

Shannon Watson

From: Shannon Watson
Sent: Tuesday, 21 January 2020 12:47 PM
To: david@transportconsultant.co.nz; Megan Oliver; Hamilton, Catherine; Head, Jeremy; Iain Dawe; Sharyn Westlake; roger.uys@gw.govt.nz
Cc: Jo Frances; Dan Kellow (InTouch); Parvati Rotherham; Michelle Conland
Subject: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path
Attachments: Content of evidence summary.docx; FOR EXPERTS SW FINAL 13012020 Eastern Bays - Summary of Submissions.xlsx
Importance: High

Afternoon all

I have now completed pulling out the submission points on the Eastern Bays Shared Path which we believe require an expert response (attached). As you are all aware there is a lot of cross over between the themes and the environmental effects of the project generally (implications of path width on user safety, ecology values, recreation amenity or user experience, sea level rise, natural character etc.), so for clarity **we have given you each a colour to draw your attention to the submissions (or themes) relevant to your area of expertise** where we require you to provide a formal response.

The colours for the respective experts are (I hope none of you are colour blind):

David Wanty (transport/traffic matters and safety)

Megan Oliver (inter/sub-tidal ecology)

Jeremy Head (natural character/visual amenity)

Iain Dawe (beach renourishment, sea level rise and alternative design features (rock rip rap islands))

Iain Dawe and Sharyn Westlake (seawall design and sea level rise)

Catherine Hamilton and David Wanty (path width)

Roger (penguins and coastal avifauna)

Catherine Hamilton (effects on recreation amenity due to loss of beach and effects on user experience)

What I am hoping for from each of you is detailed comments (or a memo) outlining what your evidence is likely to say (before formal evidence is received to alleviate potential timing conflicts) such that I can progress with the majority of my s42A hearing report. I imagine this summary can then form the basis for your formal evidence. A template of the format/content to be included in your formal expert evidence, to guide your summary, is attached for your information.

I would like each of you to address your comments on the proposal in the following manner:

- Comments on the application as lodged and your comments on the various further information responses and how your understanding of the proposal and original concerns may or may not have been addressed by the applicant (i.e comments on lodged application and those on further information prepared and amalgamated/covered together so that these effectively are read as overall comments on the application as it stood when notified)
- Submissions – responding to the relevant points raised in submissions relating to your area of expertise

I am requesting this so that all comments from the relevant experts related to their area of expertise can be found in one place and submitters and the hearing panel can see how the proposal and the relevant experts concerns may have evolved as the application has progressed, given the numerous memorandums and further information received.

Application documents and copies of submissions

Application documents and the further information responses (essentially all information related to the application up to notification) can be found here: <https://www.gw.govt.nz/EasternBaysSharedPath>

A copy of the full submissions can be found here:

Internal: https://greaterwellington-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/ainslee_brown_gw_govt_nz/EinmBmpIXGZHs7EFAegnIW0BxYvbtN803jtrXCjJoPGgEw?e=drRALc (will work for any GW staff)

External staff (contractors): https://greaterwellington-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/ainslee_brown_gw_govt_nz/EinmBmpIXGZHs7EFAegnIW0BxYvbtN803jtrXCjJoPGgEw?e=drRALc

These are numbered in accordance with the submitter numbers in the attached Summary of Submissions.

Things to consider

1. We are comfortable for your evidence/summary to be relatively succinct, and refer back to the relevant sections of the application or further information as appropriate. The evidence/summary needs to clearly state what the issues are, and what your view/assessment is, but you can refer back to the application reports or further information when describing some of the detail.
2. Please ensure that your evidence/summary is consistent with any comments you have made since the application was lodged and your section 92 responses, including insofar as some aspects or your understanding of the proposal might have moved on slightly as the application has progressed. If your view of the proposal has changed since providing comments please detail why this has changed and what your assessment of the proposal is now.
3. If there are areas where your evidence/summary will need to be consistent with that of another expert, please check in with each other directly (and let us know) to ensure the statements will be consistent.
4. Related to that, if you think you will need to recommend other or additional mitigation measures that are not yet captured **PLEASE LET US KNOW ASAP** so we can raise these with the applicant.

Responses to certain submissions

The following submissions do not require detailed comments as part of your summary but having your thoughts on these would be helpful and you need to be prepared to comment at the hearing:

- Submission #53
- Submission #63
- Submission #66
- Submission #151
- Submission #152
- Submission #174

Additional matters:

In addition, there are some elements coming out of the submissions which were touched on during the consideration of the application (pre-notification) which I feel still need to be 'closed-out'. These include:

Catherine Hamilton

- You raised concerns over beach renourishment being proposed as mitigation for loss of beach space (and therefore loss of recreational amenity) with uncertainty over its success. After reviewing Iain's comments on the application as lodged and further discussion with Iain regarding beach nourishment and coastal processes I was comfortable enough that Iain was satisfied that beach renourishment would be successful (noting that risk could be further mitigated if ongoing beach renourishment was incorporated into the proposal as contingency in the event of failure) and therefore this was not included in the original further information request. After reviewing Iain Dawes comments on the application and submissions I would like you to comment on whether you are satisfied that effects of beach loss can be appropriately addressed by beach renourishment at the affected beaches. (Happy for you to discuss with Iain directly or wait for his response below)
- If you are not comfortable with beach renourishment as the mitigation for loss of recreation amenity due to loss of beach what are the likely effects and how else might these be able to be mitigated?
- Are there any known examples of 2.5m wide shared paths and 3.5m wide shared paths (to provide visual context) that we can draw upon.

Sharyn Westlake

- Can you please comment on the suitability of the seawall design to resist scour at the base/toe and for further adaptation in future (i.e add-ons and building up) and what you consider might be required for such adaptation to be successful. What will be required to successfully upgrade the seawall in future – extent of infill? would raising the road level likely be required?

Iain Dawe

- Can you please make a qualified comment on the likely success of beach nourishment as proposed (i.e will the material used for renourishment remain in place to the extent necessary to consider it successful) and any recommendations that could be adopted by the applicant to further enhance the likelihood of successful renourishment. Again, noting that at this stage HCC have not offered to undertake ongoing renourishment of the beaches.

Megan Oliver/Roger Uys

- Do you think we need a draft CEMP prior to the hearing to provide more certainty that effects during construction can be managed? Megan we discussed this before the further information request and you didn't think it was necessary because there was enough information in the application information to show how effects will be managed, but Forest and Bird have expressed that one should be provided (to demonstrate how avoidance will be achieved as per NZCPS).
- Penguin/coastal avifauna mitigation/offsetting package is being progressed by the applicant in the background. The applicant is seeking to get alignment from GWRC/DoC/Forest and Bird and the local penguin experts (Sally Bain/Mike Rumble) on the proposed approach prior to the hearing.

Safety barriers

- We are seeking advice on the minimum width/height/standard for any safety railings which may be required and whether these are in fact legally required under the Building Act or if there are other standards that come in to play given it is a shared path. This will give us more of an understanding of the bulk and scale of the safety barrier and what this might mean for further constraining the shared path width where a barrier is required and effects on natural character and the eastern bays landscape. We are also seeking confirmation from the applicant on the length of barrier that they think is required as there is currently disagreement between the applicant and our assessment of the required length.

To be completed by

Can you please provide an initial response (your summary) by COB Friday 14 February 2020 (17/18 working days(depending on where in the country you are)). However, it would be appreciated that if coming out of the

submissions or the points identified above you notice any gaps or you are uncomfortable with something, you inform us ASAP so we can work out if we need to commission further reports or request a formal response from the applicant.

Expert workshop

I am also hoping to arrange a joint expert meeting/conference call in early February so all of GWRC's experts can come together to workshop the proposal as it stands, discuss potential trade-offs that could be made and the potential alternatives so that we have put some thought into this if questions are asked by commissioners (i.e what are the implications if the path is extended slightly further seaward) would the mitigation/offset package proposed still be acceptable, what are the likely implications on the design etc.

Please give myself or Dan Kellow a call if you have any questions or concerns.

Kind regards

Shannon Watson
Environmental Planner

GHD

Proudly employee owned

T: +64 04 474 7330 | V: 517330 | F: 04 472 0833 | E: shannon.watson@ghd.com
Level 2, Grant Thornton House, 215 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6011 | www.ghd.com

Connect



[WATER](#) | [ENERGY & RESOURCES](#) | [ENVIRONMENT](#) | [PROPERTY & BUILDINGS](#) | [TRANSPORTATION](#)

Please consider our environment before printing this email