consultation, for context) is summarised in the following pages, including the key matters discussed and whether Watercare has been able to respond to concerns raised.

Local Boards

- 5.20 The Project is within the local board areas of Waitemata, Albert-Eden, Whau, Puketapapa and Mangere-Otahuhu. The local board areas are shown in **Appendix D**.
- 5.21 Initial presentations on the Project were made to the local boards in 2011, followed by further meetings and site visits with local board representatives in late 2011 and in 2012.
- 5.22 Most of the site specific discussions since mid-2012 have been with the Albert-Eden Local Board. The proposed work at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve was a main focus of those discussions, resulting in a resolution from the Albert-Eden Local Board in February 2013 recommending to Watercare that the works be undertaken in the area of the lower car park. This resulted in Watercare's lodgement of NoR3 for the Car Park site. Discussions are now continuing (together with Auckland Council Parks) in relation to options for alternative car parking in and around the Mount Albert Memorial Reserve during the construction period.
- 5.23 An update on the Project and notification of NoR3 was provided to the Albert-Eden Local Board in May 2013. The proposed works and the submissions received in relation to the Lyon Avenue site were also discussed at this meeting. This was followed up with a site visit on 18 June 2013 to the Lyon Ave site. The Board noted their particular interest in improved access and amenity to and from the walkway at 1 Wagener Place, and offered suggestions for this. The Board has requested ongoing involvement in development of alternative pedestrian access routes, works within the Roy Clements Treeway and site reinstatement in particular. This request can be accommodated, and the Local Board will remain updated and involved during further development of the Project.
- 5.24 Watercare also attended other meetings with the Puketapapa, Mangere-Otahuhu, Papakura and Manurewa Local Boards during 2013. Updates were provided on the Project, and information presented on how it fits within the wider wastewater strategy for Auckland, planned improvements at the Mangere WWTP and condition of the Manukau Harbour.

Auckland Council Parks, Sports and Recreation

- 5.25 Since lodgement, the key area of discussion with staff at Auckland Council Parks has been in relation to the site options at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve and alternative parking at the reserve if the Car Park Site is implemented.
- 5.26 As the Project includes nine surface construction sites entirely within parks and three further sites which are partly within parks, ongoing consultation with Auckland Council Parks will be a key component of the detailed design process and subsequent delivery stages.

Auckland Council Stormwater

- 5.27 As the Project is taking place within the combined stormwater / wastewater area of Auckland, the development of the Project was undertaken in consultation with engineering staff of Auckland Council's Stormwater Unit. I was not involved in those earlier discussions, but have participated in more recent discussion relating to the proposed surface construction sites and potential opportunities for Watercare to integrate reinstatement and mitigation works with Auckland Council's wider stream catchment management programmes.
- 5.28 Discussions with Auckland Council's Stormwater Unit will continue during the detailed design process, specifically in relation to:
- (a) engineering design of the Project;
 - (b) layout of surface construction sites located adjacent to watercourses and design of temporary and permanent bridges across watercourses; and
 - (c) reinstatement works at surface construction sites located adjacent to watercourses, and opportunities to integrate those works with Auckland Council's wider stream catchment management programmes.
- 5.29 Ongoing consultation with Auckland Council's Stormwater Unit will be led by Watercare's Central Interceptor Project Manager.

Mana whenua

- 5.30 Consultation undertaken with mana whenua leading up to and following lodgement of the NoRs and resource consent applications, and the outcome of that process, is summarised in evidence of Mr Maskill.

Transport authorities and utilities

- 5.31 The proposed alignment of the Central Interceptor main tunnel and Link Sewers 1, 2, 3 and 4 interfaces with existing or future transport corridors and other infrastructure in numerous locations. This includes State Highways 16 and 20, the western rail line, the future Avondale-Southdown rail line, a Vector gas pipeline, and NZRC's Refinery to Auckland Pipeline. There are overhead power lines in the vicinity of the Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street), Pump Station 25 (Miranda Reserve) and the Miranda Reserve sites.⁶
- 5.32 Key transport authorities and network utility operators consulted over the past year have been NZTA, Auckland Transport, KiwiRail and Transpower.
- 5.33 NZTA was consulted in relation to the proposed works during 2012 and information exchanges have occurred as required during 2013. In particular, NZTA is proposing to upgrade the Western Springs interchange (SH16) in the near future. This work may have minor implications for the proposed Watercare works at the Western Springs Interchange (refer Drawing Number AEE-MAIN-1.4 on page 24 of the Hearing Drawing Set). Consultation will continue in relation to the proposed works at the interchange and other sites requiring access to the motorway corridor.
- 5.34 Watercare, Auckland Transport and other network utility operators have been in regular discussions over the past year regarding processes for designations affecting the road reserve. The parties are working collaboratively to ensure that designations of various transport and utility providers do not unreasonably restrict the rights of other transport and utility providers.

⁶ The location of key infrastructure is shown on Figure 9.4 of Part A of the AEE.

- 5.35 In this context, Watercare met with representatives of Auckland Transport in April and May 2013 to discuss their submission on the NoRs for the Project. Amendments have been made to the proposed conditions in response to their submission and to reflect the wider discussions taking place. These have been discussed with Auckland Transport and are incorporated in the Proposed Designation Conditions and the Proposed Consent Conditions included in **Appendix E** and **F** of my evidence. As the Project develops, Auckland Transport will be closely involved in the preparation of Traffic Management Plans for all of the surface construction sites, and Corridor Access Requests will be submitted for their approval prior to construction works in the road reserve.
- 5.36 KiwiRail has not lodged a submission on the Project, but discussions have continued with KiwiRail representatives in relation to the proposed works, particularly in the vicinity of Keith Hay Park where a proposed collector sewer passes under land designated for the future Avondale-Southdown rail line. There are some potential design conflicts, but options to address these have been identified and will be discussed with KiwiRail during the detailed design process.
- 5.37 Further information was provided to Transpower in response to their submission. That information included an assessment of potential settlement at each of their pylons and other facilities along the route. Amendments have been made to the proposed conditions in response to their submission. These have been discussed with Transpower and are incorporated in the Proposed Designation Conditions and the Proposed Consent Conditions included in **Appendix E** and **F** of my evidence.
- 5.38 Consultation will continue with the transport authorities, Transpower, Vector, NZRC and other network utility operators during the detailed design, pre-construction and construction phases of the Project.

Directly affected landowners and neighbours at surface construction sites

- 5.39 The locations of the proposed surface construction sites and the surrounding land uses are indicated on Drawing Numbers AEE-MAIN-26 to AEE-MAIN-33 included on pages 10 and 17 of the Hearing Drawing Set. I refer to the "directly affected landowners" as those whose land is

subject to the proposed designations. I have summarised the land ownership of the sites in section 2 of my evidence.⁷

- 5.40 Five of the proposed construction sites are located on land entirely or partly in private ownership. Since lodgement, Watercare has reached agreement to purchase three of the directly affected private properties (at May Road, Keith Hay Park and Haycock Avenue). An existing easement is in place at one of the sites (part of the Lyon Avenue site) and a Right of Entry Agreement and easements are being negotiated in relation to works at the Haverstock Road site.
- 5.41 Directly affected landowners at three of the proposed construction sites have lodged submissions on the Project. These are the New Zealand Institute of Plant and Food Research, St Lukes Gardens Apartments Body Corporate and St Lukes Gardens Apartments Progressive Society Incorporated (for ease, I will refer to them as the "**St Lukes Gardens Apartments**", but acknowledge that they are separate entities and refer to them separately where appropriate), and Tawa Farms Limited.
- 5.42 Recent consultation with immediate neighbours of the proposed construction sites has focussed on the sites where individuals have lodged submissions. These sites are Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, Lyon Ave, Haverstock Road, May Road, Keith Hay Park and Kiwi Esplanade. Recent consultation has also taken place with residents in the vicinity of Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street). This meeting was initiated by the Roskill Puketapapapa Residents' Association.
- 5.43 Consultation undertaken with directly affected landowners and neighbours since lodgement in August 2012 is summarised below, by surface construction site (ordered generally from north to south).

Western Springs Interchange

- 5.44 Tawa Farms is a directly affected landowner. Tawa Farms Limited owns a parcel of land subject to the proposed designation at the Western Springs Interchange. The bulk of their land is occupied by the existing Caltex Service Station. The land to be designated is physically separated from the service station by a fence and vegetation.

⁷ A detailed schedule of land included in the designations is included in Attachment 2 of the NoRs.

5.45 Initial contacts were made with Tawa Farms during 2012 and a meeting took place with the owner in mid-March 2013. The nature and extent of works at the site was clarified at that meeting and further information was provided in a follow up letter responding to the matters raised in the submission. As part of this, Watercare's consultants, Tonkin & Taylor Limited, undertook an assessment of the potential effects of vibration on the fuel tanks and concluded that the construction works would not impact on their integrity. This conclusion was reported in the response letter to Tawa Farms, and is addressed in the evidence of Mr Millar. Mr Millar notes that the risk to the fuel tanks from the proposed works will be less than minor and managed by the implementation of Project Vibration Standards.

5.46 The potential effects of vibration on the fuel tanks will be revisited once the detailed design is complete and as part of the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan required by Condition CNV.5 of the Proposed Designation Conditions.

Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve

5.47 As noted earlier, in paragraphs 3.9 – 3.11, both NoR1 and NoR3 designate land for surface construction sites at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve.

5.48 Consultation undertaken with Auckland Council Parks, the Albert-Eden Local Board, and neighbours prior to lodgement of NoR1 is summarised in section 8.10.2 (on page 83) of Part A of the AEE. Consultation which took place after lodgement is summarised in the table in **Appendix C** of my evidence.

5.49 When NoR1 was publicly notified in October 2012, nineteen submissions were received from neighbours opposed to the proposed works at the Reserve Site and specifically the location of the works in close proximity to residential dwellings. Residents requested that the site be relocated within the reserve, further from residential boundaries.

5.50 In response, Watercare considered further alternatives, including a modified version of the previously considered lower car park option and a further option locating the works partly within the lower car park and partly within the grassed reserve area. This consideration of alternatives included further consultation with submitters, Auckland Council Parks and

the Albert-Eden Local Board. The comparative assessment undertaken is summarised in the assessment table included as **Appendix G** of my evidence.⁸

- 5.51 All of the submitters to NoR1 were invited to attend a meeting at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve on 11 February 2013, and all apart from one attended that meeting. The proposed works were discussed, including the alternative site layouts referred to above. There was general support expressed by many (but not all) of the residents to relocate the proposed construction site into the Car Park Site.
- 5.52 The Albert-Eden Local Board made a resolution at its meeting on 13 February 2013 recommending that Watercare undertake the works in the Car Park Site.
- 5.53 In response to the consultation undertaken with residents and the Albert-Eden Local Board, Watercare then submitted NoR3 to designate the Car Park Site.
- 5.54 A key impact of that site compared to the Reserve Site, is the temporary occupation of around 65 car parks. Consultation is now continuing with Auckland Council Parks and the Albert-Eden Local Board regarding options for alternative parking during construction.
- 5.55 The residential property closest to the proposed Car Park Site (and also affected by the Reserve Site included in NoR1, but to a slightly lesser degree) is owned by the Community of Refuge Trust ("**the Trust**"). This property comprises three residential units at 2/9, 3/9 and 4/9 Wairere Avenue. The Trust specialises in housing people living with mental illness in the community and is primarily concerned about the potential effects on the tenants of their three units during construction.
- 5.56 Meetings took place with representatives of the Trust in January and May 2013. The concerns raised by the Trust and the sensitivities of their tenants are acknowledged. An amendment has been made to the proposed layout in the Car Park Site to move a proposed control chamber (and associated construction works) slightly further from the Trust's property (as shown on Drawing Number AEE-MAIN-2.2A on page 50 of

⁸ This comparative assessment table was included in Attachment 5 of the section 92 RMA response to Auckland Council on 27 May 2013.

the Hearing Drawing Set). Further refinements will be considered as part of the detailed design process.

- 5.57 Watercare and its' contractors will be required to implement all reasonable measures to minimise the effects of the construction works on adjacent residents. Consultation with the Trust well before construction starts will be a key factor in this. Watercare and the Trust are working to establish an agreed process on how best to address the specific circumstances for this site, including the circumstances in which temporary relocation may be required.
- 5.58 Other residents who lodged a submission in opposition to the Car Park Site (NoR3) are Kenneth Webb and Louise Gordon who own the property at 9 Wairere Avenue. These residents are affected to a similar degree by either the Reserve Site or the Car Park Site as the proposed construction access is located along their southern boundary. A meeting with these residents took place on 19 June 2013. I was not able to attend that meeting but understand that the key issues discussed related to the duration of works, construction traffic, noise effects and compensation.
- 5.59 The dwelling at 9 Wairere Avenue is located immediately adjacent to the proposed construction access road. A 2.5 metre high noise barrier is proposed along the property boundary. Although designed to reduce noise effects, the height of the barrier may have consequential impacts on amenity of the dwelling (e.g. reduced natural light). Options for the design of the noise barrier will be discussed with the submitter, along with other potential measures to mitigate noise and vibration effects during construction. The potential noise and vibration effects will be discussed in more detail in the evidence of Mr Cottle and Mr Millar.

Feasibility and selection of NoR1 and NoR3

- 5.60 Both the Reserve Site (NoR1) and the Car Park Site (NoR3) are technically feasible.
- 5.61 As I mentioned earlier, nineteen submissions were received from local residents when NoR1 was notified for the Reserve Site in late 2012. Many of those same submitters lodged submissions in support of NoR3 for the Car Park Site when this was notified in March 2013. These submissions reflect the fact that the Car Park Site will have less impact on residents overall compared to the Reserve Site. However, the Car

Park Site has a slightly increased impact on the CORT property and a greater impact on park users through the reduction in car parking spaces and proximity to the recreation centre and other community buildings.

- 5.62 Based on the specialist assessments undertaken by Watercare's consultants, it is our view that the effects of works at either the Reserve Site or the Car Park Site can be managed so that the landowner, adjacent residents and park users are not unreasonably impacted given the scale of the Project. At all 18 surface construction sites incorporated within the NoRs, including both the Reserve Site or Car Park Site at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, the works must be managed to comply with the same noise, vibration, traffic and other conditions.

Lyon Avenue

- 5.63 St Lukes Gardens Apartments entities represent the owners of the residential apartments on Morning Star Place, St Lukes. I understand that there are 279 residential and five commercial units within the development, housing around 800 people.⁹
- 5.64 Watercare has an existing easement over land owned by St Lukes Gardens Apartments. In 2010 Watercare signed a Development Deed with St Lukes Gardens Apartments in relation to the proposed residential development and Watercare's requirements. The existence and contents of the Development Deed will be addressed in legal submissions at the hearing.
- 5.65 Notwithstanding that existing agreement, St Lukes Gardens Apartments are affected by the proposed works at the Lyon Avenue site as they own part of the land required for the works, proposed access is via Morning Star Place, and numerous apartments are located immediately adjacent to the proposed surface construction site.
- 5.66 Watercare's former Project Manager (Mr Michael Sheffield) and I initially met with St Lukes Gardens Apartments in May 2012 to discuss the proposed works and provided further information and updates via e-mail. More recent meetings took place on 10 April and 5 June 2013. From these meetings I understand that St Lukes Gardens Apartments do not oppose the Project but do oppose the location, extent of the works and

⁹ St Lukes Garden Apartments Body Corporate submission dated 18 January 2013 and SLGA Progressive Society Incorporated submission dated 20 March 2013.

access proposed at the Lyon Avenue site. These points have been the main focus of Watercare's recent discussions with St Lukes Gardens Apartments.

- 5.67 The existing overflow point at the Lyon Avenue site is one of the two largest overflows in Auckland. The other is at Haverstock Road. Together, these overflows account for around 35 to 40% of the annual overflow volume in the Central Interceptor catchment area. Reducing these overflows is one of the key drivers for the Project, and the Project will have a significant positive effect in this locality. In order to achieve this, it is not practically possible to avoid construction works on land owned by and adjacent to St Lukes Gardens Apartments.
- 5.68 During development of the Project and more recently in response to submissions received¹⁰ and consultation undertaken, alternative construction sites were considered, specifically the proposed Lyon Avenue site and an alternative site in the Mount Albert Grammar School ("**MAGS**") playing fields. Various configurations at both of those sites have also been considered.
- 5.69 The Crown owns most of the land required for the proposed Lyon Avenue site as well as the alternative site in the MAGS playing fields.
- 5.70 Contact with MoE (on behalf of the Crown) and MAGS was initially made prior to lodgement of the NoR. More recent consultation has taken place following receipt of submissions on the NoR. Mr Munro contacted the MAGS Headmaster in April 2013 and the alternative sites were discussed at a meeting with a representative of MoE and the MAGS Headmaster and Property Manager on 8 May 2013. In summary, the feedback received at that meeting was in support of the proposed Lyon Avenue site and not in support of the alternative site in the MAGS playing fields.
- 5.71 A comparative assessment of the proposed Lyon Avenue site and the alternative site in the MAGS playing fields is presented in the assessment table included as **Appendix H** of my evidence.¹¹ Both sites are technically feasible as discussed in the evidence of Mr Cooper. The

¹⁰ Specifically from St Lukes Garden Apartments Body Corporate, St Lukes Garden Apartments Progressive Society, St Lukes Environmental Protection Society and Mount Albert Residents Association

¹¹ This comparative assessment table was included in Attachment 5 of the section 92 RMA response to Auckland Council on 27 May 2013.

summary assessment table reflects matters that have been raised by and discussed with St Lukes Gardens Apartments, MoE and MAGS.

- 5.72 Even if a site were established in the MAGS playing fields, works would still be required on the land owned by St Lukes Gardens Apartments as that is where the existing overflow is located and a connection must be made at that point.
- 5.73 Having reviewed the alternatives and considered the views of the landowners, the potential construction effects, the opportunities to mitigate those effects, and the benefits of the works, Watercare remains strongly of the view that the proposed Lyon Avenue site is the best practicable option at this location.
- 5.74 Another key point of discussion with St Lukes Gardens Apartments has been the proposed construction access to the Lyon Avenue site via Morning Star Place. Morning Star Place is a private road. The intent to use this road is clearly indicated in documentation submitted in support of the NoR, but the road is not included within the proposed designation as access for Watercare's existing and proposed activities is provided for in an existing easement and Development Deed.
- 5.75 Watercare has assessed the potential effects of the construction access on the St Lukes Gardens Apartments land and residents, and has considered a range of alternative construction access options, including numerous options suggested in the submission of St Lukes Gardens Apartments Progressive Society Incorporated.
- 5.76 A summary assessment table of the alternative construction access options considered is included in **Appendix I** of my evidence. These options were discussed at the recent meetings with MoE, MAGS and St Lukes Gardens Apartments.
- 5.77 The proposed access via Morning Star Place remains Watercare's preferred access option. Our traffic engineers have assessed all of the options and concluded that this is preferred from a traffic and pedestrian safety point of view, compared to other options assessed. Mr Hills will provide further information on this in his evidence. Access via Morning Star Place also avoids the need for construction of new roading across the MAGS playing fields or Auckland Council reserve, and avoids the

need for a bridge (or two bridges) and associated works across the Meola Creek.

- 5.78 A minor change that has been made at the Lyon Avenue site in response to consultation with St Lukes Gardens Apartments was an amendment to the proposed designation boundary to avoid impact on privately allocated car parks on the St Lukes Gardens Apartments land.¹²
- 5.79 The potential traffic and other effects on St Lukes Gardens Apartments during construction and the proposed measures to be taken to mitigate those effects, will be more specifically addressed in evidence of other witnesses. Ongoing consultation with MoE, MAGS and St Lukes Gardens Apartments will be a key component during further development of the Project. The construction management plans for the site will be prepared in consultation with the landowners, particularly those relating to traffic, noise and vibration, and regular communications will be maintained prior to and during construction to ensure that potential effects on residents are minimised to the greatest practicable extent.
- 5.80 The site reinstatement plan will also be prepared in consultation with the landowners. As noted earlier, the Albert-Eden Local Board has also requested involvement in the development of this plan – in particular, the opportunities for improved access and amenity to and from the walkway at 1 Wagener Place.

Haverstock Road

- 5.81 New Zealand Institute of Plant and Food Research ("**PFR**") own land subject to the proposed designation at Haverstock Road. Initial discussions took place with representatives of PFR in 2011 and 2012 and the most recent meeting occurred in March 2013. PFR does not oppose the works but has been seeking assurance that (in particular) the proposed works will not impact on their activities and that on completion of the works, appropriate reinstatement will be undertaken. These points have been the main focus of the discussions.
- 5.82 Watercare has been working with PFR to establish a right of entry agreement which secures Watercare's access to the land and addresses the concerns raised by PFR in relation to the construction works,

¹² Refer letter to Auckland Council dated 27 May and Attachment 7 of that letter containing the drawings at Lyon Avenue.

permanent access, reinstatement and operational requirements. A draft agreement was provided in May 2013. Watercare's Property Manager is continuing discussions with PFR on the scope and detail of the agreement.

- 5.83 The Institute of Environmental Science and Research ("**ESR**") is located on land adjacent to PFR, with access from Hampstead Road. Their nearest property boundary is around 100m from the proposed surface construction site at Haverstock Road and a short section of trenching works will be required across their driveway for construction of an associated collector sewer.
- 5.84 A representative of ESR was also present at the meeting with PFR in March 2013. A written response to ESR's submission was sent on 18 June 2013, including further detail on the proposed at the Haverstock Road site and the associated collector sewer works within their property. The letter included excerpts of the Tonkin & Taylor report on potential vibration effects as well as a copy of the designation conditions proposed. We have also requested further information from ESR regarding the particular sensitivity of their equipment so that this can be taken into account during detailed design.
- 5.85 The other directly affected landowner at the Haverstock Road site is HNZC. The proposed site access from Haverstock Road was initially located to match HNZC redevelopment plans. Those plans have since been abandoned and nine of the properties have been sold. As a result of consultation with HNZC, Watercare agreed to minor changes to the proposed access way in February 2013 so that the physical impacts of the proposed access road were contained to one property only. The designation was amended in February 2013 to reflect this.¹³
- 5.86 The ownership of the land required for the access to the Haverstock Road site will soon change from HNZC to a new owner. Watercare will then work with the new owner to finalise the access easement.

¹³

Letter to Auckland Council dated 20 February 2013.

May Road

- 5.87 Watercare has recently purchased the required land at the proposed May Road site.
- 5.88 Immediate neighbours whom have lodged submissions on the Project are Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited ("**Foodstuffs**") and Moi Moi Ong.
- 5.89 Foodstuffs was initially contacted in 2009 when various sites were being broadly considered as part of the assessment of alignment options for the main tunnel. Contact was made again with Foodstuffs in May 2012 once the alignment had been confirmed. A project information sheet was e-mailed to their General Manager, Mr Ian Brown, along with a drawing of the proposed works at the May Road site and an offer to meet with Watercare if further information was required. Meetings took place with Foodstuffs representatives in October and November 2012. Various matters were discussed at the meetings, primarily relating to the potential traffic and other construction effects of the works. These issues are reflected in the submission received.
- 5.90 The main concerns raised and discussed with Foodstuffs are the potential traffic effects on Roma Road and the wider network. In particular, Foodstuffs has suggested that access to the proposed May Road construction site should be direct to May Road. Traffic engineers acting on behalf of Watercare and Foodstuffs exchanged information on the proposed works and the potential effects from late 2012 to April 2013. Unfortunately, this process did not result in a resolution of the traffic concerns raised by Foodstuffs.
- 5.91 Based on advice from Mr Hills, Watercare is satisfied that the proposed two-way construction access to Roma Road is suitable for access to the May Road construction site, and that the potential traffic effects on Roma Road and the wider network will be no more than minor.
- 5.92 However, an additional access direct to May Road would provide greater flexibility for the construction works and would reduce the number of vehicles using Roma Road (and therefore the potential traffic effects with which Foodstuffs is concerned). Watercare has recently purchased the required land for the proposed May Road construction site. The agreement with the former owner also includes provision for direct access to May Road during the construction works, in addition to the proposed

access via Roma Road. The way in which this additional access could be used will be considered during further development of the Project.

- 5.93 Foodstuffs has recently been updated on the property purchase, and we are hoping to meet with them shortly to continue discussions regarding the Project.
- 5.94 Apart from Foodstuffs, the only other neighbour who lodged a submission on the proposed works at May Road was Moi Moi Ong. The submitter owns land immediately adjacent to the proposed site, at 51 Marion Avenue. A written response to Moi Moi Ong was sent by Watercare on 14 June 2013. As with other sites, Watercare and the contractor will keep the submitter informed prior to and during construction.

Keith Hay Park

- 5.95 Since lodgement of the NoR in August 2012, Watercare has met on two occasions with Mr and Mrs Whitehead at 18 Gregory Place, and met with Mr and Mrs Puertollano at 47A Arundel Street on 25 June 2013. Mr and Mrs Whitehead also attended this recent meeting.
- 5.96 The Whitehead property boundary is located only around 12 metres from the proposed access shaft at the Keith Hay Park site. This property is one of the closest to any of the shaft sites, and as it is two storied, mitigation of noise effects in particular will require special treatment. The potential noise and other effects and mitigation options are discussed in detail in the evidence of Watercare's expert witnesses.
- 5.97 The potential effects on the Whitehead property are acknowledged by Watercare. The Whiteheads are affected to a much greater degree than they would have been if a site originally proposed within Keith Hay Park had been pursued. A new playground has recently been constructed in that original location. A comparative assessment of the various site options considered at Keith Hay Park is presented in the assessment table included as **Appendix J** of my evidence.¹⁴
- 5.98 Mr and Mrs Whitehead have requested commitments from Watercare on certain mitigation measures (for example, a specific request for double glazing). Watercare will implement measures to mitigate construction

¹⁴ This table was provided to the Council as Attachment 5 of the section 92 response dated 27 May 2013.

effects, but until the detailed design is complete, and a construction methodology confirmed, it is not possible to specify exactly what those measures will be in relation to this or any other similarly affected property. For example, the detailed design process could result in a different arrangement of works at the site, and this may result in a different (hopefully lesser) degree of effect.

- 5.99 The Puertollano property is located adjacent to the proposed construction access from Arundel Street. I was not able to attend the meeting with Mr and Mrs Puertollano on 25 June 2013 but understand that the key issues discussed related to the construction access, number of trucks and noise effects.
- 5.100 Further assessment is being undertaken of potential noise mitigation options for both the Whitehead and Puertollano properties. At this stage we are hoping to report back to the owners with this further information later in July and discussions with them will continue during further development of the Project.

Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street)

- 5.101 Watercare was invited by the Puketapapapa Residents' Association to meet with Hillsborough residents on 16 May 2013 to discuss the Project and the proposed works at Pump Station 23.
- 5.102 The need for the proposed work was acknowledged by the residents. Particular concerns raised and discussed related to the potential noise, traffic and other construction effects. At this location the proposed access is via a steep driveway and then onto a steep residential road. Given the work is at an existing Watercare pump station located on the coastal edge, it is not practicable to establish an alternative access, but the particular requirements of the site will be reflected in the detailed traffic management plan to be prepared.¹⁵
- 5.103 Another particular issue discussed with the residents was the opportunity for provision of public access. There is no public access currently provided at this site, but this could be considered in the future, subject to Watercare's operational requirements and health and safety considerations. Watercare's Project Hobson is an example where the

¹⁵ Refer Proposed Designation Condition TM.2.

facilities required on the coastal edge have been specifically designed to provide for and enhance public access to the coast.

Kiwi Esplanade

- 5.104 Watercare representatives met with Mr and Mrs Dempsey on 5 June 2013 to discuss their submission on the NoR and consent applications. Mr and Mrs Dempsey own a residential property at 88 Kiwi Esplanade which is opposite the proposed surface construction site at Kiwi Esplanade and is also above the tunnel corridor. I was not able to attend the meeting but understand that the key issues discussed related to the tunnel alignment and construction methodology, and the provisions for payment of compensation to landowners.
- 5.105 A response letter was sent on 21 June 2013 to clarify that compensation payments to landowners above the main tunnel alignment are unlikely to be made. The key reasons for this are that Watercare does not require an easement and the proposed construction method and operation of the main tunnel are not expected to result in any adverse effects on properties above it, nor restrict any future uses of property located outside of the proposed designation boundaries. I note that no easements were established or compensation payments made to any landowners located above the Project Hobson tunnel when it was constructed in between 2007 and 2010. This has been discussed in further detail by Mr Munro. One of my colleagues has recently followed up with the Dempseys and asked whether they need any further clarification or information beyond what was provided in the response letter of 21 June.

Other construction sites

- 5.106 I have summarised the specific consultation undertaken with landowners or neighbours at eight of the proposed surface construction sites since lodgement in August 2012. There has been little recent contact with neighbours at other construction sites as no submissions were received from those locations.

- 5.107 Neighbours at all surface construction sites will be consulted well in advance of the works and communications maintained prior to and during construction. The details of this will be set out in a communications plan to be prepared at a later date.¹⁶
- 5.108 Once the detailed design is completed and the final alignment known (around 2014), Watercare will formally notify landowners directly above the tunnel alignment in accordance with section 181 of the Local Government Act 2002. This section allows Watercare to enter onto private land provided that the owners' prior written consent is obtained or the owners are given an opportunity to object to the works at a formal hearing. This is a separate process effectively dealing with Watercare obtaining a property right for its proposed works, rather than the environmental and resource management approvals being sought under the RMA.

Interest groups

- 5.109 Consultation undertaken with various interest groups and organisations prior to lodgement is set out in section 8 of the AEE. Since January 2013 Watercare has consulted with the following interest groups, all of whom have lodged submissions on the Project:
- (a) St Lukes Environmental Protection Society Incorporated ("**STEPS**")
 - (b) Mount Albert Residents Association ("**MARA**");
 - (c) Friends of Oakley Creek ("**FOOC**")
 - (d) Forest and Bird Motu Manawa Restoration Group ("**Forest & Bird**");
 - (e) Mangere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers Association ("**MBRRA**"); and
 - (f) Manukau Harbour Restoration Society ("**MHRS**").

¹⁶ Refer Proposed Designation Condition CIL.1.

STEPS and MARA

- 5.110 Watercare has attended and made presentations at the Annual General Meetings ("**AGM**") of STEPS for the past few years, including their most recent AGM on 20 June 2013, and has also attended meetings with committee representatives, most recently in April 2013. A written response to matters raised in their submission was sent to them on 17 June 2013.
- 5.111 A meeting took place with representatives of MARA on 19 April 2013. This was also followed up with a written response to their submission on 17 June 2013.
- 5.112 STEPS is actively involved in the management of the Roy Clements Treeway. The proposed works at Lyon Avenue will require removal of vegetation from within the Treeway, some of which was planted by community volunteers many years ago.
- 5.113 The submissions of both STEPS and MARA request that the proposed Lyon Avenue site be relocated into the MAGS playing fields. The options, and the issues associated with each, were discussed at the meetings with them. I have commented on the alternatives earlier in my evidence, and a comparative assessment of both sites is included in **Appendix H**.
- 5.114 Later in my evidence I will outline some additional mitigation works now proposed by Watercare in the Roy Clements Treeway to mitigate construction effects at the Lyon Avenue site. Watercare will seek specific input from STEPS in the development of this plan, and will continue discussions with STEPS and MARA during further development of the Project.

FOOC

- 5.115 A meeting took place with a representative of FOOC on 11 April 2013 to discuss their submission. A follow up letter was sent to FOOC on 17 June 2013.
- 5.116 Opportunities for riparian planting at the Walmsley Road, May Road and Keith Hay Park sites, all of which are located on the Oakley Creek, were discussed at the meeting with FOOC. Planting at these sites will be undertaken on completion of the construction works. The detail of this

will be set out in the Reinstatement Plans required by Condition SR.1 of the Proposed Designation Conditions. I understand that Auckland Council will be undertaking riparian planting and other works in both Walmsley Park and Keith Hay Park between 2013 to 2015, well in advance of the Central Interceptor main project works. We will continue working with Auckland Council to ensure appropriate integration of the various projects.

Forest & Bird

- 5.117 A meeting took place with representatives of Forest & Bird on 11 April 2013. The physical extent of the proposed works and the significant benefits of the Project were discussed, acknowledging that those benefits will not fully realised until the local network improvements (CSO Collector Sewers) were also completed. A follow up letter was sent on 2 July 2013, including further information requested at the meeting

MBRRA and MHRS

- 5.118 The interest groups with a focus on southern areas of the Project, including Mangere Bridge and the Manukau Harbour, are MBRRA and MHRS.
- 5.119 Both organisations actively engaged with their communities during the notification process in late 2012. This resulted in the receipt of 676¹⁷ pro-forma submissions opposing the Project, reflecting the level of concern about the ongoing presence of the Mangere WWTP and in particular, the discharge of treated wastewater to the Manukau Harbour. Other witnesses will respond to the matters raised in those pro-forma submissions. Set out below is a summary of the consultation undertaken with these two groups in the past year.

MBRRA

- 5.120 Five meetings have taken place with representatives of MBRRA this year. The main topics of discussion have been the scope of existing consents for the Mangere WWTP, alternatives to the Project, the existing quality of the Manukau Harbour, long term plans for the management of Auckland's wastewater and the alternatives to the proposed surface construction site and air vent at Kiwi Esplanade.

¹⁷ As recorded in section 7.1.1 of the Council's Pre-hearing Report.

- 5.121 Further information was provided to MBRRRA on all of those matters at the meetings and in comprehensive written responses sent in March and May 2013.
- 5.122 Mr Munro has responded in his evidence to the wider issues regarding Watercare's overall wastewater management strategy and the long term role of the Mangere WWTP as an integral part of that strategy.
- 5.123 A site specific matter which has been discussed at length with MBRRRA is the location of the proposed surface construction site and air vent at Kiwi Esplanade. Specifically, the MBRRRA has suggested that Watercare should locate the facilities in land owned by Watercare near the Mangere WWTP. A comparative assessment of the various site options considered in the Mangere Bridge area is presented in the assessment table included as **Appendix K** of my evidence.¹⁸ Mr Cantrell will outline the reasons why the suggested site near the Mangere WWTP is not preferred from a technical point of view. Watercare remains of the view that a more than adequate assessment of alternatives has taken place, opinions of various parties have been considered, and we remain strongly of the view that the proposed surface construction site at Kiwi Esplanade is the best alternative for the works in this area.
- 5.124 In order to mitigate potential landscape effects at Kiwi Esplanade, the permanent facilities will be designed to integrate with a new amenities block and landscaped to tie in with the surrounding park land. Mr Goodwin will outline these proposed mitigation works in his evidence. Watercare will seek input from MBRRRA on the landscaping design at this site during further development of the Project.

MHRS

- 5.125 Meetings took place with representatives of the MHRS in February and April 2013. I did not attend these meetings but have been briefed by my colleagues who did attend. The discussions covered matters concerning the existing overflows into the Manukau Harbour, Watercare's corporate responsibilities, long term plans for the management of Auckland's wastewater and the implications of the Central Interceptor Scheme.

¹⁸ This table was provided to the Council as Attachment 5 of the Section 92 response dated 27 May 2013.

5.126 Further detailed information on the current quality of the Manukau Harbour was provided to the MHRS after the first meeting in February 2013 and discussed with them in April 2013. MHRS e-mailed further questions to Watercare on 18 April 2013. Watercare responded to those questions which related to the Project in a letter dated 15 May 2013. The response included information on the key drivers for the Project, flows and loads to the Mangere WWTP, the proposed EPR structure, and existing and future treatment facilities at the Mangere WWTP.

6. KEY ISSUES

6.1 The key issues arising during the consultation process to date (from June 2011 to 8 July 2013) have been:

- (a) the long term future of the Mangere WWTP and discharges into the Manukau Harbour;
- (b) the alternatives to the Project;
- (c) the alternatives at specific construction sites – particularly those sites at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, Lyon Avenue, Keith Hay Park and Kiwi Esplanade; and
- (d) the effects of construction activities on neighbours, particularly traffic, noise and vibration effects.

6.2 All of these key issues were reflected in the submissions received.

6.3 Mr Munro has addressed items (a) and (b) in his evidence. In relation to item (c) I have provided information on the process followed at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve and the alternatives considered at Lyon Avenue. Mr Cantrell, Mr Cooper and Mr Hills also discuss the options at Lyon Avenue. Mr Cooper explains the construction methodology and the proposed use of construction management plans to minimise effects. Item (d) will be addressed in the evidence of Mr Hills (in respect of traffic), Mr Cottle (in respect of noise), and Mr Millar (in respect of vibration).

7. KEY CONSULTATION OUTCOMES POST-LODGE MENT

- 7.1 Since lodgement some changes have been made at proposed surface construction sites in response to the consultation undertaken, but no changes have been made to the fundamental design concept for the Project.
- 7.2 The main outcome has been the changes and refinements made at some of the proposed construction sites. Changes have also been made to the Proposed Designation Conditions to reflect some of the concerns raised, including conditions on additional mitigation for the proposed works at the Lyon Avenue site. The changes that have been made are discussed below.

Changes to surface construction sites

- 7.3 Changes made at surface construction sites prior to lodgement in August 2012 are summarised earlier, in **Table 1** of my evidence. Further changes made since lodgement in response to the submissions received and consultation undertaken are as follows:

(a) Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve:

- (i) a new site layout was developed in the lower car park area in response to discussion with submitters on NoR1 and a resolution of the Albert-Eden Local Board – this is reflected in NoR3 lodged in March 2013.
- (ii) a further amendment was made to the proposed layout in the Car Park Site to move a proposed control chamber (and associated construction works) slightly further from the three residential units owned by CORT at 2 – 4/9 Wairere Avenue (as shown on Drawing Number AEE-MAIN-2.2A on page 50 of the Hearing Drawing Set).

(b) Lyon Avenue:

- (i) the earlier assessment of construction site options was reviewed, including further consideration of a site in the MAGS playing fields, and a number of options for construction site access were assessed. Having

undertaken this further review, the proposed construction site at Lyon Avenue remains Watercare's preferred construction site location.

- (ii) a minor amendment was made to the designation boundary to avoid impact on privately allocated car parks on the St Lukes Group Apartments land.
- (c) Haverstock Road: – the proposed site access from Haverstock Road was initially located to match HNZC redevelopment plans (since abandoned). The proposed access was changed and NoR1 amended in February 2013 to contain the impact to one property only.
- (d) May Road: – provision has now been made for an additional construction access directly to May Road. The way in which this additional access could be used will be considered during further development of the Project.

Roy Clements Treeway

- 7.4 The impact of the construction works at the Lyon Avenue site, particularly the extent of vegetation removal, has been a key issue discussed in recent consultation and is a strong focus in some submissions (particularly STEPS and MARA).
- 7.5 The site is located within the Roy Clements Treeway, a vegetated area along the banks of the Meola Creek between Fergusson Reserve and Alberton Ave, Mount Albert. Various groups have been involved in the development of the treeway including MAGS and STEPS. Watercare has also previously contributed funding for the development of the boardwalk.
- 7.6 Discussions with St Lukes Gardens Apartments, interest groups and iwi (as outlined in the evidence of Mr Maskill) and have also highlighted concern about ongoing overflows into Meola Creek until the Project is commissioned in around 10 years time.
- 7.7 The Project will have a significant positive effect on Meola Creek and riparian margins as it will reduce overflows at this location by around 80%. However in order to achieve this, construction works are required at the Lyon Avenue overflow point to pick up flows from the existing network and divert them to the new main tunnel.

- 7.8 Acknowledging the local significance of the Roy Clements Treeway and the extent of vegetation to be removed as a result of the Project, further mitigation is now proposed beyond the area of land to be designated. The proposed mitigation involves the preparation and implementation of a "Roy Clements Treeway Vegetation Enhancement Plan". The scope of this is set out in the Proposed Designation Conditions RC.1 – RC.5.
- 7.9 The details of the mitigation works to be undertaken are yet to be developed. As Watercare does not own any of the land along the Roy Clements Treeway, the mitigation works will be subject to the approval of the landowner (the Crown). Other parties who would also be involved in the development of the Vegetation Enhancement Plan are listed in the condition. Auckland Council Parks, the Stormwater Unit and the Albert-Eden Local Board would be key parties in this process.
- 7.10 If the required approvals can be secured, all or part of these mitigation works could be implemented in advance of construction at the Lyon Avenue site. This would enable planted areas to become established before the physical works occur at the proposed construction site.
- 7.11 Note that these mitigation works are additional to the reinstatement works to be undertaken in any case at the Lyon Avenue site (refer Conditions SR.1 and SR.1B of the Proposed Designation Conditions). Concepts for reinstatement at this site will be outlined in evidence of Mr Goodwin.

Conditions

- 7.12 As noted within my evidence, various changes have been made to the Proposed Designation Conditions in response to the consultation process and submissions received. Particular examples of these are as follows:
- (a) in response to Auckland Transport, changes made regarding works within the road reserve and waiver of section 176 RMA approvals for certain Auckland Transport and utility works within the road reserve;¹⁹
 - (b) in response to Transpower, changes made regarding works in proximity to transmission lines;²⁰ and

¹⁹

Refer Proposed Designation Conditions W.1 and W.2.

²⁰

Refer Proposed Designation Conditions CM.2 (o), CM.6 and SR.1(d).

- (c) in response to St Lukes Gardens Apartments, STEPS, MARA, and iwi, additional conditions added regarding mitigation works in the Roy Clements Treeway.²¹

7.13 Other changes to the Proposed Designation Conditions and Consent Conditions are outlined later in my evidence.

8. FURTHER CONSULTATION – DETAILED DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

8.1 Consultation to date has focussed on development of the concept design, the surface construction site locations and layouts, and the mitigation of potential adverse effects. Watercare will continue to meet as appropriate with directly affected and interested parties during the detailed design and construction phases regarding the layout and design of works at construction sites. For example, a particular focus of discussions during detailed design will be the development of site reinstatement plans, and prior to construction, the development of construction management plans.

8.2 Prior to construction, a detailed communications management plan will also be prepared. This will draw on the outcomes of consultation to date, along with best practice experience from other projects. For example, for Watercare's Project Hobson – a major tunnelling project in Hobson Bay, with three surface construction sites similar in scale to the Project – a communications programme was implemented which involved regular meetings of a community liaison group and distribution of project information newsletters to the wider community. The key objectives of that communications programme were to provide information, seek feedback on how construction activities were being managed and address any concerns of residents and the wider community.

8.3 For the current Hunua 4 watermain works, Watercare and the contractor have an active communications programme in place. Prior to the trenching works in each section, residents and businesses are directly contacted and asked if they have any specific access requirements or other concerns. Active contact is maintained as the works progress. Any complaints received are responded to as quickly as possible by a team specifically appointed to manage the communications process. An

²¹ Refer Proposed Designation Conditions RC.1 to RC.5.

information newsletter is also distributed and updates provided on the Project website.

- 8.4 Similar processes will be in place for the construction phase of the Project to ensure that landowners, neighbours and the wider community are kept informed of the works and that an appropriate process is in place to deal with any issues that arise.

9. RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

- 9.1 I have reviewed the submissions received and have addressed some of the issues raised earlier in my evidence. Particular matters raised in submissions which are relevant to my brief of evidence are those relating to consultation, the Proposed Designation Conditions and Consent Conditions and stream enhancement works.

Consultation

- 9.2 The submissions of Te Akitai, St Lukes Gardens Apartments, various submitters adjacent to the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, ESR, Foodstuffs, Transpower, FOOC and J Spencer have commented that the consultation process has been insufficient.
- 9.3 I have summarised the consultation undertaken with various parties (excluding iwi) in section 5 of my evidence. Consultation undertaken with iwi is addressed in Mr Maskill's evidence.
- 9.4 Wherever possible, we have tried to respond to concerns raised in the consultation process, but with the need to also consider cost, technical and environmental constraints, it is not always possible to resolve all matters.
- 9.5 I am satisfied that the consultation process overall has been appropriate, responsive and has been approached by Watercare in an open and honest manner. This is reflected in the changes that have been made at some of the surface construction sites and to the Proposed Designation Conditions.

- 9.6 Consultation with directly affected and interested parties will continue over the next five years and beyond as part of the detailed design, pre-construction and construction phases. Although some submitters consider the consultation to date has been insufficient, with around five years until construction starts, there is still plenty of further opportunity for involvement in the detailed development of the Project and for concerns to be raised, discussed and addressed where possible by Watercare.

Conditions

- 9.7 The submissions of Hamish and Michelle Archer; Anne and Robin Boyd; Stephanie and Jeffrey Boyle; Bright Beginnings Early Childhood Education Centre Limited; Bruce Colloff; the Trust; Toby Curnow and Helen Hume; Sally Kedge and Peter Kerridge (all submitters adjacent to the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve); Transpower and Auckland Transport all request that if the designations are confirmed and the consents granted, that additional conditions are imposed.
- 9.8 We have reviewed the submitters suggested conditions and have made some changes in response to the submissions of Transpower and Auckland Transport, as noted earlier in section 7 of my evidence.
- 9.9 We have also reviewed suggested conditions from residents adjacent to the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve. Many of their suggested conditions are already incorporated (albeit in a slightly different form) in the Proposed Designation Conditions and Consent Conditions.²² In our view no further changes need to be made for this site.
- 9.10 Watercare's strong desire is to have consistent conditions across the entire Project and we are satisfied that the Proposed Designation Conditions and Consent Conditions that Watercare has advanced at this hearing properly address potential effects on residents at all of the surface construction sites, including Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve. Watercare will continue to keep the residents and other affected parties informed of the proposed works and will seek feedback where appropriate during development of the construction management plans and during the construction phase.

²² For example, conditions relating to communications, construction management, noise, vibration, traffic and site reinstatement are included in Proposed Designation Conditions DC.3, CM.2, CNV.2 – 5, TM.2, CIL.1 and SR.1.

Riparian planting and restoration; access to streams

- 9.11 The submissions of STEPS, MARA and FOOC request that Watercare undertakes stream restoration works, riparian planting and access improvements to local waterways, particularly Meola Creek and Oakley Creek.
- 9.12 As noted earlier, Watercare has agreed in principle to undertake additional mitigation works in the Roy Clements Treeway, subject to the approval of landowners.
- 9.13 Auckland Council is responsible for the overall management of stream catchments and within Auckland Council there are various groups involved in this including Auckland Council Parks and the Stormwater Unit. There are also various other external parties involved in the management of urban streams and their riparian margins – most notably, the landowners, as well as iwi and local interest groups.
- 9.14 As the Project involves works at 12 surface construction sites located immediately adjacent to watercourses, and will result in a significant reduction in wet weather overflows, it presents an opportunity to implement riparian planting or other enhancements as part of the site reinstatement. Watercare will work with Auckland Council Parks and the Stormwater Unit to identify those opportunities and, wherever possible, will integrate reinstatement works at the proposed surface construction sites to tie in with Auckland Council's wider stream catchment management programmes.

Justification for designation

- 9.15 The submission of Tawa Farms Limited questions (amongst other things) the need for a designation over their land. Although no new permanent works are proposed on their land, the land is essential to provide temporary access for construction; therefore the designation is necessary to enable the works. The access arrangements and constraints at this site are discussed in evidence of Mr Hills.

10. RESPONSE TO COUNCIL PRE-HEARING REPORT

10.1 I have read the Council's Pre-hearing Report. The report acknowledges the significant benefits of the Project and also properly acknowledges the potential adverse effects of some aspects of the Project.

10.2 Particular matters I wish to respond to are:

- (a) built heritage effects;
- (b) the "weighting" for the options assessment at the Lyon Avenue site;
- (c) the recommendations in relation to the site at the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve;
- (d) the recommended conditions (refer section 11 of my evidence).

Built heritage effects – Section 9.3.17 of Pre-hearing Report

10.3 The Council's Conservation Architect has noted the heritage interest of the existing pump station building at Pump Station 25 Miranda Reserve and the former sludge drying building at the Mangere WWTP.

10.4 This matter was responded to in our December 2012 section 92 RMA response.²³ Watercare's archaeologist is of the view that these buildings have low historic value due to their largely mid-20th century date. Accordingly we have not provided any further evidence on this.

10.5 If the existing buildings at Pump Station 25 Miranda Reserve and at the Mangere WWTP are considered by the Council to be of interest, Watercare will be happy to provide access to the Council to take records and photographs of the buildings, subject to appropriate notice and compliance with health and safety requirements.

"Weighting" for the Lyon Avenue site – Section 14.1.1 (b) of Pre-hearing Report

10.6 The Council's Pre-hearing Report queries the "greater weighting" given to the potential effects on the MAGS playing fields compared to the effects of tree removal from the Roy Clements Treeway.

²³ Attachment 4 of Central Interceptor Main Project Works Section 92 Response Report to Auckland Council, December 2012

- 10.7 I have discussed the options for this site earlier, in section 5 of my evidence. We have not allocated different weightings to different types of effects. The selection of the proposed site at Lyon Avenue is based on an overall broad judgement based on technical feasibility; constructability; cost; and social, environmental and cultural effects. This is the approach taken for the consideration of options at all of the proposed construction sites.

Recommendation on Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve – Section 14.1.2 of Pre-hearing Report

- 10.8 The Pre-hearing Report recommends that NoR1 as it relates to the proposed construction site in the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve be withdrawn.
- 10.9 As noted earlier in my evidence, both NoR1 and NoR3 designate land for surface construction sites at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve. Watercare's preferred site is now in the lower car park of the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, which is covered by NoR3. This site is supported by the Albert-Eden Local Board.
- 10.10 NoR1 has not been amended to exclude the Reserve Site at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, as Watercare wishes to be certain of the outcome on NoR3 before doing so and is able to reach agreement with the landowner on alternative car parking. Therefore both sites are being retained until there is complete certainty on the outcome of NoR3, including the ability to comply with any specific conditions which apply to that site.
- 10.11 Watercare is seeking a positive recommendation from the Commissioners to confirm the NoRs for both sites at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve, as we consider that both meet the relevant tests under the RMA.

11. CONDITIONS

- 11.1 In my role as Watercare's Resource Consents Manager, I oversee the preparation of the majority of Watercare's NoRs and consent applications. Since integration in 2011, we have sought to achieve greater consistency in our consenting processes and in particular, the conditions of consents granted.

11.2 Watercare holds hundreds of consents for its physical works projects and daily operations and reports on over 4000 consent conditions on a monthly basis as part of its Compliance Management System. Accordingly, a particular objective is to establish new designations and secure resource consents with a minimum number of appropriately focussed conditions that:

- (a) reflect the scale, nature and duration of the works or operational activity;
- (b) allow for design optimisation and operational flexibility;
- (c) are consistent between similar projects or operations elsewhere in the network;
- (d) serve a valid purpose in the management of potential adverse effects;
- (e) do not result in unnecessary costs or reporting;
- (f) are relatively simple to interpret and manage; and
- (g) do not duplicate other statutory requirements or processes, or detailed matters which are more properly included in individual landowner agreements.

11.3 The concept design for the Project has been completed to a level which enables an assessment of potential effects and identification of the range of mitigation measures that may be required. The detail is yet to be developed and a construction methodology cannot be confirmed until a contractor is appointed. Appropriate designation and consent conditions should be imposed to ensure that potential adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. However, these should also provide sufficient flexibility to allow for optimisation during detailed design and development of the final construction methodology, and for operational flexibility once the Project is commissioned. By enabling design optimisation in particular, we would hope that this would result in potential adverse effects at surface construction sites being further reduced compared to those assessed to date.

- 11.4 As the Project includes 19 surface construction sites, our preference is to establish conditions which are consistent between all of those sites. For example, construction management or mitigation conditions (such as those relating to noise, vibration, and traffic) should generally be the same for all sites to enable the most efficient approach to construction management and the most positive outcome for landowners and neighbours, whether or not they have been involved in consultation processes to date or have lodged submissions. The unique requirements for each site (proximity to residential dwellings, construction methodology etc) will be reflected in the management plan prepared for the Project or for each specific site once the detailed design is completed and a contractor appointed.
- 11.5 However, there are some construction sites where the physical works impact is sufficiently different from other sites that special conditions should be established which are unique to those sites. In this context, we support the inclusion of additional conditions relating to the following specific matters:
- (a) the provision of alternative temporary parking during construction works at the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve Car Park site, reflecting the impact of this work on park users;
 - (b) additional mitigation in the Roy Clements Treeway, reflecting the extent of vegetation removal required for the works at the Lyon Avenue site, the extent of previous community involvement in establishment of the Treeway, and the number of parties affected by the proposed works; and
 - (c) restrictions on timing of Link Sewer 4 trenching works across Kiwi Esplanade, reflecting the potential effects of construction activity on roosting birds.²⁴
- 11.6 Having regard to the considerations I have noted above, we have a number of proposed changes to the recommended designation conditions (in particular) and consent conditions included in the Council's Pre-hearing Report.

²⁴

This will be discussed in the evidence of Mr Dave Slaven.

- 11.7 Unfortunately, limited opportunity was provided for discussion between Watercare and Council staff on the Council's version of the conditions before they were included in the Council's Pre-hearing Report. We will continue discussions with Council staff prior to the hearing with a view to reaching agreement on the conditions wherever possible.
- 11.8 Watercare's Proposed Designation Conditions and requested changes to the Consent Conditions are included in **Appendix E** and **F** of my evidence. The changes compared to the recommended conditions included in the Council's Pre-hearing Report are shown as tracked changes. I will now outline the reasons for our proposed changes. Specific technical conditions are commented on in the evidence of expert witnesses.

Proposed Designation Conditions

- 11.9 As a general comment, our view is that much of the suggested detail added in the Council's Pre-hearing Report version of the proposed designation conditions is unnecessary. The reasons for this are that:
- (a) Condition DC.1 and DC.1A of the Proposed Designation Conditions requires that the works are generally in accordance with information included with the NoRs. In this case, it is unnecessary to then repeat some of that detail in the designation conditions. For example, it is not necessary to detail numerous traffic management requirements for each site as these are already indicated in the information submitted, and will be reviewed and detailed as part of the later preparation of the Traffic Management Plan.
 - (b) The designation process in the RMA establishes a clear procedure for later submission of an OPW. In this case, it is unnecessary to include extensive detail in conditions on designations, as there is a further process which enables the Council to examine the design detail of the proposed works at a later date. For example, the Council will have an opportunity to comment on the architectural design of permanent buildings as part of the OPW process, whether or not there are specific conditions on this in the designation.

- (c) Apart from the sites owned by Watercare (May Road and Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street)), all of the surface construction sites will require specific agreements to be established with the landowners. Auckland Council Parks and the Local Boards have already indicated the matters of particular interest at each site. Watercare is generally in agreement with the suggestions made and we have demonstrated our willingness to work collaboratively with Auckland Council Parks and the Local Boards. It is not necessary to include specific detail for each site in the designation conditions as this will be covered in the later landowner approval process with Auckland Council Parks, the Local Boards and other directly affected landowners. Further, as the works at most sites will not occur for around five years or more, ongoing consultation with the landowner as the Project develops will enable the design to reflect any changes that may have occurred in the meantime at each site, without being unnecessarily constrained by detailed conditions established many years in advance of the works.

11.10 Our specific comments on the Proposed Designation Conditions are set out in the table below.

Table 2: Proposed Designation Conditions – summary of reasons for changes compared to recommended conditions in Council's Pre-hearing Report

Condition No.	Proposed Change	Reason
DC.1	Document list – text amendments	Various changes have been made to the document list to include all of the documents submitted as part of the NoRs and to refer to the most recent drawings.
DC.1 (c)	Document list – deleted exclusions	As noted in paragraphs 3.11 and 10.11, Watercare is seeking a positive recommendation from the Commissioners to confirm all three NoRs. In this case, the drawings for the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve Site as incorporated within NoR1 should not be excluded from the document list.
DC1.B	Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve site – new condition proposed	The proposed new condition reflects Watercare's preference to implement the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve Car Park Site rather than the original Reserve Site, and requires that the designation area included in NoR1 is removed from reserve when the Car Park site is implemented.
DC.5 DC.7A	OPWs and Management Plans – clarification note proposed	The additional note in DC.5 clarifies that OPWs and Management Plans may be prepared as single plans for the entire Project, or as multiple plans applying to separate parts of the project (i.e. a plan may cover one or more surface construction sites). Minor text amendments have been made to other conditions to also reflect this. The ability to produce multiple plans will

Condition No.	Proposed Change	Reason
		ensure that the specific circumstances at each of the various sites will be appropriately reflected.
DC.7B	Design of permanent buildings – amended wording proposed	The need for appropriate design of permanent buildings is acknowledged. The condition has been relocated and reworded compared to the version in the Pre-hearing Report (formerly SR.7, now deleted).
DC.8	Landowner approval from Auckland Council Parks – condition deleted	Landowner approvals are required at all of the designated sites. This is covered by separate processes. It is unnecessary to state this as a condition of the designation, and in any case, if such a condition was to be included, it should not refer to only one named landowner.
CM.2 (o)	Construction management plan contents – amended text to reflect Transpower concerns	Specific provisions have been added relating to works in the vicinity of Transpower assets. The proposed text is an edited version (and relocated) compared to the version in the Pre-hearing Report (formerly CM.6, now deleted). Note that reference to the Mount Roskill substation has been removed as this is not located on land subject to the proposed designations.
CM.2 (p)	Construction management plan contents – amended text to include reference to CPTED	An additional point has been added, acknowledging the need to consider Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (“CPTED”) issues during construction as well as in the final reinstatement plans.
CM.4 CM.5	Works in parks and reserves – conditions deleted	These conditions are unnecessary as the matters are already covered in conditions DC.5, DC.7, DC.7B, CM.2, CNV.4, PM.1, CIL.1, T.1, SR.1, SR.1A, SR.1B, SR.13. The matters covered by those conditions relate generally to all surface construction sites, not just parks and reserves owned by the Council.
CM.6	Transpower infrastructure – conditions deleted	The additional matters have now been incorporated in the construction management plan condition CM.2 (o).
CNV.3	Construction hours and noise – minor edits	The condition as proposed in the Council's Pre-hearing Report was more restrictive than the NZS6803:1999 construction noise standards. The condition has been amended so that it is consistent with those standards. Mr Cottle will address this in his evidence.
CNV.4	Construction noise – text amended	Item (d) has been amended to refer to the limited use of reverse alarms during night time works rather than a complete prohibition as there may be situations where those alarms do not impact on adjacent residents, or must be included for safety reasons. The text in items (f), (h) and (i) have been amended in relation to exceedances of the construction noise standards, but the intent of the conditions is still the same i.e. that appropriate measures must be implemented and monitoring undertaken in situations where the construction noise standards are unable to be met. Mr Cottle will address this in his evidence.
CNV.5 (e)	CNVMP – additional text added	Text added to include reference to sensitive facilities at ESR.
CNV.5A, 5B, 5C and 6	Blasting and vibration – new conditions added	Conditions CNV.5A, 5B and 5C have been added and CNV.6 amended to provide for exceedances of specified blasting and vibration standards in certain circumstances. Mr Cottle will address this in his evidence.

Condition No.	Proposed Change	Reason
ON.1	Operational noise – minor edits	Text edited to clarify that measurements should be taken <i>within</i> rather than <i>at</i> the boundary of adjacent sites. Mr Cottle will address this in his evidence. Unnecessary text has been deleted from the table.
TM.2	Traffic management plan – additional items added	Additional points (f) and (g) have been added regarding works around schools and during major events in parks and reserves (formerly part of TM.4 and CH.5, now deleted). Point (h) has been edited to delete the specific reference to the timing of truck movements as this is a matter of detail which will be assessed for each individual site at the time the traffic management plans are prepared. Mr Hills addresses this in his evidence.
TM.3A	Damage in road corridor – new condition added.	The condition was previously part of the Council's suggested condition TM.4 (g) (ii), now deleted. The requirement to repair damage to the road is valid and is more clearly stated and visible in this proposed location.
TM.3B, TM3C	Car parking at Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve – new condition added	The new conditions have been added requiring alternative car parking to be provided during works at the Mount Albert War Memorial Reserve site in consultation with Auckland Council Parks and the Albert-Eden Local Board. A slightly different version was included in the Pre-hearing Report condition TM.4 (p), now deleted.
TM.4	Traffic management details at each site – condition deleted.	The condition includes an unnecessary level of detail, and duplicates matters which are already referred to in the traffic assessment for the Project and which will be developed in the detailed traffic management plans for each site. Further, the condition as worded does not provide sufficient flexibility to respond to traffic conditions at and around the sites at the time the works occur. Mr Hills will address this in his evidence. Some aspects of the condition have been retained elsewhere in the Proposed Designation Conditions as noted earlier.
W.1 W.2	Works in road reserve – text amended.	Amendments have been included to reflect discussions with Auckland Transport, and to clarify that all provisions of the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors apply, not just those for road reinstatement.
W.3	Corridor Access Requests ("CAR") – condition deleted.	The condition is unnecessary. Condition W.2 clarifies that works in the road reserve are to be undertaken in accordance with the Code of Practice. The submission of a CAR to Auckland Transport is already a requirement of that process.
CH.3 CH.4 CH.5	Heavy vehicle access – conditions deleted.	The conditions include an unnecessary level of detail, and duplicate matters which are already referred to in the traffic assessment for the Project and which will be developed in the detailed traffic management plans for each site. Mr Hills will address this in his evidence. Some aspects of the condition have been retained elsewhere in the Proposed Designation Conditions as noted earlier, for example, condition TM.2 (g) has been added to more generally refer to the need for appropriate traffic management measures during major events in parks and reserves.
CIL.2	Timing for submission of Communications Plan – condition deleted.	The condition is unnecessary as the Communications Plan is now specifically listed as a requirement of the OPW (refer DC.7) and will be submitted as part of that process.

Condition No.	Proposed Change	Reason
T.1	Tree management – condition amended	<p>Specific reference to Auckland Council Parks has been removed as there are trees affected on all sites, not just in parks. All landowners will be consulted during development of the Project. A separate approval process for works affecting trees is not required as this is already incorporated in the OPW process – refer conditions DC.7 and CM.2 (n).</p> <p>An additional item has been added, to clarify that if trees are to be transplanted outside of the designation area, this will require approval of the relevant landowner (formerly referred to in SR.9, now deleted).</p>
AH.4 AH.5	Built heritage – conditions deleted	The conditions are unnecessary. No scheduled heritage buildings or structures are affected by the proposed works. Refer earlier discussion in paragraphs 10.3 – 10.5 of my evidence.
RC.1 – RC.5	Roy Clements Treeway – new conditions added.	New conditions have been added reflecting the effects of vegetation removal at the Lyon Avenue site on the Roy Clements Treeway. Refer earlier discussion in paragraphs 7.4 – 7.11 of my evidence.
SR.1	Reinstatement plans	A Reinstatement Plan will be developed at all of the surface construction sites, regardless of the current land use or ownership. Additional points have been included in SR.1 to cover some additional matters covered in SR.2 to SR.12 (now deleted), where these are not otherwise included elsewhere in the Proposed Designation Conditions.
SR.1A	Reinstatement plans for parks and reserves	This condition was included in the original NoRs and has been reinstated as it properly requires that the Reinstatement Plans for works in parks and reserves should have regard to various park development plans already in place by the Council.
SR.1B	Reinstatement plan for Lyon Avenue site	This condition was previously suggested by Watercare to the Council and has been reinstated to tie in with the proposed new conditions RC.1 – RC.5 relating to the Roy Clements Treeway.
SR.1 – SR.12	Open space restoration plans	A Reinstatement Plan will be developed at all of the surface construction sites. It is unnecessary to differentiate between a Reinstatement Plan and an "Open Space Restoration Plan". The same general matters should be addressed regardless of the current land use or ownership. Additional points have been included in SR.1 or are already generally referred to by condition SR.1A to cover some additional matters included in SR.2 to SR.12 (now deleted) where these are not otherwise included elsewhere in the Proposed Designation Conditions.
UD.1	Urban design – condition deleted	Condition is unnecessary as the matter is already sufficiently covered in SR.1 (b) and in SR.1A which references the Auckland Design Manual – Parkland Design Guidelines.

Proposed Consent Conditions

11.11 Watercare is in general agreement with the overall structure and much of the content of the proposed consent conditions as set out in the Pre-hearing Report. Proposed additional conditions and requested changes are set out in the table below. Note that I have not commented on minor corrections or text changes which have been made simply to ensure consistency between the conditions.

Table 3: Proposed Consent Conditions – summary of reasons for changes compared to recommended conditions in Council's Pre-hearing Report

Condition No.	Proposed Change	Reason
1.1	Document list – text amendments	Various changes have been made to the document list to include all of the documents submitted as part of the consent applications and to refer to the most recent drawings.
1.7 – 1.11	Construction management, construction noise and vibration, traffic management – various text amendments proposed	The proposed amendments are the same as those included within the Proposed Designation Conditions (outlined earlier) to ensure consistency between the designation and consent conditions.
1.12A	Dust management – new condition	The proposed condition was included elsewhere in the condition set (formerly condition 8.28), but is considered more appropriate in this location as it is a general condition which applies to all aspects of the surface construction works.
1.14 – 1.19	Dust management – conditions deleted	The Project does not incorporate extensive areas of exposed earthworks (compared to a motorway project, for example) and the conditions suggested in the Pre-hearing Report are unnecessarily detailed. Dust management is sufficiently covered in proposed conditions 1.7, 1.12, 1.12A and 1.13.
1.20	Archaeology – condition deleted	The condition is unnecessary as accidental discovery protocols are already covered in condition 1.21.
1.22	Recording of existing infrastructure – condition deleted	The condition is unnecessary. Watercare regularly repairs, upgrades and replaces existing infrastructure throughout Auckland. The Project does not affect any scheduled heritage buildings or structures and the proposed condition serves no valid purpose.
2.2	Vegetation – text amendments proposed	The proposed amendments are the same as those included within the Proposed Designation Conditions (outlined earlier) to ensure consistency between the designation and consent conditions.
3.5	Construction Discharges Management Plan – information to be provided to the Council	The condition as proposed would result in unnecessary reporting to the Council on day-to-day site management issues. The condition has been amended so that only non-compliance incidents need to be reported to the Council.
3.6 (f)	Chemical Treatment Management Plan – condition (f) deleted	The condition is unnecessary as flocculation treatment systems will only be in temporary use during the construction phase of the project.

Condition No.	Proposed Change	Reason
4.6	Monitoring and Contingency Plan ("M&CP") – additional text added	The M&CP will include baseline monitoring which occurs in advance of the works. The condition has been amended to reflect that part of the M&CP should be submitted at least 12 months in advance of the works.
4.12	Pre-construction condition survey – condition deleted	The condition is unnecessary as it duplicates requirements that are already incorporated in conditions 4.9 – 4.11. Mr Twose will comment on this in his evidence.
4.14	Post-construction condition survey – additional text added	The additional text clarifies that the post-construction condition surveys only need to occur at locations where there has previously been a pre-construction condition survey. An amendment has also been made to the note defining "Completion of Dewatering" to reflect the proposed design and construction methodology. Mr Twose will comment on this in his evidence.
4.19	Groundwater monitoring – text amended	Provision of monitoring information on a six monthly basis is considered sufficient and is consistent with condition 4.31. If the monitoring undertaken shows trigger levels are exceeded, the Council will be notified within three working days as required by condition 4.23.
4.25	Groundwater monitoring – condition deleted	The condition has been deleted as the matter is sufficiently covered in condition 4.2. Mr Twose will address this in his evidence.
4.26	Settlement monitoring – additional conditions added and two conditions deleted	In essence, the additional conditions are to ensure that the settlement monitoring programme will achieve the aim of detecting settlement in locations where settlement risk is elevated. Mr Twose will address this in his evidence.
4.26	Retaining wall deformation monitoring – text amended	The condition has been amended to clarify that shaft retaining wall deformation monitoring need only be undertaken at locations within an area of high settlement risk. Mr Twose will address this in his evidence.
6.14 6.15	Stormwater management proprietary devices – conditions deleted	The permanent works will not generate large areas of impermeable surfaces. The required Operation and Maintenance Plan contains sufficient provision for maintenance regimes. It is unnecessary to also include specific requirements for a particular aspect of the stormwater management system or for Watercare to provide copies of contract documents to the Council.
6.16	Stormwater management review conditions – conditions deleted	The stormwater consent is a relatively straightforward component of the Project and does not justify a specific review condition. The normal requirements of section 128 RMA will apply and it is not necessary to repeat those requirements in the consent conditions.
7.9	Odour complaints – text deleted	Watercare has an active process already in place throughout its wastewater network to receive, respond to and action complaints ²⁵ . Reporting on individual complaints as they are received for one specific part of the network is considered unnecessary and is inconsistent with existing

25

Refer Section 6 of Section 92 Response Report to Auckland Council dated 13 May 2013.

Condition No.	Proposed Change	Reason
		processes. That part of the condition should therefore be deleted. The following condition 7.10 is appropriate as it requires records to be kept and made available to the Council on request. This would include records of any complaints received.
8.2 – 8.33	Works in contaminated land – various amendments	<p>Various amendments are proposed in order to reflect guideline documents and documentation submitted for the Project, and to remove duplication of requirements already covered in the construction management plan and other consent conditions.</p> <p>Some text changes have also been made to ensure that the conditions are specific to the nature of excavations for this project. For example (in condition 8.11), there should be no need to test for contaminants in material excavated from natural ground well below the ground surface.</p>
10.3	Emergency pressure relief discharge – text amended	The text has been amended so that it is consistent with the description in the application documents of when the EPR may activate.
10.4 10.5	Emergency pressure relief discharge – text amended	Changes have been made to the text to ensure that the EPR Discharge Management Plan is aligned with existing provisions of overflow response procedures agreed between Watercare and the Council. Changes have also been made to the timing for submission of the management plan. This is better developed once the final design of the Mangere Pump Station and EPR structure has been confirmed, rather than 3 months following grant of the consent, which is an unnecessarily restrictive timeframe and would not enable the best outcome to be achieved. Mr Roan will address these changes (and the further changes summarised below) in his evidence.
10.7	Emergency pressure relief discharge – condition deleted	The procedures for deployment of signage (including signage locations) will be set out in the EPR Discharge Management Plan. Condition 10.7 is unnecessary as it duplicates the requirement of condition 10.4 (c).
10.9	Emergency pressure relief discharge – text amended	As with the proposed Discharge Management Plan, it is preferable to prepare the Discharge Monitoring Plan once the final design of the Mangere Pump Station and EPR structure has been confirmed, rather than 3 months following grant of the consent, which is an unnecessarily restrictive timeframe and would not enable the best outcome to be achieved.
10.9 (ja) 10.10	Emergency pressure relief discharge – new text added	Condition 10.10 (now deleted) requires that monitoring is undertaken, but is too general. The proposed new condition 10.9(ja) specifies the parameters that should be monitored.
AN3 AN4	Advice notes – text deleted	The advice notes refer to a "sign-off" and "issue of a letter" by Council. The point of this text is unclear and the text has been deleted.

- 11.12 As I noted earlier, a particular objective for Watercare is to secure designations and consents with appropriate conditions that (among other things) reflect the scale, nature and duration of the works; serve a valid purpose in the management of potential adverse effects; do not result in unnecessary duplication, reporting or costs; and are simple to interpret and manage. I respectfully ask that the Commissioners keep this in mind when making their recommendation on conditions of the NoRs and decision on the resource consents.

12. CONCLUSIONS

- 12.1 Confirmation of the NoRs and grant of the consents sought will enable construction and operation of the Project. As outlined by Mr Munro, operation of the new main tunnel, link sewers and associated works will have significant benefits for Auckland – mitigating risk associated with ageing assets (particularly the Western Interceptor), providing capacity for future urban growth, and significantly reducing overflows that are currently occurring within the central Auckland isthmus network.
- 12.2 Construction of the Project, particularly at surface sites, will generate temporary adverse effects during construction. These effects need to be addressed or managed as part of the detailed design and during the construction phase.
- 12.3 A wide range of parties have been consulted during development of the Project to date, and in some instances proposed construction site locations have been changed or the layout refined to accommodate views raised.
- 12.4 Watercare has genuinely sought to address the concerns raised and accommodate the wishes of those consulted; however, with the need to also consider cost, technical and environmental constraints, it is not always possible to resolve all matters. Consultation will continue with various parties during the detailed design, pre-construction and construction phases.
- 12.5 The operation of the Project will have significant positive effects for Auckland, and with the implementation of appropriate conditions, the construction phase can be managed in a way that does not unreasonably impact on the community or the natural environment.

12.6 I respectfully request that the Commissioners recommend that the designations are confirmed, and that the consents sought are granted for the Project.

Belinda Petersen

12 July 2013

