

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Contaminated Land	Shannon Holroyd / Harry Jones shannon.holroyd@easternbusway.nz harry.jones@easternbusway.nz	Fiona Rudsits fiona.rudsits@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	1. Agreed that the contaminated land report has provided suitable justification as to why the sites at 3 Reeves Road and 11 Cortina Place remain the only areas of concern during the proposed works. Agreed that the NES:CS and AUP(OP) will likely apply to these carriageways only. Supporting appendices to confirm the results presented in the report. Overall agreed a robust investigation has been completed along these alignments.	Noted.
			2. Soil management under the NES:CS and Chapter E30 of the AUP(OP): It is unclear if the applicant is proposing to undertake soil sampling (ie a detailed site investigation [DSI]) at 3 Reeves Road and 11 Cortina Place, prior to work commencing or if soils in these locations are to be treated as contaminated and managed under the CLMP.... Therefore could the applicant please confirm at lodgement which approach they will be taking to manage soils at 3 Reeves Road and 11 Cortina Place. While either option is acceptable preference would be for testing upfront of any disturbance works.	The approach is that the soils at 3 Reeves Road and 11 Cortina Place will be treated as contaminated and will be managed by the Contaminated Land Management Plan (CLMP). The CLMP will be submitted with the application during lodgement. It is not considered feasible to undertake a Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) in the carriageway, however the CLMP will include appropriate controls and procedures for the affected sites, to manage human health and environmental risk and ensure that impacted soil requiring offsite disposal is managed in accordance with the NES:CS and is disposed off at an appropriately licenced landfill facility.

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments

Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022

EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Archaeology	Arden Cruickshank / Hayley Glover arden.c@cfgheritage.com hayley.g@cfgheritage.com	Myfanwy Eaves Myfanwy.Eaves@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	1. Positive feedback. No further information requests or suggestions for changes.	Noted.

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Arboriculture	Leon Saxon	Gavin Donaldson	1. Assess PRZ root zone incursion measurement relevant to AUP rules and standards.	The incursion measurement does not significantly change the implementation. The Tree Protection Management Plan will address root zone protection measures. The assessment takes the worst case scenario to identify where tree removals may be required however will be retained where possible.
	leon@arborlab.co.nz	Gavin.Donaldson@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	2. Recommendation that the UDLM provides for appropriate levels of replacement planting in order to achieve sustainability and carbon neutrality.	Reference to the Urban Design and Landscape Plan addressed within the updated draft Arboricultural Assessment.
			3. Recommendation for using the i-Tree Development forecasting tool to estimate lost future benefits from proposed tree removals, and remedial planting value.	The tool is not an AUP(OP) requirement. The proposed mitigation is based on best practice and guidance. The Project also has Infrastructure Sustainability Council (ISC) objectives to this effect.

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Groundwater	Moru Jia moru.jia@easternbusway.nz	Richard Simonds rsimonds@ftl.co.nz	1. Assessment should be based on Final Geotechnical Factual Report and latest geometric and stormwater drawings.	Noted and addressed within the updated Groundwater Report
			2. Method clarification for dates 9th and 10th February 2022 to report depth to groundwater, used to create the flow maps.	Noted and addressed within the updated Groundwater Report
			3. Check Table 4 - reference to E7.6.1.10 (1d) and (1e).	Updated Groundwater Report
			4. Check Table 4 compliance gaps and comments requiring clarification.	Updated Groundwater Report
			5. Check and clarify all identified omissions and errors.	Updated Groundwater Report

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Air Quality	Tracy Freeman tracy.freeman@easternbusway.nz	Paul Crimmins canconsents@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	1. Report could be improved by reducing detail, given the relatively low risk of air quality effects.	Completed, some tables and paragraphs removed
			2. It is likely that the long sections of project descriptions will duplicate material from the AEE.	None
			3. Assessment of vehicle exhaust emissions is over and above what is necessary. Recommendation for a shorter section which summarises the expert's conclusions (i.e., that the operation of the busway is not likely to impact air quality).	This was reviewed but not shortened. It is considered to be an appropriate level of detailed explanation for other consultation and stakeholders that may be concerned about traffic emissions but do not have technical understanding. It may also be useful for the sustainability assessment.
			4. Assessment can reference the NZTA Guideline Document for methodologies and thresholds employed rather than detailing the basis.	Some of the detailed methodology was removed, with cross-reference to the NZTA Guide instead.
			5. Recommendation that the Dust Management Measures could be included in the ESCP (as proposed) or CEMP. Preference is to be included in the CEMP, considering non-earthwork sources, and can be considered for the NOR, similar to Noise Management as part of a CNVMP.	On reconsideration, no modifications to the report are necessary. The main issue would be bentonite plants, which are likely to have ESC requirements anyway. Management Plans can be updated post-lodgement if needed.
			6. Instrumental Dust Monitoring is suitable, however should be time-limited to when significant construction works are occurring nearby. There is no need to continue this monitoring once works have progressed further away.	Sentence added to last paragraph of 7.2.2.1
			7. Agreed that no discharge resource consents are needed. Also agreed that the proposal is not likely to cause exceedance of NES: AQ Standards.	None
			8. Suggestion that the scope of the report be expanded so it can be relied on for forthcoming packages of the EBA to reduce costs and review time.	None

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Stormwater	Paul May paul.may@easternbusway.nz	Arsini Hanna / Lakshmi Nair / Zheng Qian	1. Recommendation to provide an assessment of Chapter 9 standards and rules in the AEE (as it relates to high use road). No maximum term of consent for this.	AUP(OP) Chapter E9 is not being triggered because stormwater runoff is directed to an existing authorised system
		arsini.hanna@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	2. Include the additional impervious areas for the 5 different parts of the project	To be addressed in the Stormwater Management Plan to be lodged with the Engineering Plan Approval
			3. Assess the category of the each of the above against NDC Schedule 4 Development Requirements for Transport Projects	Addressed within the Stormwater Assessment
			4. To include a condition that NDC requirements (WQ) and details of flood assessment and pipe capacities shall be covered under Stormwater Water Management Plans for each part of the project	This condition is not required as we are not seeking a new consent. Works will be authorised under the existing Network Discharge Consent.
			5. The report should cover the following: 10 year and 100 year rainfall data used in the design; Flood assessment results for 10 year and 100 year post development scenario covering the upsizing of pipes to resolve overland flow path issues; Table 7 & 8 are a bit confusing, the C1 to C5 are NDC performance requirements, should make it clearer	The rainfall data forms part of the flood modelling report noting this is covered in the appendices of the assessment, along with the drawings. The mitigation section of the assessment addresses effects to the overland flow path. Table 8 has been updated with the corrected references.

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Terrestrial Ecology	Fiona Davies	Rue Statham	1. Habitat Restoration Plan: Needed to address an adverse effect and condition to manage the effect. Needed now to understand its appropriateness, and suitability of the location.	The Habitat Restoration Plan will be provided post-lodgement, partnering with Mana Whenua.
	fiona.davies@easternbusway.nz	Rue.Statham@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	2. Use of compensation model	Ecological Impact Assessment updated
			3. Application of the RMA Effects Management Hierarchy	Ecological Impact Assessment updated

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Social Impact	Kate Symington / John Daly katelyn.symington@easternbusway.nz john.daly@easternbusway.nz	Robert Quigley	1. Proposal Description: Recommendations for checking errors, high level and detailed maps for what is proposed and key changes to the social infrastructure.	This section has been prepared by planning team and is consistent across reports. Have recommended planning team amend if needed.
			2. Use of the terms temporary and cumulative if describing methods	Table describing duration of effects included.
			3. Vagueness of specific project elements to describe key aspects that will drive potential social effects	Project elements have been more clearly defined with respect to the social impacts of these elements.
			4. Methodology and Analysis Overview: Description of different groups in terms of existing environment, engagement with and effects for vulnerable groups.	Additional information has been included on vulnerable groups.
			5. No specific social engagement undertaken considered a flaw. Interdependencies with other specialist assessments to be assessed.	It is accepted that this is a limitation. Additional text has been included to describe the limitation. The report has continued to be updated as specialist reports are available / updated. This process also applies to draft management plans and is ongoing.
			6. Methodology: While broad communities are assessed, vulnerable communities are not, or those directly affected such as those losing homes/businesses, or those within 100m of project, or directly affected by a flyover.	Areas have been refined including the definitions of areas and the stakeholders these capture.
			7. No literature review has been undertaken to consider social benefits and costs.	A literature review has been included. This reviews a number of other transport related social impact assessments.
			8. Social Baseline Study: site visit was undertaken by the author and should be mentioned. Concerns with online assessment, typically too siloed.	More information has been provided on the sources and information that have been used including quotes from engagement.
			9. Potential social impact categories in the IAIA framework needs to be assessed.	Assessment has been reorganised to better address the framework.
			10. Risk assessment and impact rating, to consider assessment of consequence and likelihood, underpinned by data and analysis.	This was done to inform the assessment. The detail has now been included in the tables and text of the report.
			11. Clear identification of potentially affected communities needed. Six groups suggested. Ensure vulnerable groups are not excluded.	
			12. IAP2 principles followed, however recommendation to discuss forms of participation/engagement	Table included to show how the engagement links to IAP2.
			13. Recommendation that splitting those engaged by EB2 and EB3R would be helpful for future drafts	Confirmed with customer and community team - majority of stakeholders are interested in the wider alignment so this isn't practicable.
			14. No data presented for the virtual consultation and feedback forms from a social perspective. Such analysis would detail the context, potential impact, mitigation, in relevance to which affected community and aspect of proposal.	Additional information including quotes have been included in the assessment.
			15. Study area - directly or indirectly impacted large geographical areas; social impacts to specific groups that are directly affected are quietened. Lacking population study within the existing environment. Recommendations provided for SA1s and SA2s.	Areas have been refined including the definitions of areas and the stakeholders these capture.
			16. Recommendations for describing the demographic profile, and selection of study areas relative to the social deprivation index.	This section has been deliberately maintained as factual and does not include assessment.
			17. Description of existing social infrastructure needed detailing who, what, how etc.	Included description under each heading for the different types of social infrastructure. No fire and emergency services.
			18. Description of existing transport movements needed in more detail, in relation to existing network and the proposal.	Have included information on the challenges / problem with the existing road network e.g. congestion, reliability and mode choice
			19. Community consultation outcomes lack of discussion, more detail needed.	Restructured to reflect stakeholder types and additional information provided.
			20. Outcomes raised by Mana Whenua relative to SIA	CVA's are still being prepared. Have updated this section to refer to what will be prepared. Will review when available.
			21. Assessment of effects: SIA method lacking consideration of population affected, baseline data, evidence, consequence and likelihood for risk and rating assessment, community consultation, all in relation to the proposed works. Recommendation for a description of what the social effect is.	Updated to include likelihood and consequence ratings. Included statements from consultation as relevant to demonstrate how community voice has been incorporated. RRF is discussed in detail in sections 7.4.1.3.2 Community Severance and 7.4.1.5.1 Amenity.
			22. Construction effects are assumed to be temporary when they can be permanent e.g. disruption to medical centre and long term consequences.	Table for duration of effects is included.
			23. Lacking description of potential cumulative impacts, who is affected and its consequence or likelihood.	Have included additional explanatory text. The main issue is the potential for other works e.g. utility works to compound disruptive effects.
			24. Needs an understanding of the effects and proposed mitigation offered, and role of local community organisations to help address these effects.	Mitigation is limited to the implementation of the CCP and other management plans. Have reorganised the mitigation to reflect the headings / framework.
			25. Understanding of social impact and monitoring the impact (suggestion of pre and post mitigation), potential indicators and why it needs monitoring.	

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments

Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022

EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Amendments/ Response
Landscape and Visual	Tom Lines and Chris Bentley tom_lines@easternbusway.nz chris.bentley@easternbusway.nz	Rob Pryor rob@la4.co.nz	1. Statutory context: Provisions of RMA, NZCPS and AUP relating to landscape, natural character and visual effects should be outlined in the specialist's assessment (as well as AEE)	The statutory context has been adequately assessed in the AEE, and hence has not been provided within the specialist's assessment.
			2. It would be useful to understand how the proposed mitigation measures have addressed potential intensification and increased building height and scale, relating to NPS-UD	The corridor enables and facilitates development at a macro scale, supported by the EBA Project Objectives.
			3. An indicative tree planting, shrub, and groundcover planting list or palette to better understand the overall design intent and effectiveness of the mitigation proposed	Referring below, an indicative list of trees for planting and typical groundcovers has been provided, subject to co-design workshops with Mana Whenua and consultation with Auckland Council. Detail will follow within the Urban Design and Landscape Plan and Habitat Restoration Plan to be submitted post-lodgement.

EBA Response

Hi All,

Our response to item 3 of the Landscape & Visual -AC Feedback is that we have prepared an indicative list of species which is yet to be confirmed via co-design workshops with mana whenua's plant specialist and consultation with Auckland Council's Urban Forest specialist.

Regards
Chris

TREE SPECIES

Botanical name	Common Name	Mature Height
LARGE SIZE TREE - WIDTH: 8M+ HEIGHT: 10M+		
Metrosideros excelsa	Pohutukawa	10+m
Podocarpus totara	Totara	10+m
Vitex Lucens	Puriri	10+m
Dacrydium dacrydioides	Kahikatea	10+m
Laurelia novae-zelandiae	Pukatea	10+m

Botanical name	Common Name	Mature Height
MEDIUM SIZE TREE - WIDTH: >5M HEIGHT: 6M+		
Metrosideros excelsa 'Mistral'	Pohutukawa	5m
Vitex lucens	Puriri	8m
Alectryon Excelsus	Titoki	6m
Dysoxylum spectabile	kohekohe	7m
Sophora microphylla	Kowhai	6m

Botanical name	Common Name	Mature Height
MEDIUM SIZE UPRIGHT TREE - WIDTH: <4M HEIGHT: 5M+		
Hedycarya arborea	Pigeonwood	6m
Knightia excelsa	Rewarewa	8m
Plagianthus regius	Ribbonwood	8m
Rhopalostylis sapida 'Pitt Island'	Nikau Palm	10m+

Botanical name	Common Name	Mature Height
SMALL SIZE TREE - WIDTH: <3M HEIGHT: 4M+		
Cordyline australis	ti kouka	8m
Pseudopanax ferox	Fierce lancewood	5m
Pseudopanax crassifolius	Horoeka	8m

MEDIAN PLANTING ZONE - 1.2-2M WIDE PLANTING AREA

Botanical name	Common Name	Size	Mature Height	Spacing	Type
MIX TYPE A					
Coprosma kirkii	Groundcover Coprosma	2L	0.4m	0.8m	Groundcover
Phormium cookianum 'Emerald Gem'	Dwarf Mountain Flax	2L	1m	1m	Shrub
MIX TYPE B					
Muehlenbeckia axillaris	Creeping Wire Vine	2L	0.2m	0.8m	Groundcover
Apodasmia similis	OIOI	2L	1m	0.6m	Shrub

MEDIAN PLANTING ZONE - 2-5M WIDE PLANTING AREA

Botanical name	Common Name	Size	Mature Height	Spacing	Type
MIX TYPE A - WITHIN TREE CLUSTER AREA					
Coprosma kirkii	Groundcover Coprosma	2L	0.4m	0.8m	Groundcover
Carex testacea	New Zealand Grass	2L	0.4m	0.6m	small shrub
Arthropodium cirratum	Renga Renga	2L	0.5m	0.5m	small shrub
MIX TYPE B - WITHIN TREE CLUSTER AREA					
Muehlenbeckia axillaris	Creeping Wire Vine	2L	0.2m	0.8m	Groundcover
Libertia ixioides	NZ Iris	2L	0.4m	0.5m	small shrub
Coprosma repen	Prostrate coprosma	2L	0.5m	0.8m	small shrub
MIX TYPE C - BETWEEN TREE CLUSTER AREA					
Coprosma 'Taiko'	Prostrate Mingimingi	2L	0.3m	1m	Groundcover
Dianella nigra	NZ blueberry	2L	0.5m	0.5m	small shrub
Apodasmia similis	OIOI	2L	1m	0.6m	Shrub
Juncus edgariae	Wiwī	2L	1m	0.6m	Shrub
MIX TYPE D - BETWEEN TREE CLUSTER AREA					
Coprosma acerosa Hawera	Groundcover Coprosma	2L	0.5m	1m	Groundcover
Coprosma repen	Prostrate coprosma	2L	0.5m	0.8m	small shrub
Poor Knights					
Anemanthele lessoniana	Gossamer Grass	2L	1m	0.8m	Shrub
Phormium cookianum	Mountain Flax	2L	1.5m	1m	large shrub

MEDIAN PLANTING ZONE - 5M+ & BUS STATION PLANTING AREA

Botanical name	Common Name	Size	Mature Height	Spacing	Type
Acaena inermis purpurea	Bidibidi	2L	0.2m	0.6m	Groundcover
Coprosma acerosa Hawera	Groundcover Coprosma	2L	0.5m	1m	Groundcover
Coprosma 'Taiko'	Prostrate Mingimingi	2L	0.3m	1m	Groundcover
Muehlenbeckia axillaris	Creeping Wire Vine	2L	0.2m	0.8m	Groundcover
Carex testacea	New Zealand Grass	2L	0.4m	0.6m	small shrub
Arthropodium cirratum	Renga Renga	2L	0.5m	0.5m	small shrub
Muehlenbeckia complexa	Scrub pohuehue	2L	0.3m	1m	small shrub
Dianella nigra	NZ blueberry	2L	0.5m	0.5m	small shrub
Libertia peregrinans	Mikoiko	2L	0.4m	0.4m	small shrub
Hebe 'Wiri Mist'	Shrubby Veronica	2L	0.6m	0.6m	small shrub
Phormium cookianum 'Emerald Gem'	Dwarf Mountain Flax	2L	1m	1m	Shrub
Chionochloa flavicans	Miniature toe toe	2L	1m	0.6m	Shrub
Astelia banksii	Coastal astelia	2L	1m	0.8m	Shrub
Phormium cookianum	Mountain Flax	2L	1.5m	1m	large shrub
Phormium tenax	Harakeke	2L	2m	1m	large shrub
Austroderia splendens	Toetoe	2L	2m	1m	large shrub

RAINGARDEN & SWALE PLANTING

Botanical name	Common Name	Size	Mature Height	Spacing	Type
MIX TYPE A					
Coprosma acerosa	Sand coprosma	2L	0.3m	0.8m	Groundcover
Carex virgata	Pukio	2L	0.4m	0.5m	Shrub
Carex flagellifera	Glen Murray tussock	2L	0.6m	0.5m	Shrub
Astelia banksii	Coastal astelia	2L	1m	0.8m	Shrub
MIX TYPE B					
Carex breviculmis	grassland sedge	2L	0.2m	0.3m	Groundcover
Carex virgata	Pukio	2L	0.4m	0.5m	Shrub
Apodasmia similis	OIOI	2L	1m	0.6m	Shrub
Phormium cookianum subsp. hookeri	Wharariki	2L	0.7m	1m	Shrub

ECOLOGICAL MITIGATION & REVEGETATION PLANTING

Botanical name	Common Name	Size	Mature Height	Spacing	Type
Arthropodium cirratum	Rengarenga	2L	0.5m	0.5m	small shrub
Muehlenbeckia complexa	Pohuehue	2L	0.3m	0.5m	small shrub
Phormium tenax	Harakeke	2L	2.5m	0.5m	Shrub
Hebe stricta	Koromiko	2L	2.5m	0.5m	Shrub
Coprosma repens	Taupata	2L	3m	0.5m	Shrub
Corokia cotoneaster	Korokio	2L	3m	0.5m	Shrub
Cordyline australis	Ti kouka	2L	2m	0.5m	Shrub
Leptospermum scoparium	Manuka	2L	4m	0.5m	Shrub
Coprosma crassifolia	Mingimingi	2L	4m	0.5m	Shrub
Pittosporum crassifolium	Karo	2L	5m	0.5m	Shrub
Pseudopanax arboreus	Five Finger	2L	5m	0.5m	Shrub
Kunzea ericoides	Kanuka	2L	8m	0.5m	Small tree
Sophora microphylla	Kowhai	2L	6m	0.5m	Small tree
Dacrydium dacrydioides	Kahikatea	2L	10+m	0.5m	Tree
Podocarpus totara	Totara	2L	10+m	0.5m	Tree

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments								
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022								
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	Topic	AC Feedback	EBA Response			
Erosion and Sediment Control	Fiona Davies fiona.davies@easternbusway.nz	Sam Langdon sam.langdon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	Ecological Assessment (Freshwater)	1. Clarity of whether works will be within 100m of a natural wetland	Works are within 100m of wetland. Ecological Impact Assessment updated to confirm this, but are upslope of the wetlands			
				2. Review whether works e.g. associated with outfall upgrades, may require earthworks within 10m of a natural wetland. ESC plans to show the 10m setback where earthworks are outside this area	Wetlands are located 51.8m (Wetland WL1) and 89.3m (Wetland WL2) from outfall earthworks			
				3. The trigger for 45(3) may not be applicable	Addressed in the AEE			
				4. For diversion and discharge of water within 100m of a natural wetland, this would also relate to temporary diversion and/or discharge of water during earthworks	Addressed in the AEE			
				5. Marine Ecology Report is unclear is streamworks are required. Clarify if required and if so, identify relevant reasons for consent, assessment of effects, drawings with dimensions of structures. If PA, demonstrate how the PA criteria will be met	We have confirmed through site visit that there are three freshwater streams that are located at outfall locations (outfall 13/14 and 1a and 1b) to be replaced. Planners have advised upgrades fall under permitted activity rules.			
				6. Suggestion to include a draft HRP within the application documents to indicate possible location of mitigation planting	The Habitat Restoration Plan will be provided post-lodgement, partnering with Mana Whenua.			
	Sharon de Luca sharon.deluca@boffamiskell.co.nz	Sam Langdon sam.langdon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	Marine Ecology Assessment	7. Where fish passage barriers have been identified, will these be remediated as part of the project (e.g. outfall 1A - MCC108703)?	There is no upstream habitat from outfalls, so no fish barriers.			
				8. Recommendation to include Reasons for consent within this report for consistency	Adequately addressed in the AEE			
				9. This report suggests that a NESFW consent is required relating to earthworks within a natural wetland (CMA). Recommendation that AEE and supporting documents quantify the total area of earthworks required within the 10m setback from natural wetlands.	Adequately addressed in the AEE			
				10. Clarity needed whether earthworks will be located within Marine SEA. If adjacent to SEA, drawings need to identify the extent of the SEA to show earthworks are outside the SEA	SEA extents are shown in the drawing set, referenced within the Marine Ecology Assessment.			
				Campbell Stewart campbell@southernskies.co.nz	Sam Langdon sam.langdon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	Earthworks Assessment	11. Section 3.2.1 provides tables to summarise the total area and volume of works required along the busway construction alignment however, they do not appear to include the total area of earthworks associated with the outfall upgrades / construction. To clarify infringements under the various rules (AUP:OP and NES-FW), it would be helpful to either update these tables, or include a separate table to summarise the total area and volume of works required in the various infringements / overlays: i.e. within 10m of natural wetlands, within 100m of natural wetlands, within inland natural wetland(s), within CMA natural wetland(s), and/or a SEA (where applicable).	Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Report updated
							12. Recommendation that tables 3-1 and 3-2 are updated to clarify which row includes the cut, fill and area associated with the outfall construction and the western abutment of the Pakuranga Creek bridge	The recommendation has no change or impact to the ESC assessment.
	13. Review the location of the outfalls on Figure 1 as it does not appear to correlate with the Marine Ecology Assessment or section 6 of the Earthworks Assessment	ESC Report updated						
	14. Further clarification is required regarding the proposed outfalls located outside of the CMA. In addition, further detail is required around the proposed 'channel protection works' noted in section 3.2.2. Overall, it is unclear whether works and/or structures will be undertaken within streams. The application documents will need to be updated to clarify the location of the outfalls and erosion protection in relation to streams, and the associated extent of construction works	Streams identified at three outfall locations (Outfall 13/14 and Outfall 1A and outfall 1b)						
	15. Clarify whether any of the works will be located within a SEA, and trigger consent under E1.4.3 (e.g. the extent of works associated with the outfall shown on EB3-03 appears to extend beyond the CMA boundary)	There are no Terrestrial SEAs located within or adjacent to the EB2 and EB3R footprint						
	16. Review section 3.7.2 to ensure this is consistent with the Marine and the Freshwater Ecology Assessment documents	ESC Report updated						
	17. Some of the EB3R earthworks/diversion/discharge may also be within 100m of a natural wetland (e.g. within the vicinity of 151 to 171 Ti Rakau Drive). Please review, and update the documents where required	ESC Report updated						
	18. Clarify whether land disturbance / earthworks will also occur across all areas of vegetation removal. If yes, please ensure the quantified earthworks areas correlate with the areas of vegetation removal discussed in the Marine Ecology Assessment	Addressed in the Marine Ecology Assessment						
	19. ESC drawings: Update the legend to clarify what the shading on the drawings represent (e.g. the pale orange shading; and the green shading associated with the outfall works. Identify the alignment of streams (where applicable) to clarify where outfalls and associated erosion protection are proposed in relation to the streams. Where stream works are required, please provide the dimensions of the proposed structures to clarify whether consent is required under E3 of the AUP:OP.	Updated ESC drawings provided, appended to the AEE						
	General	Sam Langdon sam.langdon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	General				20. Recommendation that a summary table is included to quantify the total area of vegetation removal required across the various overlays, and outside the CMA as discussed in the Marine Ecology Assessment, and these figures correlate with the total area of vegetation clearance discussed in the (Freshwater) Ecology Assessment	Figures are consistent between the Terrestrial Ecology and Marine Ecology Reports
							21. Clarify whether any existing culverts within watercourses (e.g. adjacent to 172 Ti Rakau Dr) will need to be upgraded / modified / reinforced / extended to accommodate the new road (or weight of development). Where upgrade / modification is required, please assess the activity against chapter E3 of the AUP:OP	None
	Additional Comments	Sam Langdon sam.langdon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	Additional Comments				22. If the works are located within a freshwater body they probably won't be able to avoid that assessment, particularly if they infringe the E3 rules and/or NES-FW regulations for fish passage (relating to structures within a stream). Where stream works are anticipated to be undertaken as a PA under E3 and/or the NES-FW they will need to provide information to demonstrate how they meet the relevant PA criteria	Stream works which relate to three outfalls (13/14, and 1A and 1b) will be undertaken as a Permitted Activity and has been addressed within the AEE.
				23. Where the outfalls are located on land (above any freshwater body) then this needs to be clearly demonstrated on their drawings	Locations of outfalls are provided for within the drawing set submitted with the application.			
				24. Where mangroves are proposed to be removed from above the CMA, they will need to determine which E3 rule is relevant, and if applicable, demonstrate how they will meet the permitted activity criteria	Not applicable.			

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments																																																									
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022																																																									
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response																																																					
Marine Ecology	Sharon De Luca sharon.deluca@boffamiskell.co.nz	Kala Sivaguru Kala.Sivaguru@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz	1. Agreed that the outfall locations fall within the natural wetland in the CMA. NES-F should be included and assessed accordingly.	Noted																																																					
			2. Query is it possible to mitigate the contaminant load to the receiving environment for Outfall 108707. What mitigation options have been considered for this outfall? (EB3R)	The outfall redirects a greater extent of catchment being received, not as a result of the busway itself. The % increases are quite large but is based on a baseline concentration of zinc in the amber range not the red range, so not as bad as some outlets. From the assessment:																																																					
			<p>Table 4: Stormwater Report - Summary of EB3R predicted change in contaminant loads</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Outfall</th> <th>TSS (%)</th> <th>Zinc (%)</th> <th>Copper (%)</th> <th>TPh (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outfall MCC_108703</td> <td>75%</td> <td>74%</td> <td>70%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outfall MCC_108707</td> <td>1%</td> <td>74%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outfalls MCC_108713</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outfall MCC_108718 & 108719</td> <td>30%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outfall MCC_108718</td> <td>30%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outfall MCC_108718</td> <td>43%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outfall MCC_108746 and MCC_108749 and New Outfall</td> <td>43%</td> <td>59%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total EB3R</td> <td>59%</td> <td>43%</td> <td>48%</td> <td>53%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Outfall	TSS (%)	Zinc (%)	Copper (%)	TPh (%)	Outfall MCC_108703	75%	74%	70%	58%	Outfall MCC_108707	1%	74%	62%	69%	Outfalls MCC_108713	100%	100%	100%	100%	Outfall MCC_108718 & 108719	30%	15%	15%	23%	Outfall MCC_108718	30%	15%	15%	23%	Outfall MCC_108718	43%	40%	40%	32%	Outfall MCC_108746 and MCC_108749 and New Outfall	43%	59%	60%	22%	Total EB3R	59%	43%	48%	53%	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1B</td> <td>MCC_108707</td> <td>280</td> <td>74%</td> <td>increase</td> <td>Concentration likely to increase over time, could approach GV value in future.</td> <td>Adverse effects on sensitive species¹⁰.</td> </tr> </table>	1B	MCC_108707	280	74%	increase	Concentration likely to increase over time, could approach GV value in future.	Adverse effects on sensitive species ¹⁰ .
			Outfall	TSS (%)	Zinc (%)	Copper (%)	TPh (%)																																																		
			Outfall MCC_108703	75%	74%	70%	58%																																																		
			Outfall MCC_108707	1%	74%	62%	69%																																																		
			Outfalls MCC_108713	100%	100%	100%	100%																																																		
			Outfall MCC_108718 & 108719	30%	15%	15%	23%																																																		
Outfall MCC_108718	30%	15%	15%	23%																																																					
Outfall MCC_108718	43%	40%	40%	32%																																																					
Outfall MCC_108746 and MCC_108749 and New Outfall	43%	59%	60%	22%																																																					
Total EB3R	59%	43%	48%	53%																																																					
1B	MCC_108707	280	74%	increase	Concentration likely to increase over time, could approach GV value in future.	Adverse effects on sensitive species ¹⁰ .																																																			
3. Clarify if there are any outfalls above MHWS and/or within the coastal inundation area? Assess Chapter E36	There are outfalls located above MHWS outside of the CMA, which have been addressed within the AEE.																																																								
4. Bridge within the Pakuranga Creek is likely to require impact or vibratory piling for the installation of piles for the bridge. Rule A114 would be triggered for underwater noise. Assessment of effects on marine fauna would be required relating to the piling works	There are no piling works proposed in Pakuranga Creek/CMA.																																																								
5. A coastal processes effect in relation to piles for the bridge within the CMA, and coastal processes effects related to energy dissipation structures associated with outfall would also be required	There are no piling works proposed in Pakuranga Creek/CMA.																																																								
6. Agreed that effects on benthic fauna from the proposal is likely to be low except the discharge effect from Outfall 108707	Noted																																																								
7. If any structures or buildings fall within the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area on land (above MHWS as defined in the AUP), this would trigger consent and assessment of effects as per the assessment criteria in Chapter E36	Noted																																																								
8. Avifauna: Tim Lovegrove briefly reviewed the effects on avifauna and agreed with the assessment of effects, he did not find any gaps in the information	Noted																																																								

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) - Resource Consent	Shane Doran / Jacques van den Heever shane.doran@easternbusway.nz jacques.vandenheever@easternbusway.nz	Martin Huang (Stantec) martin.huang@stantec.com	1. Covid-19 aftermath effects	Modelling based on the expectation that traffic patterns would return to normal by 2048.
			2. Vehicle tracking plans	Vehicle tracking curves will be included as part of the drawing set to be submitted with the application, to demonstrate intersection performance.
			3. Crash data currency	Crash data within the ITA is based on 2015 to 2019 data as this is considered most relevant, given the effects from Covid between 2020 - 2021.
			4. Parking assessment scope	The parking survey included ground level parking at the Pakuranga Town Centre only with the underground car park not included nor the on roof car park. The parking assessment to determine the utilisation of car parks when the busway is built has taken a conservative approach, adopting that both the underground and roof top parking spaces are fully utilised.
ITA - NOR	Shane Doran / Jacques van den Heever shane.doran@easternbusway.nz jacques.vandenheever@easternbusway.nz	Don McKenzie (Stantec)	1. Weekend Traffic Volumes/ Holiday Periods	Modelling is based on weekday AM and PM peaks volumes to determine the overall network requirements. This approach is consistent when assessing network wide impacts associated with a major transport initiative.
			2. Traffic Model Calibration/ Validation	The 'Eastern Busway - Base 2018 Model Update Report' will be provided as an Appendix to the ITA for lodgement. The AIMSUN and SIDRA Models build on the 2018 Base model for assessing impacts/performance of the transport system with the proposed busway.
			3. Riverhills Park, Night Market Special Events	Regarding the Night Market as these markets occur outside of the peak hours there is significant spare capacity in the transport system to support the Night Market demand. No further assessment is considered necessary for the Night Markets. Approximately 6 kerbside car parks will be lost on the western side of Gosamer Drive. It is expected that properties along Gosamer Drive have sufficient offstreet parking and the impact of this loss of on street parking is negligible.
			4. Quality of Pedestrian Provision	The existing footpath width will be maintained during construction, and supported by the CEMP and CTMP.
			5. Cortina Place	Traffic volumes at Cortina Place have been considered in the future state and are expected to remain relatively minor once fully operative in the permanent solution.
			6. Bus Stop Catchment Analysis	A catchment analysis has been undertaken of the proposed future bus station locations. Transport modelling with the busway has shown a significant increase in bus patronage along the corridor with daily passenger numbers forecast to increase from 3700 to 18000 passengers per day by 2028. This significant increase in bus passengers is a result of improved travel time and reliability of buses, better integration between bus services and more visible and higher quality stations. The combination of these factors has seen significant changes in mode share in cities where these systems have been implemented overseas.
			7. Off-street Parking Surveys - William Roberts Road	Parking assessment has taken a conservative approach, assuming full utilisation of existing parking. Existing parking space numbers will be maintained with additional car spaces provided to replace those carparks impacted during construction. The additional car parks provide access to the early learning centre.
			8. Pakuranga Plaza Parking	The reduction of car parking will be offset by the provision of a high quality public transport system including a new bus station in the forecourt of the town centre. Further a conservative assessment of car park utilisation has identified available off-street parking remains.
			9. Ti Rakau/Gosamer EB3R Works - Cyclist Provision	EBA has shown the intersection for tie-in purposes only. No cycling upgrades are proposed along Gosamer Drive as this is outside the scope and footprint of the Eastern Busway Project.
			10. Warehouse Loading Dock - Reeves Road	Vehicle tracking has been considered by the EBA and adequate provision has been provided for vehicles using the Warehouse loading dock.
			11. Crash Reporting and Analysis	Crash data within the ITA is based on 2015 to 2019 data as this is considered most relevant, given the effects from Covid between 2020 - 2021.
			12. Benefits to Pedestrian Safety	The ITA considers the overall benefits of the Project. Mode shift has not been quantified for EB2 and EB3R for staging purposes, and considers the complete Project given AT Board endorsement.
			13. Relationship of EB2/EB3R	The EB2 and EB3R packages are being lodged to Auckland Council concurrently. Regarding the EB2-3R Scenario, EB3C and EB4 were not included in the 2028 model. Regarding the Gosamer Drive Intersection, the Board has endorsed EB3C to progress, and likelihood of it not going ahead would be very low.
			14. NOR and Consent Applications	Noted.
			15. Future Medium Density Zoning	While higher density land use has not been considered in the ITA, it is expected that public transport patronage and mode share will increase given the provision of high quality public transport facilities along the corridor.
			16. Projected Future Volume Increase	The corridor is expected to reach its capacity by 2028, and the uptake in travel demand is supported by the provision of the busway.
			17. Indication of Current Cycling Facilities	Figure 10 of the ITA has been updated.
			18. Mitigation of EB2/EB3R Enabling Works	Detailed Ti Rakau Drive / Reeves Road intersection layout (e.g. guide lines through the intersection, and alignment with the three downstream lanes into which right turning traffic is led) and vehicle tracking curves will be included as part of the drawing set to be submitted with the application, to demonstrate intersection performance.
			19. Ti Rakau Gosamer - Enabling Works Mitigation	Detailed Gosamer Road / Ti Rakau Drive intersection layout (e.g. showing pedestrian and cycle facilities at the intersection) and vehicle tracking curves will be included as part of the drawing set to be submitted with the application, to demonstrate intersection performance.
			20. Construction Staging and Traffic Management	Note that scenarios and modelled results are indicative with sequence to generally follow what is stated. This allows the effects to be considered at various stages of construction and inform the development of responses. However, there will be some flexibility to construction and which will be managed by the CTMP.
			21. Reeves Road Flyover Visibility Issues	Noted - design of structure and measures to ensure appropriate sight distances will be incorporated into design.
			22. Parking Provision and Travel Demand Management at Site Offices	Onsite parking will be provided for a small number of personnel with travel plans developed to clarify for people working at the site offices their alternatives to driving their car.
			23. Operational Performance Measures	Construction team will continue to investigate options to alleviate travel delays during construction. An option currently being investigated is the use of real time travel information to inform route choice of road users.
			24. Safety/Amenity at Bus Stations	Noted - An independent Road Safety Audit has been undertaken on the proposed design and a number of additional safety measures are being considered including raised tables along Ti Rakau Drive to reduce vehicle speeds in locations adjacent to the proposed bus stations.
			25. Speed Limits	The posted speed along Ti Rakau Drive is proposed to be 50km/h.

Note - Additional Attachment

As requested, please refer Minimum Requirements Document EB234-1-DM-DC-20-0003 Revision A4

EB2 and EB3R Draft Specialist Assessments				
Auckland Council Pre-lodgement Review - June 2022				
EB2 & EB3R Assessment	EBA Specialist	AC Specialist	AC Feedback	EBA Response
Urban Design	Chris Bentley / Tom Lines tom.lines@easternbusway.nz chris.bentley@easternbusway.nz	Trevor Mackie mackiet@xtra.co.nz	1. Positive urban design effects: Reliance on AEE as there is no urban design assessment	Noted. Urban design has been included within the design process, and the proposed conditions of consent will require a Urban Design and Landscape Plan (UDLP) to be submitted post-lodgement.
			2. Reeves Road Flyover: The Landscape Assessment includes an appropriate level of detail on the mitigations planned for the RRF.	Noted.
			3. Land take and frontage rehabilitation: Recommendation to describe the process of land acquisition and future rationalisation of landholdings	The EBA have a dedicated residual land reintegration team whom are working with Eke Panuku to co-ordinate the potential for development of land.
			4. Natural Character, Landscape and Visual Effects: Consideration of NPS-UD and MDRS as basis of assessment for the more likely urban environment setting	EBA acknowledge that the Eastern Busway Project is setting up infrastructure for the future, which will be complimented by intensification. The AEE acknowledges the expected plan change and that the Project enables region-shaping infrastructure to support intensification.
			5. Temporary Effects: No lasting effect on urban form or the public realm	Agreed and noted.
			6. Street Trees: Information on species proposed for replanting, and expectation of stronger justification for the omission of stretches of street trees, and reliance of future Management Plans, and OPW requirements	The proposed condition set will require a Urban Design and Landscape Plan to be submitted post-lodgement to detail the likely scale and mix of trees, working in collaboration with Mana Whenua. In terms of determining the omission of trees, while landscaped areas were considered, specialists have worked with the EBA design and construction team given the constraints of existing and proposed utilities and services which cannot be moved or relocated to an alternative location. Transport Design Manual standards and ongoing asset maintenance was also considered during this process.
			7. Public Open Space: Discussion of positive contribution to the public realm	Noted, and the proposed mitigation is being worked through with representatives from the Auckland Council Parks and Community Facilities teams.
			8. OPW for busway, roadworks, landscaping and stations: Given the extensive use of Management Plans it is unlikely the applicant will be able to demonstrate that an OPW can be waived	An Outline Plan of Works Waiver is being sought as all Management Plans will be provided with the application at the time of lodgement, with the exception of a few to be submitted post-lodgement. The Management Plans will be supported by the proposed consent condition set and Auckland Council's certification process.
			9. District Plan level resource consents for EB3R and creation of carpark within a Residential Zone	For the avoidance of doubt, only EB2 is seeking resource consents and a Notice of Requirement (NoR). EB3R is seeking regional and district consents, having sufficient material to assess the effects. As addressed within the EB3R AEE, the proposed carpark within the Residential zoning at 105 Ti Rakau Drive is temporary in nature, to replace the loss of parking from the Edgewater Drive Shopping Centre, prior to the land formally being vested as road. The proposed temporary carpark also necessitates the access track for residents and the site haul road during construction for the westbound lane of Ti Rakau Drive.