

Decision	Waka Kotahi Request
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Paragraph 62: The decision refers to the site at 168 Flanagan Road as follows: <i>On 14 October 2021 Waka Kotahi wrote seeking permission to commission and provide a further report addressing noise and vibration effects at 168 Flanagan Road, being a property that had not been previously assessed as Waka Kotahi had thought that it would be in its ownership by the time of the Panel's consideration of the application.</i> ■ Paragraph 100 The decision refers to the following: <i>In this case, works are generally landward of the CMA and can be managed through the appropriate staging and ESCs. It is considered there are no usual specific elements of personal it would prevent a GD05 compliant ESC methodology being successfully implemented.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Paragraph 62 contains a minor error in referring to Waka Kotahi having thought that 168 Flanagan Road would be in its ownership 'by the time of the Panel's consideration of the application'. ■ As Waka Kotahi noted in its letter dated 14 October 2021, 168 Flanagan Road was identified as requiring full acquisition under the Public Works Act 1981 and was therefore excluded from the Stage 1B1 noise and vibration assessment lodged with the application. As a result of this, the site was not considered in terms of the early works noise and vibration impacts. ■ Against this background, Waka Kotahi consider it is more accurate to record that Waka Kotahi sought to provide a further report addressing noise and vibration effects at 168 Flanagan Road, as the noise and vibration report provided with the application had assumed the property would be acquired under the Public Works Act 1981, prior to any works commencing. ■ Waka Kotahi therefore request the following amendment to the Stage 1B1 decision at paragraph 62: ■ <i>On 14 October 2021 Waka Kotahi wrote seeking permission to commission and provide a further report addressing noise and vibration effects at 168 Flanagan Road, being a property that had not been previously assessed, as <u>the noise and vibration report provided with the application assumed Waka Kotahi had thought that this property it would be in Waka Kotahi's ownership prior to the commencement of the main Project works</u> by the time of the Panel's consideration of the application.</i> ■ In providing this response, Waka Kotahi has not identified specific typos but considers that paragraph 100 has errors which make the sentence difficult to understand. Waka Kotahi therefore suggest the following amendment to the Stage 1B1 decision at paragraph 100: ■ <i>In this case, works are generally landward of the CMA and can be managed through the appropriate staging and ESCs. It is considered there are no <u>unusual specific elements of the proposal that personal</u> it would prevent a GD05 compliant ESC methodology being successfully implemented.</i>
Conditions	Waka Kotahi Request
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Condition set format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Stage 1B1 condition set has been prepared as a combined condition set (designation and resource consent conditions) and individual condition sets, for ease of use by contractors and Auckland Council. The final condition set does not carry through the final amendments to conditions from the combined to the individual condition sets. ■ Waka Kotahi request the individual condition sets be amended so that they are a duplication of the combined set, in a standalone form, to avoid any risk of confusion when incorporated into the Auckland Unitary Plan text.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Index of designation and resource consents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ In its response to draft conditions dated 3 November, Waka Kotahi made amendments to cross referencing in the index of designation and resource consent conditions to reflect amendments made to conditions, in particular where cross referencing was missing or required deletion where a condition had been removed. ■ Waka Kotahi request the index of designation and resource consent conditions be amended, as set out in its response to the Panel dated 3 November and shown in the attached condition set, to accurately reflect the final condition set.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Definitions and Explanation of Terms table Application date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Waka Kotahi request the date included in the definition of Application be amended as set out in its response to the Panel dated 3 November, to accurately reflect the date the application was lodged with the EPA, being 24 June 2021.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Condition GC.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Waka Kotahi request the date included in Condition GC.1 be amended as set out in its response to the Panel dated 3 November to accurately reflect the date the application was lodged with the EPA, being 24 June 2021.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Heritage HH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Historic Heritage (HH) condition contains new conditions numbered 8 to 10. The reference to “objective” is used whereas the remainder of the set “objective” has been replaced with “purpose”. The condition currently numbered 8 also contains a reference to “condition XXX” which will need to be replaced with the specific condition reference. Waka Kotahi request the numbering of the HH condition be amended, with the replacement of the word “objective” with purpose to remain consistent with the rest of the set as shown in the attached condition set:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater SW.2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition SW.2 contains a number of typos. Waka Kotahi request the table be amended as follows as shown in the attached condition set (and as set out in its response to the Panel dated 3 November) to ensure there is no risk of misinterpretation:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicle Access VA.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition VA.1 currently sits within the groundwater condition set. To avoid confusion Waka Kotahi request VA.1 be repositioned so it sits after condition GW.9.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban and Landscape Design Framework LV.1 and LV.2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waka Kotahi note an Urban and Landscape Design Framework (ULDF) was submitted with the 1B1 application documentation. The Framework is referred to in paragraphs 138 to 141 of the decision and confirms the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document explains the design principles and anticipated outcomes Responds to Waka Kotahi social and environmental responsibilities Is informed by the Waka Kotahi Guidance Documents Has been prepared in collaboration with Mana Whenua through the Southern Iwi Integration Group Contains objectives relevant to the Project corridor Includes a series of outcomes in the form of maps The decision does not refer to a deficiency that necessitates the preparation of a further ULDF. Waka Kotahi considers that the inclusion of requirement to prepare a further ULDF, as specified by conditions LV.1 and LV.2 in the combined set is an error and that both conditions should be deleted. It is further noted that conditions LV.1 and LV.2 in the individual designation set do not require a further ULDF and instead refer to implementation of the ULDF.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General formatting issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a number of formatting issues including line spacing and font sizes within the document which are identified as track changes.