

Appendix D: Conditions proposed to be rejected



Central Interceptor Main Project Works

Watercare Services Limited

This appendix outlines details relating to those conditions proposed by Council intended to be rejected in full. Where I refer to the wording of specific Conditions, this wording is set out in the marked up Designation Conditions attached to Ms Petersen's evidence.

Proposed Condition TM.4:

- 1.1 In regards to (d) Haverstock Road, I understand that there is no intention to have access via Hampstead Road. However, as no access is proposed via Hampstead Road this condition is not considered to be appropriate or necessary.
- 1.2 In regards to (e) Walmsley Park, this condition, relating to having an on-site spotter, appears to have been developed from the FLOW recommendation based on the site access being only one way. In my opinion consideration of whether on-site spotters are required would be given to all access points in the OPW application as I have described earlier, and this is already covered in proposed condition TM.2. This condition is not accepted.
- 1.3 In regard to (f) and (g)(i) Keith Hay Park and Pump Station 23, once again I have no issue with the overall intent of the condition. However, as set out above, it is my experience that this level of detail would be covered in the OPW process. As such, I do not consider these to be appropriate or necessary.
- 1.4 In regards to (h) Kiwi Esplanade, while I agree with the purpose of this condition, it is my experience that these items would be covered in the OPW process and are best left until that time for the reasons set out above. This condition is not accepted.
- 1.5 In regards to (i) Motions Road, these are also the types of issues that are considered in the OPW process and therefore are not required or accepted as a condition.
- 1.6 In relation to (j) Western Springs Depot, as above, this detail is best left to the OPW process and not considered appropriate as a condition.
- 1.7 In regards to (k) Norgrove Avenue, this condition assumes the Asquith Avenue / New North Road intersection will still be in its current form in +/-10 years' time. Further, in my experience, truck routes and the avoidance of difficult turns is an integral part of the production of TMP's which accompany OPW applications. As such, I consider this



condition is not necessary as it is covered in conditions TM.1 and TM.2 and the general OPW process.

- 1.8 In regards to (l) Pump Station 25, once again, in my experience the banning of movements / restriction of heavy vehicle and avoidance of difficult turns is integral to production of TMP's that accompany OPW applications. As such, I consider this condition is not necessary as it is covered in conditions TM.1 and TM.2 and the general OPW process.
- 1.9 In regards to (m) Miranda Reserve, both the issues (i) "pedestrian access" and (ii) "bus stop" are in my opinion already covered in the OPW process and conditions TM.1 and TM.2. This condition is therefore unnecessary.
- 1.10 In regards to (n) Whitney Street, both the issues identified would be covered in the TMP associated with the OPW process, regardless of this condition and as such. I consider the proposed condition to be unnecessary.
- 1.11 In regards to (o) Haycock Avenue, once again in my experience the banning of movements, restriction of heavy vehicle and avoidance of difficult turns is an integral part of the production of TMP's that accompany OPW applications. As such, I consider this condition is not necessary as it is covered in conditions TM.1 and TM.2 and the general OPW process.
- 1.12 In regards to (q) May Road, the detailed management conditions relating to the May Road access is in my opinion just an example of how construction vehicles will be managed at this site. In +/- 10 years time there may be other, better ways of managing vehicles (eg GPS vehicles fleet tracking that ensures trucks do not enter / exit the driveway at the same time). Further, as I have discussed previously, Watercare has now secured access to May Road, as well as Roma Road, which would negate the need for any particular traffic management. Overall, I consider this condition to be unnecessary and would be covered in an OPW application and proposed conditions TM.1 and TM.2.
- 1.13 In regards (r) Western Springs Interchange, the monitoring of any site (including the site adjacent to the Great North road interchange), is already covered in proposed condition TM2 (f). In my opinion (as stated previously in my evidence) the location of the site means only left-in / left-out manoeuvres will be permitted and any OPW application will address this issue as well as any other mitigation considered to be appropriate. This condition is not accepted.