

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>1</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | ?Parking   |
| Section Number:              | ?8.7.1   |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | I oppose the proposal for Judy & Victor to have to remove the garage they pay to use; this came very late in the plans & is unreasonable & unnecessary   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Withdraw proposal to remove garage   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent   |
| WCC's Comment:               | The consenting of the reservoir includes a condition that requires the applicant to develop detailed design for the Rolleston Street Road end. Development of this must result in the best outcome for this area in relation to the quality of the park entrance and potential for improved parking and access. This is what Council would always consider as part of any significant development on or at the edge of a park. The opportunity to make change comes very rarely, so when it does the Council must ensure the very best long-term outcome for the park and park users. To this end, Council officers have reviewed draft plans and determined that the plan as currently proposed will result in the best outcome. While officers have read the submissions from the community and garage owner, the long-term quality and function of the road end should not be compromised by a private parking license arrangement. Encroachment licenses are personal to a property owner and all contain clauses that provide for the license to end. The license is not a permanent right. The significant redevelopment of the road end is a situation where the appropriateness of a private garage and vehicle parking arrangement could and should be considered. Council policy also requires officers to seek removal of encroachments off the Wellington Town Belt. The garage is partially on Town Belt. New encroachments are not permitted on or even adjacent to Wellington Town Belt for the same reason that the current one will be removed – because they can result in private use buildings impacting on the quality and function of the public open space and park entrance. The garage can remain at the site until the point in the project when the area is needed to complete the road end construction. This could be up to 3 years away which gives the license holder a long period of time to prepare. Council officers have met with the license holder and will work closely with them in the coming years |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Await further instruction from WCC   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>2</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | ESCP & LEMP  |
| Section Number:              | WGN1800065[35009] Refer Appendix 3, 11.4 & 11.5, 14, 10.4.2  |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 | GWRC Consents 35008-10, condition 8  |
| Comment:                     | How do we know remaining Flocculant in water discharged to stormwater is safe for fresh & seawater flora & fauna?  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Suggested Amendment:         | As already requested, please provide a recent scientific research review paper & meeting with Dr Chris Wilcox   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | The use of flocculants is common practice and supported by HEB Construction as a widely used, valid, effect, and environmentally safe water quality improvement practice if used responsibly. The use of flocculants does not require resource consent from either WCC/GWRC.  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB will provide members of the CRG an opportunity to discuss the use of flocculants with Dr. Chris Wilcox regarding the use of flocculants.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB will provide recent scientific papers detailing the impact of flocculants freshwater aquatic environments and schedule an appointment with Dr Chris Wilcox with members of the CRG. HEB will continue to use flocculants as a means of water quality treatment.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>3</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | ESCP, LEMP  |
| Section Number:              | 8.4.9, 10, 8.1, 8.2, 7.5  |
| Section Name:                |   |
| Page Number:                 |   |
| Comment:                     | what is the plan to protect & enhance the side streamlet at base of the upper field slope which runs into Papawai Stream just up-stream from the fish pass & scruffy dome, along with any other probable springs which flow into Papawai Stream & the Waitangi Tributary at all points potentially impacted by the construction? Including off-setting if damage occurs?                        |
| Suggested Amendment:         |   |
| Person(s) providing comment: |   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | If the area falls outside of the Designation and Resource Consent areas no enhancement will be undertaken.  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The Erosion & Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) details the control measures we put in place to divert clean water run-off away from exposed ground and prevention of sediment laden water entering any water courses outside the construction site. HEB will also look out for any springs that become evident during the excavation and adapt our ESCP detail to suit control of these discoveries |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| Management Plan:             |   |
| Section Number:              | 9.2.6   |
| Section Name:                |   |
| Page Number:                 |   |
| Comment:                     | What are the plans to ensure stability and no sediment run off from the road connecting the fields during construction?   |
| Suggested Amendment:         |   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Comment acknowledged and the control measures to deal with sediment control is addressed in detail in the ESCP the ESCP   |
| HEB Construction's           | Control measures will be implemented as detailed in within the  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Comment:                     | ESCP   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>5</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | ESCP, LEMP   |
| Section Number:              | 10.4.2   |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | How long will streams' monitoring continue after the reservoir is completed?   |
| Suggested Amendment:         |  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | The monitoring of streams post construction is not required under the resource consent   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB will monitor streams until the end of all landscaping, playing field construction and any other activities that have a potential to introduce sediment to the streams. In other words, until the entire project is complete. This will be approximately 8 months after the reservoir structure is complete. This is in accordance with the ESCP  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>6</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP   |
| Section Number:              |  |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 | Revised 14-04-2020 Page 73   |
| Comment:                     | Why does 'No specific section of the CEMP addresses this condition '? : 'The two streams in or immediately adjacent to the licence area /Papawai Stream, and Waitangi Stream tributary) have acknowledged and significant ecological values. The intention of all conditions is to avoid any disturbance to these streams, and protect the stream habitat, environment and function. Any damage to these streams must be reinstated and appropriately offset |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Confusing!!  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | To act in accordance with the conditions of consent  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Large sections of the LEMP/ESCP are directed toward this requirement. The condition is generic in nature, but the requirement is addressed across many sections of the plan and not only in one specific section   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>7</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Whole thing  |
| Section Number:              |  |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | Where is there provision for off-setting for loss of use of a natural amenity for 3yrs+ & the fact that it will not be the same  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | when re-instated as it was before the project- (One eg. Of this being the loss of native seedlings in the areas where vegetation will be cleared ; these would have continue to grow and contribute to native forest regeneration were this disturbance not occurring)   |
| Suggested Amendment:         |  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB will meet any off-setting requirements stipulated by the consent conditions. Off-setting of this specific nature, does not appear to be a requirement under the consents   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB cannot comment on why such measures are not present within the consent conditions.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>8</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | ESCP Appx 1  |
| Section Number:              | 4.1, 2.4   |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | Will sediment be produced by the building of reservoir footprint perimeter bunds & if so how will this be managed?   |
| Suggested Amendment:         |  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB will construct the bunds according to industry best practice guidelines  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The perimeter bunds will be constructed during dry weather and immediately stabilized to prevent sediment run-off from the bunds themselves  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>9</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP   |
| Section Number:              | 7.3, 7.3.1, 7.3.3  |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | Will additional trees be lost above the upper field on the lower south east bank when the road is put in to get excavation etc machinery up onto the slopes?   |
| Suggested Amendment:         |  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB will endeavor to retain as much vegetation of value as is determined by the independent Project Ecologist  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | No additional trees of value (pohutakawa) have been identified as needing to be removed. There is scrub and gorse in the location of this access road. There is one gum tree that needs to be considered for removal, however all reasonable attempts will be made to retain it in consultation with the landscape architect and Manager Open Spaces |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>10</b>  |
| Management Plan:             |  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Section Number:              | 8.8.1, 8.8.2, 7.4.2  |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | When will plans and consultation be provided to CRG regarding management of the ecology and flooding issues at the south end of the lower field? There have been informal recommendations by local community members with expertise in this that bioretention ponds/restored wetlands could greatly improve these aspects while still enabling sports to be played on this field. Also there is potential for new educational opportunities to be provided by ensuring all-ability access and biculturally designed information boards regarding the history, restoration and ecological values Also noting that there is already an unintentionally formed wetland there as a result of the heavy sedimentation of the stream bed and leakage through the current bund. Additionally tangata whenua could have enhanced access to Harakeke and other flax-like species for cultural purposes. This would also be prudent given the predictions that heavier rainfall events will increase in frequency because of climate heating. NB. these conditions state that there needs to be a plan in place prior to the commencement of construction. |
| Suggested Amendment:         |  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent   |
| WWL's Comment:               | Wellington Water is currently undertaking the study required under L.62. The output of the study being prepared in conjunction with WCC, will be distributed to CRG for review and comment. The LEMP will be updated to reflect the agreed outcome of the LC.62 study  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Await further instruction from WWL   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>11</b>  |
| Management Plan:             |  |
| Section Number:              | 7.1.1 , 8.5.3  |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | Assuming consent is granted for this what off-sets will there be for the 'Minor' Consent Variation wrt to the loss of open stream length for the Waitangi Stream Tributary?  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Contribution to cost of bio-retention ponds south end lower field as in Comment # 10   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB Construction can only work within the constraints identified within the conditions of consent.   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The current version of the LEMP does not reflect the proposed relocation of the stormwater inlet at the North End of the Waitangi Stream tributary. The management implications of these works will be given due consideration and addressed in a future revision of the LEMP. The consent application covering the stormwater inlet works addresses the   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | topic of offsetting. Additional riparian planting upstream of the inlet has been proposed.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Amend the LEMP and have approved by all parties in accordance with existing consents and the additional conditions detailed in the consent variations. This will occur at a future date prior to execution of the relevant works and does not form a part of this round of management plan approvals |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>12</b>  |
| Management Plan:             |  |
| Section Number:              | 10.4   |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 | Revised 14-04-2020 Page 31   |
| Comment:                     | Why?- 'The consent holder is only required to undertake in-stream monitoring at the reasonable mixing zone and monitoring at the SRP outlets if the SR's are discharging.'   |
| Suggested Amendment:         |  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB Construction will work within the constraints identified within the conditions of the consents.  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The comment relates to the nature of the conditions rather than how HEB Construction intends to manage compliance with the condition.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>13</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | All  |
| Section Number:              |  |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | How do Wellington Water & HEBs plans enhance the character & amenity of streams & wetlands which is a specified condition of the District Plan   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please provide an itemized summary answer  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB Construction will work within the constraints identified with the conditions of the consents and the planting requirements of the landscape design.  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | This comment relates to the nature of the conditions rather than how HEB Construction intends to manage compliance with the condition.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>14</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | All  |
| Section Number:              |  |
| Section Name:                |  |
| Page Number:                 |  |
| Comment:                     | Where is the documentation of the carbon and other greenhouse emission increases or decreases which this construction plan will cause; over the construction period, and over each of the following 5 years, 10yrs, 20yrs and agreed lifespan of the reservoir.                                      |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Suggested Amendment:         | Take up this opportunity for HEB & Wellington Water to be pioneers in taking Climate Change and its practical ramifications seriously, in addition to making our drinking water supplies more resilient!! A start would be to factor in the emissions produced by the construction machinery and trucks transporting excavations to the tip   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Mary Hutchinson   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | As discussed at the workshops HEB Construction will provide a detailed measure of the carbon associated with the alternative design adopted by the Project and introduced by HEB Construction. HEB notes that the decision to remove excavated material from site was undertaken after considerable consultation with the community   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Report on embodied carbon emissions   |
| Comment #                    | 15  |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP – Town Belt Garage at the top of Rolleston Street  |
| Section Number:              | 2.1   |
| Section Name:                | Site Location   |
| Page Number:                 | 9   |
| Comment:                     | <p>During the Notice of Requirement hearings, the garage at the top of Rolleston Street, used by J. Hutt and V. Anderlini was shown as unaffected, i.e. on the documentation it showed no change to the land use. This garage has been used for many years by the family as part of an encroachment licence, including to store items for neighbours.</p> <p>WCC Parks, Sport and Recreation (PSR) has seen an opportunity to provide 3 additional parks for the rugby season by terminating the encroachment licence for the garage, which is primarily on road reserve, but does encroach the Town Belt by a small amount. The Town Belt management philosophy is to terminate encroachment licences wherever possible, often when a property changes hands.</p> <p>The principle of reducing encroachments is understandable. But, in this instance, it needs to be recognised that this family is the closest household to the reservoir site, they will have to endure 3 years of noise, trucks being filled, vehicles entering and leaving the site, the sounds of site workers, all manner of banging, and probably a lot of dust. This is the most impacted family in Rolleston Street, as they live in the last house in the street. This is one of many Town Belt encroachment licences in Wellington. I understand the principle of reducing the number of encroachments, but when I think of the major amount of inconvenience and disruption that people at the top of Rolleston Street will face for 3 years, my view is that this is not the time to make that change.</p> |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please retain the garage, as a small recognition of the high level of inconvenience that will be caused to this family during the 3 years of construction.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent  |
| WCC's Comment:               | The consenting of the reservoir includes a condition that requires the applicant to develop detailed design for the Rolleston Street Road end. Development of this must result in   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>the best outcome for this area in relation to the quality of the park entrance and potential for improved parking and access. This is what Council would always consider as part of any significant development on or at the edge of a park. The opportunity to make change comes very rarely, so when it does the Council must ensure the very best long-term outcome for the park and park users. To this end, Council officers have reviewed draft plans and determined that the plan as currently proposed will result in the best outcome. While officers have read the submissions from the community and garage owner, the long-term quality and function of the road end should not be compromised by a private parking license arrangement. Encroachment licenses are personal to a property owner and all contain clauses that provide for the license to end. The license is not a permanent right. The significant redevelopment of the road end is a situation where the appropriateness of a private garage and vehicle parking arrangement could and should be considered. Council policy also requires officers to seek removal of encroachments off the Wellington Town Belt. The garage is partially on Town Belt. New encroachments are not permitted on or even adjacent to Wellington Town Belt for the same reason that the current one will be removed – because they can result in private use buildings impacting on the quality and function of the public open space and park entrance. The garage can remain at the site until the point in the project when the area is needed to complete the road end construction. This could be up to 3 years away which gives the license holder a long period of time to prepare. Council officers have met with the license holder and will work closely with them in the coming years</p> |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Await further instruction from WCC  |
| Comment #                    | 1   |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Environment Management Plan  |
| Section Number:              | DC8 d vii   |
| Section Name:                | Community Liaison Group Formation   |
| Page Number:                 | 39  |
| Comment:                     | Only 1 representative of Rolleston Street is allowed  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Given the length of the street and the impact the project will have on it, perhaps more people could be allowed. Two from the top of the street and two from lower down the street. This should be in addition to representation from Mount Cook Mobilised.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent. HEB is not in a position to comment on why conditions have been written as they are   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Please note that DC8 d vii references formation of a CLP, not the CRG currently formed. WWL will address should the requirement to form a CLG be required   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| Comment #                    | 2   |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP  |
| Section Number:              | DC23 (b)  |
| Section Name:                | Construction Traffic Management Plan  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Page Number:                 | 49   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Leave the garage in place and parking in front of it to help minimize disruption to residents parking.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt, Victor Anderlini and 39 residents of upper Rolleston Street   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent   |
| WCC's Comment:               | The consenting of the reservoir includes a condition that requires the applicant to develop detailed design for the Rolleston Street Road end. Development of this must result in the best outcome for this area in relation to the quality of the park entrance and potential for improved parking and access. This is what Council would always consider as part of any significant development on or at the edge of a park. The opportunity to make change comes very rarely, so when it does the Council must ensure the very best long-term outcome for the park and park users. To this end, Council officers have reviewed draft plans and determined that the plan as currently proposed will result in the best outcome. While officers have read the submissions from the community and garage owner, the long-term quality and function of the road end should not be compromised by a private parking license arrangement. Encroachment licenses are personal to a property owner and all contain clauses that provide for the license to end. The license is not a permanent right. The significant redevelopment of the road end is a situation where the appropriateness of a private garage and vehicle parking arrangement could and should be considered. Council policy also requires officers to seek removal of encroachments off the Wellington Town Belt. The garage is partially on Town Belt. New encroachments are not permitted on or even adjacent to Wellington Town Belt for the same reason that the current one will be removed – because they can result in private use buildings impacting on the quality and function of the public open space and park entrance. The garage can remain at the site until the point in the project when the area is needed to complete the road end construction. This could be up to 3 years away which gives the license holder a long period of time to prepare. Council officers have met with the license holder and will work closely with them in the coming years |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | Await further instruction from WCC   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>3</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP   |
| Section Number:              | DC23 c ii)   |
| Section Name:                | CTMP   |
| Page Number:                 | 49   |
| Comment:                     | Only 8 parking spaces are allowed on the field with perhaps more allowed if space permits.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please aim for more than 8 parking spaces and advise residents as soon as possible who will be eligible for the spaces. People are concerned that they won't be able to park on the park if their Resident's Parking is removed from the street.   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt, Victor Anderlini and 39 residents of upper Rolleston Street  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB will investigate potential for creating more parking spaces, however there are competing consent condition requirements for an adequately sized sediment pond and restrictions on stockpile locations that will limit the ability to provide more than 8 parking spaces   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Investigate potential for more than 8 parking spaces  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP  |
| Section Number:              | DC24(a)   |
| Section Name:                | Construction Traffic Management Plan  |
| Page Number:                 | 50  |
| Comment:                     | Preconstruction survey of Rolleston Street to be carried out.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Preconstruction survey of Rolleston Street to be carried out and made available to CRG.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction are happy to provide this information  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction to provide the pre-construction survey findings of Rolleston Street to the CRG.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>5</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP  |
| Section Number:              | DC24(f)   |
| Section Name:                | Construction Traffic Management Plan  |
| Page Number:                 | 51  |
| Comment:                     | Any identified remedial works, including repaving, shall be completed within 6 months of the completion of construction   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | 6 months seems a long time to put up with damage to the road surface. Could this time be shortened to 2 months  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB Construction will work within the constraints identified with the conditions of the consents. However, HEB is motivated to complete all works as early as is reasonably possible. Please note that sometimes weather seasons have an impact on paving repairs – winter is typically a bad time to attempt to achieve a lasting and good quality pavement repair |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The comment relates to the nature of the conditions rather than how HEB Construction intends to manage compliance with the condition.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP  |
| Section Number:              | LC38 (e)  |
| Section Name:                | Community and Stakeholder Engagement  |
| Page Number:                 | 77  |
| Comment:                     | Circulation of material to CRG is only 3 working days prior to CRG meeting  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | 7 working days if possible please   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction are happy to provide this information 7 days prior to the CRG Meetings wherever practicable.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction to provide information 7 days prior to the CRG meetings wherever practicable.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>7</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP   |
| Section Number:              | LC38 (f)   |
| Section Name:                | Community and Stakeholder Engagement   |
| Page Number:                 | 77   |
| Comment:                     | Response to CRG feedback is 20 working days. This seems a long response time. Particularly if the action is urgent.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | 10 working days and if more time is needed this is advised to CRG and a reason given   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB Construction will work within the constraints identified with the conditions of the consents.  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The comment relates to the nature of the conditions rather than how HEB Construction intends to manage compliance with the condition. HEB also wants to avoid providing premature responses prior to receiving consent mandated feedback from other parties that may influence these responses |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>8</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP   |
| Section Number:              | LC 47  |
| Section Name:                | Note re location and frequency of meetings (4 <sup>th</sup> to last line)  |
| Page Number:                 | 84   |
| Comment:                     | Wont is not a word that makes sense here   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Want is better   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>9</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP   |
| Section Number:              | LC 61 (a)  |
| Section Name:                | Licence Area Park Entrances and Edge Design  |
| Page Number:                 | 91   |
| Comment:                     | It is proposed that improved sports field parking and vehicle manoeuvring space while not impacting sports field and side line activity, function and maintenance be undertaken.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | No changes to present parking arrangements apart from widening present turning bay and yellow cross hatching it. See further comments in LEMP. Nothing should be done without public consultation and traffic and parking surveys post construction.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt, Victor Anderlini and 39 residents of upper Rolleston Street   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent   |
| WCC's Comment:               | The consenting of the reservoir includes a condition that  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>requires the applicant to develop detailed design for the Rolleston Street Road end. Development of this must result in the best outcome for this area in relation to the quality of the park entrance and potential for improved parking and access. This is what Council would always consider as part of any significant development on or at the edge of a park. The opportunity to make change comes very rarely, so when it does the Council must ensure the very best long-term outcome for the park and park users. To this end, Council officers have reviewed draft plans and determined that the plan as currently proposed will result in the best outcome. While officers have read the submissions from the community and garage owner, the long-term quality and function of the road end should not be compromised by a private parking license arrangement. Encroachment licenses are personal to a property owner and all contain clauses that provide for the license to end. The license is not a permanent right. The significant redevelopment of the road end is a situation where the appropriateness of a private garage and vehicle parking arrangement could and should be considered. Council policy also requires officers to seek removal of encroachments off the Wellington Town Belt. The garage is partially on Town Belt. New encroachments are not permitted on or even adjacent to Wellington Town Belt for the same reason that the current one will be removed – because they can result in private use buildings impacting on the quality and function of the public open space and park entrance. The garage can remain at the site until the point in the project when the area is needed to complete the road end construction. This could be up to 3 years away which gives the license holder a long period of time to prepare. Council officers have met with the license holder and will work closely with them in the coming years</p> |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Await further instruction from WCC  |
| Comment #                    | 10  |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP  |
| Section Number:              | Draft LEMP and PFMP feedback  |
| Section Name:                | LC 63   |
| Page Number:                 | 93  |
| Comment:                     | Manager will be informed of any CRG feedback received on any draft plan, and how this has been considered in the draft.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Perhaps the Manager could be given the opportunity to meet with affected CRG members and residents regarding changes to the parking at the top of Rolleston Street. We would also appreciate a copy of the feedback that will be presented to the Manager.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt, Victor Anderlini and 39 residents of Upper Rolleston Street  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent  |
| WCC's Comment:               | The consenting of the reservoir includes a condition that requires the applicant to develop detailed design for the Rolleston Street Road end. Development of this must result in   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>the best outcome for this area in relation to the quality of the park entrance and potential for improved parking and access. This is what Council would always consider as part of any significant development on or at the edge of a park. The opportunity to make change comes very rarely, so when it does the Council must ensure the very best long-term outcome for the park and park users. To this end, Council officers have reviewed draft plans and determined that the plan as currently proposed will result in the best outcome. While officers have read the submissions from the community and garage owner, the long-term quality and function of the road end should not be compromised by a private parking license arrangement. Encroachment licenses are personal to a property owner and all contain clauses that provide for the license to end. The license is not a permanent right. The significant redevelopment of the road end is a situation where the appropriateness of a private garage and vehicle parking arrangement could and should be considered. Council policy also requires officers to seek removal of encroachments off the Wellington Town Belt. The garage is partially on Town Belt. New encroachments are not permitted on or even adjacent to Wellington Town Belt for the same reason that the current one will be removed – because they can result in private use buildings impacting on the quality and function of the public open space and park entrance. The garage can remain at the site until the point in the project when the area is needed to complete the road end construction. This could be up to 3 years away which gives the license holder a long period of time to prepare. Council officers have met with the license holder and will work closely with them in the coming years</p> |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Await further instruction from WCC  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>11</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan  |
| Section Number:              | 3   |
| Section Name:                | Roles   |
| Page Number:                 | 15  |
| Comment:                     | It's useless trying to phone the WCC to contact a specific Officer.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Perhaps email addresses, cell phone numbers and the contacts' names could be included.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will include additional contact information for WCC.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>12</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CTMP  |
| Section Number:              | 6.2   |
| Section Name:                | Rolleston St to Hargreaves St diversion   |
| Page Number:                 | 26  |
| Comment:                     | No mention of lights  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Some members of the CRG suggested security lights be installed along the temporary path but they should be directed   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | away from houses.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction will need to confirm whether, or not, such lighting is permitted under the District Plan and impact on adjacent houses                       |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will investigate.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>13</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CTMP  |
| Section Number:              | 7.2   |
| Section Name:                | Neighbour notification  |
| Page Number:                 | 30  |
| Comment:                     | Letter drop   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Perhaps in addition to a letter drop to residents, a sign on the fence could show a link to the project so that people can access information electronically. |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction will seek to include additional contact information.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will seek alternative methods of providing information.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>14</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CTMP  |
| Section Number:              | 7.4.1 and 2   |
| Section Name:                | Pre-construction survey and road condition report   |
| Page Number:                 | 31  |
| Comment:                     | Can these be made available to Community Reference Group please   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Make available online   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction are happy to provide this information  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction to provide the pre-construction survey findings of Rolleston Street to the CRG.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>15</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CTMP  |
| Section Number:              | 8.4   |
| Section Name:                | Non-compliance  |
| Page Number:                 | 33  |
| Comment:                     | Reports made available on request   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Could reports please be emailed to CRG monthly and made available online  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will make material available online provided it is not considered commercially sensitive   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>16</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plant   |
| Section Number:              | IV  |
| Section Name:                | Main Scope of Work for Landscaping  |
| Page Number:                 | 12  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Comment:                     | Tress   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Should be Trees   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>17</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CNVMP   |
| Section Number:              |   |
| Section Name:                | Third paragraph   |
| Page Number:                 | 14  |
| Comment:                     | Heavy vehicle movements to and from the site associated with the export of excess fill material will be restricted to 9am to 3pm Monday to Friday. Bulk earthworks will be restricted to the earthworks season from 1 September to 31 May, unless otherwise agreed with WCC and GWRC. |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Is 3pm Monday to Friday correct?  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made. Should read 6:00pm.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>18</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CNVMP   |
| Section Number:              | B VII, VIII, IX and X   |
| Section Name:                | Equipment Machinery and Operations  |
| Page Number:                 | 22  |
| Comment:                     | Speed limit on site, engine brakes and beep beep beep reversing   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | I thought speed limit on site was to be 30km. Please no engine brakes on Rolleston Street, And thank you for limiting use of tonal backing and using alternatives. This is one of the most irritating things about heavy vehicles.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction will need to confirm whether, or not, such restrictions on engine braking is permitted under the District Plan.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will investigate.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>19</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CNVMP   |
| Section Number:              | 8.1   |
| Section Name:                | Noise mitigation  |
| Page Number:                 | 23  |
| Comment:                     | Due to the proximity to the public and residences, mitigating measures will may be required for routine activities that will take place during normal operating hours such as the rock breaking example identified earlier.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Will (not may) please.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Rock breaking as an activity is not anticipated but if it is an   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | unforeseen necessity then mitigation will be considered.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will investigate if the activity is planned.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>20</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CNVMP   |
| Section Number:              | 11.1  |
| Section Name:                | Noise Monitoring  |
| Page Number:                 | 33  |
| Comment:                     | Records provided to WCC weekly  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Can the records please be provided to the CRG and posted online weekly. That way, residents will know what the noise level has been and what to expect in the future. At least until we all get used to the increased level of noise after living in such a very quiet neighbourhood. |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction will not be conducting noise monitoring weekly for the entire length of the Project. However, where monitoring is undertaken the results can be shared.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will investigate a method for sharing the information from noise monitoring online.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>21</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CNVMP   |
| Section Number:              | Appendix 2  |
| Section Name:                | Construction Programme  |
| Page Number:                 | 37  |
| Comment:                     | This is really difficult to read.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Can we have a more legible programme please. This will at least let us know what we're in for and when.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will provide a higher resolution programme..   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>22</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Erosion and Sediment Control Plan   |
| Section Number:              |   |
| Section Name:                |   |
| Page Number:                 |   |
| Comment:                     | This was all explained so well and in such great detail by Simon at our last CRG Meeting that I don't have any comments or amendment suggestions for this plan.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         |   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Noted   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Positive feedback greatly appreciated.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Nil.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>23</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Landscape and Ecology Management Plan   |
| Section Number:              | LC 59 (b) Third Line  |
| Section Name:                | Reservoir Service Tunnel Accessway Track  |
| Page Number:                 | 23  |
| Comment:                     | Accessed by "wee"   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | What is "wee"? Can someone please explain.  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | "Wee" should read "WCC"   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | 24  |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP  |
| Section Number:              | LC 61 (a)   |
| Section Name:                | Rolleston Street Park Entrance Design   |
| Page Number:                 | 25  |
| Comment:                     | This refers to: "provides for access to the pipe tunnel entrance, walking access to the track network and improved sports field parking and vehicle manoeuvring space while not impacting sports field and side-line activity, function and maintenance." It makes no reference to not impacting on the local residents of upper Rolleston Streets' use and enjoyment of the street.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | No changes should be made to the layout of the top of Rolleston Street without prior consultation with the neighbouring residents and comprehensive traffic and parking surveys carried out post reservoir construction.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt, Victor Anderlini and 39 residents of upper Rolleston Street  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent  |
| WCC's Comment:               | The consenting of the reservoir includes a condition that requires the applicant to develop detailed design for the Rolleston Street Road end. Development of this must result in the best outcome for this area in relation to the quality of the park entrance and potential for improved parking and access. This is what Council would always consider as part of any significant development on or at the edge of a park. The opportunity to make change comes very rarely, so when it does the Council must ensure the very best long-term outcome for the park and park users. To this end, Council officers have reviewed draft plans and determined that the plan as currently proposed will result in the best outcome. While officers have read the submissions from the community and garage owner, the long-term quality and function of the road end should not be compromised by a private parking license arrangement. Encroachment licenses are personal to a property owner and all contain clauses that provide for the license to end. The license is not a permanent right. The significant redevelopment of the road end is a situation where the appropriateness of a private garage and vehicle parking arrangement could and should be considered. Council policy also requires officers to seek removal of encroachments off the Wellington Town Belt. The garage is partially on Town Belt. New encroachments are not permitted on or even adjacent to Wellington Town Belt for the same reason that the current one will be removed – because they can result in private use buildings impacting on the quality and function of the public open space and park entrance. The garage can remain at the site until the point in the project when the area is needed to complete the road end construction. This could |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | be up to 3 years away which gives the license holder a long period of time to prepare. Council officers have met with the license holder and will work closely with them in the coming years  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Await further instruction from WCC  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>25</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP  |
| Section Number:              | LC 63   |
| Section Name:                | Draft LEMP and PFMP Feedback  |
| Page Number:                 | 26  |
| Comment:                     | A draft LEMP and PFMP, including any proposed variation to an approved LEMP or PFMP, must be submitted to the WCC Manager Open Space and Recreation Planning for comment and feedback at least 20 working days prior to the final management plan/s being lodged with the CMO for certification     |
| Suggested Amendment:         | The final draft LEMP and PFMP and proposed variations should also be submitted to the CRG for comment and feedback at least 20 working days prior to the final management plans being lodged with the CMO for certification.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt and Victor Anderlini  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB will comply with the conditions of consent.   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB cannot comment on why the conditions were written this way.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>26</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP  |
| Section Number:              | LC 63   |
| Section Name:                | Note  |
| Page Number:                 | 26  |
| Comment:                     | It is expected that the Manager will be informed of any CRG feedback received on any draft plan, and how this has been considered in the draft. This should include details of where feedback has or has not been addressed or incorporated in the draft document, and the reasons for this action. |
| Suggested Amendment:         | A summary of the CRG feedback received on any draft plan and how this has been considered in the draft should also be submitted to the CRG including details of where the feedback has or has not been addressed or incorporated in the draft document and the reasons for this action.             |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt and Victor Anderlini  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB is providing a detailed response in this very document which will be made available to the CRG – refer to plan/section/page details provided above by feedback respondents to find the location of the changes  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>27</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP  |
| Section Number:              | 7.3.2   |
| Section Name:                | Table 17. Clearing Schedule   |
| Page Number:                 | 50  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Comment:                     | Herbicide   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | What kind of herbicide? Last year WCC wiped out my bees by randomly spraying with herbicide. Is the herbicide that you propose to use not toxic to insect life?   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction does not wish to harm insect life  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will consult with WCC regarding the herbicide they have used and seek an environmentally safer product.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>28</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP  |
| Section Number:              |   |
| Section Name:                | Manuka Trees  |
| Page Number:                 | 51  |
| Comment:                     | Manuka trees being uplifted and removed from neighbourhood.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Why can't the manuka trees be replanted in a neighbouring area. Several manuka trees were planted adjacent to the steps leading from Rolleston Street to Bell Road upon special request. They are thriving. Why can't the removed manuka trees be replanted somewhere around that area? Manuka are bee friendly and as many bee friendly trees as possible should be retained near to the reservoir site.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Judy Hutt   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB must comply with agreements between other parties   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Agreement has been reached between Wellington Water and Taranaki Whanui ki te Upoko o te Ika for them to take possession of the manuka trees  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>29</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP  |
| Section Number:              | 8.7   |
| Section Name:                | Park Edges and Entry Design   |
| Page Number:                 | 97  |
| Comment:                     | The design of this layout appears to cater solely for parking and maneuvering of vehicles for sports field users. No consideration appears to have been given to what local residents would prefer. The recommended layout appears to be encouraging more vehicles to park in the street – mostly for spectators at sporting events that take place only on weekends and on relatively few weekends a year. It should also be noted that both the upper and lower parks are too small for serious rugby games so the use of the fields are limited by this. The residents of Rolleston Street live there 365 days of the year, yet no consultation, parking or traffic surveys appear to have been conducted. It would be helpful if the current turning bay was extended slightly, yellow hatched and perhaps some more parallel parking introduced next to the turning bay. At present large trucks such as the rubbish and recycling trucks have no problem in using the current turning bay. Of course, enforcement of illegally parked vehicles should be put in place. It is also the WCC stated policy that "From time to time parking issues arise that require |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>a tailored approach to an area of the city. The area surrounding the airport – where there is a significant overflow of airport parking – is a recent example of that. In the future, any significant change to the transport infrastructure in a particular area will effect the provision of parking and also require a “whole of transport system” approach.” All of us who live at the top of Rolleston Street are of the opinion that Rolleston Street is a prime example of where this provision should be taken into account. Residents were particularly incensed about the proposed removal of the garage at the top of the street which they perceived to be an important community asset.</p>   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | <p>This recommended plan be removed from the LEMP until the project is completed. Consultation and surveys should be conducted one year after the completion of the reservoir. That would be ample time to ascertain how many users of the sports field need to be catered for. In the meantime, when the park is hired for a game it should be emphasized that it would be preferable to share vehicles when travelling to a game or walk or cycle to a game. This would fit in with WCC’s parking policy objectives to “support shift in type of transport used – facilitate a shift to using active (e.g. walking and cycling) and public transport through parking management and pricing to move more people driving fewer vehicles” It would also fit in with their stated policy: “changes to how parking is provided and managed need to be made incrementally over time, in consultation with effected communities”</p>  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | <p>Judy Hutt, Victor Anderlini, 3 people from Brooklyn who use the park and walking tracks every day and 39 very concerned people who live at the top end of Rolleston Street</p>   |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | <p>Silent</p>   |
| WCC’s Comment:               | <p>The consenting of the reservoir includes a condition that requires the applicant to develop detailed design for the Rolleston Street Road end. Development of this must result in the best outcome for this area in relation to the quality of the park entrance and potential for improved parking and access. This is what Council would always consider as part of any significant development on or at the edge of a park. The opportunity to make change comes very rarely, so when it does the Council must ensure the very best long-term outcome for the park and park users. To this end, Council officers have reviewed draft plans and determined that the plan as currently proposed will result in the best outcome. While officers have read the submissions from the community and garage owner, the long-term quality and function of the road end should not be compromised by a private parking license arrangement. Encroachment licenses are personal to a property owner and all contain clauses that provide for the license to end. The license is not a permanent right. The significant redevelopment of the road end is a situation where the appropriateness of a private garage and vehicle parking arrangement could and should be considered. Council policy also requires officers to seek removal of encroachments off the Wellington Town Belt. The garage is partially on Town</p> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | Belt. New encroachments are not permitted on or even adjacent to Wellington Town Belt for the same reason that the current one will be removed – because they can result in private use buildings impacting on the quality and function of the public open space and park entrance. The garage can remain at the site until the point in the project when the area is needed to complete the road end construction. This could be up to 3 years away which gives the license holder a long period of time to prepare. Council officers have met with the license holder and will work closely with them in the coming years  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Await further instruction from WCC   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>1</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CTMP – Liaison with Kāinga Ora for truck movements   |
| Section Number:              | 7.5  |
| Section Name:                | Kāinga Ora Rolleston Street apartments   |
| Page Number:                 | 32   |
| Comment:                     | I understand that the Omāroro project team will be meeting with Kāinga Ora regularly. That is good news. The community has been advised by the Omāroro (HEB) project team that the Kāinga Ora (Hawkins) construction vehicles will use Hargreaves Street, not Rolleston Street. In earlier community consultation with the Kāinga Ora team, the community was told that Kāinga Ora’s project will use Rolleston Street for their heavy vehicles, and that Hargreaves Street is too steep. During the Omāroro excavation phase, when heavy vehicle movements on Rolleston Street are expected every 5 minutes, it is not feasible for Kāinga Ora’s vehicles to also be using Rolleston Street, together with residents’ vehicles. |
| Suggested Amendment:         | WCC traffic team is the adjudicating body. Please ensure that a workable solution is put in place. Thanks.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber  |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | Supportive   |
| HEB Construction’s Comment:  | Until HEB has a detailed understanding of the timing and requirements of Kāinga Ora (Hawkins) traffic movements, we cannot comment further on what the solution may be   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Consult with Hawkins and WCC traffic team  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>2</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP – Town Belt Garage at the top of Rolleston Street   |
| Section Number:              | 2.1  |
| Section Name:                | Site Location  |
| Page Number:                 | 9  |
| Comment:                     | During the Notice of Requirement hearings, the garage at the top of Rolleston Street, used by J. Hutt and V. Anderlini was shown as unaffected, i.e. on the documentation it showed no change to the land use. This garage has been used for many years by the family as part of an encroachment licence, including to store items for neighbours. WCC Parks, Sport and Recreation (PSR) has seen an opportunity to provide 3 additional parks for the rugby season by terminating the encroachment licence for the garage, which is primarily on road reserve, but does encroach the Town Belt by a small amount. The Town Belt management  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>philosophy is to terminate encroachment licences wherever possible, often when a property changes hands.</p> <p>The principle of reducing encroachments is understandable. But, in this instance, it needs to be recognised that this family is the closest household to the reservoir site, they will have to endure 3 years of noise, trucks being filled, vehicles entering and leaving the site, the sounds of site workers, all manner of banging, and probably a lot of dust. This is the most impacted family in Rolleston Street, as they live in the last house in the street. This is one of many Town Belt encroachment licences in Wellington. I understand the principle of reducing the number of encroachments, but when I think of the major amount of inconvenience and disruption that people at the top of Rolleston Street will face for 3 years, my view is that this is not the time to make that change.</p>  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please retain the garage, as a small recognition of the high level of inconvenience that will be caused to this family during the 3 years of construction.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent  |
| WCC's Comment:               | <p>The consenting of the reservoir includes a condition that requires the applicant to develop detailed design for the Rolleston Street Road end. Development of this must result in the best outcome for this area in relation to the quality of the park entrance and potential for improved parking and access. This is what Council would always consider as part of any significant development on or at the edge of a park. The opportunity to make change comes very rarely, so when it does the Council must ensure the very best long-term outcome for the park and park users. To this end, Council officers have reviewed draft plans and determined that the plan as currently proposed will result in the best outcome. While officers have read the submissions from the community and garage owner, the long-term quality and function of the road end should not be compromised by a private parking license arrangement. Encroachment licenses are personal to a property owner and all contain clauses that provide for the license to end. The license is not a permanent right. The significant redevelopment of the road end is a situation where the appropriateness of a private garage and vehicle parking arrangement could and should be considered. Council policy also requires officers to seek removal of encroachments off the Wellington Town Belt. The garage is partially on Town Belt. New encroachments are not permitted on or even adjacent to Wellington Town Belt for the same reason that the current one will be removed – because they can result in private use buildings impacting on the quality and function of the public open space and park entrance. The garage can remain at the site until the point in the project when the area is needed to complete the road end construction. This could be up to 3 years away which gives the license holder a long period of time to prepare. Council officers have met with the license holder and will work closely with them in the coming years</p> |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Await further instruction from WCC  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>3</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP – Predator Free trapping   |
| Section Number:              | 7.8.3   |
| Section Name:                | Animal Pest Contractors   |
| Page Number:                 | n/a   |
| Comment:                     | The Predator Free Mt Cook Newtown Berhampore group has been setting traps in the Town Belt around Prince of Wales Park.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please ensure that the local Predator Free group is in the loop. Thanks.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction agrees with the concept advised.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will consult with CRG about the practical possibility of achieving this goal.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | CEMP –Education Opportunities for Schools   |
| Section Number:              | DC.7 c) iii)  |
| Section Name:                | Community Liaison   |
| Page Number:                 | 38  |
| Comment:                     | From a community perspective, the school education component of the Pukeahu National War Memorial was of great benefit, and very successful.<br>For Omāroro, it will be great to have some public open times, an idea floated at the workshops.<br>I would like to see a high level plan for how schools can benefit from learning opportunities during the Omāroro project. In my role as Coordinator for Mt Cook Connect, I would be happy to liaise with schools or help in any useful way to bring the education component to fruition.<br>The schools in the area are Brooklyn, St Bernard's, Ridgeway, St Mark's, Mt Cook School, Wellington High School, Wellington College, and Wellington East Girls' College. |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please develop a high level plan for how schools can benefit from learning opportunities during the Omāroro project.<br>Thanks.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction agrees with the concept advised.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will consult with CRG about the practical possibility of achieving this goal.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>5</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | CTMP – Car Parking Changes in Rolleston Street (Residents & Massey University)  |
| Section Number:              | Appendix B  |
| Section Name:                | Omāmororo Reservoir SSTMP Sketch 1 - Rolleston Street Temporary Speed Limit   |
| Page Number:                 | 47  |
| Comment:                     | Please knock on all the doors at the top of Rolleston Street to make sure everyone is up to speed with the changes to car parking, related to the broken yellow lines planned for the   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | bend and up to the top of Rolleston St.<br>During the Pipeworks phase, some residents who relied on coupon parking were furnished with Residents' Parking permits for the duration of the project.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please make contact with Massey University on Wallace Street to advise that there will be no parking in Rolleston Street.<br>Please ensure that the students are advised via social media. A few posters could be a good idea.<br>Please doorknock Rolleston Street residents. Many thanks.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil.  |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | HEB Construction will consult with CRG about the best practical method(s) of achieving this level of communication.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP – Papawai Stream Fish  |
| Section Number:              | 7.4   |
| Section Name:                | Stream Discharges   |
| Page Number:                 | 52  |
| Comment:                     | At the community workshop we heard about the bund that will be created on the steep slope from the reservoir site, leading to the western side of the Lower Prince of Wales Park and the Papawai Stream. This bund will stop fill dropping down the slope into the stream. If the bund fails, and the native fish are compromised, how will the team know that this is happening? |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please can the stream be tested weekly to make sure it has not been impacted?   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB Construction can only work within the constraints identified with the conditions of the consents.   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction is confident that a breach of this nature will not take place and will be monitoring to make certain.<br><br>The comment relates to the nature of the conditions rather than how HEB Construction intends to manage compliance with the condition.   |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | ESMP – Rainfall Micro-climate   |
| Section Number:              | 35  |
| Section Name:                | Rainfall and flocculation monitoring of SRP   |
| Page Number:                 | 20  |
| Comment:                     | In previous extreme rainfall events, the community has noticed that the rainfall around Prince of Wales Park has been much heavier than in the wider Wellington area. Has any account been taken of the micro-climate of the site? (N.B. The really intense rains seem to fall every 1-3 years.)  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Is it possible to record rainfall at the site, for comparison with the Mansfield Street, Newtown, Monitoring Site? That way, if the rains are a lot more intense at the Omāroro site, the practices could be adjusted based on the micro-climate, if necessary?   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB Construction can only work within the constraints identified with the conditions of the consents. The monitoring site is fixed.   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The comment relates to the nature of the conditions rather than how HEB Construction intends to manage compliance with the condition.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>8</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP – Memorial Bench Seat  |
| Section Number:              | 8.10.2  |
| Section Name:                | Existing Bench Seat and Plaque  |
| Page Number:                 | 111   |
| Comment:                     | A suggestion was made at the community workshop to relocate the bench seat to the Town Belt area above the work site. Great idea!   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Endorsing this suggestion.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Noted   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Positive feedback greatly appreciated.  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Move seat uphill from construction site boundary for duration of construction   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>9</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | CNVMP   |
| Section Number:              | 5   |
| Section Name:                | Sensitive Receivers   |
| Page Number:                 | 16  |
| Comment:                     | There will be residents in the area who are wholly unaware of the reservoir work starting up. Noise and dust are likely to be their main concern, together with car parking.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | When site preparation begins, and Russell starts to make contact with the sensitive receivers, it would be great if the team was able to offer a short presentation to allay fears about noise travelling, dust mitigation, and the alternative parking arrangements. |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction agrees with the concept advised.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will consult with CRG about the practical possibility of achieving this goal.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>10</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | LEMP – Fish Habitat   |
| Section Number:              | 21(e)   |
| Section Name:                | Discharge Activities  |
| Page Number:                 | 12  |
| Comment:                     | A pH range has been defined for the acidity of the sediment ponds before water is discharged into the stormwater system.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please advise what pH range banded kōkopu and kōura can tolerate? Thanks.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: |   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB will discharge water from ponds within the pH range indicated   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB notes that the pH range indicated for discharge is  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | standard industry practice, that a 50m reasonable mixing zone will further alter the pH level to more closely reflect the ambient pH level of the stream. The discharge activity is will be a series of isolated events that will not permanently alter the pH level of the stream  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Discharge pond water within the pH range stipulated in management Plans   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>11</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | CTMP – Pedestrian Access to Papawai Restoration Area  |
| Section Number:              | 1.3   |
| Section Name:                | Location  |
| Page Number:                 | 2   |
| Comment:                     | Papawai Restoration Area is the area just below the Lower Prince of Wales Park and Pavilion. This is the area being restored by the community at monthly working bees, and used for our annual Spring Fling community picnic. Please confirm that this area will be accessible to the community throughout the project. Thanks. |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Confirmation sought.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | C. Comber   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction agrees with the concept advised.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will consult with CRG about the practical possibility of achieving this goal.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>1</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 3   |
| Section Name:                | Roles and responsibilities  |
| Page Number:                 | 15  |
| Comment:                     | WCC contact details only have team names and WCC's main phone number. It can be very difficult, at times, trying to get to the right person when contacting the Council.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please add the people's names of those responsible for the Road Protection Team, MOSRP, and CMO, along with their extension number, mobile number, and email address.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction will include additional contact information for WCC.   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>2</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 6.2   |
| Section Name:                | Rolleston Street to Hargreaves Street temporary diversion   |
| Page Number:                 | 26  |
| Comment:                     | Lighting not mentioned, which is a health and safety matter.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please add a bullet point to explain lighting (e.g. installed lighting, ambient lighting, any trees pruned, etc)  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction will need to confirm whether, or not, such lighting is permitted under the District Plan and the impact of lighting on adjacent houses |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | HEB Construction will investigate.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>3</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 7.2   |
| Section Name:                | Neighbour notification – letter drop  |
| Page Number:                 | 30  |
| Comment:                     | Electronic copies of letters are useful, and a wider audience might be interested in what is happening around the neighbourhood.                        |
| Suggested Amendment:         | In addition to letter drops, an electronic copy of letters is made available to CRG members on the same day or before the letter drop.                  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction are happy to provide this information  |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | HEB Construction to provide the electronic copies to the CRG for distribution.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 7.4.1 and 7.4.2   |
| Section Name:                | Preconstruction survey, and Road condition inspections  |
| Page Number:                 | 31  |
| Comment:                     | Inspection reports are made to Council. It would be nice if they are available to the community also.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Also email a copy of inspection reports to the CRG, and make available online.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB Construction are happy to provide this information  |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | HEB Construction to provide the pre-construction survey findings of Rolleston Street to the CRG.  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>5</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 7.5   |
| Section Name:                | Kāinga Ora Rolleston Street apartments  |
| Page Number:                 | 32  |
| Comment:                     | It states the site has dual access to Rolleston St and Hargreaves St. I understood site access is via Rolleston St only. The kerbing on Hargreaves has recently been replaced, and there is no driveway shaped into the kerbing.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please check and confirm the stated access.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | We are engaging with the Kainga Ora Rolleston St Apartments project and have established a regular series of meetings with their contractor, Hawkins. We understand their intent is to make use of Rolleston St for site access however it is not yet clear if this will be feasible in tandem with anticipated reservoir construction traffic movements. Feasibility will be determined through the WCC traffic management and corridor access permit processes. Should Kainga Ora require access through Hargreaves St, they may in the future construct a drop-kerb                    |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Nil.  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 7.5   |
| Section Name:                | Health and Safety   |
| Page Number:                 | 32  |
| Comment:                     | Bullet point 4 states<br>"Requirements to abide by local and temporary speed restrictions".<br>When speed restrictions were put in place for Wright St, during the closure of Wallace St (for reservoir pipe works), a vast majority of the traffic ignored the 30kmh speed limit. There was no means implemented to enforce the temporary limit, making the temporary limit non-purposeful.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Include a statement identifying the means for enforcing the requirement to abide by the speed restrictions.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Silent  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB has a responsibility to implement traffic management plans to safely and effectively execute to works. Enforcement of speed restrictions upon the general public falls outside of HEB's responsibility. However, HEB will brief all Construction personnel on the speed restrictions and will monitor adherence to speed restrictions by construction personnel. HEB encourages the CRG to report the details of any non-compliance to HEB that can be passed on to enforcement authorities (general public speeding) or addressed directly with construction personnel if applicable |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 7.5   |
| Section Name:                | Health and Safety   |
| Page Number:                 | 32  |
| Comment:                     | Does not mention about trucks using engine/exhaust brakes. This noise is highly irritating.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Include a bullet point that trucks are not to use engine brakes on suburban streets, especially Rolleston St.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | HEB will actively strive to prevent engine brakes being utilized during construction of the reservoir. However, if safety requirements determine that engine brakes must be used in specific situations then engine braking may be required. Safety comes first on all HEB projects |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | HEB Construction seek to prevent engine brakes being used subject to safety considerations  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>8</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 8.4   |
| Section Name:                | Non-compliance with the CTMP  |
| Page Number:                 | 33  |
| Comment:                     | It states the register, and any reports, shall be made available to WCC and CRG upon request.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please automatically email reports to CRG on a regular basis (e.g. monthly), rather than needing to be requested. Please also make reports available online.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | HEB Construction are happy to provide this information provided it is not commercially sensitive  |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>9</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 5.1.1   |
| Section Name:                | Construction vehicle entrance   |
| Page Number:                 | 20  |
| Comment:                     | The CTMP does not mention the Dorking Road access to the site.<br>The Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (top of page 11, points iii and iv) mentions the Dorking Road access and retaining wall at the Dorking Road access.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Perhaps include a reference to the Dorking Road access point, and if/how it will be used both during and after the construction project, along with any associated traffic management.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | Text change suggested will be made.   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>10</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)  |
| Section Number:              | General comment   |
| Section Name:                |   |
| Page Number:                 |   |
| Comment:                     | Although reference is made to ISO standards for noise, the lay person may find these difficult to follow. They may also think that truck noise is measured at the truck, rather than a distance from the truck. Given sensitivity people may have to new and increased noise levels (speaking from experience with Wright St being the main road for six months), having an explanation around how measurements are made, and where, might be useful. It may also be useful to make someone available, with a noise measurement device, at the request of residents to show them what the noise level is at their property. |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Perhaps document, for the lay person, that the noise level for trucks is measured at a distant location (house façade?) rather than at the truck.<br>A comment may fit somewhere around section 8.1 (page 21) "Construction Traffic – Rolleston Street"   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | Text change suggested will be made.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>11</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)  |
| Section Number:              | 3.2   |
| Section Name:                | Vibration   |
| Page Number:                 | 9   |
| Comment:                     | Paragraph<br>"Short-term vibration' applies to transient or impulsive vibration sources such as blasting or drop-hammer piling."<br>My understanding is that these two activities will not be undertaken on the Omāroro site.   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Perhaps replace blasting and drop-hammer piling with examples of activities that will be undertaken on the reservoir site.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | Text change suggested will be made.   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>12</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 4.2  |
| Section Name:                | Hours of Operation   |
| Page Number:                 | 14   |
| Comment:                     | Paragraph<br>“Heavy vehicle movements... restricted to 9am to 3pm Monday to Friday.”   |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please confirm or correct the 3pm time.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb  |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | Supportive   |
| HEB Construction’s Comment:  | Nil  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made. Should read “6:00pm”   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>13</b>  |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)   |
| Section Number:              | 8.1  |
| Section Name:                | Noise Mitigation – Construction Traffic – Rolleston Street   |
| Page Number:                 | 21   |
| Comment:                     | Paragraph (word of interest underlined)<br>“Noise from construction traffic is predicted to be able to comply with the construction noise levels at <u>most</u> properties on Rolleston Street.” |
| Suggested Amendment:         | The term “most” needs to be clarified. Properties outside “most” should be identified and mitigation strategies communicated.  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb  |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | Supportive   |
| HEB Construction’s Comment:  | Nil  |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made.  |

| Comment #                    | 14  |
|------------------------------|---|
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)  |
| Section Number:              | 8.1   |
| Section Name:                | Noise Mitigation – Construction Traffic – Rolleston Street  |
| Page Number:                 | 22  |
| Comment:                     | <p>Point (viii) states<br/> “No exhaust brakes or engine retarders are to be used on the site.”</p> <p>There is no statement about use of engine brakes on Rolleston St. This is a noise that can easily become highly irritating.</p> <p>In addition, Point (iii) on page 23 states “Do not use engine exhaust brakes”, but does not specifically state Rolleston Street, or any other residential street.</p> <p>The document “Prince Of Wales / Omāroro Reservoir Construction Noise Assessment Rp 001 R052016849   12 September 2017, by Marshall Day Acoustics (<a href="https://www.wellingtonwater.co.nz/assets/Uploads/Appendix-H-Construction-Noise-Assessment.pdf">https://www.wellingtonwater.co.nz/assets/Uploads/Appendix-H-Construction-Noise-Assessment.pdf</a>), page 15, para 5.2.2 states<br/> “...Use of engine braking will be prohibited. All drivers should be familiar with the CNVMP and operate the vehicles to reduce the noise on Rolleston Street as much as possible.”</p> |
| Suggested Amendment:         | <p>Include statement(s)...<br/> “No exhaust brakes or engine retarders are to be used on Rolleston Street.”</p> <p>This could be further extended to any residential street.</p>  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction’s Comment:  | HEB will actively strive to prevent engine brakes being utilized during construction of the reservoir. However, if safety requirements determine that engine brakes must be used in specific situations then engine braking may be required. Safety comes first on all HEB projects   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | HEB Construction seek to prevent engine brakes being used subject to safety considerations  |

| Comment #                    |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Management Plan:             | 15<br>Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)  |
| Section Number:              | 8.1   |
| Section Name:                | Noise mitigation – Mitigation when noise limits are predicted to be exceeded.   |
| Page Number:                 | 23  |
| Comment:                     | <p>Paragraph starting<br/> “Due to the proximity to the public and residences, mitigating measures <del>will</del> may be required for routine activities that will take place during normal operating hours such as the rock breaking example identified earlier.”</p> <p>The portion “<del>will</del> may” requires correction. Routine activities should be mitigated. The term “may” is indecisive and unclear.</p> |
| Suggested Amendment:         | <p>Return the paragraph to original wording with the use of “will”.</p> <p>“Due to the proximity to the public and residences, mitigating measures will be required for routine activities...”</p>  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction’s Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Construction’s Action:   | Text change suggested will be made.   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>16</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)  |
| Section Number:              | 9   |
| Section Name:                | Stakeholder Engagement and Complaints   |
| Page Number:                 | 31  |
| Comment:                     | <p>The first paragraph refers to early stakeholder engagement as a mitigation of noise, and proactive stakeholder engagement as a means to minimise the impact of construction works. The paragraph is (points of interest underlined):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“A key component of HEB Construction’s approach to <u>mitigation of the noise is early stakeholder engagement</u>. This approach recognises that while the predicted noise levels are within performance standards/limits residents will most likely find the character of the construction operation noise different and therefore they will be more aware of the sound. Through <u>early and proactive stakeholder engagement</u> HEB Construction <u>will seek to minimise the impact of construction works</u> on potentially affected parties.”</p> |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Reword this paragraph to something that reflects that stakeholder engagement is to improve stakeholder understanding of noise generated by the construction project, rather than stating that stakeholder engagement mitigates and minimises the impact of noise.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction’s Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made.   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>17</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)  |
| Section Number:              | 11.1  |
| Section Name:                | Noise monitoring  |
| Page Number:                 | 33  |
| Comment:                     | <p>Paragraph ii states<br/>                   “All monitoring data will be recorded and kept as a matter of record. The monitoring records will be updated and provided to the WCC weekly.”</p> <p>Having this information available publicly would be very useful, especially to help community members adjust to the new and increased noise. This information could also be supplied to the Omāroro website and/or the CRG on a regular basis (perhaps monthly).</p> |
| Suggested Amendment:         | <p>Include a new point/paragraph<br/>                   “The monitoring records will be updated, published to the Omāroro website, and provided to the CRG monthly.”</p>  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction’s Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made.   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>18</b>   |
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)  |
| Section Number:              | 12.2  |
| Section Name:                | Reporting and Pre-Construction Requirements   |
| Page Number:                 | 35  |
| Comment:                     | <p>The following paragraph refers to the CEMP<br/>                   “Noise and or vibration complaints will be dealt with in accordance with the methodology specified within Section 10 “Complaints Management” of the CEMP.”</p> <p>However, the CEMP Section 10 (Complaints Management, page 144) only appears to mention how the project will address complaints. There does not appear to be information about how someone is able to make a complaint.</p>       |
| Suggested Amendment:         | <p>Please add information about how a community member can make a complaint – i.e. who should be contacted, including the contact person’s name, title, phone number (and extension), and email address. If there is an online form, then please provide the URL.</p> <p>If the method for making a complaint is already documented, please add a reference to that information location.</p>   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction’s Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction’s Comment:  | Nil   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | Text change suggested will be made.   |

| Comment # 19                 |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Management Plan:             | Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)  |
| Section Number:              | Appendix 2  |
| Section Name:                | Construction Programme  |
| Page Number:                 | 37  |
| Comment:                     | This is so pixelated that it is impossible to read. Having the programme available would be very handy for residents to know likely timing of activities in order to prepare for impacts. |
| Suggested Amendment:         | Please paste a clear copy of the programme. Perhaps make the programme available online (updated regularly), and add a URL to Appendix 2.   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Steve Cromb   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Supportive  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | Nil.  |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | HEB Construction will provide a higher resolution programme..   |

| Comment # 1                  |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Management Plan:             | CTMP  |
| Section Number:              | 6.6.2   |
| Section Name:                | Harrier Club Access   |
| Page Number:                 |   |
| Comment:                     | The arrow points to the solid green line down the access road between Scottish harriers and Salisbury Tce. This is called a walking track, but with the number of vehicles now using that access road, at the same time as pedestrian use is heaviest, it will be unsafe for pedestrians. A dedicated pedestrian accessway is required for this link. |
| Suggested Amendment:         |   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Frank Cook  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB will direct pedestrians to use alternate access points to the Harriers clubrooms  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | There are alternate access points to the clubrooms that would avoid the need to use the Salisbury link and avoid the interface with vehicular traffic   |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | Install signage to direct Harriers to alternate access to their clubrooms   |

| Comment # 2      |  |
|------------------|--|
| Management Plan: |  |
| Section Number:  |  |
| Section Name:    |  |
| Page Number:     |  |
| Comment:         | Strength of pipe crossing at changing sheds. Previous onsite conversations Wellington Water staff have indicated the pipe will not be strong enough to accommodate the heavy traffic proposed. What are the plans to strengthen this pipe, shown below? Any intrusion into the stream would require separate approval from Wellington Regional Council. The commentary around DC 20 refers to stability of this roadway from a geotechnical perspective but it appears there |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | is no reference to the strength of the pipe crossing.<br>In view of the stream protection required it is important the CRG understand whether there is the intention to bridge the pipe crossing, replace the pipe, or whether the existing pipe is now considered to be of adequate strength.  |
| Suggested Amendment:         |   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Frank Cook  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | On initial inspection, HEB Construction considers the pipe strength suitable and does not envisage any issues. A temporary works design will be undertaken for all existing service and utility crossings, including the link road pipe (culvert)   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | If a new pipe is required, then appropriate permissions will be sought.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>3</b>  |
| Management Plan:             |   |
| Section Number:              |   |
| Section Name:                |   |
| Page Number:                 |   |
| Comment:                     | Water from bottom field flowing into stream<br>The Erosion & Sediment Control Plan aims to discharge water from the lower field, after treatment, into the stormwater water system. That system discharges into the stretch of open stream where which Koaro and N Banded Kokopu are living. The snip below from page 2 ESCP APPENDIX 1: Version 3 (10/06/2020), show the discharge into the stormwater.<br>What action is proposed for monitoring the effects this discharge may have on those fish and other fresh water life?<br>The same plan section 12 Stream Works, states "No stream works are planned in relation to the Project, however riparian enhancement through planting is to take place."<br>The above discharge into the stream should be classified as stream works as it is modifying the nature of the water discharged into the stream.<br>The snip over page from the WCC maps shows the stormwater discharge into the open stream. |
| Suggested Amendment:         |   |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Frank Cook  |
| HEB Construction's Position: | HEB confines itself to meeting the conditions and definitions of the consenting authorities   |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The discharge of suitably treated water into a stream does not constitute stream works.   |
| HEB Constructions Action:    | No further action   |
| <b>Comment #</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| Management Plan:             |   |
| Section Number:              |   |
| Section Name:                |   |
| Page Number:                 |   |
| Comment:                     | Groundwater at base of reservoir.<br>Does the GWRC consent allow for the dewatering/ taking of groundwater from the immediate reservoir surrounds to continue on completion of the reservoir?<br>If so, what clause in their consent allows this?   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | If not what will happen to the drains around the base perimeter of the reservoir?  |
| Suggested Amendment:         |  |
| Person(s) providing comment: | Frank Cook   |
| HEB Construction's Position: | Comply with consent conditions and permitted activity rules  |
| HEB Construction's Comment:  | The groundwater consent does not address the diversion of groundwater, post construction, from around the base of the Reservoir as this is covered by Permitted Activity rules within the Regional Plan. The stormwater drains situated around the Reservoir are connected to the existing stormwater network. |
| HEB Construction's Action:   | No further action  |