

Appendix 2: CONSULTATION, FEEDBACK AND RESPONSES
Site Specific Management Plan 003 -[SectorS 360-370-380]
MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway

01 SEPTEMBER 2014 - CERTIFIED ISSUE - REV C

The following tables set out the responses to comments raised by reviewers and those parties consulted in regard to the preliminary SSMP. The project responses are either reflected in the certification issue to which this Appendix pertains, or have been directed to other processes for action, or have been considered but for the reasons noted not agreed to. The parties consulted are those identified by the consent conditions and for Wharemauku Basin are:

- Te Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai;
- KCDC;
- Kāpiti Cycling Incorporated;
- Implementation Group of the Kāpiti Coast District Council Advisory on Cycleways, Walkways and Bridleways
- Friends of Wharemauku Stream ; and
- Landscape focus groups DC 57A a)
 - ii) Eastern side of the designation between Kāpiti Road and Mazengarb Road including Greenwood Place, Elder Grove, Cypress Grove, ~~Spackman Crescent, Makarini Street, Palmer Court, St James Court and Chilton Drive~~; (See SSMP 4)
 - v) Milne Drive through to Quadrant Heights;

COMMENTS ON SSMP3: WHAREMAUKU BASIN

KCDC REVIEWERS COMMENTS [JW=Julia Williams- Landscape Architect; DP = Deyana Popova-Urban Designer; Stu Kilmister-CWB Planner; provided as document and also meeting notes

Condition Reference	Condition Detail	Reviewer/ commenter	KCDC Reviewer's comment	reference in SSMP	Management Plan Author's response
	CWB	SK	Indicate tactile pavers, painted cycle lanes and traffic island on plans.		Included on Sheet 10
	AEE Visual and Landscape plans	DP/JW	Changes to planting around Kapiti Road intersection including numbers and location of large grade trees and layout of Wetland 4. Agree with proposed design changes and support the reasons/rationale. Planting covered in 'M2PP Planting Philosophy at Interchanges DRAFT 16 June 2014'.		No response required
	AEE Structural - Bridges	DP	Agree with proposed design changes and support the reasons/rationale stated in the SSMP document (with a special reference to Kapiti Road Crossing -Bridge Development Study M2PP-38R-D-REPG-010/Rev A and (Bridge Summary Wharemauku, M2PP-12-D-MPL). The form of the Kapiti Road bridge and Wharemauku Stream bridge are different from the approved AEE scheme, in terms of column form and dimensions and also in terms of column number in the case of Wharemauku Stream Bridge. Further design detail provided for abutments' treatment. The new design is consistent with the revised approach to bridge design		No response required

			throughout the project and responds well to the key ULDF objectives and relevant consent conditions.		
ULDF	The changes to the bridges' form/design are recorded and assessed against the relevant ULDF principles in the Summary at the end of: - Appendix: Kapiti Road Bridge - the Summary of the Kapiti Road Crossing -Bridge Development Study M2PP-38R-D-REPG-010/Rev A. - Appendix: Bridge Summary Wharemauku, M2PP-12-D-MPL- See notes below against individual principles	DP/JW	The assessments of the changed bridges' form/design against the relevant principles as set out in Bridge Appendices illustrate a general alignment with those principles. Kapiti Road Bridge - fine tune the detailed treatment of the abutments - there is a possibility to treat the base of the abutments with smooth/un-textured finish to differentiate it from the sloping abutment form and break down horizontally the abutment wall surface. - consider narrowing down the dividing strips between the textured abutment panels (to 300mm) and treat them as negative detail in a smooth surface (rather than with patterns as suggested) - consider extending the lines of the dividing strips on the abutment wall to the footpath surface and mark them on the footpath through texture/paving. This will tie up the rhythm of the abutment treatment to the footpath and enhance the urban nature of this junction. - The assessments of the changed bridges' form/design against the relevant principles as set out in Bridge Appendices illustrate a general alignment with those principles.		See details on SHEET 13 A plain surface at the toe of the abutment will attract tagging. We believe that the change in angle of the surfaces (abutment and vertical toe wall) already provides visual relief to the abutment wall. Agree dividing strips already 300mm wide. No Change proposed. Agree, surface contrast along these lines will be added to the footpath under the bridge deck, through use of contrast in colour and texture of plain concrete and expose aggregate. See detail Sheet 13
			CWB entry details to be resolved and finalised.		The CWB entrances relevant to this SSMP will all be Type 1 entrance design, shown on Sheet 20
	LMP principles, methodologies and procedures (where appropriate)	DP/JW	These have been well thought through and established under previous SSMPs		No response required
	LMP Attachment 1 Landscape mitigation by character area	DP/JW	Appropriate		No response required
	Urban Design Conditions				
	Condition DC.59A e) requires SSUDPs to be prepared for locations where the Expressway interacts with local vehicular and non-vehicular pedestrian/cyclist movement. For SSMP4, the locations include: Ihakara extension /Wharemauku Stream	DP	Condition appropriately addressed (subject to clarifying the issues re: gateway significance) Kapiti Gateway specifically noted on DC59A e): need to ensure that changes to large scale planting including using few large trees in the most prominent locations close to the bridge have not lessened the 'distinctive gateway' that was presented to		The Kapiti gateway includes all of the interchange, encompassing the Expressway and the local road locality, as this node will be experienced by users travelling and viewing it in all directions. The distinctiveness of the 'gateway' is provided through the planting design as well as the detailing of the underbridge space. Both the planting design and bridge abutment finishes are unique to the Kapiti interchange and provide a definite contrast to the rest of the Expressway.

	Kapiti Road		the BOI and embedded in conditions. Question what is distinctive about this specific gateway in its final form? Consider the use of marker elements and/or enhancing the footpath under the bridge through texture/paving (see also notes under AEE Principles set out in ULDF above)		<p>The specimen tree with low under planting concept has been part of the Kapiti interchange design throughout the AEE process and is reflected in the detailed design. The formalised placement of the trees will set up a distinctive rhythm as users cross the Kapiti bridge or use the on/off ramps. This is in contrast to the majority of the Expressway planting, comprising mixed groupings of species that will have a more homogenous visual appearance beneficial biodiversity outcomes. It will be very apparent to Expressway users that they are entering a 'different' place. In addition, a view to Kapiti Island (especially for southbound traffic) through the gap in the tree planting will add to the experience. The tree planting either side of the on/off ramps will create an 'avenue gateway' as Kapiti Road is approached/departed.</p> <p>For people passing under the Expressway on Kapiti Road, the underbridge surface finishes present an urban response, with light coloured and distinctively textured abutment panels. The abutment toe walls continue beyond the bridge integrating with the planting on the embankments.</p> <p>We agree that continuing a surface contrast from the abutment toe across the footpath under the bridge would add to the distinctiveness of this area. Consequently this has been added to the design (Sheet 13).</p> <p>In relation to the suggestion to add 'marker elements' – there is sufficient space for these to be incorporated as additional elements if the community wishes to at some stage. However, the design elements already incorporated make the interchange a distinctive gateway within the Expressway corridor, without additional structures.</p>
DC.59A f)	DC.59A f) lists the matters to be provided and in summary includes detailed design of for the benefit of pedestrians, cyclists and others:	DP	Stuart Kilmister to Comment?		SK comments included above.
	- Lighting;		Condition appropriately addressed subject to providing detail to low level lighting.		The CWB intersections with local road will be lit with a light pole as for CWB lighting. Low level lighting such as a bollard has now been discounted due to potential for vandalism.
	- Footpath and on-road cycle lane design (1.5m on road and 2.0m footpaths); - Safe crossing points for CWB;		Condition appropriately addressed in principle (subject to firming up detail) Fine tune/firm up detail re: intersection with local road treatments for the proposed different type treatments to ensure continuity (refer to e-mailed notes from 14 July summarised on pages 8/9 of this document)		The CWB entrances relevant to this SSMP will all be Type 1 entrance design, shown on SHEET 20. Finalisation of CWB entrances for other locations beyond this SSMP are still being finalised.
	- Visual treatment of structures and landscape (retaining walls, noise mitigation structures and landforms);		Condition appropriately addressed in principle (subject to firming up detail and addressing outstanding issues re: Wharemauku bridge) Firm up detail re: proposed density of patterns on (noise wall) wall panels. Also it is important to ensure that the indicated		The Patterning on the noise walls will be generally as shown on SHEETS 17 & 18, using 3 different scale of the same pattern.

			75mm concrete capping over fill material (between TL4 Expressway barrier and noise wall) on Sheet 14 is implemented. There is no detail re: ground treatment under Wharemauku bridge on southern side (10m from top of stream bank to abutment including 3m CWB) and northern side (17m strip for future road corridor). This needs to be addressed.		Capping detail is included in the detailed design drawings and will be implemented. Riprap (approximately 200mm min. stones dimension) will be installed on the ground under the Wharemauku bridge (as for Waikanae bridge). The riprap will continue through the stream bed Provision will be made for the CWB (south bank) and informal footpath (north bank) across the riprap (see Sheet 7).
	Local property access;		Condition appropriately addressed		No response required
	- Landscape treatment (LMP and SSMLPs);		Condition appropriately addressed		No response required
	- Bridge piers and abutment design (location of piers, scale and materials);		Condition appropriately addressed (subject to firming up some detailed design elements) Ensure consistency between plan drawings and text. (see also comment under 'AEE Principles set out in ULDF' above)		completed
	- Signage;		Condition appropriately addressed		No response required
DC.59A g)	DC.59A g) requires preparation of a SSUDP for the (CWB) path network and include: - Final alignment and form of CWB. - Provision for a 3.0m wide two-way path - Connections - Boardwalks; - Lighting, safety provisions for crossing of local Roads - CPTED review.	DP	Conditions appropriately addressed CPTED review undertaken		No response required
DC.59A g)	In addition, SSMP4 shall consider the following in relation to Condition 59A i) vi) Makarini St area pedestrian bridge 1. Location and design 2. location of connections. vii) Mazengarb Rd1. design of retaining walls Network Integration Plan Condition DC.64 a) in relation to the CWB; Condition DC.64 b) ii) in relation to lighting.	DP	Makarini St area pedestrian bridge not included in this SSMP and will be developed at a later stage Condition appropriately addressed in principle subject to firming up detail		These Conditions refer to SSMP 4

DC57(f)	<p>Landscape Conditions Condition DC57(f) lists the matters to be provided and in summary includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vegetation to be retained; - Vegetation protection measures; - Proposed Planting (including the stages) - Fernbird habitat created; - Maintenance standards; - Detailed specifications; - A maintenance regime; - Landscape treatment of any noise barriers; - Landscape treatment for pedestrian and cycle facilities. 		<p>Vegetation to be retained plans progressing through the certification system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Liaise with Council Parks directly re type of specimen trees to come to a mutually agreed solution re tree species. -Details of tree planting yet to be provided including tree pits, screens and irrigation systems. <p>Planting plans M2PP-38R-D-DWG-8201 & 8202 have large unmarked (blank) areas at the edge of the designation, mainly on the eastern side. If existing ground cover has been cleared, need some indication of what final treatment will be. JW to contact KCDC re: future use and requirements.</p> <p>Noise fence detail (NB7), Would prefer to see capping on fence if possible for a neater/more residential finish</p> <p>Suggest plans include additional cross-section around CH5900 (Milne Drive) to show impact of 3m high noise wall plus 2m fence on adjacent residents</p>		<p>No response required</p> <p>Meeting held with Lex Bartlett, KCDC Leisure and Open Space Manager on 11th August to discuss planting and species selection. As a result planting plans and species have been amended and a combination of rewa rewa and pohutukawa (<i>Metrosideros</i> 'Mistral') with shrub underplanting will be used.</p> <p>Tree pit and screen details provided on Sheet 4 and standard detail M2PP-23R-D-DWG-8900. No irrigation to be installed but in each specimen tree pit a 1.0m long x 65mm diameter perforated plastic pipe set vertically beside the rootball with the top projecting 50mm above the finished mulch level will be installed.</p> <p>Any disturbed ground outside the planting footprint will be made good and grassed. Depending on the final location of the designation boundaries these areas may or may not remain as part of the Expressway corridor.</p> <p>The noise fences will not have capping.</p> <p>Cross section CS8 through 51 Milne drive shows this</p>
DC 57 e), DC 57A, and DC 59Aj)	<p>Consultation</p> <p>DC 57 e), DC 57A, and DC 59Aj) requires consultation with the following parties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Te Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai; - Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC). - Friends of Wharemauku Stream - Kāpiti Cycling Incorporated and the Implementation Group of the Kāpiti Coast District Council Advisory on Cycleways, Walkways and Bridleways in respect of the CWB and any cycle or pedestrian connections <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Three landscape focus areas Eastern side of designation Kapiti to Mazengarb Road 2. Western side Kapiti to Mazengarb Road incl (Cheltenham Drive and Lincoln Court) 		No consultation feedback to date		Record of consultation is detailed in the relevant tables below.

	3. Milne Drive to Quadrant Heights				
	CPTED Review		CPTED Review undertaken Concern for Cypress Grove properties that back onto the designation re use of 'concealed' space behind back fence. Will this provide a space for unwanted activity or for residents to remove sections of fence to re-establish use of the land?		Low planting is proposed on the Expressway side of the boundary behind Cypress Grove properties. Low planting adjacent to solid fences is CPTED principle, to avoid creating hiding places that encourage antisocial behaviour.
ULDF 5.11	Planting Design Principles Develop the planting structure at the Kāpiti and Te Moana interchanges to specifically enhance the visual amenity of the public open space as well as to provide shade and shelter.		Ensure massed planting between Kapiti Road and Wetland 4 allows some viewshafts through/over wetland ie don't screen all views from the road but allow for viewshafts to the wider open space.		Views to the wetland from the Expressway and on-ramp will be possible between the specimen trees, with better views available from the more elevated Expressway.
	Locate vegetation strategically to provide visual screening to the Expressway and associated structures, noise walls, and bunds.		Ensure that planting that backs onto taller noise barriers alongside the expressway is of sufficient scale to provide a backdrop to noise walls in views from the road, as well as screening views from adjoining residential properties		Taller tree species have been added to the planting mix for planting adjacent to taller noise walls. In places this may not be possible where stormwater swales are immediately adjacent to noise walls, or where underground stormwater infrastructure does not allow such planting.
ULDF 5.12	CWB Design Principles Consider lighting through the urban areas to provide for evening use of the path.		Further work required to address issues of lighting on CWB affecting adjoining residential properties. Cross sections CS1 shows one potential problem area. Need to check cross-section through Milne Drive re elevation of CWB wrt adjoining properties to see if there may be issues with light spillage.		Comment re cross section CS1 refers to SSMP4. The luminaire on the CWB light poles will be specifically selected to avoid light spillage with light directed down toward the CWB. The poles will be on the residential side of the path and directed toward the CWB and expressway, to ensure the downward light is directed away from neighbouring houses. Cross section CS8 shows the relationship between the CWB lighting, Expressway lighting and the adjacent house. These particular residents have requested fairly low vegetation next to the noise fence. In this location, some light spill from the Expressway lights will be unavoidable due to their height and primary purpose to light the road for safety reasons.
LMP 8.41	Screen views of Expressway and specific elements such noise walls and fences;		Ensure that planting that backs onto taller noise barriers alongside the expressway screens views from adjoining residential properties.		Taller tree species have been added to the planting mix for planting adjacent to taller noise walls. In places this may not be possible where stormwater swales are immediately adjacent to noise walls, or where underground infrastructure does not allow such planting.

COMMENTS ON SSMP3: WHAREMAUKU BASIN					
KAPITI CYCLING INC. (LS) Lynn Sleath					
IMPLEMENTATION GROUP OF THE KAPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL, advisory on Cycleways, walkways and Bridleways [JN] Jan Nisbet					
<i>Condition Reference</i>	<i>Condition Detail</i>	<i>Reviewer/commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>reference in SSMP</i>	<i>Management Plan Author's response</i>
DC59A.g, & DC59A.i) v) 2.	CWB	LS	We note that the drawings suggest that the CWB crossing of Kapiti Road will be controlled by traffic signals incorporating the motor vehicle movements from the northbound off ramp. We	Sheet 10	Independently operated cycle lights and pedestrian lights will provide a controlled CWB crossing across Kapiti Road for either cyclists or pedestrians. The same controlled crossings will be provided for the shared path on the south side of Kapiti Road where it crosses the south bound on ramp and northbound off ramp.

DC59Ai(xi)			suggest that some thought is required here to providing cyclists with some priority rather than merely incorporating the cycle phase with the motor vehicle off ramp movements, as this will encourage cyclists to await a phase change rather than chancing things and merely proceeding against a red phase.		
	CWB	LS	The choice of alignment for the CWB east of Wharemauku Stream is appreciated, because it provides interest and variation by using the noise bund.	Sheet 2	Noted. However, neighbouring residents to the noise bund requested that the CWB be located down the slope slightly in order to retain their privacy (ie they prefer that CWB users do not overlook their property). The CWB has been moved off the top of the bund but still retains varying horizontal alignment along its length.
	CWB	JN	Agrees with comments made by LS and Stuart Kilmister (KCDC). Also: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure coloured surfaces at CWB entrances are non-slip • Confirm that there is space for horses (unclear on plans). • Reiterate preference for a pair of steel crash barriers arranged to provide a physical message to cyclists, together with raised surfacing and words to warn of the proximity of traffic. 		Coloured surfaces would be standard textured surface used for on-road cycle lanes. 1.0m wide grass verge provided for horses beside 3.0m path see SHEET 20 NZTA and M2PP traffic safety auditors strongly oppose the use of bollards or barriers on cycleways that can cause harm to cyclists

COMMENTS ON SSMP3: WHAREMAUKU BASIN
- **LANDSCAPE FOCUS GROUPS DC 57A A)**

- ii) Eastern side of the designation between Kāpiti Road and Mazengarb Road including Greenwood Place, Elder Grove, Cypress Grove, Spackman Crescent, Makarini Street, Palmer Court, St James Court and Chilton Drive;
v) Milne Drive through to Quadrant Heights;

Condition Reference	Condition Detail	Reviewer/ commenter	Comment	reference in SSMP	Management Plan Author's response
		Tom Reid (29-31 Quadrant Heights),	What will the view be from my section? Street lights? Will sunlight be blocked?		The primary view will be from the back of your section to the east. Beyond the 2.0m high noise fence you will see the tops of the mixed native vegetation, which will eventually reach 3-4m height 8-10 years). This is extremely unlikely to shade morning sun from your property.
		John and Cushla Anderson (39 Quadrant Heights),	What will the view be from my section? Street lights? Will sunlight be blocked?		39 Quadrant: The conifer trees in the expressway designation will be removed (at the owners' request). This will open up the construction site to the residents. The CWB has been moved off the top of the bund, and located further to the east
		Tom Reid (29-31 Quadrant Heights)	Request that CWB realigned off the top of the bund to protect their privacy.		CWB has been realigned off the top of the bund to the east.
			How does resident maintain their own fence with noise wall abutted against it?		Fences will only be able to be maintained or constructed from residential property side.
			Planting between CWB and boundary to be 4m min. height and not block the sun.		The CWB has been realigned off the bund for privacy reasons so would not be visible. The proposed planting will range from 3-5 m high.
		John and Cushla Anderson (39 Quadrant Heights)	Want to see the conifers on boundary removed and replaced by olive trees		The conifers on the boundary will be removed at owners' request. Olive trees are included in the planting plan (at owners' request).
		Craig Anderson (17 Datum Way)	Request for dense (5-10m) planting between boundary and CWB		The proposed planting will be dense mixed native shrubs and trees, ranging from 3-5 m high, which will obscure views to the CWB and limit access to the boundary.

	Craig Anderson (17 Datum Way)	Request to keep macrocarpa trees	Agree, this has been noted on 'Vegetation to be retained' plans. Three of the four macrocarpa trees can be retained, subject to final survey and CWB alignment.
	Craig Anderson (17 Datum Way)	Request to bring planting programme forward as much as possible	Wherever possible finished areas will be planted as early as possible. This however is dependent on supply of eco-sourced plant stock, and the construction finish date in relation to the winter planting season (June – August)
	Peter and Mary-Anne Smith (51 Milne Drive)	Construct the grassed link between Milne Drive and CWB at a track access, not against our property	The link to Milne Drive will not be formalised at this stage, pending final property agreements. If a CWB link is formalised it will be toward the north end of this stretch of Milne Drive, not adjacent to 51 Milne Drive property.
	Peter and Mary-Anne Smith (51 Milne Drive)	Request for low (less than 2.0m tall) planting between boundary and CWB	Noted- Detailed planting plans will include this
	Shona Watson (17 Greenwood) Adam Mirartana (18 Greenwood Plc)	Requires cross-section through their property	Cross sections prepared and issued.
	Shona Watson (17 Greenwood)	Requests higher planting between boundary fence and footpath	Tall planting adjacent to tall fences in publicly accessible locations can encourage anti-social behaviour and is avoided where ever possible. This has been highlighted in the 'Crime prevention through environmental design' assessment (CPTED). Given the minimum width available here it is proposed to provide low dense planting between the path and the boundary. A 2.0m high timber fence will be provided for security purposes, given there will be a public footpath immediately adjacent to the property. The fence would have vertical palings with the no climb side facing the footpath.
	Adam Mirartana (18 Greenwood Plc)	How will the noise fence look on my boundary?	A 2.0m high timber boundary fence (built to noise wall standard) will be constructed to secure the residential property from the public footpath.
	Adam Mirartana (18 Greenwood Plc)	How long will planting take to establish?	The maintenance period for the planting is for 3 years after construction by then the planting will be well established. The specimen trees will take many (approximately 20) years to reach their mature height
	Adam Mirartana (18 Greenwood Plc)	What will the walkway look like and will there be a fence on my boundary?	A 2m high timber fence will be provided for security purposes, given there will be a public footpath immediately adjacent to the property. The fence would have vertical paling with the no climb side facing the footpath.
	Anita and Jon Haylock (24 Cypress Grove)	Will there be boundary fencing along Makarini Street?	The Alliance is not intending to construct fences along the Expressway/residential property boundaries.
	Anita and Jon Haylock (24 Cypress Grove)	How close will planting be to my property / will there be a fire break?	A 3.0m wide grass maintenance strip will be located on the Expressway side of the boundary at this location.
	Sam Barns (12 Greenwood)	Request for plans showing further detail between Kapiti Road to Mazengarb	Plans sent to Mr Barns
	Mike Cartmer 24 Observation Place	Planting should be done in a manner to minimise noise in high wind Planting should minimise pollen release\ Planting should be done in a manner to dissuade people from approaching the sound fence	The timber noise fence will provide noise mitigation. While vegetation may assist with this it is not recognised as an effective method of mitigating noise. The plants are a mix of native species already present throughout Kapiti. The variety of species means that they will flower at different times of the year and will not create a mass of pollen at any one time. The dense mass of vegetation between the CWB and the noise fence, once established, will deter people from entering the area.
LANDSCAPE FOCUS GROUPS DC 57A b)			
Summary feedback from immediately adjoining residential property owners, following 10 day feedback period on Draft SSMP issued 21 July 2014			
	Brian Daw 47 Quadrant Heights	Suggested red flax be planted in designation beside timber noise fence to deter walkers from climbing	2.0m high timber fence will have palings facing the footpath (rather than rails) to discourage climbing from the public side. There is no planting planned adjacent to the noise fence at this location, the existing olive trees within the designation will be retained.

			fence, colour will complement the light green olive trees.		
		Adam and Amanda Miratana , 18 Greenwood Place	<p>Questions that noise mitigation proposed (1.1m barriers) is adequate compared to 2m and 3m noise walls and fence proposed south of Kapiti Road, near Milne Drive.</p> <p>2.0m high fence would not provide our property with privacy, and wouldn't provide any noise mitigation. Increase the height of the fence; possibly have a 2m fence on a retaining wall (500mm).</p> <p>It was advised to us by you that we could plant on our side to mitigate the privacy and visual aspect of the expressway at our expense. It is not financially viable for us to do this.</p> <p>Request confirmation as to what type of fence will be built</p>		<p>The noise mitigation plan was approved as part of the BOI process; Alliance Stakeholder communications team have provided additional information</p> <p>The 2.0m high timber fence is being provided for security purposes because of the new public footpath that passes this property. At 2.0m high it will provide privacy from footpath users. Vegetation once established on the Expressway and expressway ramp embankments will provide some privacy from road users.</p> <p>Planting was suggested as a possibility if visual screening was desired higher than the 2.0m fence. The Alliance is not undertaking planting on private property.</p> <p>The fence will be built to noise fence standard.</p>
		Stewart Watson, 17 Greenwood Place	<p>Questions that noise mitigation proposed (1.1m barriers) is adequate compared to 2m and 3m noise walls and fence proposed south of Kapiti Road, near Milne Drive.</p> <p>Request that timber fence on boundary be increased in size from 2.0 metres to 2.5 metres to provide greater security against potential trespassers.</p>		<p>The noise mitigation plan was approved as part of the BOI process, Alliance Stakeholder communications team have provided additional information.</p> <p>2.0m high timber fence will have palings facing the footpath (rather than rails) to discourage climbing from the public side. 2.0m is the standard fence height being provided by the Alliance.</p>

COMMENTS ON PRELIMINARY ISSUE SSMP3: WHAREMAUKU BASIN

TE ATIAWA KI WHAKARONGATAI

<i>Condition Reference</i>	<i>Condition Detail</i>	<i>Reviewer/ commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>reference in SSMP</i>	<i>Management Plan Author's response</i>
57 e) i	SSMP to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai				<p>SSMP Issued for comment 10/7/14, no formal comments received as at 27/8/14, despite follow up email reminders requesting feedback on 6/8 and 14/8/14.</p> <p>In addition, the Alliance design team are working with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai to develop design of some elements along the CWB corridor. This work considers the whole Expressway route. The first stage, currently underway, will identify the particular locations of significance to Te Atiawa. If these locations occur within this SSMP area, landscape elements or features will be designed and incorporated into the CWB corridor, in consultation with Te Atiawa.</p>

<i>COMMENTS ON PRELIMINARY ISSUE SSMP3: WHAREMAUKU BASIN</i>					
FRIENDS OF WHAREMAUKU STREAM Gordon Cameron =GC					
<i>Condition Reference</i>	<i>Condition Detail</i>	<i>Reviewer/ commenter</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>reference in SSMP</i>	<i>Management Plan Author's response</i>
		GC	<p>The Friends are pleased to have been consulted and are positive about what is being proposed and that it is consistent with their expectations.</p> <p>The Friends focus is primarily on water quality and planting along the stream to assist in improving water quality.</p> <p>In their experience the Friends have found that planting needs only one season of intense maintenance, after that it becomes fairly self-sustaining and needing only occasional maintenance.</p> <p>Friends are keen to see SSMP2 when it's prepared because of the proximity and relationship to Wharemauku Stream, especially the details of the flood storage area and the proposed planting in this area.</p> <p>One of the aims of the Friends is to see taller trees planted along Wharemauku Stream to increase shading and the subsequent benefits that will accrue to habitat and water quality. Gordon was pleased to see the enrichment planting proposed on the northern side of Wharemauku Stream.</p>		Noted, no response required.