9. Stakeholder Feedback

	Reference	Summarised feedback from stakeholders	NX2 Response
Stakeholder A	1	Some of the terminology used is difficult to understand for a layperson. Request that table on pages 25-26 expanded to provide more definitions.	Our aim is to make the document simple to understand for all readers. To that end we have added in more definitions to the table covering roading, ecology, earthworks and landscaping terms.
	2	The area adjacent to Te Arawhiti Pua Ngahere (52100) is inconsistently shown.	The plans have been updated to be consistent on both pages. This specific area will be planted.
	3	Request more specific detail on types of species planted around Te Arawhiti Pua Ngahere, near Perry Road.	We have shown the general mix of planting (e.g. terrestrial mitigation, wetland planting) on these plans and the species are noted in the planting schedule in section 8. In some particular cases where the project will be particularly visible from private dwellings, such as those at the end of Perry Road, we will work with the owners to discuss specific screen planting within their property.
	4	Request further clarity regarding planting adjacent to the wetland (chainage 52200). The mitigation planting system is inconsistently shown.	In the draft version there was red shading surrounding the wetland which disguised the planting type. Shading on both plans has now been removed so that the correct planting proposed can be seen.
	5	There are labels that pertain to a property, which is outside of the designation.	These labels have been removed, no works are proposed outside of the designation without landowner approval.
	6	Request more detail about bridge barrier design patterning is needed, in reference to page 29 of the ULDSP and Condition D36(a).	The form and shape of the barriers are accurately shown in this figure, specific details included in Section 4.1. Hōkai Nuku are currently in the process of putting together concept designs for any artistic details that would be applied to the bridge, with likely locations under discussion, including barrier, footpath or steel girder, which is likely to incorporate reference to the pathway of the ancestor Kahumatamomoe. The outside of the barrier has a simple design with a crease / shadow line low on the hip, but with no patterning / artwork proposed.
	7	There are contradictory statements regarding noise mitigation. Paragraph 4.5 claims there are "no instances identified where noise mitigation required", yet the stakeholder understands that the noise modelling has not been completed.	The ULDSP is not the mechanism used to authorise the Project compliance with permanent noise conditions. However the design team have progressively worked with an acoustic expert for compliance with the conditions, including modifications to road elevations, and barriers. Noise mitigation would become relevant to the ULDSP if any specific design elements such as noise walls are necessary to achieve these conditions, as we would carefully consider the design of these elements. In this sector, modelling completed to date has shown that no specific design mitigation is required. The noise modelling will be provided to Auckland Council for certification against the relevant conditions.
	8	There is no discussion of the use of rumble strips. An example was given of a different motorway project, which experienced noise complaints following the use of rumble strips. The stakeholder suggests mention of this is needed.	Rumble strips will be installed to alert drivers when their vehicles begin to stray from their lane. These are commonly used under line markings, and are not obvious to motorway users. Text has been edited in ULDSP sections 4.1 and 4.14.
	9	Recalling back to Board of Inquiry discussions, suggest that dense early planting would be better for native birds and other wildlife habitat.	All planting in this sector is native and chosen to be suitable to the environment that it will be planted in to ensure the best chance of success. Planting will be undertaken as early as possible, subject to plant and topsoil sourcing in areas which will not be impacted by construction activities. In areas where construction will occur (such as cut and fill areas) planting will occur later, once we can be certain the plants will not be damaged. We have updated the text in Section 5.13 to include this.
	10	Section 4.11 does not mention the use of predator free fencing, despite the area surrounding Te Arawhiti Pua Ngahere discussed (in the Board of Inquiry hearing) as predator free.	Pest control undertaken for the Project focuses on healthy variability and growth of native plant species (refer section 4.11 and 4.12), however, 'predator free' fences are not specifically proposed nor required by conditions or the ULDF. The Project has employed a Kauri Dieback Management Plan throughout construction in order to prevent the spread of the disease. Fences will be installed before the operational stage of the Project to restrict access of other pest species - such as goats, pigs, cows, sheep.
	11	Request that the wetlands between 52200 and 53200 be re-designed to be narrower, and the designation boundary on the southern side of the fish farm to be wider, to accommodate more dense screening.	The size and location of the stormwater wetland is constrained and cannot be narrowed any further or moved elsewhere. The wetland design is determined by resource consent requirements to provide sufficient capacity for adequate treatment of carriageway runoff. Narrowing the wetland any further would also increase water velocity, reducing the wetland's treatment efficiency, and the faster moving water has the potential to remobilise the accumulated sediment. NX2 also looked into moving the wetland west, however this option was discounted due to topographical constraints and limited space available between the motorway and existing large stream. It is not practicable to move the wetland north or south as it is required to be located adjacent to the low point in the motorway carriageway in order to capture carriageway runoff. NX2 has previously looked into widening the designation, however, this cannot be achieved as exhibited by the land acquisition issues during the Board of Inquiry. MPT and PLR planting mixes will be used to screen the wetland and merge with the surrounding landscape.
	12	The wetlands (temporary, and permanent) situated between chainage 52200 and 52300 should been screened from residential properties.	As noted above (item 11), this wetland is in a tightly constrained area; not just due to the narrow width available but also due to the topography (it is sited at the lowest point). The planting around the wetland, once established, will not be discernible from the surrounding planted area. There is no requirement to screen permanent wetlands from residential properties.

	Reference	Summarised feedback from stakeholders	NX2 Response
Stakeholder A	13	Dense planting is required up to the edges of the designation to create a better stitched together landscape (specifically at chainage 52200).	The designation area at this chainage is narrow, and planting from the terrestrial planting mix will be accommodated in this area where it can fit around the wetland. Discussion on why the wetland is constrained in this area is included in comment 11.
	14	Use of mesh on cut batters will look engineered and unnatural. What are 'final slope grades and surface treatments" and why not use them instead?	As explained in section 4.8 of the ULDSP, the mesh over rock cuts will be provided for safety reasons. The rock cuts are necessary to construct the road. The exact gradients of the rock cuts and lay-back gradients will be confirmed at the time of construction, once the rock conditions are known. 'Final slope grades' refers to the angle of the final slope, which is not certain at this stage as it will be determined on the ground on site. 'Surface treatments' refers to the range of options available to stabilise these surfaces, this includes rock mesh (refer to section 4.8).
	15	Confusion when the discussion of Moir Hill Bridge design turns to a discussion of all bridges - the Te Arawhiti Pua Ngahere design details have not yet been decided, so want to ensure considerations for this design is not compromised.	The text has been updated to clarify this; there is only one bridge in this ULDSP.
	16	The bridge colours described in Section 4.2, stating "all bridges will be a neutral grey" do not meet ULDF which states that Te Arawhiti pua Ngahere (which was then called the Kauri Eco Viaduct) is to have "a dark and recessive viaduct colour."	The text in the Moir Hill and Hikauae ULDSP (this document) has been altered to state "the bridge in this sector will be neutral grey colour" which is more accurate.
	17	Comment that the text focuses a lot on the driver experience, and not enough on views for residents e.g. Residents of Perry Road.	Text has been added into sections 4 and 5 of the ULDSP to detail where the motorway can be viewed. For the most part in this sector, views of the motorway will be obscured by the existing trees and forestry pines. This achieves section 5.7 of the ULDF.
	18	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Draft Urban and Landscape Design Sector Plan for the Central Sector.	Thank you for your feedback.
Stakeholder B	19	1. The ULDSP is recommended to acknowledge the “stepped” application approach of the conditions of consent, and provide a table to qualify/quantify the mitigation required by consent condition D59 (possibly as an appendix). 2. It is advised that the process used to establish replacement planting is identified, so that the new vegetation will reflect the vegetation removed, including the location, mix of species, planting densities, size at planting, layout and successional planting to support establishment.	The ULDSP is not the mechanism to measure compliance of the Project with conditions, including D59. Compliance with this condition will be made clear at a later stage, through the appropriate channels.
	20	The ULDSP does not identify the forest/ecosystem types that have been removed, and/or acknowledges how/where these ecosystems will be located in the mitigation planting: this should be included in Section 8 (pg. 58): Ecological mitigation planting, and identified on the various Sector Plans.	The ULDSP is not required to identify the forest/ecosystem types that have been removed. However, the document sets out our response to replacement of ecosystems, by concentrating on areas where it is most beneficial, as determined by the Project ecologist. The ULDSP is not a mechanism to measure compliance of the Project with conditions including D59.
	21	In reference to condition D59 and section 3.2 of this document is recommended to reference and include further details of terrestrial and wetland ecology, which could be found with terrestrial and wetland ecosystems of Auckland and associated Biodiversity mapping available on the publically accessible Auckland Council GIS website.	The purpose of the ULDSP is to implement the ULDF and demonstrate how the permanent works achieve this. Information has been included where possible to add further detail, it relates to the final urban and landscape design outcomes of the Project.

	Reference	Summarised feedback from stakeholders	NX2 Response
Stakeholder B	22	The 'longitudinal wildlife corridors' should be referenced and identified. A larger overview plan would best represent these corridor aspirations as per condition D36.	Wildlife corridors have been developed and enhanced along the alignment in locations where it has been considered most beneficial by ecologists. These are not specifically demarked in the plans in Section 7. In the Moir Hill and Hīkauae sector, these are provided on both sides of the alignment around the Perry Road area (Chainage 52850 – 53500 on western side of alignment; Chainage 52850 – 53550 on eastern side). The mitigation planting and landscape restoration planting in this area connects existing mature and regenerating forest patches in this area with the new planting to provide forested habitat and corridors for native wildlife [D36].
	23	It is unclear as to how long expanses of "GRASS - TO PASTURE" or " GRASS – HYDROSEEDED" are contributing to the wildlife corridors. Clarification should be given as to how these areas "connects existing mature and regenerating forest patches in this area with the new planting, and will provide continuous forested habitat for native wildlife."	It is accepted that the grassed areas are not contributing to the enhancement of wildlife corridors, however in general the grass treatments have been used in areas that have been determined to have lesser ecological values, as determined by ecologists.
	24	The Ecological mitigation planting does not acknowledge Myrtle Rust issues, especially around sourcing of plant material (e.g. eco-sourcing).	Myrtle Rust is not specifically mentioned in the ULDSP. Consideration of the potential impacts on the landscaping species used is reflected in ratio of non susceptible / susceptible species utilised on the project.
	25	The planting programme does not include the staging of planting in relation to the construction programme and maintenance regime, as per condition D36(c)(vi).	Details of the planting program are contained in section 5.18 of the ULDSP, the planting programme diagram has been updated to show the maintenance period.
	26	There is concern about the use of mulch for revegetation planting and around stormwater ponds. There is also concern about the use of mulch as a weed suppressant in revegetation areas, which is not in line with what is specified in the ULDSP.	Mulch will not be used in areas of Mitigation Planting - Wetland, Mitigation Planting, Terrestrial, Mitigation Planting Stream Edge (see Section 7) or in swales and areas below the stormwater wetland permanent water level. In areas that are steeper that 2:1, mulch is expected to slip down the slope, and biodegradable geotextile fabric will be used instead. Text has been added to clarify this in section 5.20.
	27	Section 4.11 (Pest Control) is too broad and lacks detail of how this will occur (methods, traps/bait station placement etc.). The pest control will not just be limited to possums and rats, or ungulates; mustelids should be included too. The ULDSP should acknowledge, and be consistent with, the Pest Free Auckland 2050 initiative. This section needs to be updated (re: condition D36C(ii)).	An assessment of pests along with methodologies for control is required by NZTA P39 Standard specification for highway landscape treatments (P39) and will be undertaken to prevent potential damage to landscape works, however, there is no requirement in the conditions or the ULDF to meet the Pest Free Auckland 2050 initiative but consideration will be given as required by P.39. The pest assessment has not been completed prior to the issue of the ULDSP. The ULDSP focuses on outcomes, detail is not provided on the methodologies for those outcomes. The design includes the provision of a seven wire post and batten fence as a measure to prevent incursion and spread of animal pests. This can be seen in the plans in Section 7 of the ULDSP.
	28	Section 4.12 is too broad and seems limited to management of weeds along the pavement edge/swales only. The section lacks detail of how this will occur in revegetation and existing forest areas (including methods, weed species to be targeted within the various ecosystems and/or including preparing planting areas). Any methodology and herbicide application must be identified for each weed species and be 'fit-for-purpose' (e.g. use near and within aquatic habitats). This section needs to be updated (re: condition D36C(ii))	Weed control has been addressed through design by purposefully considering the areas where weeds may propagate and providing design solutions that discourage weed growth. Factors that contribute to this include the use of paved medians, hard interfaces at road margins and drainage elements that minimise the potential to harbour weeds. Details on the highway design elements including medians etc. can be found in Section 4 of the ULDSP. Item 27 above includes more discussion on this.

	Reference	Summarised feedback from stakeholders	NX2 Response
Stakeholder B	29	Overall I am of the opinion that this document, in general, addresses the three overall outcomes for the project that require: • An uncluttered, clean highway; • A stitched-together landscape; and • Celebration of the cultural footprint of mana whenua. I am of the opinion that the ULDSP is generally consistent with the matters set out in Conditions D33, D34, D36, D36A and D37.	Thank you for taking the time to contribute to this process.
	30	It is acknowledged that 'stitching' has not been able to be fully achieved in areas of existing pine plantation. As a compromise, it is proposed to grass areas of cut and fill between the proposed highway and existing pine plantation. This does not meet the outcomes sought through the project. The grassed areas will accentuate the change in landuse and create a break or buffer between the highway and dominant landscape character of the pine forest on either side. The level of impact this will have on the experience along the highway is unclear as there is insufficient information within the document. This is likely to be significant given the extent of hydroseeding, especially in areas of soil disposal.	Stitching means creating visual connection between areas; for example, a visual link between areas of productive forestry land on both side of the road, or stream planting connections. The way the stitch occurs is not always by way of planting. A number of factors have been considered in the use of grassed areas as a landscape treatment throughout the forestry areas and on soil disposal sites. These include: the challenge of providing any landscape treatments that would appropriately stitch together the landscape in this area (other than re-instatement of pine plantation). - A preference to use native species for replanting instead of plantation pines - Benefits that are gained by maximising landscaping treatments in other parts of the project where the benefits from such planting can be maximised (visual screening, ecological enhancement etc.) - Maintenance requirements which incorporates the need to control weeds and mammalian pests throughout the project. - Uncertainty as to the future land uses in these locations - Grass is not an unexpected sight along motorway sides
Stakeholder C	31	In order to fully understand the visual extent and scale of cut/fill it would be useful if the sector plans included approximate final RL levels. This will help to better understand the visual impact of large areas of hydroseeded grass.	Symbols have been added to the plans in Section 7 to show spot heights of selected cut and fills and relative alignment height.
	32	A scale is requested to be provided for the detailed design plans.	A scale has been added to the detailed design plans in Section 7
	33	It is recommended that the Road Element cross sections (4.13 of the ULDSP) show an indicative chainage.	The cross sections have been developed with the intention of showing multiple scenarios. As such, these cross sections have not been taken from any specific point along the alignment. The detailed design plans in section 8 of the ULDSP contain locations of some of the motorway elements (such as signs, maintenance bays, stormwater inlets/outlets, bridges, kerb and channel, swales, catchpits, lighting etc.) and the table in section 4.14 describes the different elements and their approximate locations throughout the motorway alignment
	34	In general, the stakeholder considers that the draft ULDSP meets the majority and intent of the conditions set out in the designation and overarching ULDF for Ara Tūhono, subject to the addressing of the minor matters set out above.	Thank you for taking the time to contribute to this process and the outcomes of this project.
Stakeholder D	35	There is concern over the final landscape design in terms of fire risk and its potential to spread to the adjacent pine plantation. Native trees with lower oil content has been suggested as an alternative to the proposed species. It was further noted that due to observed strong winds along the ridge between the top of Schedewys Hill to Moir Hill Road, wider berms are recommended as a buffer, to reduce the risk of fires spreading uphill.	Planting is set back from the road and the wide shoulders of the road limit the potential for fire risk from road users (Section 4.7). Species that have high oil content have been used predominantly as a stage nursery crop. In time these will be replaced by canopy species growing through. In general trees with higher oil content have a tendency to survive better in dry and exposed positions typical throughout the alignment. In areas of pine plantation the predominant landscape treatment is grass.
E	36	Draft concepts look great.	Thank you for taking the time to contribute to this process and the outcomes of this project.

	Reference	Summarised feedback from stakeholders	NX2 Response
Stakeholder F	37	Because the Moirs Hill Walkway will be severed by the motorway. Seeking clarification regarding the Moirs Hill Walkway's new alignment.	The Moirs Hill Walkway is to be reconnected as generally shown in the sector plans in chapter 7. The detailed design for this alignment will not be shown in this ULDSP as it is being designed separately and will be subject to a separate authorisation process, likely via a separate resource consent.
	38	Seeking an understanding regarding the main principles of revegetation along the designation, in particular, wanting clarification on species in the area that was previously in pine forest.	The vegetation within the Project designation is shown within the sector plans in chapter 7 and explained in sections 5.12 to 5.21. The areas where the existing pine forests will be cleared will generally be replaced by hydroseeded grass.