



Environmental  
Protection Authority  
*Te Mana Rauhi Taiao*

---

## ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS

---

# Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

April 2017



## Executive Summary

On 14 December 2016, the New Zealand Transport Agency (Transport Agency) lodged an application for six notices of requirement and 25 resource consents with the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Northern Corridor Improvements proposal (the Proposal).

The Hon Dr Nick Smith, Minister for the Environment, directed the proposal to be heard and decided by a Board of Inquiry (the Board) as a proposal of national significance on 8 February 2017.

The EPA publically notified the proposal and the Minister's direction on 22 February 2017 and called for submissions. The submissions period closed on 22 March 2017.

The EPA received:

- 33 submissions before the close of the submission period.

No late submission were received. However, one submitter provided a late addendum to their original submission. The Board granted a waiver to allow this information to be included on 06 April 2017, as outlined in Board Minute and Direction 03.

Of the 33 submissions received by the EPA;

Position on the proposal:

- Two submitters (6.1%) **oppose** the Proposal in full
- Eight submitters (24.2%) **oppose** the Proposal in part
- One submitter (3.0%) was **neutral** on the Proposal
- 13 submitters (39.4%) **support** the Proposal in part
- Nine submitters (27.3%) **support** the Proposal in full

Decision sought

- Four submitters are seeking the proposal be **declined** (12.1%)
- Six submitters are seeking the proposal be **granted** (18.2%)
- 22 submitters are seeking the proposal be **granted with conditions** (66.7%)
- One submitter has **not offered a view** on whether the proposal should be approved or declined (3.0%)

Wish to be heard:

- 21 submitters (63.6%) have indicated that they **wish to be heard** at the hearing
- 12 submitters (36.4%) have indicated that they **do not wish to be heard** at the hearing

Location:

- The majority of submitters are from Auckland (93.9%) with two submitters not stating their location (6.1%).
- The majority of submitters are from the North Shore area (36.4%) and Central Auckland (33.3%)

**Sector:**

- Ten submitters (30.3%) identified as individuals
- 12 submitters (36.4%) identified as businesses or business groups
- Seven submitters (21.2%) identified as interest or community groups
- Four submitters (12.1%) were councils, or government agencies

A range of opinions have been raised in the submissions, primarily on topics around traffic and roading, construction and property specific impacts. A number of submissions have indicated the relief they are seeking, including changes to the project design and scope.

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1 Explanatory Information</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.1 Use of this document .....	6
1.1.1 Administration .....	6
1.1.2 Limitations .....	6
<b>2 Introduction</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1 Proposal Background.....	7
2.2 Public Notification.....	8
<b>3 Submissions Received</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>4 Overview of Submissions</b> .....	<b>9</b>
4.1 Position of submitters on the Proposal .....	9
4.2 Decision sought on the proposal by submitters .....	9
<b>5 Trends observed in submissions</b> .....	<b>10</b>
5.1 Submitters wishing to be heard.....	10
5.2 Submissions by location.....	10
5.3 Submissions by sector .....	11
5.4 Trade Competition.....	12
<b>6 Submission subjects or themes</b> .....	<b>12</b>
6.1 Transportation .....	13
6.2 Construction Impacts .....	17
6.3 Operational Impacts .....	18
6.4 Social Impacts.....	21
6.5 Specific Impacts .....	22
6.6 Other Impacts.....	24
<b>7 Conditions Requested</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Full List of Submitters</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Conditions sought by Auckland Council</b> .....	<b>36</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1: Submitters who wish to be heard by position .....	10
Table 2: Submissions by Location .....	10
Table 3: Submissions by Auckland suburb .....	10
Table 4: Submissions by sector and position .....	11
Table 5: Common issues and concerns raised in submissions .....	12
Table 6: Submitters who submitted on Transport and Traffic matters .....	13
Table 7: Submitters who submitted on Busway and Bus stations matters .....	15
Table 8: Submitters who submitted on Shared Use Path and cycle ways matters .....	16
Table 9: Submitters who submitted on Construction effects .....	17
Table 10: Submitters who submitted on Health and Safety matters .....	18
Table 11: Submitters who submitted on Urban Design and Visual Effects .....	19
Table 12: Submitters who submitted on Noise and vibration matters .....	20
Table 13: Submitters who submitted on Stormwater and flooding matters .....	21
Table 14: Submitters who submitted on Community facilities .....	22
Table 15: Submitters who submitted on Terrestrial Ecology and Plantings .....	22
Table 16: Submitters who submitted on Property Impacts .....	23
Table 17: Submitters who submitted on Infrastructure matters .....	24
Table 18: Submitter who submitted on Other Impacts .....	25
Table 19: Requested Conditions .....	25

# 1 Explanatory Information

## 1.1 Use of this document

The purpose of this report is to assist the Board and parties to the board of inquiry process. The information provided in this report is as follows:

### Executive Summary

Section 1	Outlines the purpose, structure, and limitations of this report
Section 2	Provides background on the Proposal and the submission process
Section 3	Provides information on the submissions received
Section 4	Provides an overview of the submissions
Section 5	Identifies trends within submissions including the number of submitters that wish to be heard at the hearing, where submitters are located, whether submitters are individuals, groups, or organisations and whether submitters are trade competitors
Section 6	Contains a summary of the types of matters raised across a number of submissions and identifies each submission that raised that matter
Section 7	Summarises the specific conditions sought by submitters
Appendix 1	Provides the full list of submitters (alphabetically and numerically)
Appendix 2	Specific conditions sought by Auckland Council

### 1.1.1 Administration

Each submitter is referenced by their organisation name, or by their surname(s), and first initial(s). Each submitter has also been assigned an EPA submitter reference number for administrative purposes.

This analysis of submissions provides an overview of the submissions received, and outlines the general opinions provided in these submissions. The themes described within this report reflect the views represented by submitters, and do not reflect any view of the EPA.

### 1.1.2 Limitations

Identification of trends and concerns within this report are based on information provided by submitters in their written submissions, and taking into account any changes requested by submitters following close of submissions, and up to 06 April 2017.

The analysis was produced using a combination of computer generated data and manual checking to analyse the submissions.

It is not unusual for submissions received on proposals of this nature to cover a broad range of issues and offer differing levels of detail. Although each submission is unique, an analysis of the submissions

necessarily involves a degree of generalisation. Summaries of matters raised and conditions proposed are therefore not a replication of original submissions.

The trends and common matters raised are summarised in Section 6 and are based solely on the content of submissions. The analysis contains only matters raised across a number of submissions and may not refer to all matters raised.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Proposal Background

On 14 December 2016, the New Zealand Transport Agency (Transport Agency) lodged an application with the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for six notices of requirement and 25 resource consents for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Northern Corridor Improvements proposal (the Proposal).

The Proposal intends to upgrade the capacity and safety of the sections of State highway 1 (SH1) and State highway 18 (SH18) between Albany Highway and Oteha Valley Road as well as direct motorway interchange connections between SH1 and SH18. This work will provide the final motorway connection for the Western Ring Route Project. The Proposal also includes an extension of the Northern Busway (the Busway) from Constellation Bus Station to Albany Bus Station and shared use paths (SUP).

The proposed changes to SH1 can be generally described as:

- Widening of the carriageway to include extra general traffic lanes in each direction between Oteha Valley Road and Constellation Drive including the widening of SH1 overbridges to Greville Road and Rosedale Road
- Upgrade to the northbound off-ramp of the SH1/Oteha Valley Road interchange and to both the northbound and southbound off-ramps and northbound on-ramp of the SH1 /Greville Road interchange
- Provision of a new dual direction busway (Northern Busway Extension) adjacent to the southbound carriageway shoulder of SH1 between the Albany and Constellation Stations
- Provision of a new off-road Shared Use Path (approximately 4km) adjacent to the southbound carriageway of the Northern Busway Extension
- Offline replacement (to immediate south) of McClymonts Road overbridge with the inclusion of a cycle lane and footpaths on either side; and
- Widening of Rosedale Road in both directions (east/west bound) including the inclusion of footpaths on either side.

SH18 will be upgraded to full motorway standard from the Albany Highway interchange to SH1. The proposed changes to SH18 can be generally described as:

- Offline realignment to the north of the existing SH18 section between the Albany Highway interchange and SH1 providing two lanes in either direction and improvement of the existing substandard westbound off-ramp sight distance to the Albany Highway interchange;

- Upgrade to the Caribbean Drive T-junction intersection with the Upper Harbour Highway to accommodate additional lanes;
- Provision of a new Paul Matthews Road interchange with a westbound on-ramp and eastbound off-ramp only;
- Closure of the existing Upper Harbour Highway off-ramps to the Z petrol station and to Unsworth Drive; and
- Provision of a new off-road Shared Use Path (approximately 2.3km) from Albany Highway interchange to Constellation Drive.

The Northern Busway extension will require the following works to Albany and Constellation Bus Stations:

- Reconfiguration of the car park to provide for the busway link into the Albany Station;
- Minor reconfiguration of the Albany Bus interchange and adjacent signalised intersection of Cornerstone Drive and Elliot Rose Avenue; and
- Upgrades to Constellation Bus Station to provide facilities for the new northbound busway movements as well as a new pedestrian overpass linking the northbound and southbound platforms.

## 2.2 Public Notification

The Northern Corridor Improvements proposal was publicly notified on Wednesday 22 February 2017. The public notice was published in the New Zealand Herald, The Dominion Post, The Press, and The Otago Daily Times. A condensed version of the public notice was also placed in the North Harbour News, North Shore Times and Rodney Times on Thursday 23 February 2017.

The EPA identified 2,173 owners and occupiers of properties within, and adjoining the Proposal area who each received “direct notification” of the Proposal. The EPA’s direct notification pack included a copy of the public notice, an informative cover letter, and a flyer advertising the independent Friend of Submitter service.

Copies of the application, public notice, submission form and flyers advertising the independent Friend of Submitter service were made available on the EPA website, or by link from the EPA website, and at the following locations:

- EPA Head Office, Level 10, 215 Lambton Quay, Wellington
- Albany Village Library – Kell Drive, Albany, Auckland
- Takapuna Library – 9 The Strand, Takapuna, Auckland
- Orewa Library – 12 Moana Avenue, Orewa
- Orewa Service Centre – 50 Centreway Road, Standmore, Orewa
- East Coast Bays Library (in Browns Bay) – Bute Road, Browns Bay, North Shore, Auckland
- Auckland Central City Library – 44/46 Lorne Street, Auckland

Submissions on the proposal could be made via the EPA’s online submission form, by email, or by hard copy delivered by post, email, or delivered in person to the EPA or to the Applicant.



As per section 149E of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), the submission period ran for 20 working days and ended at 5:00pm on 22 March 2017.

### 3 Submissions Received

As of the close of submission period at 5:00pm on 22 March 2017 the EPA received 33 complete submissions (see Appendix 1). This includes submissions the EPA received by post that were date stamped on or before the date of submissions closing, as well as submissions that were incomplete when first received, but where the EPA was able to contact the submitter and additional information was provided by the submitter before the close of the submission period.

No late submission were received. However, one submitter provided a late addendum to their original submission. The Board granted a waiver to allow this information to be included on 06 April 2017, as outlined in Board Minute and Direction 03.

## 4 Overview of Submissions

### 4.1 Position of submitters on the Proposal

The submission form asked submitters to indicate whether they support, support in part, oppose, oppose in part, or are neutral with regards to their view on the Proposal. Submitters indicated their position by using the check boxes in the submission form. The responses are outlined below.

- Two submitters (6.1%) **oppose** the Proposal in full
- Eight submitters (24.2%) **oppose** the Proposal in part
- One submitter (3.0%) was **neutral** on the Proposal
- 13 submitters (39.4%) **support** the Proposal in part
- Nine submitters (27.3%) **support** the Proposal in full

### 4.2 Decision sought on the proposal by submitters

Submitters were asked to indicate the decision they would like the Board to make on the proposal. Submitters indicated their position by using the check boxes in the submission form. The responses are outlined below.

- Four submitters (12.1%) would like the Board to **decline** the Proposal
- Six submitters (18.2%) would like the Board to **grant** the Proposal
- 22 submitters (66.7%) would like the Board to **grant** the Proposal **with conditions**
- One submitter (3.0%) indicated **no view** on the decision they would like the Board to make

## 5 Trends observed in submissions

### 5.1 Submitters wishing to be heard

Twenty-one submitters (63.6%) indicated in their submission that they wish to be heard at the hearing.

Twelve submitters (36.4%) indicated in their submission that they do not wish to be heard at the hearing.

The EPA will provide all submitters who indicated they wish to be heard at the hearing, with the opportunity to confirm their wish. Accordingly the number who want to be heard at the hearing may decrease.

The table below identifies the proportion of submitters who wish to be heard or do not wish to be heard depending on their position on the application.

**Table 1: Submitters who wish to be heard by position**

Position	Number of submissions	Percentage	Wish to be heard	
			Yes	No
Oppose in full	2	6.1%	50.0%	50.0%
Oppose in part	8	24.2%	62.5%	37.5%
Neutral	1	3.0%	100.0%	-
Support in part	13	39.4%	84.6%	15.4%
Support in full	9	27.3%	33.3%	66.7%

### 5.2 Submissions by location

The majority of submitters are from Auckland (93.9%), with two submitters not stating their location (6.1%).

The majority of submitters are from the North Shore area (36.4%) and Central Auckland (33.3%). The following table identifies the submitters from each area, or relevant geographic area, in terms of who supports the Proposal, opposes the Proposal, and who are neutral.

**Table 2: Submissions by Location**

Location	Number of submissions	Percentage	Position		
			Support (in full or in part)	Oppose (in full or in part)	Neutral
Auckland	31	93.9%	64.5%	32.3%	3.2%
Other / not specified	2	6.1%	100.0%	-	-

**Table 3: Submissions by Auckland suburb**

Location	Percentage	Position
----------	------------	----------

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

	Number of submissions		Support	Oppose	Neutral
North Shore (including; Takapuna, Northcote, North Harbour, North Shore, Birkenhead, Unsworth Heights, and Greenhithe)	12	36.4%	50.0%	50.0%	-
Albany (including; Albany, Rosedale, Murrays Bay, and Northcross)	4	12.1%	75.0%	25.0%	-
Central Auckland (including; Auckland Central, Wellesley Street, Victoria Street West, Shortland Street, Symonds Street, Newmarket, and Parnell)	11	33.3%	72.7%	18.2%	9.1%
Auckland – other (including; West Harbour, Botany, Lynfield, and Penrose)	4	12.1%	75.0%	25.0%	-
Not stated	2	6.1%	100.0%	-	-

### 5.3 Submissions by sector

The majority of submissions are from businesses and business groups (36.4%), and then individuals (30.3%). The following table identifies the submitters from each sector in terms of who supports the Proposal, opposes the Proposal, and who is either neutral or have mixed views.

**Table 4: Submissions by sector and position**

Sector	Number of submissions	Percentage	Position		
			Support	Oppose	Neutral or mixed
Individuals	10	30.3%	70.0%	30.0%	-
Businesses, business groups and trusts	12	36.4%	50.0%	41.7%	8.3%
Interest/Community groups	7	21.2%	85.7%	14.3%	-

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

Councils and government agencies	4	12.1%	100.0%	-	-
----------------------------------	---	-------	--------	---	---

## 5.4 Trade Competition

No submitters indicated that they are trade competitors of NZTA.

## 6 Submission subjects or themes

A number of topics were raised across several submissions. Each of the topics below is discussed in more detail in the following sections.

The discussions provided below are not intended to provide a comprehensive discussion of all topics, aspects, concerns or requests raised in submissions, but provide an overview of the views of submitters on this Proposal.

**Table 5: Common issues and concerns raised in submissions**

Topic	Number of submitters referring to topic	Percentage
Transport and traffic	19	57.6%
Construction effects	15	45.5%
Busway and Bus stations	15	45.5%
Shared Use Paths and cycle ways	14	42.4%
Property Impacts	14	42.4%
Urban design and visual effects	10	30.3%
Noise and vibration	8	24.2%
Stormwater and flooding	5	15.2%
Health and Safety	5	15.2%
Community facilities	4	12.1%
Terrestrial Ecology and plantings	4	12.1%
Infrastructure	3	9.1%

## 6.1 Transportation

The theme of transportation includes all discussions on transportation, traffic issues, congestion, intersection design, alternative road layouts, busways and bus stations, shared use paths and cycle ways.

### Transport and Traffic

Nineteen submitters (57.6%) identified transport and traffic aspects relating to the proposal. The submissions discussed traffic issues, road design, intersection design, and alternative road layouts.

Submitters provided a diverse range of views on transport and traffic aspects.

There was a high level of agreement that the current situation was prone to congestion. While some parties were of the view the Proposal would resolve these issues, others believed the situation would be unchanged or become worse as a result of the Proposal. There was some discussion about improved amenity and service due to a superior transport connection, and the consequential increase in traffic as a result of this improved situation, and the additional opportunities (social, cultural, employment, economic) that would result from this. There was also dispute that the Proposal would lead to any economic improvement.

There was support for the route improving resilience to the system, but concern that the Proposal was failing to provide for local traffic movements. A number of submitters offered alternative designs, or intersection modifications, or requests for additional inclusions within the Proposal scope. A number raised concerns that the current Proposal would either hinder or prevent future improvements/developments, and at the very least would cause additional disruptions. Questions were also raised regarding the development and calibration of the traffic modelling.

Concerns were raised about ancillary activities, including; ensuring assets meet appropriate standards, including safety standards, traffic disruptions during construction, lack of car parking, and issues around availability of options for refuelling if petrol stations close as a result of the Proposal.

**Table 6: Submitters who submitted on Transport and Traffic matters**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126290	Auckland Transport
126313	Bike Auckland
126516	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (Willmott, D)
126350	Flourishing Property Company Limited
126267	Fogarty, P
126086	Goris, D
126355	Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey Association

126321	Infrastructure New Zealand
126022	Iseke, G
126084	Klein Molekamp, B
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126192	National Road Carriers (Inc)
126351	Olson, S
126154	Polaris Rentals Limited & Others
126097	Speary, D
126341	Watercare Services Limited
126347	Yen, T
126329	Young, G

### Busway and Bus stations

Fifteen submitters (45.5%) discussed the busway in their submission. This included submissions on the busway, the busway location and the proposed changes to the bus stations, including recommendations for additional bus stations.

There was support for the extension of the busway and enhancement of public transport. However, the importance of future proofing this alignment was noted. Some submitters discussed the alignment of the busway (both for and against the proposed alignment). There were also issues raised around the height of the busway, impacts on specific properties as a result of the busway, and some dispute about the inclusion of the busway in this Proposal at all.

The concept that buses using the busway could provide an alternative route for road users during construction disruptions, and the long term benefits on bus travel times was also discussed.

There was some discussion around the Albany bus station link in particular, ensuring it is appropriately designed and does not restrict future development opportunities.

Insufficient car parking, or a requirement for additional car parking at bus stations was raised by submitters multiple times, as was a request for the inclusion of an additional Rosedale bus station. There was also a request to ensure there are provisions at bus stations for people accessing the facilities using active modes of transport (for example walking and cycling).

**Table 7: Submitters who submitted on Busway and Bus stations matters**

<b>EPA Reference Number</b>	<b>Submitter Name</b>
126345	Auckland Council
126290	Auckland Transport
126313	Bike Auckland
126516	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (Willmott, D)
126086	Goris, D
126321	Infrastructure New Zealand
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126339	Melanesian Mission Trust Board and St Johns College Trust Board
126309	Ministry of Education
126274	Perera, N&I
126097	Speary, D
126095	Tregonning, C
126271	Waste Management NZ Limited
126329	Young, G

### Shared Use Path and Cycle ways

The Shared Use Path (SUP) was discussed by 14 submitters (42.4%). The matters raised included; the SUP, walkways, cycle ways, access to the SUP, and the location of the SUP and cycle ways.

There was support for the inclusion of SUP and cycle ways as part of the Proposal. This includes the positive impact of the SUP on amenity, and the importance of providing for active transport, as well as potentially an alternative transport option during construction. However, some submitters disputed the inclusion of SUPs' in this Proposal.

The SUP was supported for the enhancement of connectivity, but safety and privacy concerns due to increased visibility of sites as a result of the SUP were raised. Some site specific impacts were also raised, and some site specific enhancements were suggested.

There were a number of comments on the location of the SUP, to ensure it can be accessed by residential areas. The connection of Albany bus station to McClymonts Road was raised as an important area for connectivity, as was the provision of cycling facilities (parking and storage) at the bus stations. Concerns were raised around the height of the SUP.

Concerns were raised around the loss of connectivity and disruptions to pedestrians and cyclists during construction, and suggestions were made on some additional desirable linkages that had not been included in this Proposal. Also where 'stair only' access is indicated, modifications were suggested to enable cycle access as well. There was some discussion about the integration with the Auckland Transport roading network.

A number of safety improvements were suggested, including separating cycling and walking, ensuring there are safe connections into the local road network, narrowing of the path at points, ensuring provision is made for less confident cyclists, ensuring protection/separation of cycle lanes from motorists, ensuring there are safe crossing points, using traffic calming measures where constrictions occur, inclusion of good sightlines and avoiding using safety chicanes.

Support for integration of network utilities within the SUP, was also raised by submissions, including design to allow easy access to utilities with minimal disruption to the SUP.

**Table 8: Submitters who submitted on Shared Use Path and cycle ways matters**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126290	Auckland Transport
126313	Bike Auckland
126516	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (Willmott, D)
126267	Fogarty, P
126086	Goris, D
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126339	Melanesian Mission Trust Board and St Johns College Trust Board
126309	Ministry of Education
126351	Olson, S
126271	Waste Management NZ Limited
126341	Watercare Services Limited
126329	Young, G



## 6.2 Construction Impacts

The theme of construction impacts, includes all discussions on construction effects, and potential impacts on health and safety.

### Construction effects

Construction impacts was discussed by 15 submitters (45.5%).

A number of concerns regarding construction impacts were raised, some of which were site specific impacts, these include the impacts on children, education facilities or recreational facilities. There was discussion on ensuring construction does not adversely affect existing assets in the area.

Concerns were raised around the use of vehicles for construction, and the impacts of construction on safety and accessibility, particularly for vulnerable or mobility impaired people, and the importance of maintaining safe and clear access to sites during construction, as well as ensuring that existing pedestrian and cycle paths remain open through the construction period as much as possible.

Construction traffic management issues were raised, including; concerns regarding diversion of traffic onto inappropriate routes that may be inconvenient or unsafe, having additional heavy vehicles using local roads, damage to roads, effects on the operation of the public transport network, impacts on freight movements and the need for any construction traffic management measures to comply with relevant codes of practise.

The effects of construction on; amenity, noise, and dust was raised. Submissions raised concern around a lack of clarity around duration of construction effects. There was also concern on erosion and sediment control as well as water quality management associated with construction.

A number of submitters noted the need to be kept informed of works, or informed of disruptions to roads during construction. There was some requests for further detail on the management of construction effects, and construction work causing damage or interference with boundary properties, and how adverse effects will be managed. It was noted that there is no provision for submitters to participate in the development of management plans.

**Table 9: Submitters who submitted on Construction effects**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126290	Auckland Transport
126313	Bike Auckland
126203	Farro Fresh Food
126350	Flourishing Property Company Limited

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126339	Melanesian Mission Trust Board and St Johns College Trust Board
126309	Ministry of Education
126165	National Mini Storage Limited
126304	Transpower New Zealand Limited
126271	Waste Management NZ Limited
126341	Watercare Services Limited
126347	Yen, T
126329	Young, G

### Health and Safety

Five submitters (15.2%) discussed health and safety aspects of the Proposal, including the safety of workers, and others.

Submitters raised health and safety concerns around ensuring safe roading connections, and the risks associated with closures and diversions. Particular concerns have been raised for contractors working near the high voltage network, children exposed to increased traffic and outside noise, as well the risks from the increased new access by the SUP on adjoining properties.

**Table 10: Submitters who submitted on Health and Safety matters**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126309	Ministry of Education
126304	Transpower New Zealand Limited

## 6.3 Operational Impacts

The theme of operational impacts includes discussions of impacts from the point the Proposal would be operative, and covers ongoing or long-term impacts.

## Urban Design and Visual Effects

Ten submitters (30.3%) discussed aspects relating to the visual environment, including urban design, visual effects, and aesthetic designs.

A number of submitters discussed the importance of managing visual impacts, including a note on the importance of recognising the visual needs of residents and road users.

The changes the proposal will make in terms of visibility had diverse views expressed by submitters, with concerns raised around a loss of profile, blocking of views of sites and removal of key visual markers. Concerns were also raised around having an increased profile from public spaces.

Concern was raised that traffic would become more visible, therefore there would be a need for appropriate screening to be undertaken. A number of structures were considered to have a negative visual impact, predominately bridges and retaining walls, and suggestions were provided on measures to manage the visual impact, including; translucent noise walls, or enhanced design of structures to reduce their visual impacts.

Concern was raised that some recommended design opportunities had not been included, and that the proposed consent conditions did not align with the Urban Design Framework Plan. Alternative views suggested that the visual design elements were unnecessary extras.

**Table 11: Submitters who submitted on Urban Design and Visual Effects**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126516	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (Willmott, D)
126350	Flourishing Property Company Limited
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126339	Melanesian Mission Trust Board and St Johns College Trust Board
126123	Shasha Service Limited
126110	Syds Investments Limited
126341	Watercare Services Limited
126347	Yen, T

## Noise and Vibration

Eight submitters (24.2%) discussed noise and vibration impacts.

Submissions raised that the existing noise environment is already affected by high traffic noise, and that operational noise could be managed by noise barriers, building mitigation, and the use of low noise road surfaces.

Concern in regard to construction, and operational, noise and vibration issues were both raised. There was discussion around the impacts from the last time an additional motorway lane was added, and there was also an acknowledgement, and a concern, around the uncertainty of noise and vibration effects.

A number of uncertainties were raised in the submissions. These included; the appropriateness of the tools for compliance, noise descriptions, and frequency and severity of exposure to noise levels in excess of proposed criteria.

A number of property specific noise and vibration concerns were raised, as were specific concerns about elevated noise levels around Wren Place as a result of the bridge, and the need to provide noise barriers for reserves or parks to maintain amenity values. There was discussion on the requirements for children, particularly in relation to childhood centres.

**Table 12: Submitters who submitted on Noise and vibration matters**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126350	Flourishing Property Company Limited
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126250	Tozer, E
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126123	Shasha Service Limited
126110	Syds Investments Limited
126347	Yen, T

## Stormwater and Flooding

Five submitters (15.2%) discussed stormwater and flooding issues. These concerns related to the proposed stormwater management for the Proposal, existing issues, and areas of concern.

A number of submitters raised concern in regard to stormwater or flooding issues relating to individual properties, in particular, areas already experiencing flooding, drainage, overflow or ponding issues. The

submissions also raised concern that the Proposal did not make the current situation any worse, or negatively impact on the ability to undertake work to manage/address these issues. Concern was raised about the increased risk of flooding, and the frequency of flooding not being adequately addressed.

Concerns on the impact on existing stormwater ponds was raised, as was the requirement to ensure continuity of stormwater service, ensuring water quality meets discharge requirements, and that capacity and quality upgrades are able to occur.

There was also discussion around the management of stormwater assets, both now and in the future, particularly where these are located on land not owned by the applicant, and the management of consents, including those held by other agencies.

There was discussion on water quality, the impact on the ecological values of Oteha Stream, and managing erosion and sediment runoff from construction activities.

**Table 13: Submitters who submitted on Stormwater and flooding matters**

<b>EPA Reference Number</b>	<b>Submitter Name</b>
126345	Auckland Council
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126165	National Mini Storage Limited
126271	Waste Management NZ Limited
126341	Watercare Services Limited

## 6.4 Social Impacts

The theme of social impacts includes all discussions on social or community impacts, including the wider environment.

### Community facilities

Four submitters (12.1%) discussed impacts on community facilities.

There was discussion on the impacts on community facilities, including; loss of reserve land/public open space, the projected shortage of sports fields on the North Shore, relocation of the Hockey facility, and the cascading impacts of this. It was noted that direct negotiations between the applicant and with community facilities were occurring.

**Table 14: Submitters who submitted on Community facilities**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126516	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (Willmott, D)
126355	Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey Association
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche

### Terrestrial Ecology and Plantings

Four submitters (12.1%) discussed the terrestrial ecological aspects, including proposed, or requested, plantings.

Submissions raised support for native plantings, and the enjoyment associated with native bird life using these areas, as well as reinstatement of plantings impacted by works. The converse was also raised, with concern around the impact of landscaping blocking visibility.

**Table 15: Submitters who submitted on Terrestrial Ecology and Plantings**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126341	Watercare Services Limited

## 6.5 Specific Impacts

The theme of specific impacts includes all the discussions on impacts that have a limited radius of concern, notably property impacts and impacts on infrastructure assets.

### Property Impacts

14 submitters (42.4%) discussed property impacts, primarily on their own properties.

A number of submitters raised concerns regarding their own properties, and in particular raised concerns around; encroachments, loss of land, closeness of structures, impacts on property values, impacts on business activities, restrictions on the ability of sites to operate, impacts on proposed developments, provision of access to property, damage or interference with properties adjacent to work sites, requests for

relocation as a result of the project and assurances that future issues on individual properties will be addressed.

There were also concerns around worsening living conditions, traffic management during construction, and a loss of access to shops as a consequential loss from the Proposal.

Concerns were raised as to reduced ability to be outside, or to undertake lawfully authorised activities with objectionable effects that would become prone to reverse sensitivity effects including complaints as a result of the Proposal moving sensitive receivers close to the site. There was also uncertainty around the impacts on individual sites.

**Table 16: Submitters who submitted on Property Impacts**

<b>EPA Reference Number</b>	<b>Submitter Name</b>
126345	Auckland Council
126203	Farro Fresh Food
126350	Flourishing Property Company Limited
126267	Fogarty, P
126355	Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey Association
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126250	Tozer, E
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126339	Melanesian Mission Trust Board and St Johns College Trust Board
126165	National Mini Storage Limited
126177	North Shore Vintage Car Club of NZ Incorporated
126123	Shasha Service Limited
126110	Syds Investments Limited
126271	Waste Management NZ Limited
126341	Watercare Services Limited
126347	Yen, T

## Infrastructure

Three submitters (9.1%) discussed the impact on infrastructure. All service providers with infrastructure assets in the Proposal area, raised the proposed impacts on their assets, and plans to maintain and develop these assets.

Comments were predominately around; ensuring management of impacts on existing infrastructure, recognition of existing infrastructure, maintaining operation of infrastructure, ensuring future ability to upgrade infrastructure, and infrastructure specific requirements (i.e. design standards).

**Table 17: Submitters who submitted on Infrastructure matters**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126304	Transpower New Zealand Limited
126314	Vector Limited
126341	Watercare Services Limited

## 6.6 Other Impacts

The final category is the 'Other Impacts', where submissions discussing these topics was at a low level (1-2 submissions). These topics were; mitigation measures, landfill, community impacts, social impacts, ground water and lighting.

### Other Impacts

The parties raising these concerns have been noted in the table below.

The key points of the topics are indicated in bullet points below:

- Lowering water table may have detrimental effects on the surrounding area
- Street lighting on the bridge will be too bright
- There is a possibility for community severance to occur during construction, and disruption to educational facilities, and consequential effects on learning and achievement of students
- An ongoing liaison with Mana Whenua through all stages of the Proposal is supported
- Auckland Council need an involvement in management plans
- Consultation was very poor and information was vague or misleading, and did not recognise the diverse community in Unsworth Heights
- There are community impacts on local shops at bottom of Unsworth Drive, and Z Service Station as a result of the off-ramp being closed
- Further information is considered necessary to allow parties to undertake a full assessment of the Proposal
- The Rosedale Closed Landfill has a number of specific requirements, including;
  - Managing discharges from the landfill including meeting discharge consents



- Health and Safety for staff, contractors and members of the public
- Management of contaminated land
- Odour from excavation of wastes
- Ensuring overall risks from the landfill are not increased, including those associated with landfill infrastructure
- Detailed design process, including with the Council, is still needed to manage the landfill

**Table 18: Submitter who submitted on Other Impacts**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	
126345	Auckland Council	Landfill, Mana Whenua, Mitigation, Information gaps
126290	Auckland Transport	Mitigation
126267	Fogarty, P	Consultation, Community impacts
126309	Ministry of Education	Social impacts
126177	North Shore Vintage Car Club of NZ Incorporated	Groundwater
126123	Shasha Service Limited	Lighting

## 7 Conditions Requested

The table of requested conditions provides an overview of the conditions requested by submitters. The table does not record conditions verbatim. If a submitter has asked for a similar condition multiple times within their submission, this has been recorded once.

**Table 19: Requested Conditions**

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	Requested conditions
126345	Auckland Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [See Appendix 2]</li> </ul>
126290	Auckland Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect the function and reliability of bus service between Constellation and Albany stations through avoiding delays on bus trips</li> <li>• Ensure passenger capacity can be retained by ensuring any alternative routes used during peak hours are able to have double decker buses</li> <li>• Recognise the additional costs of diverting buses along alternative routes to cater for construction</li> </ul>

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	Requested conditions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage the timing and staging/methods of undertaking works on the busway stations to minimise service disruption and patron inconvenience</li> <li>• Require any assets to be vested in Auckland Transport must comply with relevant Auckland Transport codes of practise and/or engineering standards</li> <li>• Provide requiring authority approval under section 176(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 to enable to Auckland Transport to undertake routine work on local road assets [agreed condition between Auckland Transport and the Applicant]</li> <li>• Require any mitigation required for NZTA assets, including screening/plantings, to be located within NZTA land. If mitigation is required within Auckland Transport controlled assets, such as the local road network, approval must be gained from Auckland Transport</li> </ul>
126313	Bike Auckland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require improvements to the SUP design</li> <li>• Require improvements to the cycleway</li> <li>• Require improvements for cycle access</li> <li>• Include measures to ensure separation between cyclists and general traffic</li> <li>• Require modification to ensure safe crossing options</li> <li>• Require appropriate signage</li> <li>• Require measures to maintain access to existing pedestrian and cycle paths during construction, with closures required for construction to be minimised and outside peak hours</li> <li>• Do not allow use of SUP chicanes as these interrupt cycling convenience, create pinch points and constitute unnecessary crash hazard</li> <li>• Require collaboration with Auckland Transport regarding cycle parking and storage</li> <li>• Provide connection to the SeaPath at Esmonde Road</li> </ul>
126516	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (Willmott, D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require consideration of alternative road design [as prepared by submitter]</li> <li>• Require provision for additional direct motorway to motorway connections or assurance that such ramps are not precluded from future development</li> <li>• Require sensible and cost-conscious justification for additional provisions for pedestrians and cyclists</li> <li>• Reduce lateral intrusion into the hockey fields</li> <li>• Focus on the requirements of the road rather than alternative transport options</li> </ul>

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	Requested conditions
126203	Farro Fresh Food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure [submitter] is kept informed of the works</li> <li>• Ensure the works/project has no impact on property [own site]</li> </ul>
126350	Flourishing Property Company Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of further measures to manage construction noise effects to ensure they are appropriate for high density, noise sensitive residential activities anticipated for [own site]</li> <li>• Ensure potential for high density development on [own site]</li> <li>• Maintain vehicle access to [own site]</li> </ul>
126267	Fogarty, P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend the T2 lane at Constellation on ramp down to the highway</li> <li>• Build southern ramps to/from SH1 or increase the number of right turn lanes out of Caribbean Drive back to the Barbados roundabout</li> <li>• Relocate the SUP to the southern side of SH1 to make it more accessible</li> <li>• Re-consult/re-notify the people of Albany, North Harbour Industrial Area and Unsworth Heights to outline the disadvantages of the project for them to allow them to make an informed decision on whether to make a new submission</li> </ul>
126086	Goris, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake an investigation into local traffic movements</li> <li>• Undertake improvements to Jack Hinton Drive</li> <li>• Install traffic lights at the Rosedale Road and Paul Matthews Road ends of Jack Hinton Drive</li> <li>• Include the Rosedale Busway location</li> </ul>
126355	Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the Hockey facility be relocated to proposed new site in agreed timeframes</li> <li>• Require the new Hockey facility to be constructed on terms agreed with the submitter</li> <li>• Ensure the submitter is able to obtain funding to build its planned betterment component</li> </ul>
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the notice of requirement to be withdrawn in part or modified to avoid any part of the [own site] being required for designation and construction activities</li> <li>• Shift alignment of SH1 to the west to provide greater separation and avoid any land take of [own site]</li> <li>• Relocate bus lanes and SUP to the western side of SH1</li> <li>• Remove the SUP</li> <li>• Reduce vertical alignment and location of bus lanes and SUP to provide these structures at the same or lower height as SH1 and prevent blocking views of [own site] from SH1</li> </ul>

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	Requested conditions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change vertical alignment or design or location of flyover to prevent structure blocking views to the site from SH1</li> <li>• Include additional land within the NOR to the north of the [own site] to enable the [own site] to be extended north to compensate for the loss of storage, space, access and vehicle manoeuvrability</li> <li>• Require the Busway and SUP to be constructed at a reduced height</li> <li>• Require the Busway to be constructed on a bridge structure with SUP underneath</li> <li>• Ensure vehicle access is available to all units on [own site] including by truck, during and following construction</li> <li>• Ensure visibility of [own site] from SH1 is maintained</li> <li>• Maintain amenity values of site during and following construction, including form, design and lighting of retaining wall</li> <li>• Include measures to ensure the form, design and lighting of the SUP and busway maintains amenity values as viewed from [own site]</li> <li>• Include clear objectives and standards to address construction effects on the site during construction</li> <li>• Require consultation [with submitter] on the Construction Management Plans</li> <li>• Provide mechanism for Kiwi to have input into landscaping designs and conditions for landscaping to avoid screening of facilities</li> </ul>
126084	Klein Molekamp, B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include additional motorway interchange connections</li> </ul>
126250	Tozer, E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require remediation or compensation for any noise impacts that become apparent after construction</li> </ul>
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require an attractive permanent sound barrier be put in place from the corner of Caribbean Drive and native planting to be replaced prior to earthworks beginning</li> <li>• Install new signage stating the suburb of Meadowood and associated replacement plantings</li> <li>• Increase the number of carparks at Constellation bus station</li> <li>• Require upgrades be undertaken to the community house and playground as compensation for the loss of reserve land</li> </ul>

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	Requested conditions
126339	Melanesian Mission Trust Board and St Johns College Trust Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require notification of when works will commence and any changes to roading layouts, any roading markings and temporary road closures which may affect access to their site</li> <li>Retain the designation boundary (6750)</li> <li>Retain location of the busway and SUP</li> <li>Retain an MSE wall required for the busway and SUP along the boundary of the site</li> </ul>
126309	Ministry of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require conditions to address effects on school properties that have been well socialised with affected schools</li> <li>Add the Ministry of Education to the list of representatives as an interested stakeholder in the SCP (SCP.3)</li> <li>Require specific consideration of the disruption to educational facilities and the impacts construction works may have on pedestrian and cycle connectivity (SCP.4)</li> <li>Include condition CTMP.3(f) for detours to be the shortest and most convenient [support from submitter for proposed condition]</li> <li>Include mitigation measures to ensure community connections are maintained to avoid severance</li> <li>Require schools to be kept well informed of potential works through engagement and real-time media</li> </ul>
126165	National Mini Storage Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure stormwater design will ensure the area to the east of Miro Place will not flood</li> <li>Ensure new stormwater systems are designed to divert water away from the existing culvert</li> <li>In the Construction Management Plan require the contractor to detail the processes and measures to be undertaken when working beside neighbouring properties to keep disruptions to a minimum and steps to be taken should any disruption/damage occur</li> </ul>
126192	National Road Carriers (Inc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a design and construction principle that requires that when the construction is completed the road will meet the highest possible standards to enable freight transport efficiency, safety and effectiveness</li> <li>Require the road to meet OM/OD standards along the route for 50T-plus heavy vehicles</li> <li>Ensure the project has safety and future proofing provisions including; shoulder lanes, stopping areas and dedicated bus and freight ways (ideally separate)</li> <li>Ensure access to interchanges and turning circles are designed to allow larger classes of HCV (B-train and bulk fuel tankers) to corner safely</li> <li>Ensure underpasses are to an acceptable specification and height for all permitted freight vehicle configurations</li> </ul>

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	Requested conditions
126177	North Shore Vintage Car Club of NZ Incorporated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require suitable retaining be constructed along the southbound corridor between Oteha Valley Road and McClymonts Road</li> <li>Require any alteration to the existing water table to have due regard to the effect it may have on the surrounding area, particularly [own site]</li> </ul>
126351	Olson, S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide separate walking and cycle paths (not a Shared Use Path)</li> </ul>
126274	Perera, N&I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide an additional busway station in the vicinity of Rosedale</li> <li>Include a short term parking area on the northern side of Sunset Road adjacent to the bus lane linking Sunset Road to Constellation Station</li> </ul>
126154	Polaris Rentals Limited & Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Either build or plan for the west to south link</li> <li>Use clover leaf designs to encourage traffic flow by avoiding blockages at intersections</li> </ul>
126097	Speary, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide sufficient car parking associated with the bus stations</li> </ul>
126110	Syds Investments Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make the lane alignment less intrusive by using undeveloped land to the north</li> <li>Retain business profile by having no side barriers</li> <li>Provide signage for businesses losing profile</li> </ul>
126304	Transpower New Zealand Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure suitable conditions and mitigation measures are included to ensure the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid is not compromised</li> <li>Ensure minimum requirements to mitigate effects on cables relating to safe and reliable operation, and options for installation of a future circuit</li> <li>Ensure minimum access to cables is protected, including 24/7 access</li> <li>Construct a suitably engineered box culvert tunnel over existing cables</li> <li>Require development of either a Network Utility Management Plan (NUMP) or an Electricity Infrastructure Management Plan (EIMP) including a Transpower review of this plan</li> <li>Prevent any work from occurring within existing Transpower designation areas and around undesignated cables within the construction area until Transpower has all RMA approvals to authorise the installation of additional circuits including all protective and practical structures</li> </ul>
126095	Tregonning, C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Give consideration to the needs of the local community (Browns Bay)</li> </ul>

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	Requested conditions
126314	Vector Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise and provide for Vector's existing infrastructure</li> <li>• Ensure the function and operations of Vector and its infrastructure are not unreasonably compromised by the project</li> <li>• Ensure all costs incurred to Vector's infrastructure by the Proposal are covered by the applicant</li> <li>• Include measures to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects on all assets and associated infrastructure</li> <li>• Include an agreement with the applicant around any construction near Vector to ensure protection or relocation as appropriate</li> <li>• Require that should any additional approvals be required for relocation of assets, this will be done on Vector's behalf and at the applicant's cost</li> </ul>
126271	Waste Management NZ Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require consultation and engagement with affected stakeholders for the development of the Management Plans, including consultation with the submitter</li> <li>• Amend the designs or conditions to manage effects of the proposed busway and SUP</li> </ul>
126341	Watercare Services Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure continued and uninterrupted performance of the Rosedale Wastewater Treatment Ponds and the ability to upgrade in the future</li> <li>• Control construction to ensure no deterioration of water quality in the WWTP</li> <li>• Reinstate Watercare's landscaping when construction is finished</li> <li>• Provide appropriate barriers to prevent people accessing the Watercare site, particularly from the new SUP</li> <li>• Maintain reasonable vehicle access between Ponds 1 and 2 and around southern edge of Pond 1 during construction</li> <li>• Replace the vehicle access along the western edge of Pond 2</li> <li>• Relocate the boat ramp at Pond 2 before the existing boat ramp is removed</li> <li>• Protect the dam wall along the southern edge of Pond 1, particularly the part of the dam wall which forms the 'finger' of Pond 1 and is closest to the proposed construction site</li> <li>• Maintain Watercare's existing vehicle access to the WWTP from Paul Matthews Road</li> <li>• Consultation with Watercare during preparation of the landscape plan</li> <li>• Include a condition requiring a review of designations at the end of construction</li> </ul>

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name	Requested conditions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans to show the designated land only required for construction stage</li> <li>• Require procedures and methods to protect continued operation of existing sewer lines during construction (TS5 and TS7)</li> <li>• Include conditions to manage sediment being released into either Pond 1 or 2 during the construction period</li> <li>• Provide engineering support and protection to the TS5 pipe bridges</li> <li>• Require any transmission sewer diversions to meet Watercare's Design and Construction standards</li> <li>• Include provision for a utility corridor with the planned areas of work to enable future installation and maintenance of the proposed new sewer line</li> </ul>
126347	Yen, T	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of living conditions, before, during and after construction</li> <li>• Lump sum compensation to move if current conditions are unliveable</li> <li>• Cash compensation for rent for two people for duration of construction</li> <li>• Lump sum compensation to permanently move if future situation will be unliveable</li> </ul>
126329	Young, G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the upgrade of Constellation and construction of the SUP before work begins on the highway to give road users an effective alternative</li> </ul>



## Appendix 1: Full List of Submitters

The list is provided alphabetically (by organisation or last name), and then numerically (by EPA reference number)

### Full List (alphabetically)

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126345	Auckland Council
126290	Auckland Transport
126313	Bike Auckland
126516	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (Willmott, D)
126203	Farro Fresh Food
126350	Flourishing Property Company Limited
126267	Fogarty, P
126086	Goris, D
126355	Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey Association
126321	Infrastructure New Zealand
126022	Iseke, G
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126084	Klein Molekamp, B
126250	Tozer, E
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126339	Melanesian Mission Trust Board and St Johns College Trust Board
126309	Ministry of Education
126165	National Mini Storage Limited
126192	National Road Carriers (Inc)
126177	North Shore Vintage Car Club of NZ Incorporated
126351	Olson, S
126274	Perera, N&I
126154	Polaris Rentals Limited & Others
126123	Shasha Service Limited

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

126097	Speary, D
126110	Syds Investments Limited
126304	Transpower New Zealand Limited
126095	Tregonning, C
126314	Vector Limited
126271	Waste Management NZ Limited
126341	Watercare Services Limited
126347	Yen, T
126329	Young, G

## Full List (numerically)

EPA Reference Number	Submitter Name
126022	Iseke, G
126084	Klein Molekamp, B
126086	Goris, D
126095	Tregonning, C
126097	Speary, D
126110	Syds Investments Limited
126123	Shasha Service Limited
126154	Polaris Rentals Limited & Others
126165	National Mini Storage Limited
126177	North Shore Vintage Car Club of NZ Incorporated
126192	National Road Carriers (Inc)
126203	Farro Fresh Food
126233	Meadowood Community Crèche
126250	Tozer, E
126267	Fogarty, P
126274	Perera, N&I
126271	Waste Management NZ Limited

---

**Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal**

126290	Auckland Transport
126304	Transpower New Zealand Limited
126313	Bike Auckland
126309	Ministry of Education
126314	Vector Limited
126321	Infrastructure New Zealand
126329	Young, G
126341	Watercare Services Limited
126339	Melanesian Mission Trust Board and St Johns College Trust Board
126351	Olson, S
126350	Flourishing Property Company Limited
126347	Yen, T
126345	Auckland Council
126355	Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey Association
126352	Kiwi Self Storage Limited
126516	Centre for Urban and Transport Studies (Willmott, D)

## Appendix 2: Conditions sought by Auckland Council

Auckland Council's submission included four appendices with detailed conditions, and information requests. This table outlines these, and are categorised by topic.

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
General	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include conditions providing for input from stakeholders (where appropriate) in the preparation of management plans, and appropriate objective performance standards and content requirements</li> <li>• Include conditions for a process where the plans, once prepared are submitted to the Council for certification/approval</li> <li>• Require the various management plans are required by either the designation and/or consent conditions as appropriate</li> <li>• Include provision for a Community Liaison Group to be established prior to works commencing and meeting regularly to provide feedback. Membership could include, but not be limited to; Upper Harbour Local Board representatives, iwi, recreation groups, Council representatives, Council controlled organisations and relevant specialists</li> <li>• Require a 20 working day time frame to allow for comprehensive certification and/or approval of management plans</li> </ul>
	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient information provided to allow Council to gauge the full range of potential effects</li> <li>• Additional information is sought to enable full understanding of the consideration of alternative and preferred options for the corridor, key intersections, modelling and other work used to estimate growth and net economic benefits</li> <li>• Additional information on the modelling used to estimate gross and economic benefits</li> <li>• Additional information on the options analysis supporting the preferred alignment for the flyovers connecting SH18 and SH1</li> <li>• Additional information on any work done on how the estimated gross and net economic benefits may have changed and confirmation of the current Benefit Cost Ratio</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council supports on-going liaison with Mana Whenua through all stages of the proposal</li> <li>• Concern around lack of involvement for the Council to certify and/or approve management plans, the lack of details as to the content of these plans, and the placement of most land use controls within consent conditions, rather than the designation conditions</li> <li>• Lack of provision for a Community Liaison Group in conditions</li> <li>• Need for longer timeframes for Council to certify and approve management and communications plans</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
Transport and Traffic	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the alignment and intersections layout which delivers adequate amenity for movements by all modes to Paul Matthews Road, Caribbean Drive and Constellation Drive.</li> <li>• Include designation conditions to require the Construction Environment Management Plan (to be certified/approved by the council) and supporting plans to achieve               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acceptable degrees of travel time variability for local road traffic, using only appropriate diversion and haulage routes; and</li> <li>- Safe and efficient temporary routes for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport services during construction</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide for future proofing of;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The busway for future rail conversion, and for future connections to the north and west, to support the development of a long term sustainable transport network; and</li> <li>- The intersection of SH1 and SH18 to provide future direct south facing connections</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require the links to the busway, including links to stations, to provide efficient and reliable journey times</li> </ul>
	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional information is needed to allow Council to fully consider aspects of the proposal, assess the potential transport effects and evaluate appropriate mitigation (where necessary)</li> <li>• Ascertain the extent to which consideration was given to options that increased the integration of the busway within key population catchments and growth areas</li> <li>• Provide the complete busway (and therefore cycleway) drawings</li> <li>• Demonstrate future proofing of the busway alignment</li> <li>• Provide evidence to support expansion and operational suitability of the proposed busway stations</li> <li>• Clarify the degree of connectivity of the SH1 and SH18 SUP spine to the wider active mode network</li> <li>• Provide additional assessment detail, including evidence of the model development, calibration and validation, and details of the forecast changes to the traffic on local roads. Performance of the network for delay, including evidence base of the Busway while accessing egressing stations is also required</li> <li>• Provide additional evidence of the resilience of the proposal through testing of alternative demand and network scenarios is required to assess the potential effects on the local network, and therefore community</li> <li>• Provide additional evidence to demonstrate the Proposal will deliver safe and efficient connections for key movements in the Unsworth Heights and Rosedale areas</li> <li>• Provide information/clarification in relation to the weaving performance of options tested</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
Landscape and urban design	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify the proposal and/or designation conditions to implement the recommendations of the Urban Design Panel as set out in their recommendations</li> <li>• Include all design opportunities identified in the Urban Design Panel recommendations particularly;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- retaining wall planting,</li> <li>- a new stormwater pond near the Lucas Creek/Oteha Valley Road interchange,</li> <li>- confirmation that a shared/pedestrian path and bridge across Spencer Road ridge will be provided,</li> <li>- an SUP connection over Greville Road to the Rosedale Landfill future open space,</li> <li>- details of the cultural narrative design for the Constellation Drive bus station,</li> <li>- a mound between the two earth ramps and lanes that connect SH1 and SH18 at the Constellation Drive / Caribbean Drive interchange,</li> <li>- the retaining wall south of Rosedale Road shifted to accommodate planting</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure the proposal is designed and implemented to adequately mitigate adverse landscape and visual effects</li> </ul>
	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information with detailed elevations and 3 dimensional drawings to provide details of the scale, appearance and design treatment, including materials and theming for;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Retaining walls, including railings</li> <li>- Bridges and elevated lanes, including railings</li> <li>- Proposed noise walls</li> <li>- SUPs and cycle ways, including surface treatments and railings</li> <li>- Proposed plantings</li> <li>- Detailing for the bus station walling and other key structural elements</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide survey-accurate photomontages to confirm the level of effects associated with development and reconfiguration of each intersection will be as concluded in the AEE</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disconnection between the Urban Design Landscape Framework and the Urban Design Landscape Plan</li> <li>• Misalignment of the Urban Design Framework Plan with draft consent conditions</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
Auckland Urban Design Panel Recommendations (Attachment 2)	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SUP should be relocated to the south side of SH18 in order to provide better access to residential areas</li> <li>• Alignment and design of the busway link into Albany bus station to address               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restriction on future development opportunities in that part of the centre</li> <li>- Visual impacts of the overpass particularly on Lucas Creek escarpment</li> <li>- Opportunities to be used by pedestrians and cyclists; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Possible access to future light rail alignment on the eastern side of SH1</li> </ul>
	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Urban Design Panel was unable to fully assess the urban design merits of some aspects such as retaining walls and new bridge structures because of the absence of key details of materials, scale and appearance</li> <li>• Further design development is needed around the following areas;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Treatment of retaining walls including height, design treatments and design environments that will be experienced by different views</li> <li>- Scale of retaining walls where they face residential properties and impact on outlook, sunlight and amenity</li> <li>- Use of translucent noise walls beside public spaces or reserves to maintain their visual and perceptual amenity [supported]</li> <li>- Further resolution of noise wall design and materiality to ensure consistency with draft UDLF</li> <li>- Detailed design of under passages and overbridges to ensure continuous high quality connections of cyclists and pedestrians</li> <li>- Application of UDLF's principles to the Alexander Stream thought at least a replacement underpass, with an opportunity for bridge connection to daylight the stream and provide connectivity</li> <li>- Future proofing of potential connections to open space areas such as Rosedale Landfill, Watercare Ponds and Rosedale South Reserve</li> <li>- Provision of additional cycling and pedestrian crossing points over SH18</li> <li>- Loss of hockey fields and other open space within Rosedale South Reserve and supports the replacement of these facilities on a like-for-like basis</li> <li>- Loss of local amenity value of the open space land with motorway related infrastructure should be offset through improvements to other open spaces within the corridor to provide the same level of lost amenity</li> </ul> </li> <li>• General support for planting proposals with related outcomes needing to be specified in relation to supporting the wildlife corridor, greater visual screening of the motorway infrastructure</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
		from residential properties and amenity for both motorway users and local residents
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of mitigation and enhancement planting as currently proposed is ambiguous</li> <li>• Heartened to learn of engagement undertaken with iwi and supports constructive engagement to be reflected in the final UDLF and in detailed design</li> </ul>
Public open space and community facilities	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require that if that replacement land to compensate for the loss of open space cannot be achieved, that upgrades are provided to the Unsworth Heights reserves as compensation</li> <li>• Include a designation condition requiring development of an appropriate and adequate Public Open Space Remediation Management Plan, to be submitted to the Council for approval</li> <li>• Include a designation condition requiring mitigation and reinstatement measures for Constellation Reserve in the area affected by the new road, including the design and landscape details for the road frontage</li> <li>• Provide compensation for the loss of the Constellation Reserve land for sports fields, and replacement land in the Rosedale area, and if this is not possible then replacement land should be investigated elsewhere in the Upper Harbour Local Board area</li> <li>• Include conditions to require retaining walls and other structures in public open space or SUP to be designed to mitigate adverse visual and amenity effects including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landscape planting, use of Mechanical Stabilised Earthen living walls, art patterns on walls and other similar treatment devices; and</li> <li>- The implementation of an integrated art work programme on public open space land to engage the community with the art plans to be submitted to the Advisory Panel for Art in Public Places Auckland and the Community Liaison Group (as requested by the Council)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Include conditions of consent to address any adverse environmental effects and ensure appropriate mitigation from the Rook Reserve stormwater treatment pond</li> <li>• Provide a SUP on both sides of SH18 to future proof access, or relocate the SUP to the south side of SH18 to provide better access to residential areas and parks</li> <li>• Extend the SUP with appropriate safety features</li> </ul>
	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide additional information for the council to fully assess the potential effects and proposed mitigation measures on Rook Reserve and the adjacent Alexander Stream, following confirmation Rook Reserve is the preferred site</li> <li>• Provide additional information on the development and evaluation of alternative options to the location of the SUP on the northern side of SH18</li> <li>• Provide additional details to the reserve reinstatement plan to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify the type and quality of remediation anticipated</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrate how the UDLF will be implemented through the 'parks remediation plan'</li> <li>- Identify the reserves subject to this plan</li> <li>- Clarify the timing and delivery of remediation works and transition of assets back to the Council; and</li> <li>- Provide landscaping concept plans</li> <li>• Provide information on alternative measures to mitigate the impacts on recreational users, should the proposed relocation strategy not be able to be achieved</li> <li>• Provide an assessment of effects including mitigation measures, for Rook Reserve stormwater treatment pond and adjacent Alexander Stream</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address the replacement of 12.4ha of public open space land in a community where it is very difficult to find suitable land</li> <li>• Provide certainty that the proposed 'reserve reinstatement package' will deliver appropriate remediation, place making and the return of parks and shared path to the public in an effective and efficient manner</li> <li>• Provide for the replacement of open space functions, particularly the land set aside for future sports fields at Constellation Reserve while ensuring replacement land is of sufficient quantity, quality and is suitably located</li> <li>• Ensure recreational groups that lease council owned sports fields and park land that are directly or consequently affected by the Proposal are permanently relocated to their reasonable satisfaction within an agreed timeframe</li> <li>• Ensure key components of the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan within the Proposal area are secured</li> <li>• Provide a safe and attractive alternative SUP bridge over SH18 to supplement the existing underpass between Omega and Alexander Stream reserve</li> </ul>
Noise and vibration	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include conditions to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Require an assessment of the estimated quantum and frequency of exceedance of the maximum 70dB L<sub>Aeq</sub> criterion used to determine daytime effects, and also the 45 dB L<sub>Aeq</sub> for night time</li> <li>- Require all dwellings and other noise sensitive receivers likely to be exposed to noise levels of 45 dB L<sub>Aeq</sub> at night to be protected by temporary or permanent noise barriers, to have double glazing and/or ventilation installed by the contractor before construction noise begins</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require a Construction Environmental Management Plan and supporting plans to be approved by Council</li> <li>• Require a condition that operational noise will meet a particular level of performance, and that roads will be designed and constructed to achieve this</li> <li>• Include conditions to control noise levels for both the outdoor play areas and the upper floors of the two child care centres</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require attractively designed noise barriers for all residential dwellings abutting the alignment and for the Unsworth Heights reserves</li> <li>• Require in addition to modelling, noise monitoring of post construction performance, as described in P40, with field measures, to be incorporated into determination of compliance</li> <li>• Provide additional information including evidence of model development, calibration and validation for noise</li> <li>• Additional information is needed to determine the potential adverse effects on people in dwellings and commercial properties exposed to high levels of construction noise and vibration</li> <li>• Provide clarification of discrepancies in the assessment of activity sound power levels and compliance distances</li> <li>• Provide an explanation for NZTA's reasons for omitting from the adopted assessment the <math>L_{AFmax}</math> noise levels to fully understand the construction effects of the proposal</li> </ul>
Rosedale Closed Landfill	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include conditions to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects on the proposal, including effects that have cost implications for the Council, relating to the ongoing management of the Rosedale Closed Landfill by the Council. Such conditions may include a bond.</li> <li>• Require the designation be reduced to the minimum area necessary after construction to avoid landfill infrastructure being subject to the Agencies designation</li> <li>• Include additional conditions that require <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For all areas within the construction zone, the Agency is to assume responsibility of the Council's existing consents in relation to the Rosedale Closed Landfill, including consent monitoring, variation of our existing consents where monitoring is not possible is due to construction activities and for obtaining consents relating to their construction impacts</li> <li>- Require the Applicant to undertake all required consent monitoring</li> <li>- Require the Applicant to undertake inspections during construction to mitigate the potential health and safety risk</li> <li>- Require the Applicant to allow for Council access post construction monitoring points and where possible relocate them within Council Land</li> <li>- Require provision of access for the Council during construction for any equipment required to be inspected, maintained or adjusted for the purposes of managing gas risk on or off-site</li> <li>- Require provision of access for Council to monitoring/inspection points in the detailed design</li> <li>- Require settlement monitoring of the western landfill slopes to be undertaken pre-, during and post-construction</li> <li>- Require CCTV of underground infrastructure pre-, during and post-construction</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Analysis of submissions: Northern Corridor Improvements proposal

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include a requirement for Council certification for the location and design of, including access to landfill and landfill monitoring infrastructure</li> <li>- Require detailed design to mitigate the impact of the works on the upstream groundwater and leachate levels and potential increase in risk of future seeps, and the impacts on waste stability</li> <li>- Enable the consent holder to meet their consent requirements if there are overlaps with the proposal and the consent renewal period</li> <li>- Require the Agency to be responsible for disposal of all refuse materials excavated during construction works</li> </ul>
	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require provision of a consenting strategy for works affecting the Rosedale Closed Landfill for consent variations, transition of monitoring and liability arrangements during and post construction (to be agreed through separate agreements) to be provided for approval</li> </ul>
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure the location of landfill infrastructure is taken into account in the detailed design process</li> </ul>
Rosedale Closed Landfill (Attachment 3)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require conditions that; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council to be a key party within the detailed design process of the CEMP and to approve the vesting of Rosedale Closed Landfill related assets to Council</li> <li>- Draft CEMP to be provided to Councils Closed Landfills and Contaminated Land Response (CCLR) team prior to submission to the Council</li> <li>- Require the CEMP to demonstrate how effects on the Landfill will be avoided, remedied or mitigated, including effects on the ongoing operation and management of the closed landfill</li> <li>- Conditions must require any comment from the CCLR team to be provided with the draft CEMP when submitted to the Council for approval</li> <li>- Detailed design to mitigate the impact of the works on upstream groundwater and leachate levels and potential increase in risk of future seeps</li> <li>- The detailed design mitigate the impact of the works on waste stability</li> <li>- Detailed design process is to include consideration of the benefit of moving the gas ring main to the eastern side of the access road</li> <li>- The Applicant to provide for access for Council to monitoring/inspection points in the detailed design</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amend CEMP.7(g) LW.4(e) to include Council CLCLR Site Manager and Gas Plant Manager as emergency contacts as Emergency Response contacts</li> <li>• Require the Landfill Management Plan to be referenced in the Contaminated Site Management Plan and that the Contaminated Site Management Plan be required to take the Landfill Management Plan into account</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the Applicant to take responsibility for all wastes and contaminated soils disturbed as part of the works</li> <li>• Require a consenting strategy as part of the CEMP covering both Landfill Reinstatement Works Plan and Landfill Construction Method Statements and that the consenting strategy covers; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consent variations</li> <li>- Transition of monitoring and liability during and post construction</li> <li>- Strategy for altering the Applicant's designation following completion of construction</li> <li>- The designation to only include the minimum extent required to operate and maintain the NCI works; and</li> <li>- A strategy for delays that overlap the Rosedale Closed Landfill consent renewals</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require that the CLCLR approve the location and design of; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to and replacement gas ring main, leachate collection system, gas interception and trench</li> <li>- Access road running along the bund edge and alongside the retaining wall; and</li> <li>- The access to and replacement monitoring points</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require the Applicant to assume responsibility for all Rosedale Closed Landfill consent monitoring (stormwater, leachate, groundwater diversion, air, trade waste) activities required to occur in the construction zone</li> <li>• Require the Applicant to provide access for Council during construction for operational requirements</li> <li>• Require the Applicant to provide post-construction access to relocated monitoring and inspection points within Council land</li> <li>• Require the Applicant to undertake pre-, during and post-construction settlement monitoring of the western landfill slopes, CCTV of underground infrastructure (including terminal manhole and leachate discharge pipe under the motorway; stormwater pond 7; above ground channel and underground box culvert assets)</li> <li>• Require the Applicant to be responsible for disposal of all refuse materials excavated during the project</li> <li>• Require the Landfill Construction Method Statements to include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Details on how the landfill will be reinstated once the works are complete</li> <li>- Details including temporary reconfiguration of leachate, gas and stormwater infrastructure</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require that any access stubs into the Closed Landfill site are secure to prevent any unauthorised access onto the Closed Landfill</li> <li>• Require approval of the Landfill Construction Method Statements by CLCLR as asset owner on behalf of the Council</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require a Bond or similar instrument to cover the risks to Council assets or for managing potential impacts on the operational aspect of the Closed Landfill</li> <li>• Include a condition to the designation or consent to require there is no noxious, dangerous, offensive or objectionable odour beyond the site boundary where the construction works take place</li> </ul>
Stormwater and flooding	Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the Agency to provide its requiring authority approval to enable the Council to undertake maintenance, repair or upgrading works of Council's stormwater assets without further Agency approval</li> <li>• Require compliance with the requirements of the Auckland Council Network Discharge Consent</li> <li>• Include a condition requiring that predicted overflow volumes take into consideration future plans for the wastewater treatment plant or increase the capability of the Constellation pond</li> <li>• Require that all stormwater treatment devices are designed and constructed in accordance with the Auckland Unitary Plan requirements, Council's TP10 and TR2013/035</li> <li>• Include conditions to require; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in the construction phase stormwater effects, in particular erosion and sediment effects, be managed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of the project</li> <li>- that relevant construction management plans, including an erosion and sediment control plan, be submitted for approval by Council prior to works commencing; and</li> <li>- Require water quality monitoring during construction to assess the actual effects on the receiving environment from sediment discharges</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Include appropriate mitigation measures to manage the risk of road flooding, including demonstrating; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Western slope stability of the Rosedale Closed Landfill is within the accepted factors of safety due to inundation of the toe;</li> <li>- The leachate, gas management and monitoring systems are protected for inundation and infiltration;</li> <li>- The road is protected from the stormwater network channel and inlet structure's overflows;</li> <li>- Any overflows from the stormwater pond No.7 are directed via engineered structures</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require that flows from OF12 are not increased and that further means of peak flow attenuation be required to retain flows at pre-NCI levels or better</li> <li>• Require detailed design of new culverts to be provided to the Council for certification at least 20 working days prior to commencement of construction</li> <li>• Require the detailed design for managing flood issues within the Meadowood Reserve are prepared in consultation with the Council and do not limit the opportunity of Council to undertake planned flood mitigation works within the reserve</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include conditions to ensure that the effects and risks to users from flooding of the underpass are not further increased, taking into account;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The increase in flow magnitude, depth, frequency and duration of flooding; and</li> <li>- More frequent storms events such as the 5-year ARI event in terms of flood depth and flow velocities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require the design of the proposed Constellation dry detention pond is amended to ensure the project does not limit the ability of the Council to undertake planned upgrade works</li> <li>• Require that direct access from a public road to new Council assets is provided on an unrestricted basis</li> <li>• Require the applicant to demonstrate how it intends to;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vary existing council consents noting that there are restrictions under s127 of the RMA on who is able to apply for a change to an existing consent</li> <li>- Obtain and transfer any new dam consents to the Council, noting the Council is not the land owner and there are restrictions under s136 of the RMA in terms of the transfer of water permits</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require demonstration of how the Applicant will ensure any ongoing operational consent conditions for the dams will be met during the construction period</li> <li>• Require by designation condition the applicant to demonstrate how it intends to manage impacted dam consents by varying existing consents, obtaining and transferring new consents, and meeting operational conditions during the construction period</li> <li>• Require if upgrading of the existing culvert is required that this be carried out at the same time as the other project works</li> <li>• Require that funding of the proposed culvert upgrade and the other works associated with the increase conveyances of flows from Pond 1 to Pond 2 are agreed to be by the beneficiaries of the proposed works</li> <li>• Ensure the design of the proposed new pond does not limit the Council's ability to undertake the planned upgrade works on the ARC refuse pond nor result in the cost of upgrading to be unduly and significant increased</li> <li>• Ensure direct access way from a public road to the new assets is provided on an unrestricted basis.</li> <li>• Ensure any consent granted is structured in such a way that any ongoing consent matters related to council assets can be easily distinguished to enable transfer of consents to the Council in the future</li> </ul>
	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarification that the proposal does not include a new stormwater pond at Lucas Creek</li> <li>• Provide an assessment on the impact from the project on the frequency, duration, and magnitude of flows on the downstream channel and properties with existing flood risks</li> <li>• Require the applicant provide clarity on the function of Pond 1 and 2</li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If predicted overflow volumes do not take into consideration future plans for the wastewater treatment plant or increase the capability of the Constellation pond the proposed reduction in Constellation pond volume is opposed.</li> </ul>
Stormwater and flooding (Attachment 4)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend condition SW.1 to specify that stormwater management should be undertaken in accordance with the plans and information submitted with the application, including the technical stormwater report.</li> <li>• Include a condition to clarify that the consent holder will be responsible for all service relocations required for construction of the project [condition SW.2]</li> <li>• Include a condition requiring liaison with service providers to address the following matters [condition SW.2]; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Methods that the consent holder / requiring authority will use to enable infrastructure providers to access existing network utilities for maintenance at all reasonable times, and to access existing network utilities for emergency works at all times, during construction and ongoing activities associated with the designations</li> <li>- Measures for the protection, relocation and/or reinstatement of existing infrastructure services; and</li> <li>- Measures to provide for the safe operation of plant and equipment and the safety of workers, in proximity to existing network utilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Require clarification as to the approach to be taken where separate consents are required for service relocations and/or that an operating agreement may be needed between the Applicant and Council to address appropriate notification and access protocols where works are undertaken by either party within the designation area [condition SW.2]</li> <li>• Require the impact of flow magnitude and frequency of flooding, in addition to flood levels, be reflected in condition SW.3</li> <li>• Require appropriate stormwater management measures are in place during both the construction and operation phase to ensure continuity of stormwater management at all times [condition SW.4]</li> <li>• Amend condition SW.5 to identify that the purpose of the condition is to confirm that the final design meets condition SW.1 and to identify the specific matters that should be addressed, including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Design calculations for; flow attenuation devices, stormwater treatment device sizing, bypass device design, stormwater treatment device efficiency</li> <li>- Design drawings, including all structures, outfalls, treatment devices, bypass devices, wetlands and ponds, swales and overland flow paths</li> <li>- Catchment plans detailing the area draining to each device; and</li> <li>- Outfall locations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete the 'deemed certification' approach and provide adequate timeframes for council review of post-consent documents [conditions SW.5, SW.9 and SW.18]</li> <li>• Amend condition SW.6 to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refer to the final detailed design as required by SW.5; and</li> <li>- Be amended so that any modifications are required to be discussed with and certified by Council and/or new approvals sought where required. [Suggested wording '<i>Any subsequent amendments to the final designs required by Condition SW.5 shall be submitted for approval in writing to the Auckland Council [specify relevant role] at least 20 working days prior to implementation</i>']</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amend conditions SW.7 and SW.8 to clarify requirements for necessary consents to be obtained for any modification to overland flow paths</li> <li>• Require additional information be provided to confirm that appropriate planting can be achieved and that this is reflected in conditions [SW.10]</li> <li>• Amend SW.10 to require planting plans to be in accordance with the relevant Council design guidelines, including those relating to the planting of swales and wetlands</li> <li>• Amend condition SW.11 to include a requirement for on-going maintenance of planting</li> <li>• Require submission of documents [condition SW.12] to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have timeframes consistent with Council practice; and</li> <li>- Unless otherwise specified, all conditions relating to stormwater management devices apply in relation to both the Applicant and Council assets that will be affected by the Proposal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amend condition SW.14c to clarify that both physical and legal access to stormwater management devices needs to be addressed, and that this should be maintained to a standard at least equivalent to that existing [suggested wording '<i>(c) The methods the consent holder will use to ensure that provision, both physical and legal, is made for future maintenance access to utilities to a standard at least equivalent to that currently existing.</i>']</li> <li>• Require condition SW.15 to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Specify the outcome and purpose of the Stormwater Operation and Maintenance Plan i.e. certify that it meets the design outcomes specified in SW.1 or certain performance standards identified in the technical Stormwater Management Report</li> <li>- Include the operation and maintenance requirements for the long term operation of the stormwater systems implemented as part of the project</li> <li>- Make the timing of submitting the plan to Council consistent with standard Council requirements (at least 20 working days); and</li> <li>- Deletion of the 'deemed certification' approach</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Include an additional clause to condition SW.16 to require monitoring of flood effects to ensure they are no greater than</li> </ul>



Overall Topic	Type	Condition or Request
		<p>those modelled [suggested wording ‘<i>The Stormwater Operation and Maintenance Plan shall include a monitoring programme for upstream and downstream flooding to be agreed with the Auckland Council [insert name of relevant role]. The monitoring programme shall have a duration of ten years. The flooding report shall be submitted to the Auckland Council at the end of each year. The Stormwater Operation and Maintenance Plan shall be updated at the end of the monitoring programme, as relevant, to revise procedures for the management of flood water.</i>’]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include an addition to clause h of SW.16 so that in addition to requiring the retention of records of all inspections and maintenance for the stormwater management system for 3 years following the end of the defects liability period, in the first instance, and thereafter, for the preceding 3 years</li> <li>• Require the timeframes for the submission of documents to be consistent with Council practice (at least 20 working days) [condition SW.18]</li> <li>• Include a specific review trigger in relation to flooding events in condition RV.1</li> <li>• Include conditions requiring; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consent holder to notify the Council in writing at least 10 working days prior to the start date of the works authorised by the consent; and</li> <li>- Pre-construction site meetings with Council’s Regulatory team</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure conditions are amended or drafted in such a way that they are able to ensure the intended stormwater outcomes are delivered, including in terms of allocation of responsibility, review and monitoring opportunities</li> </ul>