

Appendix 2: CONSULTATION, FEEDBACK AND RESPONSES
Site Specific Management Plan 004 - [Sectors 410-420]
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 are:

- Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC).
- 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.
- Te Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai;
- Two Landscape Focus Areas (DC 57A a)
 - o 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;
 - o iii) Western side of the designation between Kāpiti Road and Mazengarb Road including Cheltenham Drive and Lincoln Court; (Metlife care)

COMMENTS ON PRELIMINARY ISSUE SSMP4: KAPITI MAZENGARB

KCDC REVIEWERS COMMENTS [JW=Julia Williams- Landscape Architect; DP = Deyana Popova-Urban Designer; SK=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
DC.59A g)	CWB detail	SK	Why are the CWB paths either side of Mazengarb road not opposite each other? Is acceptable to have pedestrians and cyclists crossing Mazengarb on an angle? My preference would be to introduce a curve into the CWB path bringing the path closer to the southern abutment, and more in line with the CWB opposite.	SHEET 7 bridge master plan	The CWB entrances are offset to discourage cyclists riding straight across the road. The crossings/drop kerbs will be opposite each other
DC.59A g)	CWB detail	SK	On the northern side of the newly lowered local road there appears to be either a wide shoulder or a path disappearing near contour 8.0. can you confirm what it is, either path or shoulder? More detail of the layout of the CWB exit onto Mazengarb Road from the north is desirable given the uncertainty of the pavement (path or shoulder) type in this area.	SHEET 8 bridge master plan	Drawn incorrectly. Mazengarb Road has a 1.5m shoulder on both sides of the road. Mazengarb Road will be kerb and channel with grass up to the kerb on the northern side, with Kapiti blue under the bridge decks.
DC.59A g)	CWB detail	SK	Cross section through CH 7800; will the highway have a barrier on the western side to prevent vehicles from ending up on the CWB in an accident scenario?	SHEET 10 section	There are safety barriers along the whole length of the Expressway
DC.59A g)	CWB detail	SK	CS3 cross sectional elevation of Mazengarb bridge appears to show a 2m wide footpath on the north side and a 1.5m wide footpath on the south beside a garden area, is that correct? (Question relates to sheet 8 also)	SHEET 11 Bridge elevations	No. footpath on south of Mazengarb Road only. Proposed width 2200mm to tie into existing. Space provision has been made for future footpath on north side- currently there is no footpath to tie into.

DC.59A g)	CWB detail	SK	Visualisation looks great although it doesn't show Mazengarb Road lowered and the difference in distance between the two CWB entries/exits to the abutments is not apparent.	SHEET 12 Mazengarb Road	Mazengarb Road has been lowered in the visualisation. The visualisation is intended to show the general appearance of the new bridge, detailed plans should be referred to as well.
DC.57A a) and b)	Maintenance along Makarini Street boundary	JW	Assumed that the maintenance track shown in the adjoining sector to the south in SSMP 3 would extend and run to Mazengarb Road. The swale (which is about 5.0m wide) could be also used for vehicle access for landscape maintenance. This would ensure that an eye would be kept on the boundary and thwart any incursion into the designation.	SHHETS 2 & 3	Maintenance access only needs to extend as far as shown on SSMP3 (ie to a sewer line manhole). The SSMP planting plans show swale planting extending between the end of the maintenance access and the swale; the SSMP and the planting plans are consistent with each other. The landscape constructor has confirmed that pedestrian access is only needed for vegetation establishment along the noise bund and this access will be along the unplanted top of the bund. The swale, which is a v-channel with riprap in the invert, could be straddled by vehicles if the swale was grassed but the series of scruffy domes along the length of the swale would be an obstacle to vehicles. A planted swale located adjacent to massed planting is consistent with planting design principles applied elsewhere. Additional maintenance width would require steepening the noise bund gradients beyond the standard.
DC.57A a) and b)	Noise wall	JW	On cross section CS3 the 2.0m noise wall is not shown.	SHEET 8	The cross section has been updated and annotated accordingly.
DC.57A a) and b)	Noise wall	JW	The noise wall at the Mazengarb Road bridge has been reduced from 3.0m to 2.0m in height. Is there a reason for this?	SHEET 11	There should have never been a 3.0m high wall shown here.
DC.57A a) and b)	Noise walls	JW	There appears to be two parallel noise walls to the southeast of the Mazengarb bridge, a 2.0m high timber wall along the residential boundary (shown in brown) and a 2.0m high concrete noise wall extending to the west from the barrier (shown in light blue). Are both needed, wouldn't the timber wall provide sufficient screening?	SHEET 11	The noise mitigation was well traversed at the recent Mazengarb hearing; the design shown is as directed by the noise expert and is in line with the council decision.
DC.57A a) and b)	Noise walls	JW	Is there a standard transition between noise walls? 2.0m transitional wall between TL4 and 2.5m noise wall. What is the transition between 2.0m wall and TL4-a 1.0m change in height?		Height change is 900mm (TL4 is 1100mm). There is no transitional structure between these heights.
DC.57A a) and b)	Timber noise fence	JW	Are the palings going to be buried 100mm in the ground? I assume the palings will therefore be ground treated (H4), which is a large additional cost.	SHEET 15	The palings will be ground treated to H5. No additional cost as this treatment was allowed for in the original estimate.
DC.57A a) and b)	Property access	JW	Please firm detail re access to 353 Mazengarb Road	SHEET 3	NZTA Property are satisfied with the property access which is possible via the maintenance access to culvert in Sector 430 (north of Mazengarb Road). SHEET 3 has been annotated accordingly.

DC.59A e) vii)	Bridge Development Study	JW	Confirm whether there will be lighting under the Mazengarb Bridge (Principle 6, Bridge Development Study)	SHEETS 4, 5 & 20	Lighting under the bridge is made clear in various parts of the SSMP. The bridge development study has been updated accordingly; there will be architectural lighting under the Mazengarb Road bridge (SHEET 20).
----------------	--------------------------	----	---	--------------------	---

COMMENTS ON PRELIMINARY ISSUE SSMP4: KAPITI MAZENGARB KAPITI CYCLING INC. [LS] Lynn Sleath IMPLEMENTATION GROUP OF THE KAPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL, advisory on Cycleways, walkways and Bridleways [JN] Jan Nisbet					
Condition Reference	Condition Detail	Reviewer/commenter	Comment	reference in SSMP	Management Plan Author's response
DC59A.f ii and iii and DC59A.g, DC59Ai(xi) and DC.57 c)	CWB		<p>As expressed to the Board of Enquiry, we remain concerned about the crossing of the CWB over Mazengarb Road. We note the comment “Details to be finalised” on Sheet 7 and look forward to commenting on these when available.</p> <p>The artist’s illustration in Sheet 12 confirms that there will be limited visibility of westbound motor vehicles below the new bridge for northbound users of the CWB. The illustration suggests a very limited open crossing with no control. We suggest that our previous comments about Otaihanga Road crossing should apply here. They are repeated below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide advance signs to alert vehicles of the potential for people crossing the road. The Alliance should consider the use of smart warning signs. There are products that detect the presence of a cyclist approaching on the CWB, and then provide a signal to a variable message sign set up to provide the standard MOTSAM ‘cyclist’ symbol in a yellow flashing mode. 2. The two ends of the CWB should incorporate the latest treatment used by KCDC for the nearby Otaihanga Road crossing beside the Main Trunk Rail Line. This includes 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. 	SHEET 7	<p>‘Details to be finalised’ refers to the intersection of the CWB with the footpath. The four generic designs are currently being refined and finalised in consultation with Stu Kilmister (KCDC) and NZTA. The four design options will all be used at various locations along the route, and generally need to allow for maintenance vehicle access.</p> <p>Additional signs are not required as available sightlines match/exceed the design standards.</p> <p>NZTA do not concur with the use of barriers that force users to dismount. The design will clearly signal to users that the crossing is approaching through the use of; Gabion blocks that create a clear ‘entrance’ and visual narrowing of the 3.0m path, change in surface texture (chipseal) coloured surface at entrance.</p> <p>NZTA and M2PP traffic safety auditors strongly oppose the use of bollards or barriers on cycleways that can cause harm to cyclists.</p>
	CWB	JN	<p>Agrees with comments made by LS and Stuart Kilmister (KCDC). Also:</p> <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. 		<p>Coloured surfaces would be standard textured surface used for on-road cycle lanes.</p> <p>1.0m wide grass verge provided for horses beside 3.0m path see SHEET 20</p> <p>NZTA and M2PP traffic safety auditors strongly oppose the use of bollards or barriers on cycleways that can cause harm to cyclists</p>

COMMENTS ON PRELIMINARY ISSUE SSMP4: KAPITI MAZENGARB TE ATIWA KI WHAKARONGATAI					
Condition Reference	Condition Detail	Reviewer/ commenter	Comment	reference in SSMP	Management Plan Author's response
57 e) i	SSMP to be prepared in consultation with Te Atiawa ki Whakarongatai		Comments not received as yet		<p>SSMP 4 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>

COMMENTS from 7 JULY INFORMATION EVENING SSMP4: KAPITI MAZENGARB Landscape Focus Areas (DC 57A a) Consultation with residents of properties close to the Expressway (identified for their sensitivity to visual effects) 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 iii) Western side of the designation between Kāpiti Road and Mazengarb Road including Cheltenham Drive and Lincoln Court; (Metlife care)					
Condition Reference	Condition Detail	Reviewer/ commenter	Comment	reference in SSMP	Management Plan Author's response
DC 57 A a)		Joe Patten, Jan Scrimshaw (14 & 16 Chilton Drive)	Can you put barbed wire or electric fence on top of noise fence?		The M2PP Alliance will not be installing barbed wire atop the noise fence. This would be an undesirable element in a residential area due to its institutional appearance. The double sided 2.0m high noise fence will deter people from climbing the fence.
			Will the noise fence adjoin existing fences to avoid gaps, and how would an existing fence on the boundary be maintained?		<p>Yes, a security fence will join to each end of the noise fence to fully secure the Chilton Drive area from Mazengarb Road.</p> <p>NZTA will maintain the noise fence as it is a Condition of consent that noise mitigation be provided.</p>
			How will the Mazengarb Road embankments prevent people from the road climbing up to Chilton Drive properties?		The embankments would be climbable (4h:1V grade), but they will be planted to discourage people from walking there. The 2.0m high noise fence at the top will be double sided to make it difficult to climb from both sides.
			Preference that the land at the end of Chilton Drive is not made into a playground -- it's better to be planted up openly. Cherry trees? Mix of grass and some planting?		<p>The planting design will consist a combination of grass and trees to keep it open, where possible existing vegetation will be retained. The detailed planting design has not been completed yet; cherry trees could be included in this design.</p> <p>A playground is not planned for the area.</p>

		Jeannette Cottier (22 Chilton Drive)	Concerned that ground rises on the back of her property and that planting will not be sufficient to achieve mitigation.		The rising ground is a noise bund that will hide views of the Expressway and will also reduce Expressway noise to consented levels.
		ML Adam (6 Oxford Court), Jeannette Cottier (22 Chilton Drive, Linda Schager (107B Makarini Street)	Requires cross-section through their property		Sections prepared and issued. 14/7/14
		Linda Schager (107B Makarini Street)	Can the boundary fence have clear panels to maintain light?		The Alliance is not constructing boundary fences.
		Linda Schager (107B Makarini Street)	Request low vegetation in area adjacent to boundary, not flax.		The cross section provided, shows low planting adjacent to the boundary. This will be a species of rush called oioi.
		Linda Schager (107B Makarini Street)	Wasps have been a nuisance in the area, and are attracted to native trees (like the "five finger"). Could the planting please avoid trees producing a strong honeydew.		Wasps are a recent problem is due to a proliferation of wasp nests that have established in the blackberry and long grass. On-going pest management within the designation will continue to control this problem.
		C Ramsey (37B Chilton Drive),	Will water run onto my section from the noise bund?		No it will not, the soil and plants on the bund will intercept and absorb rainwater. In the event of a storm when there may be run off, the drainage channel at the toe of the bund will intercept the water to be drained away in pipes.
		C Ramsey (37B Chilton Drive) Linda Schager (107B Makarini Street)	What will the view be from my section? Street lights? Will sunlight be blocked?		<p>The new view beyond any existing boundary fence will be a planted bund, the Expressway will not be visible.</p> <p>There are no lights on the Expressway at this location. The CWB on the far side of the Expressway will be lit but these lights will not be visible beyond the earth bund.</p> <p>While the bund itself will not have potential to shade, the vegetation once grown may intercept the sun when it is at a low angle at some times of the year. Generally the bund planting will avoid tall growing species at the apex of the bund.</p> <p>The cross section provided to 107B Makarini St- shows the top of the bund approximately 19m from the dwelling and 2.5 m higher than the property ground level.</p>

Appendix 3: BRIDGE SUMMARY- MAZENGARB BRIDGE
Site Specific Management Plan 004 - [Sectors 420]
MacKays to Peka Peka Expressway

01 SEPTEMBER 2014 - CERTIFIED ISSUE - REV C

