

Reference	Original para ref for SHA.	Stakeholders Comment	NX2 Response
1	1	The affected landowners are not engineers. Stakeholders are not versant with some jargon used in the sector plan. For example, what is "rip-rack rock"? Limited definitions are provided, but pg. 25-26 need to be expanded to explain those missing elements.	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	2	The area adjacent to the Eco Viaduct (52100), on pg. 46 does not match the same paddock on pg. 47. Whilst I appreciate that this Sector Plan only covers the Central area south of the viaduct, this is confusing, and relevant to my decreased amenity. Could you tell me if this is paddock (46), or planting (47) ?	The plans have been updated to be consistent on both pages. It is noted that Te Arawhiti Pua Ngahere (referred to as the Eco Viaduct (52100)) is not within this sector, and will instead be addressed in the Warkworth ULDSP.
3	3	Whilst I appreciate the pictures of the plant species intended for this WHOLE SECTOR (pg. 59-61), the lack of specifics around what will be planted around Site 15A is of concern. The Designation in this area is very narrow, much narrower than the rest of the alignment, so specifics of species type is very important to those landowners who are reliant on trees for visual screening of the project.	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	4	The sedimentation pond on pg. 47 is different to the sedimentation pond on pg. 46 in that it does not show MPS (Mitigation Planting-Stream). Which version is accurate? Does this happen anywhere else?	In the draft version there was red shading surrounding the wetland (referred to as the sedimentation pond) which disguised the planting type. Shading on both plans has now been removed so that the correct planting proposed can be seen.
5	5	On pg. 46 and pg. 47 there are labels indicating a line of "Existing poplars to be retained". This is presumptive as it assumes activity on my property, outside the Designation, that is no business of NX2 or NZTA. Nor is it appropriate to the brief of the Sector Plan. This label needs to be removed from all pages where it appears.	These labels have been removed, no works are proposed outside of the designation without landowner approval.
6	6, 27	On pg. 29 there is a comment about Bridge Barrier Design with a note –"details of this yet to be confirmed". This contravenes Condition D36 (a) i. Is there a valid reason for this?	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	7	I note in Para. 4.5 on pg. 16 of the Sector Plan the statement that says "There have been no instances identified where noise mitigation is required." However, I have been informed by NX2 (15.01.2108) that the latest Noise Modelling Report by MDA is to be released "next month". Is this statement pre-empting the release of the formal report?	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	8	I can find no reference to the use of Rumble Strips on the road surface of the motorway. Following construction of other motorway projects ( example MacKays to Peka Peka), the affected landowners have complained that the presence of Rumble Strips contributes greatly to the noise nuisance from the new road. There appears to be no discussion about this issue in the current Sector Plan.	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. Also refer to the answer under reference 7 above, which notes how this document is not the mechanism to specify noise details.
9	9, 10, 11, 15	<p>In 2013 when I was notified by Auckland Council that my property was classed as a SEA (Significant Ecological Area), I undertook an extensive planting program to provide feeding trees for the native birds of Site 15A. It is not unusual during the spring to have upwards of 20 Kereru and Tui in my orchard feeding.</p> <p>It is a lost opportunity to wait for the end of the project for planting. At the BOI Mr Don, Ecologist for NZTA, stated that there may be long term effects on the bat and bird populations as "the replanted vegetation would take some time to mature enough to be of value to these species". (Final Decision, pg. 80 (348)). Therefore dense, and early planting will help provide both wildlife corridors and connectivity to the rest of the Perry Rd community, most of whom have an active interest in the welfare of the surrounding wildlife.</p> <p>I suggest planting could occur in select locations where it does not interfere with construction activity. Such areas as 52100 and 52200 would be ideal for such planting. I would also suggest planting in other appropriate locations be brought forward to C2 (pg. 40 Central Sector Plan).</p> <p>Ms Hunt suggested the contractor "plant natives to create a larger grove of indigenous native vegetation so you would end up potentially in 30 years driving through a grove similar to Rotorua, Waipoua Forest, and Mangamuka" (Line 5-11 pg. 3175 ).</p>	<p>We acknowledge the planting undertaken on the owner's properties near Te Arawhiti Pua Ngahere (referred to as Site 15A).</p> <p>All planting in this sector is native and chosen to be suitable to the environment that it will be planted in for the best chance of success. Planting will be undertaken as early as possible, with densities provided in section 8. This is 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. The section 5 'design statement' provides commentary on the planting in this sector and how it will contribute to the driver experience.</p> <p>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 Hikauae 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]. We have updated the text in Section 5.13 to include this.</p> <p>Early planting on existing ground rather than on engineered cuts and fills are being explored with Hokai Nuku, mainly in Ecological Mitigation Planting mixes. However, eco-sourcing seed to propagate from and the procurement process takes time and restricts the ability to do this.</p>
10	12	At the BOI there was much discussion about attempting to keep Site 15A predator free. The most important reason for this is to prevent the risk of Kauri Dieback disease. The government has also expressed a goal of having all of New Zealand pest-free by 2050. Carol Bannock (previous ecologist for NZTA) states that "providing pest free corridors means another chance for another egg to hatch and another chick to survive to adulthood". Section 4.11 of the Sector Plan has no mention of the use of predator free fencing for Site 15A. Could this be a missed opportunity of keeping the Kauri of Site 15A free of this dreaded disease?	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	14, 19	<p>Bronwyn Hunt requested trees be planted north and south of the Fish Farm, accepting that the Kauri Dieback Management Plan would be the qualifier. (Line 24 pg. 3172 BOI Transcript ).</p> <p>The pond should be re-designed to be narrower so the space between it and the Designation Boundary, on the southern boundary of the Fish Farm is wider to provide for more dense screen planting.</p>	<p>Planting of kauri trees is being undertaken in several locations to the north and south of the fish farm. In this sector plan, which shows planting to the south only, terrestrial mitigation planting includes kauri trees.</p> <p>The size and location of the stormwater wetland (referred to as the pond by the Stakeholder) 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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Reference	Paragraph reference for Stakeholder A	Stakeholders Comment	NX2 Response
12	18	In light of these comments, and in order to meet D34, I consider the Sediment ponds (Temporary, and Permanent) situated between 52200 and 52300 to be part of the structural works of the project which I need to be screened from.	As noted above (reference 11), this wetland (referred to as the sediment pond by the Stakeholder) 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 in and 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. Please note this ULDSP
13	13	During the Board of Inquiry process, Commissioner Bronwyn Hunt stated that she wanted "the Tangata Whenua to be protected by more Kauri rather than less (Line 6 pg. 3171 BOI Transcript).	Condition D59 is incorporated into the design of planting. This condition requires that replacement planting is provided for kauri that are removed within the designation.
14	21	Section 3:2 of the Draft Urban and Landscape Design Sector Plan – Moir Hill and Hikauae Creek Sector discusses the issue of a "Stitched Together Landscape. Bullet point 4 suggests the design outcome of "maximising areas of productive pastoral and forestry land to enable the handback of large tracts of land to be reverted to their previous land use". As the designation in this area is only 45 metres wide (approximately), this is an unrealistic expectation. Therefore, dense planting to the edges of the designation would be a more realistic way of "stitching together the landscape".	It is true that the designation width in this area 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 reference 11.  Please refer to section 3.2, (including the diagram and section 5.17). Stitching together the landscape is a design concept of planting similar to the existing surrounding environment, not only through dense planting. Stitching also 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. It is also noted that there is land in this sector that will be handed back.
15	22, 23, 24	Section 4:8 of the Draft Urban and Landscape Design Sector Plan – Moir Hill and Hikauae Creek Sector discusses the issue of how High Cut Batters will be left expose to showcase local geology. Such obvious and "brutal" cuts in an area of green rolling hills and native vegetation will look totally man-made and engineered, which according to D37(d) ii is to be avoided.  Use of mesh on cut batters hardly contributes to a "refined and minimalistic aesthetic" (Outcome 3.9 pg. 9 Sector Plan) and adds clutter to the driving view. It is also contrary to the ULDF requirement for a "clean uncluttered highway". It contravenes D37 (b), which requires "cut rock faces to resemble natural features". Mesh is not a "natural feature". Mesh is an "engineered solution" which D37(d) ii states is to be avoided.  If there is "uncertainty related to existing rock quality" (pg. 24 Sector Plan) what are the "final slope grades and surface treatments" which may be needed, and why not go with these in the first instance to avoid the use of mesh?	The rock cuts are necessary to construct the road at a reasonable gradient and leaving the high batters exposed is consistent with the ULDF and will showcase the geology as a key feature of the motorway journey. This gives effect to ULDF sections 4.8 and 4.9. The exact gradients of the rock cuts, lay-backs and adjacent land will be confirmed at the time of construction, once the rock conditions are known. Waiting for confirmation of the conditions, allows treatment to be considered on a case by case basis, which can reduce the use of surface treatments.  As explained in section 4.8 of the ULDSP, the mesh over rock cuts will be provided for safety reasons. The mesh will be lightweight and will generally stop at least 5m above the road level, with the lower edge of the mesh being a clean and consistent line, in order to be less visually imposing.  'Surface treatments' refers to the range of options available to stabilise these surfaces, this includes materials such as rock mesh (refer to section 4.8), shotcrete and rock bolts. 'Final slope grades' refers to the angle of the final slope, which is not certain at this stage as it will be determined on site when the geology is exposed.
16	16	Also, during the BOI process the Chairman offered me personally " 700 Kauri trees within the Designation, north and south of the Mahurangi, around Site 15A" (Line 34 pg. 3173).	Nothing was conditioned in this regard. As above, the removal of kauri is avoided where possible and any removal will require replacement as per condition D59. Also refer to reference 11.
17	17	These discussions during the BOI led me to expect that significant planting in the vicinity of Site 15A would be provided for in the tendering, design and construction phases of the project.	Nothing was conditioned specifically in this regard. Condition D59 provides general planting requirements, which have been reflected in the section 7 Landscape plans.  <u>Also refer to the answer under reference 11.</u>
18	25	Section 5.4 of the Draft Urban and Landscape Design Sector Plan for the Moir Hill and Hikauae Creek Sector discusses the specifics of the bridge over the motorway that is the carriageway for Moir Hill Road. It is, therefore, confusing when in para. 3 of this section the discussion turns to ALL bridges. As details for the Eco Viaduct have not yet been decided I would like to ensure this does not compromise considerations for the Eco Viaduct, at the southern end of the Northern Sector.	The text has been updated to clarify this; there is only one bridge in this ULDSP.
19	26	In Section 4.2 on page 16 of the Draft Urban and Landscape Design Sector Plan for the Moir Hill and Hikauae Creek Sector it is stated that "all bridges will be neutral grey". This contravenes ULDF which makes specific exception for the Eco Viaduct as seen from Perry Rd (refer to pg. 36 Specific Outcomes, bullet point 6) which requires "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. The 'Eco Viaduct' is not within this sector, and is instead addressed in the Warkworth ULDSP.
20	20	Dense and extensive tree planting around Site 15A and its approaches, both north and south, will assist with combating light pollution in the valley, which latest research has found "CAN DISRUPT MATING CUES FOR FAUNA, AND FLOWERING CUES FOR FLORA" ( Christopher Kyba, NOV 2017)	It is noted that there are no street lights proposed in the central sector, or along Te Arawhiti Pua Ngahere (referred to as Site15A), which will be shown in the Warkworth ULDSP. The extensive landscaping proposed to the south of Te Arawhiti Pua Ngahere that is within this sector is shown in the section 7 landscape plans and mixes are described in section 5. Also refer to reference 11.
22	28	The success of large infrastructure projects such as this is how well they fit into the community in which they are built. Throughout the Draft Urban and Landscape Design Sector Plan for the Moir Hill and Hikauae Creek Sector there are numerous references to "enhancing the driver experience". By contrast the effect on the amenity of the affected landowners is mentioned infrequently (the ratio is 7:1). There is no doubt that the countryside through which this motorway winds is very scenically beautiful. However, these drivers will be travelling through the area at speeds of 100 kms per hour, and will hopefully have their eyes on the road. They may experience the road on a daily, weekly, or annual basis. The effect of this motorway on the families and properties that neighbour the project - both during construction and operation -will be felt 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.	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.
23	29	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.