

## Attachment B: Further Evidence Requested in Council Pre-hearing Report

Further Evidence Requested	Provided by:
<b>Notices of Requirement - Pre-hearing Report, section 14.1.1, pages 247 - 248</b>	
(a) The extent to which consultation and engagement undertaken by Watercare enables informed decision-making having regard to Maori values.	Garry Maskill Belinda Petersen
(b) In regards to the Lyon Avenue site:	
(i) the viability of the alternative site on the Mount Albert Grammar School playing fields; and	John Cooper Belinda Petersen
(ii) the greater weighting on the effects of the school playing fields than the effects of tree removal from Roy Clements Treeway	Belinda Petersen
(c) In regards to Pump Station 23 (Frederick Street), the matter of the retention of the existing Pohutukawa tree in the north-west corner of the reclamation (nearest to 33A Frederick Street).	John Goodwin David Slaven
(d) In regards to the Kiwi Esplanade site, the feasibility of transplanting the Pohutukawa trees proposed to be removed, elsewhere on the esplanade.	John Goodwin David Slaven
(e) The Requiring Authority's suggested conditions as amended by the authors.	All relevant experts
(f) Matters raised by submitters such as:	
(i) Section 176 approvals;	Belinda Petersen
(ii) Whether the suggestion of signalling the intersection of Sandringham Road Extension/Gilford Avenue and inclusion of signal controlled pedestrian crossings on each approach is feasible; and	Leo Hills
(iii) Whether further construction noise and vibration condition amendments or mitigation measures are needed in relation to:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the MAWMR lower car park site; and</li> </ul>	Peter Millar Mat Cottle
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Community of Refuge Trust tenants at 2, 3 and 4/9 Wairere Avenue who are particularly sensitive noise receivers in close proximity to non-compliant noise.</li> </ul>	Peter Millar Mat Cottle
(g) Characterisation of the nature of the emergency pressure relief discharge:	
(i) The extent and land use areas draining into the pump station under the discharge scenario, by way of a map of the contributing catchment with flows to the tunnel and the pump station.	Clint Cantrell
(ii) The storm event intensity and duration and Average Recurrence Interval ("ARI") in the discharge scenario.	Peter Roan
(iii) The likely maximum duration and volume of the discharge scenario considered.	Peter Roan
(iv) The quality of the discharge in terms of its likely contaminant composition and mass loads, in accordance with the estimated discharge volume and storage period as considered in the discharge and effects scenario.	Peter Roan

(v)	The planned capacity of the pump station in terms of outgoing flow of main and standby pumps.	Clint Cantrell
(vi)	If a comparison of the EPR discharge quality with WWTP effluent during plant bypasses is relevant, the monitored quality of the WWTP effluent discharge in terms of contaminant composition and mass loads of permitted discharges.	Peter Roan
<b>Resource Consents - Pre-hearing Report, section 15.1, page 283</b>		
(a)	Consenting requirements for ongoing and future network discharges in the area of influence of the Central Interceptor.	Already covered in separate NDC application and explained in legal submissions
(b)	Clarification required in terms of the assumptions on the discharge scenario considered in the assessment of effects.	Peter Roan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In particular, with regard to the nature of the discharge, including the EPR discharge quantity and quality aspects;</li> </ul>	Peter Roan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the storm scenario;</li> </ul>	Peter Roan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the comparative quality information of permitted WWTP discharges; and</li> </ul>	Peter Roan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the contributing catchment and the planned pumping station capacity.</li> </ul>	Clint Cantrell
(c)	Clarification on the consideration of alternative discharge locations, but not alternative sites, having regard to:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the financial implications and effects on the environment of the selected option when compared with other options;</li> </ul>	Clint Cantrell
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>including options to provide greater dilution and dispersion into the receiving environment (while having regard to the considerations specified in Policies 20.4.3 and 20.4.4 of the Coastal Plan).</li> </ul>	Clint Cantrell
(d)	Clarification on the potential adverse effects on the environment	Peter Roan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>including effects on sediment quality from the discharge of stormwater and toxic contaminants at the proposed location;</li> </ul>	Peter Roan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effects on the shoreline of Ambury Park and Puketutu Island when considering existing and future use of open public space and esplanade reserves;</li> </ul>	Peter Roan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effects from the potential discharge of litter; and</li> </ul>	Peter Roan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>floatable solids (if any).</li> </ul>	Peter Roan
(e)	Clarification on inconsistencies between the notification timeframe in the event of a discharge occurring from the EPR structure in the proposed condition of consent with that in the Wastewater Overflow Incident Controllers Manual.	Peter Roan
(f)	Clarification on the extent to which the applicant has the ability to predict an EPR discharge occurrence before it occurs, relying on monitoring actual rainfall, suitable control technology and the available hydraulic model of the system; and	Clint Cantrell
	whether the responsibility for erecting warning signage in areas affected by a EPR discharge is adequately allocated to Auckland Council Environmental Health Licensing and Compliance Team, as identified in the Response Manual, or is better allocated to the applicant.	Peter Roan Belinda Petersen