

8 March 2024

Todd Elder
Senior Policy Planner
Auckland Council Plans and Places

Sent via email: todd.elder@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Dear Todd,

**Section 92 response to additional information request for Notice of Requirement – Whenuapai
Wastewater Servicing Scheme Package 1**

Please see the below response to the additional information requests sought pursuant to Section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991, dated 9 February 2024.

The following attachments are included to support out responses:

- Attachment 1: Updated Assessment of Effects on the Environment
- Attachment 2: Updated Appendix O - Traffic Impact Assessment
- Attachment 3: Updated Appendix N - Noise and Vibration Assessment
- Attachment 4: Prior email correspondence with Council regarding the functional need for the construction footprint to be within the wetland
- Attachment 5: Updated Appendix Q - Functional Need Assessment

I trust that the above sufficiently addressed the matters raised in your s92 request. Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions.

Yours faithfully,



William Hung
Senior Resource Consent Planner
Strategy and Planning
Watercare Services Limited



21 Pitt Street,
PO Box 6345, Auckland,
1141, New Zealand
T: +64 9 300 9000 // F: +64 9 300 9300
E: info@beca.com // www.beca.com

William Hung
Via email: William.Hung@water.co.nz

8 March 2024

Attention: William Hung

Dear William

Watercare Services Limited – Whenuapai Wastewater Servicing Scheme Package 1 – Notice of Requirement – Further request for information response

The following sets out our response to the additional information request (dated 9 February 2024), in relation to the Whenuapai Wastewater Scheme Package 1 Regional Resource Consent Application lodged by Watercare Services Limited for works in Whenuapai, Auckland.

In addition, we understand that following a review by Watercare in relation to the construction methodology for installing the gravity main underneath Brigham Creek Road, it has been determined that the application documents only need to refer to the installation of the pipeline via trenchless means (ie. pipe hammering).

In support of this response, and given the confirmation by Watercare of the construction methodology in relation to installation of the pipeline beneath Brigham Creek Road, the following documents have been updated and are attached:

- Attachment 1: Updated Assessment of Effects on the Environment
- Attachment 2: Updated Appendix O - Traffic Impact Assessment
- Attachment 3: Updated Appendix N - Noise and Vibration Assessment
- Attachment 4: Prior email correspondence with Council regarding the functional need for the construction footprint to be within the wetland
- Attachment 5: Updated Appendix Q - Functional Need Assessment

All other appendices to the AEE remain unchanged and as lodged 6 October 2023.

Transport

TRA1. The applicant has provided the phasing summary as requested. They have modelled a 'normal traffic' scenario with 70 second cycle time and a 'Christmas traffic' scenario with 60 seconds. This is different to the results in the appendix of the TIA, which have cycle times of 120 seconds and 90 seconds. This means that the phasing summary results do not align with the movement summary results provided in the TIA. The applicant needs to provide phasing summary and movement summary outputs that are consistent, so the effects on Brigham Creek Road can be understood.

A phasing summary for both scenarios has been provided with the same cycle time as the movement summary. A 120 second cycle time for the 'normal traffic' scenario and a 90 second cycle time for the 'Christmas traffic' scenario has been modelled. Please refer to Section 4.3.3 and Appendix B of the Updated TIA provided in Attachment 1 of this response for details.

**make
everyday
better.**

TRA5. Further assessment is needed to demonstrate that a 23m truck and trailer can manoeuvre within the designation boundary, particularly at the northern end where there is an existing house immediately adjacent to the boundary. The applicant has not provided vehicle tracking as requested. The applicant's response indicates that tracking may occur outside the designation boundary for a minimal section. We consider that this is not acceptable, as the designation boundary needs to accommodate all works and vehicle tracking. While the layout for the access road is not confirmed at this stage, vehicle tracking should show it is feasible for a truck to turn at the north end bend (near the Contractor Area Hub) and the south end bend (near Spedding Road). Please provide indicative vehicle tracking of the temporary access road near the rising main, to demonstrate it is feasible for all tracking to be undertaken within the designation boundary.

The TIA has been updated to show tracking into and out of SAP 4. The recommended measures for the Construction Traffic Management Plan have also been updated to account for the amended tracking. Please refer Appendix D and Table 5-1 of the Updated TIA provided in Attachment 2 of this response respectively.

TRA6. The applicant needs to demonstrate that vehicle tracking can occur within the designation boundary, and also avoid constraints such as the stormwater pond.

- The applicant's response provides two possible locations for SAP4, as shown in the diagram provided. We note that these accesses are outside the designation boundary, which is not permitted.
- These access locations would also likely interfere with the stormwater pond west of Tamiro Road. The applicant has not provided evidence that an access road could be formed here without avoiding this constraint.

The applicant also needs to show an indicative internal access road, as the formation of this access will impact on manoeuvring to and from Tamiro Road.

- The response mentions that they were advised that there would be sufficient space to turn around within the site and exit in a forwards direction, but evidence is not provided to support this.
- If the access road is not oriented 90 degrees to the vehicle crossing on Tamiro Road, this will change the vehicle tracking that was shown in the TIA.

Please provide vehicle tracking for SAP4, that demonstrates that access can be provided within the designation boundary. Please demonstrate how an internal access road near SAP4 can facilitate vehicle manoeuvring and allow a truck to enter and exit onto Tamiro Road in a forward direction

Please refer to the response to TRA 5 above.

TRA7. This request needs to be resubmitted to understand whether a truck can sufficiently access SAP4. Appendix D of the TIA provides vehicle tracking of a truck turning into the SAP4 access on Tamiro Road and Joseph McDonald Drive. The tracking currently shows inbound movements only, and not outbound movements. The tracking shows that a body of a truck will hit a tree near the SAP4 access on Tamiro Road. We note that the tracking is difficult to view as it is provided in a series of screenshots. Furthermore, the Brigham Creek Road / Joseph McDonald Drive intersection is not included.

Please provide an updated set of vehicle tracking drawings for truck movements travelling from Brigham Creek Road into the SAP 4 access. Please show inbound and outbound truck movements, whilst avoiding street furniture such as trees.

Please refer to the response to TRA 5 above.

Engineering

ENG1. The response has provided some detail, but does not provide any clarity or information if the rearrangement of the structures were considered. Did the Requiring Authority consider a different layout of structure(s) on the site? If not why not?

Consideration has been given to the location of structures on the site in proximity to the wetland, as part of the functional need assessment prepared as part of the regional consent application (BUN60425801). It is our understanding that Council has accepted the functional need for the wastewater pump-station (and therefore the wastewater lines) has been demonstrated. Please refer to Attachment 4 for correspondence between Watercare and Ms Brogan McQuoid, Team Leader, North West Unit Resource on this matter.

ENG3. Planning – The response from the Requiring Authority states: “The memo is jointly prepared by Watercare and BECA with technical input from the designer (GHD and WSP).”

The information request from Council acknowledges BECA and Watercare. The information request seeks details of each person that contributed to the preparation of the report and their specialisation.

Can you please confirm the name of the person(s) who authored the report and their specialization and qualification.

Watercare

- Peter Ataallah – Senior Project Manager (CPEng)
- Byron De Villiers - Programme Manager (PMP)
- William Hung - Senior Planner (BPlan)

Beca

- Jenny Vince - Technical Director – Planning (MEnvSc)
- Rachael Clark - Intermediate Planner (MUrbPlan)

GHD

- Simon Wang - Northern Water Design Team Leader (CPEng)

WSP

- Marina Kudoic - Project Director, Water (BEng Mech)
- Jack Gwillim - Water Engineer (BEng Mech (hons))

Please refer to Attachment 5 of this response for an updated Functional Need Assessment, including the authors of the document.

ENG4. Please update the supporting Assessment of Environmental Effects to include this assessment.

Please refer to Attachment 1 of this response for an updated Assessment of Effects on the Environment, including analysis of the works against Auckland Unitary Plan RPS Chapter B7 Toitū te whenua, toitū te taiao – Natural resources.

Ecology

ECO3. Thank you for providing the response in the table. Can you please update the technical documents and Assessment of Environmental Effects to include the additional information?

Please refer to Attachment 1 for an updated Assessment of Effects on the Environment, including comment regarding lighting at the contractor areas. No further updates to the technical documents are considered necessary.

Yours sincerely



Rachael Clark

Planner

on behalf of

Beca Limited

Phone Number: + 6493009283
Email: Rachael.Clark@beca.com

Copy

Peter Ataallah, Watercare

William Hung, Watercare