

XMeier (Xenia)

From: XMeier (Xenia)
Sent: Wednesday, 21 October 2020 9:44 am
To: 'Mark Ross'
Subject: LUC60364574 - Haycock Avenue Manhole Replacement - reply
Attachments: 2020 10 Response to query_Att Civil dwg_3.PDF; 2020 10 Response to query_Att Civil dwg_2.pdf; 2020 10 Response to query_Att Civil dwg_1.pdf

Morena Mark

Response to your questions in **red** and **bold** below.

Bests. Xenia

From: Mark Ross <mark@sentinelplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 19 October 2020 8:58 am
To: XMeier (Xenia) <Xenia.Meier@water.co.nz>
Cc: Colin Hopkins <Colin.Hopkins@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: LUC60364574 - Haycock Avenue Manhole Replacement - queries

CAUTION: External Email!

Hi Xenia

I'm just working my way through my report for the Haycock Avenue replacement manhole and have noted some additional matters that need to be addressed.

- Figure 3.2 in the AEE shows the location of MH01 in 81 White Swan Road and its proposed connection to the CI works in 2 and 4 Haycock Avenue. However, this excerpt does not align with the plans contained in Appendix B, which don't seem to show MH01 or its connection to the works in 2 and 4 Haycock Avenue. As the Appendix B plans are dated 2012, I assume that these are outdated. As such, can you please submit the plans that show the manhole works proposed?

Updated civil drawings attached. The plans in Appendix B of the application show that connecting works were considered in 2012 application. As also mentioned in the application documents, the layouts and dimensions provided were approximate and were likely to change during detail design. In this case, MH01 is now connected directly to the main CI works rather than connecting via a new CC8 line (in blue). Note that the CC8 line is also consented as part of the CSO package of works (R/LUC/2012/2850, R/LUC/2012/2850/1, 40852, 40852, 40853 and 40856) but these consents have not yet been exercised.

- Having re-reviewed my previous site photos for the batch 2 OPW application, and having checked GIS, there is a stream in close proximity to the works. Within riparian yards (10m in this instance), general standard [E26.5.5.2.\(12\)\(c\)](#) allows for earthworks less than 10m² or 5m³ for the installation of new network utilities as permitted activities. Assuming that the manhole is located within 10m of the stream, while the area limit will unlikely be exceeded, I'm assuming that more than 5m³ of earthworks will be required? Can you please confirm? If more than 5m³, then I'll need to liaise with the Council engineer, but it would be likely that conditions in respect of erosion and sediment control will be required, which I'm assuming could be extensions of those that will be implemented within 2 and 4 Haycock Avenue.

There will be around 500m³ of earthworks for the new manhole; however, as mentioned above, connecting works and associated earthworks were included in the 2012 application and the effects are within the overall consented envelope. Any erosion and sediment effects will be managed through the existing CI consent and associated earthworks conditions. There is a Council certified E&SCP for the site. Please let me know if you would like me to send you a soft copy. Zac from Southern Skies was the Council reviewer so perhaps he could confirm the effects are adequately addressed by the existing consents?

- Following on from the above, trees over 6m in height, or 600mm in girth within a riparian yard are protected, with an alteration or removal works requiring consent. I note a couple of trees from my old site photos that may meet or exceed these parameters and which may be within the 10m riparian yard. However, I am uncertain of the location of these trees with respect to works required for the proposed manhole. As such, can you please confirm whether or not any such vegetation will be affected by the proposed works?

Site establishment at Haycock Avenue started on 4 May 2020 and vegetation removal has been completed in accordance with the certified TPMP (relevant section included below). A kohuhu was located within the riparian margin but did not exceed the thresholds.



Figure 4 Impacted Trees at 2 and 4 Haycock Avenue

Tree #	Botanical name	Common name	Height	Girth	CSR(m)	Age class	Ownership	Comments	Proposal
1	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	American sweetgum	14	2000	8	Mature	Private	Consultation with tree owner required prior to removal	Remove
2	<i>Magnolia x Soulangeana</i>	Deciduous Magnolia	2	300	2	Semi-mature	Private	Bird of paradise growing beneath.	Remove
3	<i>Ilex aquifolium 'Variegata'</i>	Variegated holly	4	700	2	Semi-mature	Private	Variegated holly.	Remove
4	<i>Citrus x paradisi</i>	Grapefruit	4	700	2	Mature	Private		Remove
5	Mixed species	Mixed species	4	500	3	Mature	Private	<i>Camellia</i> x1 <i>myrsine australis</i> x 2, dead tree x1. Corner of site	Remove
6	<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>	Tree privet	5	1000	4	Mature	Private	Located within 3/81 White Swan Road.	Remove
7	<i>Pittosporum tenuifolium</i>	Kohuhu	6	550	4	Mature	Private	Riparian margin	Remove
8	<i>Cupressus sp.</i>	Cupressus	5	600	2	Mature	Private	Remove	Remove
9	<i>Citrus x paradisi</i>	Grapefruit	4	700	2	Mature	Private		Remove
10	<i>Phoenix canariensis</i>	Phoenix palm	10	2000	5	Mature	Private		Remove
11	<i>Metrosideros excelsa</i>	Pohutukawa	12	2000	5	Mature	Private		Remove
12	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Flowering cherry	6	1000	4	Mature	Private	2 on site, 2 overhanging from neighbours.	Retain/Prune /Protect
13	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	American sweetgum	12	2300	7	Mature	Road Reserve	Prune for access	Prune

Figure 5 Tree Inventory and Action Proposal – Arborist Report

I'll keep working through my report in the meantime.

Any queries, please let me know.



Regards

MARK ROSS
CONSULTANT PLANNER
SENTINEL PLANNING

mark@sentinelplanning.co.nz

PH (09) 551 6205

MOB 021 619 282

WEB www.sentinelplanning.co.nz

123A Kitchener Road, Milford,
PO Box 33995, Takapuna 0740