

SUBMISSION ON APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENTS BY BOFFA
MISKELL FOR CENTREPORT'S PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT
KAIWHARAWHARA POINT..

Submitter: Trelissick Park Group

Peter Reimann, Chairman, email peter.reimann@paradise.net.nz

Group Contact: Frances Lee, 24 Orari Street, Ngaio, Wellington 6035

Tel. 4792 600. email flee24@clear.net.nz

Decision Sought: the Trelissick Park Group (TPG) believes that the adverse effects of this proposal are more than minor and that the Resource Consent Applications to GWRC and WCC should be publicly notified.

Reason: there are too many details which would affect the public on this very prominent site which are not amply covered or ignored in the application. As part of the Gateway to Wellington, any development on this site needs very careful and special treatment.

Background: TPG has been involved with possible developments in this area for many years. It helped form the Kaiwharawhara Reclamation Working Group in the early 1990s which played an active role in the area with the aim of preserving parts of this special harbour environment for the public benefit. The area is a major part of the important ecological corridor formed by the Kaiwharawhara Stream - which runs through the park to the harbour and sea at the estuary- and extends inland to the large catchment contained by Zealandia and Mt.Kaukau.. In addition (more recently) WCC's Sanctuary to Sea Walkway should be extended to the public beach on the northern side of the Point (managed by DOC) – currently it virtually ends at the southern end of the park. This is a special site needing special attention! The application contains much detailed and useful engineering drawings on recontouring/earthworks/excavations of the Point; stormwater infrastructure and discharge; asphalt surfacing/paving; bund and fence building, etc.

However details are lacking on various aspects: -

- of major concern is the lack of landscape drawings to show the visual result of the whole development from various places surrounding the area so that those living on the adjacent hillsides and those entering Wellington by road, rail and ferry can visualise the effect of what is planned ;
- details of proposed plantings are scant – far more detail on species and placement with drawings is needed - and the time given for completion of this activity is too short. (At a recent CPort meeting, interested parties had asked for some “softening” -by plantings - of the somewhat harsh environment proposed by piles of logs and containers - but this has not eventuated);
- where lighting will be placed and the effect on the surrounding roads and houses;
- not enough information regarding noise during development and afterwards during working hours (will log trains and trucks be arriving ‘overnight’);
- will the logs and containers be brought to the Point by both rail and road – the road link to the site from ‘the north’ via Aotea Quay with its sharp turn to the terminal road would be somewhat difficult for large trucks. (Regarding some comment on a possible slip road from the motorway directly on to the site,

whenever NZTA has been asked, it has said it would not be approved as such an exit would be too near the Aotea exit and cause confusion on the highway). A rail route to the site, would mean building a new link to travel through the terminal. In both cases, trucks and trains crossing a busy and restricted terminal area would surely be a problem for KiwiRail. This aspect of the development is not covered.

- a second siding railway “may” be added starting from south side of the estuary (more future work and noise and will the existing bridge be adequate to take two lines) It is also proposed the existing line be “realigned to the N edge” – presumably this is an extension to the edge of CPort’s site not on to the marginal strip;
- details of the bund and security fence are shown on p.12 – the bund 4-5m high and the fence on top of it at 2.1m high giving a combined height of 6-7m. This is extraordinarily high all around the site. Yet somewhere else it is stated that the fence could be inside the bund so at ground level. Then outside the bund there is to be a totally clear zone of 2m. Presumably all this is contained in the site area and none on the marginal strip. Extra plantings on the strip would probably be needed to hide some of the fence and site contents. It would have been useful to have drawings of the proposed fence particularly where it adjoins the marginal strip and with its existing vegetation;
- Appendix 9 mentions sewage disposal pipes to go from the site to the ferry terminal. Presume this is from the small service area alongside the estuary. Surely a sewage pipe planned to cross a water body should have been covered in the report. If attached to a bridge with heavy traffic passing along, it might need special consideration (as it is not clear how much traffic will enter the site by the smaller lower bridge - presumably all the trucks).

17 July 2016