

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
1	1/1	Glenn Chadwick		1.1 Support - NOR All	I am writing to add my voice of support for the CRL project. As a daily user of commuter trains in Wellington I strongly believe that the link will make Auckland a more vibrant city, which is easier to travel around. It will also make Auckland a more attractive holiday destination - especially to those who don't drive - or won't drive in a city that they are unfamiliar with. I feel it is important to register my support - despite not living in Auckland, because it should be on record that this project has support from people outside Auckland.
2	2/1	Erin E Wi		1.1 Support - NOR All	
3	3/1	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	5 The submitter seeks that: (a) The NOR for the CRL proposal be cancelled and withdrawn. (b) That any designation of other approval of the CRL proposal includes and is subject to LIFE's property and facilities first being relocated and re-established on an alternative site with the same attributes as the LIFE Central site and facilities and within a specified timeframe not exceeding 2 years from the designation approval date; (c) That the lapsing period of any designation or approval be limited to 5 years; and (d) Any further, additional or consequential relief that is necessary or appropriate in respect of the matters referred to in this submission.
3	3/2	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	5.26 Social impact	(d) The AEE makes no reference to the LIFE Central Site and facilities in respect of the "existing environment" and the AEE Table 7.3 ("Summary of Assessment of Effects on the Environment" makes no reference to LIFE Central or the proposal's serious adverse effects on it, including disruption, noise and vibration with particular reference to LIFE's auditorium and facilities (including electronic, audio and visual equipment). (e) The only apparent AEE reference to LIFE Central is in respect of "intangible effects" under the heading "Concern Around Loss of Community and Cultural Facilities". This is an insufficient recognition of the CRL proposal's effects on LIFE; and even then the AEE in addressing them only acknowledges that such effects are not able to be "completely avoided", with the only suggested "methods to mitigate" being "...communications and liaison with those affected...". Significantly, the AEE acknowledges in respect of the CRL proposal that "...the effects of construction will be significant". However, in addressing such effects, the AEE simply and somewhat generally asserts that, "methods and practices are available (and have successfully been used on other projects) and will be implemented where practicable via conditions on the designation to avoid, remedy or mitigate these adverse effects". (g) There is apparently no detail on how such avoidance, remediation or mitigation of adverse effects would occur other than the generalised approach of a proposed "Environmental Management Framework", under which there would be (one or more) "environmental management plans" (including a construction environmental management plan).
3	3/3	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	4.2 RMA policy framework	(h) Significantly, however, the "identified management plans under the EMF would not be developed or provided to the Auckland Council until the Outline Plan procedure stage under section 176A of the RMA; meaning that the substantive assessment of the CRL's adverse environmental effects (and any particular measures to address them) would not be done until after the public (including affected property owners) have lost the opportunity for statutory input - in what effectively amounts to a deferral of the adverse effects assessment beyond the Requirement evaluation and determination.
3	3/4	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	5.23 Property rights	(i) In respect of the "main construction site area" (of which LIFE's site is part) the AEE asserts "there is also the potential of this land being 'blighted' pre-construction...". This assertion is incorrect as it is already the actual and continuing adverse effect of the requirement (and the designation if the requirement is confirmed) that the LIFE site and its development plans are stymied. Prior to the CRL being proposed LIFE had pre-application meetings with the Auckland Council in respect of its already-developed plans for the expansion of its facilities on the site including the auditorium, to accommodate the rapidly-growing LIFE community and the public notification of the CRL requirement has already stymied those proposals, as the NOR demonstrates. (j) The proposed 20 year lapse period is opposed and the paragraph 2.2.7 reasons are insufficient and apparently incomplete. The asserted "certainty to affected land owners" amounts to the "certainty" of a 20 year blighting period (if approved) for affected land owners - assuming even that period is not extended. It is understood that neither Auckland Transport nor the Auckland Council currently has the necessary funding to construct the proposed CRL, in respect of which the statutory "financial responsibility" is a necessary precursor to the legitimacy of the NOR. Given the severity of the proposal's adverse effects on LIFE (and other property owners and members of the community) the lapsing period (if the designation is approved) should be the statutory 5 year period, for which Auckland Transport may obtain, on its merits, an extension under section 184 of the RMA if warranted. The statutory lapse period would remove the uncertainty and lack of accountability that would accompany a 20 year lapse period.
3	3/5	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	5.22 Legal	(j) The proposed 20 year lapse period is opposed and the paragraph 2.2.7 reasons are insufficient and apparently incomplete. The asserted "certainty to affected land owners" amounts to the "certainty" of a 20 year blighting period (if approved) for affected land owners - assuming even that period is not extended. It is understood that neither Auckland Transport nor the Auckland Council currently has the necessary funding to construct the proposed CRL, in respect of which the statutory "financial responsibility" is a necessary precursor to the legitimacy of the NOR. Given the severity of the proposal's adverse effects on LIFE (and other property owners and members of the community) the lapsing period (if the designation is approved) should be the statutory 5 year period, for which Auckland Transport may obtain, on its merits, an extension under section 184 of the RMA if warranted. The statutory lapse period would remove the uncertainty and lack of accountability that would accompany a 20 year lapse period.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
3	3/6	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	5.24 Designation lapse period	(j) The proposed 20 year lapse period is opposed and the paragraph 2.2.7 reasons are insufficient and apparently incomplete. The asserted "certainty to affected land owners" amounts to the "certainty" of a 20 year blighting period (if approved) for affected land owners - assuming even that period is not extended. It is understood that neither Auckland Transport nor the Auckland Council currently has the necessary funding to construct the proposed CRL, in respect of which the statutory "financial responsibility" is a necessary precursor to the legitimacy of the NOR. Given the severity of the proposal's adverse effects on LIFE (and other property owners and members of the community) the lapsing period (if the designation is approved) should be the statutory 5 year period, for which Auckland Transport may obtain, on its merits, an extension under section 184 of the RMA if warranted. The statutory lapse period would remove the uncertainty and lack of accountability that would accompany a 20 year lapse period.
3	3/7	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	3.4 Whether the designations are reasonably necessary / NOR is an unreasonable burden	(k) In its present form (including the proposed lapse period) the CRL proposals fail to achieve the stated "Project Objectives" and is accordingly not reasonably necessary to achieve the Project Objectives (or "AT's wider objectives).
3	3/8	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	4.1 Part 2 RMA	(L) In summary, the CRL proposal does not achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources under Part 2 of the RMA and does not satisfy the section 171 RMA criteria.
3	3/9	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	The submitter seeks that: (b) That any designation of other approval of the CRL proposal includes and is subject to LIFE's property and facilities first being relocated and re-established on an alternative site with the same attributes as the LIFE Central site and facilities and within a specified timeframe not exceeding 2 years from the designation approval date; (d) Any further, additional or consequential relief that is necessary or appropriate in respect of the matters referred to in this submission.
3	3/10	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The submitter seeks that: (c) That the lapsing period of any designation or approval be limited to 5 years; and
3	3/11	CLC Trust Board	attn Malcolm McLean	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	(a) The NOR for the CRL proposal be cancelled and withdrawn. (b) That any designation of other approval of the CRL proposal includes and is subject to LIFE's property and facilities first being relocated and re-established on an alternative site with the same attributes as the LIFE Central site and facilities and within a specified timeframe not exceeding 2 years from the designation approval date.
4	4/1	RH and PJ Hansen, Trustees	Berathan Trust	1.17 Neutral, did not specify - NOR 2	
4	4/2	RH and PJ Hansen, Trustees	Berathan Trust	1.18 Neutral, did not specify - NOR 3	
4	4/3	RH and PJ Hansen, Trustees	Berathan Trust	1.19 Neutral, did not specify - NOR 4	
4	4/4	RH and PJ Hansen, Trustees	Berathan Trust	5.23 Property rights	3.1 The loss of property rights. To the extent that property rights are affected or we are required to surrender property rights, we expect compensation at full market value and reimbursement of any associated expenses
4	4/5	RH and PJ Hansen, Trustees	Berathan Trust	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	3.2 ...To the extent that damage ensues we seek full compensation.
4	4/6	RH and PJ Hansen, Trustees	Berathan Trust	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	3.2 Impact on and risk of damage to our buildings and/or the underlying substratum. We expect to be provided with full disclosure of any anticipated risk of injury arising from the planned works, including engineering and other expert reports, and the opportunity to peer review the advice given at the cost of Auckland Transport. 3.4 Third party losses. It is foreseeable that our tenants which include a restaurant, a professional practice and a telecommunications company housing delicate equipment, could be adversely affected by construction works. We seek assurances that they would be compensated for any consequential losses.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
5	5/1	Ian Wells		1.1 Support - NOR All	I believe developing public transportation is fundamental to all cities. Furthermore, it will never be a "better time" to develop rail in Auckland. The more time passes the harder it will be. Think of Auckland 100 years from now, not 10 years.
6	6/1	Michael Riley		1.1 Support - NOR All	
6	6/2	Michael Riley		5.10 Transport - operational	We moved close to the location of the New Lynn Transport Interchange after Waitakere City Council's primary design workshop, held in 1996. In short, we "bought in" to the philosophy of a Transit-Oriented town centre, and we look forward to the day when we can go from a two-car family, down to a single-car family. Since then, we have been pleased to see the development taking place, not just on the ground, but towards making the rail network a 'backbone' for commuter travel to the CBD and, from there, around the Auckland region. The CRL is an integral part of reducing the travel time from the western stations to Auckland CBD, and it is not acceptable (in our view) that we should have to travel from West Auckland to East Auckland, in order to access a rail corridor to the CBD and beyond. The bulk of the CRL will be located underground, and the long-term impact on land will be minimal, when compared to the benefits that it will have to a major portion of Auckland Council's population. It is hard for us to fathom how the upgrading of a highway to serve the population north of Orewa could possibly have the same or greater benefit than a commuter tunnel that serves all of the people from Mt Eden, through West Auckland and all the way to Waitakere / Kaipara. Sir Dove-Myer Robinson saw the need for this around 50 years ago, and it is our view that only politics stands in the way of its development, which is not a reasonable reason for ratepayers / taxpayers not to have a timely commuter service to Auckland CBD.
7	7/1	Adam Blake		1.1 Support - NOR All	
8	8/1	Bin Liu and Shengqiao Liao		1.25 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 2	
8	8/2	Bin Liu and Shengqiao Liao		1.26 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 3	
8	8/3	Bin Liu and Shengqiao Liao		1.29 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 6	
8	8/4	Bin Liu and Shengqiao Liao		5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	We hope can get enough money to buy a new property which has similar living condition in Auckland Grammar School zone (2 bedroom, 2 car parks, 2 bathrooms, new building)
8	8/5	Bin Liu and Shengqiao Liao		5.23 Property rights	Our property is located in Auckland Grammar School zone. For our family, our son may get good education is the top important issue. This is the reason we bought it. Therefore owning this property is very important for our family. Many people have to move home because of this project. It will cause the price of properties in this school zone increasing sharply. So, it will be a tragedy for us losing our home and unaffordable for us to purchase a new property. In addition, our unit is a new building and has very good living condition property in Auckland Grammar zone.
9	9/1	Alan W Hughes		1.1 Support - NOR All	
10	10/1	Andre Braunias		1.1 Support - NOR All	
11	11/1	Kun Li		1.1 Support - NOR All	
11	11/2	Kun Li		5.10 Transport - operational	I highly support the notices of requirement not only because the traffic circumstances will be greatly improved and it contributes to the environmental protection, also improves our metropolitan image internationally.
11	11/3	Kun Li		5.19 Sustainability	I highly support the notices of requirement not only because the traffic circumstances will be greatly improved and it contributes to the environmental protection, also improves our metropolitan image internationally.
11	11/4	Kun Li		5.28 Mitigation - monetary	I hope i can be helped to find a similar property in the same area. I bought this property not only because it is in Auckland Grammar Zone, but also close to Auckland Hospital. I am a heart-transplant receiver and go to hospital very often. Or i hope i can get enough compensation so i can buy a similar house in the same area myself.
12	12/1	Quay West Body Corporate	attn: Barry Davis, Chairperson	1.1 Support - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
12	12/2	Quay West Body Corporate	attn: Barry Davis, Chairperson	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	As chairperson of the Quay West Body Corporate I write on behalf of both the residents and Quay West Hotel operation. The Quay West complex has 253 owners and approximately 253 car parks. It is extremely important from the Hotel perspective that 24 hour 7 day a week access is maintained to the complex. This also applies to the car park which has access off Albert Street through either Mills Lane or Swanson Street.
12	12/3	Quay West Body Corporate	attn: Barry Davis, Chairperson	5.1 Noise - construction	As chairperson of the Quay West Body Corporate I write on behalf of both the residents and Quay West Hotel operation. The Quay West complex has 253 owners and approximately 253 car parks. It is important that noise be kept to a minimum particularly at night because of the hotel operation.
12	12/4	Quay West Body Corporate	attn: Barry Davis, Chairperson	5.2 Noise - operational	As chairperson of the Quay West Body Corporate I write on behalf of both the residents and Quay West Hotel operation. The Quay West complex has 253 owners and approximately 253 car parks. It is important that noise be kept to a minimum particularly at night because of the hotel operation.
13	13/1	Andre de Graaf		1.1 Support - NOR All	
13	13/2	Andre de Graaf		5.10 Transport - operational	Auckland City is in dire need of boosting investment in public transit. Through my work - I am an architect and urban designer - I experience regularly the pent up demand for a well functioning and efficient mass transit system. Furthermore I am of the firm view that if the city is to become globally competitive, be an attractive place to visit and retain our talent pool (including my own children as they grow older), a fundamental component enabling this would be the City Rail Link. Many attributes that will make Auckland an attractive and competitive city flow from this single infrastructure project - more than any other. It is currently the sheer volume and level of car dominance within the city centre that inhibits its potential. I urge the Council to find every way in which to expedite the CRL and support all of the above NORs.
14	14/1	Sara Stillwell		1.1 Support - NOR All	
15	15/1	Richard Donaldson		1.1 Support - NOR All	
15	15/2	Richard Donaldson		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
16	16/1	Nikki Stillwell		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
17	17/1	Nikki Stillwell		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
18	18/1	John Polkinghorne		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
19	19/1	Liam Winter		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
19	19/2	Liam Winter		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	The CRL enables significant growth in high productivity, high value knowledge industries in the central city.
19	19/3	Liam Winter		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Would like to see the footprint at Aotea Station expand to provide for a station exit through to Elliott / Darby Streets. These streets are a logical link between the proposed station and Queen Street, and their high pedestrian amenity as shared spaces mean they are well suited to high pedestrian volumes. In addition the site on the corner of Victoria and Albert Streets is a massive development opportunity, and the station exit should be designed to integrate with a new building.
19	19/4	Liam Winter		5.10 Transport - operational	The CRL enables 2-3 times as many trains to run on the metro rail network, thus providing the high standard of rail rapid transit service that Aucklanders want and need.
20	20/1	Johnny Sun	Dream Home Group	1.4 Support - NOR 3	
20	20/2	Johnny Sun	Dream Home Group	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I think the best way is to build the flyover railway because Auckland is located at the seismic belt which means the earthquake may break our underground work. So it is quite risky. Alongside, the underground system will cost more money and more time to be finished. So i think Auckland should build the flyover train like the sky train in Vancouver.
21	21/1	Nicola de Wit	Environmental Defense Society	1.1 Support - NOR All	
21	21/2	Nicola de Wit	Environmental Defense Society	5.10 Transport - operational	Environmental Defence Society Inc. supports the notices of requirement for the City Rail Link for the following reasons: The City Rail Link will provide for more train movements across the entire Auckland rail network which will increase the usability of public transport in Auckland in terms of number of services and amount of area serviced by a station.
21	21/3	Nicola de Wit	Environmental Defense Society	5.19 Sustainability	The CRL will have ongoing benefits for environmental and health objectives (particularly air quality) and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
21	21/4	Nicola de Wit	Environmental Defense Society	5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	The CRL will have ongoing benefits in terms of inner city redevelopment resulting in improvements in urban amenity, and will assist in achieving the Auckland Plan's vision of making Auckland the world's most liveable city.
22	22/1	Glen McCabe		1.1 Support - NOR All	
22	22/2	Glen McCabe		3.1 Appropriate solution	
23	23/1	Graeme Bulling	Boston Properties Limited	5.23 Property rights	Acquisition of part of the land at 14-22 Boston Road, Mt Eden will have a disproportionate negative effect on the adjoining land in the same title.
23	23/2	Graeme Bulling	Boston Properties Limited	1.29 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 6	Not to approve any designation over any part of the land at 14-22 Boston (Road) without the consent and cooperation of the owner of the land.
24	24/1	Boyang Shi		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	We really need a bridge or a rail network to the North Shore, a rail network to the East City, rather than spend \$2.86 billion for some one save 6-10 minutes for them to go to west city. There are many buses, it would not take long time if their use bus. City Rail Link lose millions of dollars per year and haven't balance their financial income yet, we are still in economic depression. We should spent money we really need. We could not build more and more apartment and business office in City area. But there are more and more people move out from central Auckland area, such as Albany, Flat Bush, Massey, Henderson Valley.
24	24/2	Boyang Shi		1.25 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 2	
24	24/3	Boyang Shi		1.26 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 3	
24	24/4	Boyang Shi		1.28 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 5	
24	24/5	Boyang Shi		1.29 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 6	
25	25/1	Hamish O'Neill		1.1 Support - NOR All	
25	25/2	Hamish O'Neill		3.1 Appropriate solution	
26	26/1	Jeffrey S Evans	Lighthouse and CS Family Trust Partnership	1.1 Support - NOR All	
27	27/1	Kanwal Sandhu		1.1 Support - NOR All	
28	28/1	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	1.25 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 2	
28	28/2	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	1.26 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 3	
28	28/3	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.17 Air quality	6.2.1. Air quality / contamination - the construction of the CRL is expected to generate dust, adversely affecting air quality and people's health. Construction activities are also likely to disturb contaminated land, causing odour discharges. Of particular concern is the likely disturbance to the land on the corner of Pitt and Vincent Streets (opposite the Eclipse Apartment block) which housed a garage / petrol station for many years to 2010.
28	28/4	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.1 Noise - construction	6.2.2. Noise -there will[be a significant increase in noise during construction (as a result of machinery use, for example). Tunnelling work is expected to be carried out 24 hours per day, seven days per week. This noise is like[y] to adversely affect residents of the Vincent Street area, causing sleep disturbance and general nuisance and annoyance.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
28	28/5	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.3 Vibration - construction	6.2.3. Vibration -the use of machinery during construction will also cause vibration. This vibration has the potential to damage buildings, both superficially (cracking plaster, for example) and structurally. The applicant's technical advice identifies that any buildings on Vincent Street with basement structures more than four stories below ground level will be notable receivers of vibration.
28	28/6	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	Structural -the applicant's technical advice says the structural effects of construction could fall into the Slight to Moderate category. However, a detailed assessment of the effects has not yet been carried out (the applicant's technical advisors are apparently awaiting finalisation of the design and construction aspects of the CRL). The applicant's technical advisors have suggested that it may be necessary to make improvements to the upper subgrade levels of the supporting ground of the Eclipse Apartment block. Any such improvements will further adversely affect the apartment owners and residents.
28	28/7	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.20 Economic	6.2.5. Adverse economic effects -the construction of the CRL will have adverse economic effects, for example by reducing the amenity value of the Eclipse Apartments. The submitters expect apartment owners will have difficulty renting their apartments, particularly during the construction phase. The designation and acquisition of the substrata [and will also limit development rights for surface landowners. Sections 176 and 178 of the Resource Management Act 1991 prohibit landowners from doing anything on their [and would prevent or hinder the CRL project.
28	28/8	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.26 Social impact	6.2.6. Adverse social effects -the construction will adversely affect the social wellbeing of residents in the Vincent Street area, particularly because of the harm caused to their living environment, their health (referred to in more detail below), their loss of mobility and restricted access to their properties during construction. The adverse social effects are likely to extend for a considerable period given that resource consents have not yet been applied for. The design and consent process will take some time, followed by five to six years of construction.
28	28/9	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.35 Health / safety	6.2.7. Adverse health effects -the dust and contaminants from construction are likely to adversely affect people's health. The construction is also likely to cause residents stress, anxiety, and feelings of uncertainty. 6.2.8. Adverse impacts on the landscape, visual and amenity values.
28	28/10	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.12 Public amenity / streetscape - construction	6.2.8 Adverse impacts on the landscape, visual and amenity values.
28	28/11	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	5.32 Adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated	
28	28/12	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	6.4. Originally the tunnels were to be located under road reserve. However, the applicant now seeks to construct the eastern tunnel directly beneath the Eclipse Apartment block. The applicant has not adequately considered alternative routes, insofar as they relate to the Vincent Street area.
28	28/13	Pal Properties (2008) Limited	attn: Phil Shannon	4.1 Part 2 RMA	6.5. The notices of requirement are contrary to sections 5 and 7 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and do not promote the: 6.5.1. sustainable management of natural and physical resources enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety (s 5); 6.5.2. efficient use and development of natural and physical resources (s 7(b)); 6.5.3. maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (s 7(c)); and 6.5.4. maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment (s 7(f)).
29	29/1	Graham W A Bush		1.1 Support - NOR All	1. Essential to optimise the benefits of electrification. 2. Will radically improve movement in the CBD. 3. Will reduce amount in inner city commuting by motorcar. 4. Will encourage a positive change in commuting culture. 5. Potential to create an inner rail loop. 6. Will make rail travel in Auckland generally more appealing.
30	30/1	Bruce Cade		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
30	30/2	Bruce Cade		6.1 Project funding / economic	Auckland cannot afford it. Where are the funds coming from? Has any provision been made for possible cost over-runs? Most ratepayers would never use it
31	31/1	Marion Steele		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
32	32/1	Wayne Moore		1.1 Support - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
32	32/2	Wayne Moore		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Need for rail to be underground. I would submit an above ground / street rail would be cheaper to build and more quickly. The advantage of an above ground rail would: * Allow for views. * In the event of an earthquake / disaster be easier to access the site. * Add to tourism another feature to enjoy the central city. * To be readily visible and easier to find. It can be built above streets and park reserves, following the same route, plus an extension to Newmarket to create a loop. In addition land use could be redeveloped as new living / commerce premises and maybe use to create station areas, similar to the way Newmarket mix with apartments and commerce has been achieved.
33	33/1	Deep Mitra and Ian Kohler Architect in Association	Mahatma Gandhi Charitable Trust	1.1 Support - NOR All	
34	34/1	Daphne A Lawless		1.1 Support - NOR All	
34	34/2	Daphne A Lawless		6.1 Project funding / economic	The Notice of Requirement should be enacted in full. The Council should identify alternative funding streams should the Government continue to obstruct this project. The Council should also make sure that barriers to intensification " such as minimum parking requirements or minimum dwelling sizes " are abolished.
35	35/1	Derek Shaw		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	The Rail Project will only ever be used by a minute token percentage of Auckland ratepayers.
35	35/2	Derek Shaw		6.1 Project funding / economic	The real cost will exceed any estimates several fold and will bankrupt the city.
36	36/1	Greg Loveridge	Robt. Jones Holdings	1.9 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 1	We think the rail link is part of a step change that is needed in Auckland Infrastructure. The history of Auckland is littered with stop gap developments that fail to account for Aucklands growth and accordingly we are supportive of a large project that has large ambitions. We also support a strong focus of the CBD as the engine of the Auckland economy.
36	36/2	Greg Loveridge	Robt. Jones Holdings	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	On a specific note we have concerns about traffic flow on Albert Street as one of our buildings has car parks that exit on Durham Lane and then Albert Street. Indeed there are a number of buildings affected and this needs some special consideration. A specific plan for the car parks exiting on Durham Lane through the construction period. This may include a dedicated short lane between Durham Lane and the Victoria / Albert intersection or perhaps altering the current Durham Lane one way system.
37	37/1	Daniel Carpenter		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
38	38/1	Minh Lu		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
39	39/1	Dawn Edwards		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	Adverse effect on environment and residential areas. An extravagant use of rate payers money that is mainly of benefit to those who live on one side of the bridge. It is about time a share of ratepayers money was used for people living at the North end of the Harbour Bridge from Northcote onwards and environs " no train service, poor bus service, limited and often expensive ferry services to name a few.
40	40/1	Nicolas Reid		1.1 Support - NOR All	The CRL is a necessary and very effective piece of infrastructure that would establish a future for Auckalnds transport and land use that is far more efficient, productive and sustainable than what could be achieved without it. Unleashing the latent value that is currently trapped in the rail corridors is worth the price many times over. The CRL should be progressed as soon as possible.
40	40/2	Nicolas Reid		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I request that the surface designation for Aotea Station be extended to the parcel of land currently occupied by Wilsons Parking, bordered by Albert St, Victoria St, Elliott St and the Atrium on Elliott building. The purpose of which is to allow an additional entrance to Aotea Station connected via a pedestrian linkage through Wilsons Parking site to the intersection of Darby St and Elliott St. Together with Darby St, this could provide a direct, straight and level pedestrian link between the Aotea Station and Queen Street, and would likely function as the stations busiest entrance. Such a linkage could be a public laneway on the site as an extension of Darby St itself, or simply an easement to ensure pedestrian connectivity through the site in some form when it is eventually developed and built over. I request that the surface designation of Newton Station be extended to the properties fronting the northern corners of the intersection of Newton Rd, Khyber Pass and Symonds St, for the purpose of allowing for an additional station entrance or entrances to be established to the north side of this busy intersection. Newton Station should be designed with a concourse level underneath Symonds Street with access from multiple street level entrances from differing sides of the road and intersections. I fear that the current proposal for a single entrance to street level on one side of the street only will prove inadequate in the future, as the need to provide long signalised crossings for high passenger flows to the station would conflict with bus operation, bus to train transfer, and general traffic movements. Consideration should also be given to an additional southerly entrance within the proposed designation, nearer to the current location of Mt Eden Station. I request that the surface designation along the NAL be extended to cover all adjacent properties between Dominion Rd and Porters Ave. The purpose of this is to allow for a future station on the western line at Dominion Rd (a simple two track side platform station, not a rail interchange), possibly as a direct replacement for Mt Eden Station which would become largely superseded by CRL operations. The purpose of this station would

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					be to service the local area and integrate with a future rapid bus or light rail service operating on the Dominion Rd corridor. Currently Dominion Rd buses travel via View Rd and Mt Eden Rd, a path that introduces considerable longer trips and delays relative to the direct path via Ian McKinnon Drive. A station at Dominion Rd with a corresponding pair of bus stops would allow Dominion Rd bus services to use the fast and direct path to the city without losing connectivity to the rail network.
41	41/1	Warren F Sanderson		1.1 Support - NOR All	
42	42/1	David Dangerfield		1.1 Support - NOR All	Aucklands public transport has been deficient for a generation and has taken a back seat while motorways have been built which can no longer keep up with traffic demand. Key reasons for support: 1.International cities are closing down freeways into the city (eg Seoul) and forcing use of public transport (they've worked out that you just can't make enough roads for cars!). 2.Traffic in Sydneys CBD peaked in 1999 and had been declining ever since because of investment in light rail / other public transport efficiencies. Non-commercial vehicles need to be discouraged from Auckland. 3.Sydney commenced building a city circle when the population was less than 1 million and was finished in 1956 when it was still less than 2 million. Demonstrates vision and foresight " if they had not bitten the bullet then, imagine where they would be now! Not to mention a north shore line. 4. Auckland needs to have an efficient rail system to promote investment and growth that will bring economic benefits to the rest of the country. 5. Newmarket is a dead leg and a killer for travel time on the western line. It takes just as long for me to ride my push bike from Sturges Rd Henderson to Beach Rd (20km) as it does to catch the train (just wrong!). 6. There are currently no stations at the top end and middle of town to service the majority of businesses in town. Britomart just is not central to where everyone works.
43	43/1	Murray J Cripps		1.1 Support - NOR All	
44	44/1	Linda Tangianau		1.1 Support - NOR All	
45	45/1	Michael E Forrest		1.1 Support - NOR All	
46	46/1	Bill Horner		1.15 Neutral, did not specify - NOR All	
47	47/1	M Schultz		1.1 Support - NOR All	
48	48/1	Clifford R Dew		1.1 Support - NOR All	There is no doubt for the urgent need for the CRL to be constructed...The CRL is not a central rail loop to serve the CBD only, it is a proposal that will open the whole existing rail network to substantial improvement and will advance the availability and attractiveness of public transport in Auckland to an extent never ever experienced before.
48	48/2	Clifford R Dew		6.1 Project funding / economic	Not to proceed now is so short-sighted as to be ridiculous. Not proceeding will lead to increased costs as is evident when comparing original cost estimate from the 1920's, 1940 / 50s with todays figures, and the same will appear as increases, if in the future years we look back to the 2013 from 20 years in the future. Introduction of current infrastructure bonds offered now will assist with the costs against the present population and borrowing will spread the financial load into the future amongst those of coming generations who will reap the benefits of positive action now.
48	48/3	Clifford R Dew		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	Cost of bus rights of way is massive because of the large land requirement and it must be expensive. Parking of off service buses in the CBD will grate garaging in the CBD and the wasteful use of prime land. Rail requires less of that limited space and much of the initial network already exists as the nucleus of a wider system. Cost to extend the rail system must be less than the same corridor required to build bus access. Congestion from buses entering the CBD will only increase gridlock and never be to the advantage of a good integrated public transport system rather than using rail with feeder buses to suburban rail hubs. Leasing of airspace above any of the three proposed rail stations on the CRL would allow private activity to build and the benefit from their development while giving return to local rail operators. It would advance their financial intake and add to the progress of the city and its environment. I fully support the designations and an early start to the physical construction of the CRL.
49	49/1	Martin Evans		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
49	49/2	Martin Evans		6.1 Project funding / economic	I oppose the use of ratepayers funds for the construction of the City Rail Link as the costs have not been adequately quantified, the demand has not been adequately assessed and in particular the risks of the project are very high. Council need to have the scheme underwritten by a commercial venture experienced in operating such a facility rather than an inexperienced Council should the project proceed.
50	50/1	Kelvin Chan		1.1 Support - NOR All	
51	51/1	Peter F Chichester		1.28 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 5	
51	51/2	Peter F Chichester		1.29 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 6	
51	51/3	Peter F Chichester		5.34 Construction methodology	I would like it to be known that i oppose the drilling under my properties. Some years ago (you will have on record) a waste water / stormwater pipe was laid under our house of which we consented to do, which involved extensive drilling. Over a period of time, it left the property shaking slightly whichever a heavy vehicle passed by, over time the shaking was becoming more prominent. We have tried to get in touch with Clearwater but to no avail as the original manager is not locateable. To this day it has been something we just have had to put up with, including the damage that it caused (we had to replaster the lounge and garage window which cost us a lot of money to repair). I shudder to think what a tunnel will do! Hence the reason for my objection. I am currently away in India and plan to be back around June 2013. You can contact me however on this email address of the Indian mobile number above. We would like you to guarantee that this drilling will not affect out building in the longterm. With this guarantee the Council needs to come to this residence and inspect the property, acknowledge the problem so it can be rectified.
52	52/1	Duncan W Young		1.1 Support - NOR All	I am a strong advocate for this project and would like to see it completed in my lifetime, not in those of future generations. From discussions with other pensioners I am not alone in my views and there will be more of us in the next few decades all with the same needs.
52	52/2	Duncan W Young		5.10 Transport - operational	Briefly summarised - The CRL would provide choice and flexibility to the elderly, broadening their horizons in terms of access to the City Centre and around the region through enhancing the reliability and resilience of the transport network.
53	53/1	Ian H Stanborough	RA Stanborough and Son	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	Build the tunnel without disturbing our property.
53	53/2	Ian H Stanborough	RA Stanborough and Son	5.23 Property rights	We have operated a family plastering business from 6-10 Ngahura Street since 1933. We oppose the compulsory purchase of our property as the train lines do not even come close to the property. It would appear the property is only required for a construction site for plant and storage.
54	54/1	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	1.31 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 1) subject to conditions / amendments	
54	54/2	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	a. Vehicular access to the internal parking areas of 148 Quay Street is taken from Tyler Street. The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) prepared by Flow Transportation Consultants notes that there will be at least partial closure of Tyler Street or Galway Street over a period of three and a half years (section 9.3 page 67 of the ITA). It is noted that private vehicles are recorded as lower priority in terms of movement (section 2.2 page 7 of the ITA), and no mention can be found with regard to maintenance of private vehicle crossings in either the Assessment of Effects or the ITA that accompanied the NoR. The Body Corporate wishes to ensure that vehicular access to the building will be maintained during the construction period, or suitable other measures agreed.
54	54/3	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	5.1 Noise - construction	b. The noise and vibration report prepared by Marshall Day is very general, and not specific to effects on 148 Quay Street. The Body Corporate is concerned about effects on internal amenity during the construction timeframe, especially because the works about 148 Quay Street and there appears to be no opportunity to establish noise barriers.
54	54/4	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	5.3 Vibration - construction	c. The Body Corporate is also concerned about any vibration effects on the building and how dust will be managed. The building will need to be regularly cleaned during this period.
54	54/5	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	5.17 Air quality	c. The Body Corporate is also concerned about any vibration effects on the building and how dust will be managed. The building will need to be regularly cleaned during this period.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
54	54/6	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	5.20 Economic	d. Construction works discourage pedestrian movements, which in turn affect the viability and vibrancy of surrounding businesses. At face value, the three and half year time frame for construction works for this sector of the City Rail Loop seems excessive, and the Body Corporate is concerned about impacts on the ground floor commercial units.
54	54/7	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	b. Modification of the NoR to include specific details relating to noise, dust and vibration control, (including surveying pre, during, and post construction and cleaning)
54	54/8	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	Indemnification agreements with regard to the building at 148 Quay Street.
54	54/9	Body Corporate 164980 148 Quay Street	attn: Alistair White	5.34 Construction methodology	c. Reinvestigation of the construction methodology to reduce construction times and consequent effects on neighbouring businesses, particularly those retail stores and restaurants at 148 Quay Street;
55	55/1	Sydney Struwig		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
56	56/1	Rebecca Turner		1.1 Support - NOR All	
57	57/1	Rebecca Webb		1.1 Support - NOR All	
58	58/1	Jessica Anderson		1.1 Support - NOR All	
59	59/1	Martin Ball		1.1 Support - NOR All	
60	60/1	Andrew S Comber		1.1 Support - NOR All	
61	61/1	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
61	61/2	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.26 Social impact	(a) The community impact of displacing a large number of residents and businesses from the Eden Terrace / Mount Eden area and broader property and social impacts;
61	61/3	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.22 Legal	2.1 Auckland Transport does not have an interest in the land sufficient for undertaking the CRL
61	61/4	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.20 Economic	(b) The economic effects from displacing a large number of residents and businesses from the Eden Terrace / Mount Eden area;
61	61/5	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.3 Vibration - construction	
61	61/6	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.12 Public amenity / streetscape - construction	(d) The inability to properly serve pedestrian connectivity in and around stations.
61	61/8	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.10 Transport - operational	Long terms effects: (e) The closure of Beresford Street to vehicles and other permanent obstructions to transport connectivity. Short term effects: (a) traffic and transportation disruption. Positive effects are overstated: (a) The increase in rail patronage and public transport; (b) The reduction in traffic congestion; (d) A number of positive effects are outcomes that will occur irrespective of the CRL. For example, the provision of electric trains, rather than diesel trains.
61	61/9	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.23 Property rights	Short term effects: 2.3(f) Large areas of land being used as construction depots. The Notices represent a planning blight on the community for a project that is unviable, as demonstrated by the need for a 20 year lapse date.
61	61/10	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.7 Contamination	Short terms effects: 2.3(e) Contaminants being deliberately and inadvertently released into the environment.
61	61/11	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	4.1 Part 2 RMA	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
61	61/12	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	4.2 RMA policy framework	The positive effects of the CRL are sufficiently weak and the adverse effects are sufficiently significant that the Notices are inconsistent with: (b) The Regional Policy Statement (c) Relevant provisions of the applicable district plans.
61	61/13	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	2.6 There are better and/or more appropriate alternatives to deliver the project objectives, including: (a) alternative methods (using buses as the primary public transport carrier in the CBD); (b) Alternative alignments (away from Eden Terrace); and (c) Alternative methods (lowering the North Auckland Line to allow all of the alignment through the 3.1: (b) That the alignment be moved so that the designation does not require acquisition of the submitter's land. (c) That the design and construction methodology be altered so that the area through Eden Terrace is underground and a greater use of land already held or controlled by Auckland Council for construction / enabling work.
61	61/14	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	3.4 Whether the designations are reasonably necessary / NOR is an unreasonable burden	2.7 As a result of the forgoing, the CRL and the Notices are not reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of Auckland Transport.
61	61/15	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.24 Designation lapse period	The Notices represent a planning blight on the community for a project that is unviable, as demonstrated by the need for a 20 year lapse date.
61	61/16	ML Hoeft Partners	attn: JML Hoeft	5.33 Trees	2.8 Additionally, in the Tree Assessment that Auckland Transport have commissioned in relation to the designation, a number of native trees at 34 Nikau Street have not been identified - two cabbage trees, a palm tree and a mature pohutukawa tree. These trees need to be identified and included as part of Auckland Transport's decision making process for the designation.
62	62/1	Michael Davison		1.1 Support - NOR All	
63	63/1	Martin Crooks		1.15 Neutral, did not specify - NOR All	Completing the rail network requires strategies for East and North before an inner city loop
64	64/1	Jamie Hutchens	Regent Trust	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
64	64/2	Jamie Hutchens	Regent Trust	5.23 Property rights	That any property directly adjacent to the rail link and is not directly over the rail link should not have any restrictions placed on it.
65	65/1	Monsignor Paul Farmer, St Benedicts Parish	attn: Mark Ross	1.22 Neutral, did not care, but requested conditions / amendments - NOR All	
65	65/2	Monsignor Paul Farmer, St Benedicts Parish	attn: Mark Ross	5.3 Vibration - construction	Vibration, both during construction and when the CRL becomes operational and the potential adverse effects they may have on on-site activities and building integrity. It is noted that the Church is scheduled under the Auckland Council District Plan: Auckland City Isthmus Section and is currently the subject of an application by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) to enter the Church and Presbytery Complex into the NZHPT Register of historic places, historic areas, wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas. Accordingly, ensuring that these buildings are protected and retained in terms of their built heritage qualities is of the utmost importance to the Parish.
65	65/3	Monsignor Paul Farmer, St Benedicts Parish	attn: Mark Ross	5.4 Vibration - operational	Vibration, both during construction and when the CRL becomes operational and the potential adverse effects they may have on on-site activities and building integrity. It is noted that the Church is scheduled under the Auckland Council District Plan: Auckland City Isthmus Section and is currently the subject of an application by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) to enter the Church and Presbytery Complex into the NZHPT Register of historic places, historic areas, wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas. Accordingly, ensuring that these buildings are protected and retained in terms of their built heritage qualities is of the utmost importance to the Parish.
65	65/4	Monsignor Paul Farmer, St Benedicts Parish	attn: Mark Ross	5.1 Noise - construction	Noise, both during construction and when the CRL becomes operational and the potential adverse effects they may have on on-site activities.
65	65/5	Monsignor Paul Farmer, St Benedicts Parish	attn: Mark Ross	5.2 Noise - operational	Noise, both during construction and when the CRL becomes operational and the potential adverse effects they may have on on-site activities.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
65	65/6	Monsignor Paul Farmer, St Benedicts Parish	attn: Mark Ross	5.9 Transport - construction	Construction traffic and any effects that may have on traffic movements along st Benedicts Street, Alex Evans Street and their associated intersections.
65	65/7	Monsignor Paul Farmer, St Benedicts Parish	attn: Mark Ross	5.23 Property rights	The protection of land starting 5m below the surface of the Church and the impact that may have on the potential for any future site development.
66	66/1	Jenny Dixon: Deputy Vice Chancellor	University Of Auckland	1.1 Support - NOR All	
66	66/2	Jenny Dixon: Deputy Vice Chancellor	University Of Auckland	5.23 Property rights	The University has a strong interest in how the transport network functions and would like to ensure that we remain connected with ongoing developments. With the likely acquisition of the Newmarket site the University's central city presence will be further consolidated. Our long term investment depends on effective transport connections within the city.
66	66/3	Jenny Dixon: Deputy Vice Chancellor	University Of Auckland	5.10 Transport - operational	Public transport is a significant consideration for the operation and future development of The University of Auckland. The University supports the CRL as a critical link enhancing the rail network, in conjunction with an integrated transport plan for the city which includes the bus network.
66	66/4	Jenny Dixon: Deputy Vice Chancellor	University Of Auckland	5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	The acquisition of the Newmarket site provides a challenge in terms of attracting investment. The CRL will play a critical role in providing for increased activity within the CBD and Newmarket.
67	67/1	Allan Matson		1.8 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR All	This is a submission on a notice of requirement by Auckland Transport (Requiring Authority) for: City Rail Link (CRL). My submissions relate to Notices of Requirement 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, most specifically those relating to the Albert Str Karangahape (sic) The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are in broad terms related to effects on building fabric of heritage significance. My submission generally supports the notices of requirement but encourages greater thought be given to making the most of opportunities provided by existing heritage fabric.
67	67/2	Allan Matson		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I seek the following recommendation or decision from Council (give precise details including the general nature of any conditions sought). I seek the exclusion of buildings notated 14, 15 and 16 and 395 at the intersection of Albert Street and Victoria Street West. Other comments relate to matters such as the above-ground station at Beresford Street - which will be the subject of subsequent development design.
67	67/3	Allan Matson		5.8 Built heritage	I seek the following recommendation or decision from Council (give precise details including the general nature of any conditions sought). I seek the exclusion of buildings notated 14, 15 and 16 and 395 at the intersection of Albert Street and Victoria Street West. Other comments relate to matters such as the above-ground station at Beresford Street - which will be the subject of subsequent development design.
68	68/1	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	1.1 Support - NOR All	
68	68/2	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.8 Built heritage	The owners of affected buildings are concerned about costs resulting from the vibration and settlement issues associated with the CRL. In particular they want advice or clarification as to whether they should spend money on reinforcing their buildings to bring them up to the new earthquake standards now or wait until after the CRL is completed. The construction of the CRL will involve levels of vibration and settlement which will affect several buildings of historic note in our area, obviously all of them are important to the Karangahape Road Business Association (KBA) but some are of more particular concern. The most important of these is the Mercury Theatre (BHD 57) which according to the documentation will probably suffer "moderate" damage. ...as the oldest surviving theatre in Auckland and an intact example of its type it is unique. It will also play an important part in the area's social life in the future; as the resident population of the area increases this theatre is ideally placed to serve not only the local population but its location literally on the doorstep of the K Road Metro station will mean its future audience will be drawn from all over Auckland because of the CRL. By encouraging evening patronage of the rail line the Theatre may have a contributing part to play in the viability of the CRL itself therefore it needs to survive the construction process with as little damage as possible. The other structure of particular concern is the Pitt Street Buildings Leo O'Malley (BHR 47) {which is probably in the most delicate condition of any building in our area}. Situated on the most prominent corner in the K Road Precinct it and the nearby Naval & Family Hotel (BHR 49) are regarded by a great many as symbols of K Road, any conspicuous damage to them would have a devastating effect on the streetscape and heritage precinct. The buildings adjacent to and including the former Hallensteins Brothers Building (BHR 50) are of moderate concern as most of them are small and the effect as determined as slight. With the exception of the Norman Ng bldg (BHR 51) the streetscape formed by these structures is more important than their interiors. ...Of greater concern is the 1912 Fire Station at 1 Beresford Square (BHR 12). This is a prominent landmark with a tower and is a keystone building in the streetscape. One presumes the absence of

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					the 1944 Fire Station (BHR 77) from appendix A is because of its solid reinforced concrete construction, it is an important structure however and of interest. Presumably this also accounts for the absence of the Wembley Building (BHR 231) at 59 Pitt Street. Could we have the status of both these buildings clarified? The Dentists Chambers at 65 Pitt Street (BHR 230) are of particular interest; this small building plays a significant part in the streetscape and is one of the few buildings of its type which has never been painted, its retention is very important for the aesthetics of 'new' Beresford Square / station entry. Very concerning is the absence from the list of two structures; Hopetoun Alpha and the Men's Underground Toilets. The Toilets (BHR 236) were noted by Auckland Transport as the only heritage structure on the entire route of the CRL to be danger. The KBA was under the impression that they were to be incorporated into the new Station Entrance; so their absence from the Appendix is worrying. Could the status of this building be clarified? As they were retained by Auckland city Council in 1993 when they were decommissioned and made part of the Supper Club Bar it would seem inappropriate to lose them now. If the Toilets cannot be retained on their present site because of the design of the entrance then they could be relocated elsewhere in Beresford Square. The absence of Hopetoun Alpha (BHR 13) is perplexing as it is one of our most important structures, being a concrete building from 1875.
68	68/3	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	The owners of affected buildings are concerned about costs resulting from the vibration and settlement issues associated with the CRL. In particular they want advice or clarification as to whether they should spend money on reinforcing their buildings to bring them up to the new earthquake standards now or wait until after the CRL is completed. The construction of the CRL will involve levels of vibration and settlement which will affect several buildings of historic note in our area, obviously all of them are important to the Karangahape Road Business Association (KBA) but some are of more particular concern. One presumes the absence of the 1944 Fire Station [BHR 77] from appendix A is because of its solid reinforced concrete construction, it is an important structure however and of interest. Presumably this also accounts for the absence of the Wembley Building [BHR 231] at 59 Pitt Street. Could we have the status of both these buildings clarified? The Dentists Chambers at 65 Pitt Street [BHR 230] are of particular interest; this small building plays a significant part in the streetscape and is one of the few buildings of its type which has never been painted, its retention is very important for the aesthetics of 'new' Beresford Square / station entry. Very concerning is the absence from the list of two structures; Hopetoun Alpha and the Men's Underground Toilets. The Toilets [BHR 236] were noted by Auckland Transport as the only heritage structure on the entire route of the CRL to be danger. The KBA was under the impression that they were to be incorporated into the new Station Entrance; so their absence from the Appendix is worrying. Could the status of this building be clarified? As they were retained by Auckland city Council in 1993 when they were decommissioned and made part of the Supper Club Bar it would seem inappropriate to lose them now. If the Toilets cannot be retained on their present site because of the design of the entrance then they could be relocated elsewhere in Beresford Square. The absence of Hopetoun Alpha [BHR 13] is perplexing as it is one of our most important structures, being a concrete building from 1875. I note that on one of the other sheets marked "technical archaeological appendices" that it is mentioned that another historic structure the Former Wesleyan Chapel {BHR 74} will be affected by the construction of the Karangahape Road station as is it in "close proximity". However his building is actually some distance away on Vincent Street and is not near the station at all. So this may in fact be the 1875 Congregationalist Church {Hopetoun Alpha} [BHR 13] if this a case of mislabeling it is a cause of concern. Few people searching for the listings of historic buildings are going to look through one marked "technical archaeological appendices" while those lists dealing specifically with built heritage do not consistently mention certain significant buildings in our precinct [the 1944 Fire station and Hopetoun Alpha being cases in point]. The only item of concern is the absence of a noise Scatter Map for this area. There is one for Beresford Square but not one for the Mercury Lane site. The site is overlooked by the George Court Apartment Building (BHR 48) and the hours of construction, light disturbance at night and noise problems will be of particular concern to the apartment owners there. {Incidentally these noise scatter maps are actually within a document marked "technical archaeological appendices" which not a place most people will think to look for them}. The noise scatter diagram for Beresford Square shows our greatest concern as it shows that the penetration of noise {and possibly dust} may range quite far. This may have a major impact on the businesses on Beresford Square.
68	68/5	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.3 Vibration - construction	The owners of affected buildings are concerned about costs resulting from the vibration and settlement issues associated with the CRL. In particular they want advice or clarification as to whether they should spend money on reinforcing their buildings to bring them up to the new earthquake standards now or wait until after the CRL is completed. The construction of the CRL will involve levels of vibration and settlement which will affect several buildings of historic note in our area, obviously all of them are important to the Karangahape Road Business Association (KBA) but some are of more particular concern. (See Built Heritage comment for specific concerns)
68	68/6	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.20 Economic	Economic Impact Mercury Lane Fortunately there are very few ground level businesses in the area where the Mercury Plaza construction site is to be located. As there appears to be the possibility of little or no disruption to the traffic flow in the area the remaining businesses on Mercury Lane and Cross, Canada and East Streets should be small.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
68	68/7	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Beresford Square It is of particular concern to the KBA that there is as little disruption to vehicle and pedestrian access to Beresford Square as possible. Obviously a certain portion of the square and the middle of the road will become an open hole when the vertical access to the station is constructed but at least some access must be maintained on both sides of the square. To the south this means vehicle access to Day Street, Samoa House Lane and the Theta complex, quite a large number of cars need access on this side which includes several apartment blocks and a number of business carparking buildings. The north is slightly less problematic but will still require access; Hopetoun Alpha does have a separate entrance from Pitt Street and 1 Beresford has comparatively little traffic flow; this is the side of the square with the run through to Pitt Street which both the nearby Fire Service and St John's Ambulance may want kept open. When the centre of the Square is being dug up as a construction site even if vehicle access is maintained on either or both sides it will mean the loss of a significance amount of on-street parking. The loss of this parking for two years or more will be problematic and will probably have the greatest economic impact on the area as many customers patronising businesses at the Pitt Street intersection regularly park here; extra advertising for the Cross Street Car Park is an option as is the reopening of the Auckland Transport owned carparking facility on the corner of Day Street. The noise scatter diagram for Beresford Square shows our greatest concern as it shows that the penetration of noise {and possibly dust} may range quite far. This may have a major impact on the businesses on Beresford Square.
68	68/8	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.34 Construction methodology	The noise scatter diagram for Beresford Square shows our greatest concern as it shows that the penetration of noise {and possibly dust} may range quite far. This may have a major impact on the businesses on Beresford Square. Of particular concern is Hopetoun Alpha which may lose extensive bookings due to the prolonged presence of a construction site directly on its doorstep {for most of their clients the approach from Beresford Square to the venue is part of the effect they are paying for - they won't want to use the back entrance}. Also to be considered is the loss of parking if the two parking areas to the west of Hopetoun Alpha are commandeered for this project as is indicated in the AAE appendix 1 Aerials. Some of the long term parking lost from this site might be absorbed by the reopening of the day Street Carpark but the effect on Hopetoun Alpha as a business will need clarification.
68	68/9	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	As a location for temporary Public Art such a structure could be a very good PR tool for the CRL; the KBA would be interested in taking part in such a project as there would be ample space for murals about the heritage of K Road, Street Art as well as information panels about the CRI. Such a structure might mitigate the noise and dust problems while providing a temporary asset to the area.
68	68/10	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The owners of affected buildings are concerned about costs resulting from the vibration and settlement issues associated with the CRL. In particular they want advice or clarification as to whether they should spend money on reinforcing their buildings to bring them up to the new earthquake standards now or wait until after the CRL is completed. The construction of the CRL will involve levels of vibration and settlement which will affect several buildings of historic note in our area, obviously all of them are important to the Karangahape Road Business Association (KBA) but some are of more particular concern. (See Built Heritage comment for specific concerns).
68	68/11	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.16 Urban design framework	Station/Entry/Square Design The KBA wishes to be actively involved in the consultation regarding the design of Beresford Square, the entry and the Station in Beresford Square and Mercury Lane and the artworks inside the station. A striking design for these prominent sites is required with reference to: examples of structures such as; the Paris Metro entrances by Hector Guimard, the Place Colette [Musee Du Louvre] by Jean-Michel Othoniel and Fosteritos in Bilbao Spain. Post construction of the station entrance Beresford Square itself will need to be reconstituted, this would be an appropriate time to redesign the square. The KBA would want input into this process as there are several possibilities, including extending the square down toward Hopetoun Street, new art works, fountains, plantings and the transformation to shared space. The KBA wishes to be actively involved in consultation concerning the final appearance of the Station in Mercury Lane including artworks inside. As all the surrounding buildings will have been demolished as part of the CRL construction process the KBA will want input into the future design of this space. This will be an excellent opportunity for the creation of a link between Mercury Lane and East Street. Such a square, plaza or lane would hasten the construction of Apartment blocks on the adjacent South, East and Galatos Streets thus increasing the viability of the CRL. The KBA are enthusiastic to support high density housing round the Mercury Lane entry with artists'/ artisans' work / live / retail studios; A unique opportunity to support the Precinct's position as an incubator for creative industries.
68	68/12	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.1 Noise - construction	The only item of concern is the absence of a noise Scatter Map for this area. There is one for Beresford Square but not one for the Mercury Lane site. The site is overlooked by the George Court Apartment Building (BHR 48) and the hours of construction, light disturbance at night and noise problems will be of particular concern to the apartment owners there. Incidentally these noise scatter maps are actually within a document marked "technical archaeological appendices" which not a place most people will think to look for them. The noise scatter diagram for Beresford Square shows our greatest concern as it shows that the penetration of noise and possibly dust may range quite far. This may have a major impact on the businesses on Beresford Square. The other businesses will be mostly affected by noise and dust especially those with outdoor seating. The best solution to this problem could be to construct a solid hoarding - to physically fence off the centre of the road. The example of the Soho development in Grey Lynn shows how such a hoarding not only lowers the level of visual chaos but can also be a visual asset.
68	68/13	Barbara L Holloway	The Karangahape Road Business Association	5.17 Air quality	The other businesses will be mostly affected by noise and dust especially those with outdoor seating. The best solution to this problem could be to construct a solid hoarding - to physically fence off the centre of the road. The example of the Soho development in Grey Lynn shows how such a hoarding not only lowers the level of visual chaos but can also be a visual asset.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
69	69/1	Stephen Selwood	New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development Incorporated	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	NZCID supports investment in core infrastructure and we support the need for a rail corridor linking Britomart Station to the western line (north Auckland line). However, we are not convinced that the proposed corridor achieves optimal integration of existing and future land use and transport demand and therefore do not support the request for designation along the corridor identified in the six Notices of Requirement.
69	69/2	Stephen Selwood	New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development Incorporated	3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	(Only parts of the NZCID sub included due to its length. See Sub 69 for full details) There has not been a substantial review of the CRL alignment since the general route was identified around the turn of this century, in spite of changing economic, social and environmental conditions and subsequent evidence showing the project demonstrated low benefits relative to high costs. Comprehensive studies undertaken since 2004 have been limited by criteria framed by the expectation of underground rail from Britomart to Mt Eden stopping at Aotea Centre and Karangahape Rd. Consequently, more innovative solutions have not been given due consideration or have been discarded on the basis of high level cost estimates before receiving serious evaluation of benefits. In light of poor economic returns for the proposed CRL, it is now necessary that other route alignments are investigated. ... NZCID does not consider standard transport appraisal provides an accurate estimate of what impact the CRL will have on Auckland. We consider the use of a 30 year evaluation period for a 100+ year tunnel to be flawed and 8 per cent discount rates to be inappropriate in general. We note that with discount rates around 6 per cent and longer timeframes the case for the CRL becomes economic. ... URS 2004 The general alignment described in the Notices of Requirement was formally identified through a 2004 study by URS for the old Auckland City Council (shortly before these functions were vested in the Auckland Regional Transport Authority or ARTA). To select a preferred alignment, the 2004 study initially isolated five "key objectives": 1. Minimise the length (and therefore the cost); 2. Optimise the alignment for operational considerations (e.g. fewer curves and larger radius curves); 3. Minimise the vertical gradients; 4. Minimise the impact to private property; and 5. Select station locations with the optimum and simplest passenger access potential. It is very important to note that the object of this study was not to determine the optimum alignment that would best serve existing and future transport demand into and through the city. The primary emphasis of the study was to find an appropriate engineering solution that minimised the length of the CRL and therefore the cost. ... APB&B 2010 The next key study in relation to the alignment of the CRL was the 2010 Auckland CBD Rail Link Study developed by consultant group APB&B for Kiwirail's predecessor, ONTRACK and Auckland Transport's predecessor, ART AS The 2010 study aimed 'to identify a preferred route for an underground rail link from Britomart to the western line (North Auckland Line - NAL) around the Mt Eden area'. ... The CCFAS did not consider city access from a first principles standpoint but accepted the current alignment of the CRL as a given. ... Our concern is much less with the evaluation of the CRL itself, but with the initial sequence of decisions, and the context within which those decisions were informed, which led to the identification of the CRL as the preferred transport solution for the central city. In our view, a number of assumptions, limitations and other factors have at various stages prevented a full and comprehensive "blank sheet" consideration of how to get future Aucklanders in, out and around the CBO. Rather, as is common with a project of this scale and complexity, a series of incremental decisions have guided numerous decision makers towards an increasingly narrow response to Auckland central city transport challenges. * MULTIPLE DECISION MAKERS * INCREMENTAL DECISION MAKING * RESTRICTIVE GUIDELINES FOR SUCCESSIVE STUDIES * PROCESSES THAT PRIORITISE COSTS OVER BENEFITS
69	69/3	Stephen Selwood	New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development Incorporated	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Although carrying a higher initial capital cost, a longer rail tunnel connecting more high density, high use, destinations has potential to have better economic return than the whole of life cost of the proposed CRL alignment and the additional bus and or light rail services that will be needed to support it. Given growth opportunities and existing land use planning and phasing, it is impractical to continue to ignore Wynyard Quarter as an alignment option for the CRL. Given projected bus congestion along Symonds St, and the planned expansion of the University of Auckland Campus at Newmarket, it is impractical to ignore rail options in the university quarter. Before the Notices of Requirement are advanced, cost-benefit assessment is required to investigate whether the additional benefits from delivering rail to Wynyard, the university and other transport generators in the city centre exceed the engineering costs of doing so compared with rail solutions to the less important centres around K Rd and Newton. If the project alignment is revised to take into consideration key transport generators, such as Wynyard Quarter, Auckland University and Auckland Hospital, we consider the project will better serve the Auckland Council's central city land use planning, private sector property demand and will better integrate with other potential future investments.
69	69/4	Stephen Selwood	New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development Incorporated	5.10 Transport - operational	We consider that a link removing the "bottleneck" in Auckland's rail network resulting from the termination of east, west and southern lines at Britomart is essential for the future growth of the central city.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
69	69/5	Stephen Selwood	New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development Incorporated	6.6 Business case	(Only parts of the NZCID sub included due to its length. See Sub 69 for full details) City Centre Future Access study 2012 In response to a ministerial request, Auckland transport commissioned a final major study published in December 2012. The City Centre Future Access Study (CCFAS) by SKM is important because it was the first evaluation of wider access to, from and around the wider central city area and incorporating other transport modes and projects'. The study group also included representatives from central government, including the Ministry of Transport, New Zealand Transport Agency and the Treasury and was the first related to the CRL to fully incorporate Treasury's Better Business Case framework (which was concluded part way through the 2010 work stream). The CCFAS did not consider city access from a first principles standpoint but accepted the current alignment of the CRL as a given. The CCFAS found that, without the CRL, by 2021 Auckland's central city area would be suffering significant transport pressures, with bus, rail and private motor vehicle capacities at or near maximum during the morning peak across not just the central city, but along many major corridors leading to the city. The participating partners in the CCFAS considered a long list of 46 options across multiple modes to meet the key objectives of the study. From this list, three "headline" transport options were agreed and carried forward for further investigation: Underground rail (the CRL), Surface bus (improved bus priority services on key corridors), Underground bus (a dedicated bus tunnel along Wellesley St). The study evaluated the three options along with separate multi-modal packages to support the headline projects. The CRL was the most expensive option but was also found to produce the highest benefits and to be the only option that delivered sufficient capacity to the city centre after 2030. It produced a benefit cost ratio of 0.4 under standard appraisal and 0.9 including wider economic benefits (WEBs). The surface bus option was the most affordable, but delivered relatively little capacity and by consuming general traffic lanes also contributed to slower private motor vehicle travel speeds. It produced a benefit cost ratio of 0.0 under standard appraisal and 0.3 including wider economic benefits (WEBs). The underground bus option provided marginally more capacity than the surface bus option, but carried a greatly increased price. It produced a benefit cost ratio of 0.1 under standard appraisal and 0.2 including wider economic benefits (WEBs). When combined with surface bus improvement, the CCFAS found that the CRL headline option would provide the best solution to city centre transport challenges. The total cost of this multi-modal package was estimated at \$2.232 billion (NPV) and returned BCRs of 0.4 and 0.9 under standard and wider economic analyses, respectively. Discussion of key issues 1. Alignment options have never undergone adequate economic appraisal. 2. There has been no economic evaluation of the total costs and benefits of transport to the city centre. 3. Phasing
70	70/1	James Cowie		1.31 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 1) subject to conditions / amendments	12.1 The TSR generally supports NOR 1, subject to the concerns described in this submission being addressed by appropriate designation conditions, or the outcomes sought being guaranteed by other means. 12.4 In the absence of designation conditions sufficient to ensure that any construction effects of the CRI Project on TSR are adequately managed to its satisfaction, TSR requests that NOR 1 is withdrawn because it: (a) Is inappropriate and/or unnecessary; (b) Does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; (c) Does not provide for the efficient use and development of natural resources; (d) Is contrary to good resource management practice; and (e) Does not meet the relevant requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), including the purposes and principles under Part 2 of the Act. 12.5 Accordingly, without limiting the scope of this submission, TSR requests that the following concerns be addressed by appropriate designation conditions. If such conditions cannot be imposed on Auckland Transport's designation, then TSR requests that Auckland Council recommends that Auckland Transport withdraw the NOR. Decision sought: 41 TSR seeks the following recommendation or decision from the territorial authority: 41.1 The withdrawal of NOR 1 unless changes to the CRL designation are made and designation conditions that address the matters set out above are included. 42 These designation conditions (examples of which are specified in more detail above) are as follows: (a) Acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits; (b) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake a pre-construction assessment, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings, as well as an adaptive management approach to vibration effects; (c) Maintenance of vehicular and pedestrian access to TSR at all times, the maintenance of east/west movements across Albert Street and advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure/diversion; (d) Measures to reduce congestion along Albert Street; (e) That TSR would receive advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1; (f) That hoardings are visually appealing and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel and the hoardings and construction areas are appropriately screened by plantings; (g) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake urban design rehabilitation works once construction is completed; (h) Measures to address economic impact s; and (i) Measures to address any adverse air quality effects.
70	70/2	James Cowie		2.3 Consultation	12.2 Although a number of conditions are suggested by Auckland Transport, there is overall very little certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply or measurable outcomes. Rather, the management of adverse effects through conditions is left to be considered under an Environmental Management Framework, which is yet to be written, TSR is very concerned that any management plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NOR 1 would be dealt with through the Resource Management Act's Outline Plan of Works process without an opportunity for TSR's input. 12.3 TSR Owners expect greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for TSR 's quality of life, health and well-being, property values and access to our properties .

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
70	70/3	James Cowie		5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	12.2 Although a number of conditions are suggested by Auckland Transport, there is overall very little certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply or measurable outcomes. Rather, the management of adverse effects through conditions is left to be considered under an Environmental Management Framework, which is yet to be written, TSR is very concerned that any management plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NOR 1 would be dealt with through the Resource Management Act's Outline Plan of Works process without an opportunity for TSR's input. 12.3 TSR Owners expect greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for TSR's quality of life, health and well-being, property values and access to our properties. Advance notice of construction: 31 The TSR Body Corporate is obliged to provide notice to its owners of any planned construction activity. In order to enable TSR to fulfill its obligations, TSR seeks a designation condition requiring 18 months advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1. 32 TSR also seeks a designation condition requiring at least 30 working days notice of any construction activities, road closures or diversions including the expected duration of the works which would affect TSR.
70	70/4	James Cowie		4.1 Part 2 RMA	12.4 In the absence of designation conditions sufficient to ensure that any construction effects of the CRI Project on TSR are adequately managed to its satisfaction, TSR requests that NOR 1 is withdrawn because it: (a) Is inappropriate and/or unnecessary; (b) Does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; (c) Does not provide for the efficient use and development of natural resources; (d) Is contrary to good resource management practice; and (e) Does not meet the relevant requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), including the purposes and principles under Part 2 of the Act.
70	70/5	James Cowie		5.1 Noise - construction	14. Noise arising from construction of the CRL has the potential to create significant disturbance for TSR's residents during both daytime and night-time hours. Given the nature of TSR residents, quiet enjoyment during both daytime and night-time hours is essential. Many of the residents are high level business executives who require quiet enjoyment over weekends. 15. The Noise and Vibration Assessment report attached to the CRL Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) identifies noise effects ¹ and suggests criteria for 1. However, Auckland Transport does not appear to have undertaken any construction noise modeling for construction activities along Albert Street. There is no definition or what are acceptable levels of construction noise. These criteria would apply 7 days a week with no allowance made for different levels over weekends or public holidays. 16 The recommended project criteria at 6.2.1 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment state potential noise limits as follows: 16.1 Daytime (7am - 11pm) limits of db(laeq) 75; and 16.2 Night time (11pm till 7am) limits of db(LAeq) 60. 17 This noise is measured 1 metre from the facade of the building. According to the Noise and Vibration Assessment, such noise would translate to an internal noise of approximately 45db laeq for buildings with sealed glazing. 18 The Noise and Vibration Assessment further states that certain activities are predicted to exceed this criterion. Secant piling for example, would result in noise levels of 89 dB LAeq at a 10 metre setback. While the Noise and Vibration Assessment classifies internal noise levels above 55dB LAeq as having a minor effect these levels are also acknowledged as resulting in annoyance and reduction in work efficiency. Over the long period of construction works, TSR submits that noise would have a significant adverse effect upon both TSR residents and our guests and its employees. 19 Vibration effects may also be experienced by guests and employees of TSR during construction. The Noise and Vibration Assessment recognises that the adverse effects of construction vibration on building occupants could be significant, especially for buildings identified as notable receivers, which includes TSR. Adverse effects could range from annoyance, to loss of amenity or inability to undertake work. 20 TSR has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities on its residents. Consequently, TSR seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. These conditions could include, for example: 20.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of 10am and 4pm on weekends. 20.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm. 20.3 A prohibition on parking, or unloading from, construction vehicles immediately outside the TSR. 21 TSR also seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to mitigate adverse noise and vibration effects. These conditions could include, for example: 21.1 An option for relocation for residents and guests of TSR to be available at any time during the construction of the project where applicable noise or vibration limits would be exceeded. Alternative accommodation would be required to be of a similar standard and location as agreed by TSR Owners Corp. 21.2 A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide acoustic insulation for the entire building where exposed to construction noise (for example, double glazing, wall insulation treatment and an alternative revolving door access at all entrance ways) to ensure that the noise standards are met at all times.
70	70/6	James Cowie		5.3 Vibration - construction	19 Vibration effects may also be experienced by guests and employees of TSR during construction. The Noise and Vibration Assessment recognises that the adverse effects of construction vibration on building occupants could be significant, especially for buildings identified as notable receivers, which includes TSR. Adverse effects could range from annoyance, to loss of amenity or inability to undertake work. 20 TSR has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities on its residents. Consequently, TSR seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. These conditions could include, for example: 20.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of 10am and 4pm on weekends. 20.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm. 20.3 A prohibition on parking, or unloading from, construction vehicles immediately outside the TSR. 21 TSR also seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to mitigate adverse noise and vibration effects. These conditions could include, for example: 21.1 An option for relocation for residents and guests of TSR to be available at any time during the construction of the project where applicable noise or vibration limits would be exceeded. Alternative accommodation would be required to be of a similar standard and location as agreed by TSR Owners Corp. 21.2 A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide acoustic

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					insulation for the entire building where exposed to construction noise (for example, double glazing, wall insulation treatment and an alternative revolving door access at all entrance ways) to ensure that the noise standards are met at all times. Structural vibration effects: 22 Vibration from the construction of the CRL may cause structural or more superficial damage to buildings and chattels, especially our Glass Curtain Wall. TSR is located within the construction vibration contour set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment and is specifically identified as a notable receiver. 23 TSR seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. These conditions should include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings and chattels (at times convenient to TSR). 24 These conditions should also provide for a precautionary adaptive management regime, where vibration limits start at a relatively low level and would be allowed to increase only if monitoring establishes that there are no problems.
70	70/7	James Cowie		5.5 Structural - individual buildings	Structural vibration effects: 22 Vibration from the construction of the CRL may cause structural or more superficial damage to buildings and chattels, especially our Glass Curtain Wall. TSR is located within the construction vibration contour set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment and is specifically identified as a notable receiver. 23 TSR seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. These conditions should include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings and chattels (at times convenient to TSR). 24 These conditions should also provide for a precautionary adaptive management regime, where vibration limits start at a relatively low level and would be allowed to increase only if monitoring establishes that there are no problems.
70	70/8	James Cowie		5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Access: 25 Construction of the CRL would result in significant effects on the road transport network and access to TSR for public and private transport and pedestrians. These effects include diversions, extended travel times, delays, segregation and increased congestion on public bus operators and users, emergency vehicles, private vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. 26 TSR seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. 27 The Integrated Transport Assessment for CRL notes that "access to all properties will be maintained, but as noted above, certain movements will not directly be possible, but will be restricted to left in, left out manoeuvres to either the temporary northbound or southbound carriageway along Albert Street." 28 The AEE proposes, as a means of mitigating temporary adverse road transport effects, that: 28.1 The Construction Environmental Management Plan would include how TSR owners and residents access can be maintained during construction via left in, left out movements to TSR on Albert Street. 28.2 Access to the Albert Street entrance area of the TSR can be maintained in a left in left out arrangement. 28.3 Access to the basement level carparking and service area for the TSR can be maintained via Mills Lane / Swanson Street (left in/left out). 29 TSR seeks designation conditions requiring vehicular and pedestrian access to TSR is available at all times and the maintenance of east/west movements across Albert Street for vehicles and pedestrians. 30 Additionally, to alleviate congestion along Albert Street, TSR seeks designation conditions requiring truck movements up Albert Street to be restricted. These conditions could require, for example, truck movements up Albert Street to be restricted during peak hours (6:00 to 9:00 and 16:00 to 19:00) on weekdays, where alternative routes are available. Advance notice of construction: 31 The TSR Body Corporate is obliged to provide notice to its owners of any planned construction activity. In order to enable TSR to fulfill its obligations, TSR seeks a designation condition requiring 18 months advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1. 32 TSR also seeks a designation condition requiring at least 30 working days notice of any construction activities, road closures or diversions including the expected duration of the works which would affect TSR.
70	70/9	James Cowie		5.12 Public amenity / streetscape - construction	Visual amenity: Hoardings: 36 Hoardings would be erected along the Albert Street footpath, leaving a footpath width of 15 metres. Given the duration of construction, and the imposing nature of these hoardings, TSR seeks designation conditions requiring that these hoardings be visually appealing (both at ground level and having regard to the views from above) and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel. TSR seeks in particular a designation condition requiring that the design of hoardings adjacent to the boundary of the property are agreed by TSR prior to erection. 37 In addition, appropriate screening by plantings agreed to by TSR would be necessary to mitigate the impact of the hoardings and construction works areas on TSR Apartments which overlook Albert Street.
70	70/10	James Cowie		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Construction 38 The amenity of Albert Street would be severely reduced during the construction period of the CRL To mitigate these effects, TSR seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to undertake urban design rehabilitation works. These rehabilitation works could include an upgrade to the road and footpath along Albert Street, including access to TSR.
70	70/11	James Cowie		5.20 Economic	Loss of trade: 33 A number of TSR owners lease out apartments and parking spaces in the building. Construction of the CRL could result in serious adverse economic impacts, as tenants may discontinue and/or not renew their leases. It is foreseeable that the disruptions caused during the construction phase would result in significant financial loss for owners. 34 TSR is also concerned that potential damage to the stability and sustainability of the existing building, which may be irreversible, or not be evident until well after the construction phase. 35 Accordingly, TSR seeks designation conditions to mitigate any economic loss, as a result of the likely loss of tenants and property values.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
70	70/12	James Cowie		5.17 Air quality	Air quality: 39 The potential for adverse effects on air quality and measures to avoid them are outlined in the technical report at Appendix 7 to Auckland Transport's notices of requirement. TSR is concerned about impacts on its owners and guests and on the building itself and seeks designation conditions requiring measures to address any adverse effects. 40 These measures may include, but are not limited to, approved dust suppression methods and the regular cleaning of the exterior of TSR. Particular consideration should be given to the potential for dust to adversely affect the buildings fresh air supply duct and permeate the Glass Curtain (and Logias).
71	71/1	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	1.31 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 1) subject to conditions / amendments	12.4 In the absence of designation conditions sufficient to ensure that any construction effects of the CRL Project on Stamford are adequately managed to its satisfaction, Stamford requests that NOR 1 is withdrawn because it: (a) Is inappropriate and/or unnecessary; (b) Does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; (c) Does not provide for the efficient use and development of natural resources; (d) Is contrary to good resource management practice; and (e) Does not meet the relevant requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), including the purposes and principles under Part 2 of the Act. 12.5 Accordingly, without limiting the scope of this submission, Stamford requests that the following concerns be addressed by appropriate designation conditions. If such conditions cannot be imposed on Auckland Transport's designation, then Stamford requests that Auckland Council recommends that Auckland Transport withdraw the NOR.
71	71/2	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	2.3 Consultation	12.2 Although a number of conditions are suggested by Auckland Transport, there is overall very little certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply or measurable outcomes. Rather, the management of adverse effects through conditions is left to be considered under an Environmental Management Framework, which is yet to be written. Stamford is very concerned that any management plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NOR 1 would be dealt with through the Resource Management Act's Outline Plan of Works process without an opportunity for Stamford's input. 12.3 Stamford expects greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for Stamford's business and operations.
71	71/3	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	12.2 Although a number of conditions are suggested by Auckland Transport, there is overall very little certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply or measurable outcomes. Rather, the management of adverse effects through conditions is left to be considered under an Environmental Management Framework, which is yet to be written. Stamford is very concerned that any management plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NOR 1 would be dealt with through the Resource Management Act's Outline Plan of Works process without an opportunity for Stamford's input. 12.3 Stamford expects greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for Stamford's business and operations. Advance notice of construction: 31 Stamford is contractually obliged to provide notice to its guests of any planned construction activity. In order to enable Stamford to fulfill its contractual obligations, Stamford seeks a designation condition requiring 18 months advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1. 32 Stamford also seeks a designation condition requiring at least 30 working days notice of any construction activities, road closures or diversions including the expected duration of the works which would affect Stamford. Decision sought: 41 Stamford seeks the following recommendation or decision from the territorial authority: 41.1 The withdrawal of NOR 1 unless changes to the CRL designation are made and designation conditions that address the matters set out above are included. 42 These designation conditions (examples of which are specified in more detail above) are as follows: (a) Acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits; (b) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake a pre-construction assessment, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings, as well as an adaptive management approach to vibration effects; (c) Maintenance of vehicular and pedestrian access to Stamford at all times, the maintenance of east / west movements across Albert Street and advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure / diversion; (d) Measures to reduce congestion along Albert Street; (e) That Stamford would receive advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1; (f) That hoardings are visually appealing and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel and the hoardings and construction areas are appropriately screened by plantings; (g) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake urban design rehabilitation works once construction is completed; (h) Measures to address economic impacts; and (i) Measures to address any adverse air quality effects.
71	71/4	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	4.1 Part 2 RMA	12.4 In the absence of designation conditions sufficient to ensure that any construction effects of the CRL Project on Stamford are adequately managed to its satisfaction, Stamford requests that NOR 1 is withdrawn because it: (a) Is inappropriate and/or unnecessary; (b) Does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; (c) Does not provide for the efficient use and development of natural resources; (d) Is contrary to good resource management practice; and (e) Does not meet the relevant requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), including the purposes and principles under Part 2 of the Act.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
71	71/5	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.1 Noise - construction	<p>Noise effects: 14 Noise arising from construction of the CRL has the potential to create significant disturbance for Stamford's guests during both daytime and night-time hours. Given the nature of Stamford's clientele (ie corporate / business guests, airline crews, tourists etc) quiet enjoyment during both daytime and night-time hours is essential. The leisure market also requires quiet enjoyment over weekends. 15 The Noise and Vibration Assessment report attached to the CRL Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) identifies noise effects' and suggests criteria for acceptable levels of construction noise. These criteria would apply 7 days a week with no allowance made for different levels over weekends or public holidays. 16 The recommended project criteria at 6.2.1 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment state potential noise limits as follows: 16.1 Daytime (7am - 11pm) limits of db(LA_o,) 75; and 16.2 Night time (11pm till 7am) limits of db(LA_e,) 60. 17 This noise is measured 1 metre from the facade of the building. According to the Noise and Vibration Assessment, such noise would translate to an internal noise of approximately 45db LA_e, for buildings with sealed glazing. 18 The Noise and Vibration Assessment further states that certain activities are predicted to exceed this criterion. Secant piling for example, would result in noise levels of 89 dB LA_{eq} at a 10 metre setback. While the Noise and Vibration Assessment classifies internal noise levels above 55dB LA_e, as having a minor effect, these levels are also acknowledged as resulting in annoyance and reduction in work efficiency. Over the long period of construction works, Stamford submits that noise would have a significant adverse effect upon both Stamford's guests and its employees. 20 Stamford has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities on its guests. Consequently, Stamford seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. These conditions could include, for example: 20.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of 10am and 4pm on weekends. 20.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm. 20.3 A prohibition on parking, or unloading from, construction vehicles immediately outside the Stamford. 21 Stamford also seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to mitigate adverse noise and vibration effects. These conditions could include, for example: 21.1 An option for relocation for guests of Stamford to be available at any time during the construction of the project where applicable noise or vibration limits would be exceeded. Alternative accommodation would be required to be of a similar standard and location as agreed by Stamford. 21.2 A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide acoustic insulation for the entire building where exposed to construction noise (for example, double glazing, wall insulation treatment and an alternative revolving door access at all entrance ways) to ensure that the noise standards are met at all times.</p>
71	71/6	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.3 Vibration - construction	<p>19 Vibration effects may also be experienced by guests and employees of the Stamford during construction. The Noise and Vibration Assessment recognises that the adverse effects of construction vibration on building occupants could be significant, especially for buildings identified as notable receivers, which includes the Stamford . Adverse effects could range from annoyance, to loss of amenity or inability to undertake work. 20 Stamford has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities on its guests. Consequently, Stamford seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. These conditions could include, for example: 20.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of 10am and 4pm on weekends. 20.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm. 20.3 A prohibition on parking, or unloading from, construction vehicles immediately outside the Stamford. 21 Stamford also seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to mitigate adverse noise and vibration effects. These conditions could include, for example: 21.1 An option for relocation for guests of Stamford to be available at any time during the construction of the project where applicable noise or vibration limits would be exceeded. Alternative accommodation would be required to be of a similar standard and location as agreed by Stamford. 21.2 A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide acoustic insulation for the entire building where exposed to construction noise (for example, double glazing, wall insulation treatment and an alternative revolving door access at all entrance ways) to ensure that the noise standards are met at all times. Structural vibration effects: 22 Vibration from the construction of the CRL may cause structural or more superficial damage to buildings and chattels. Stamford is located within the construction vibration contour set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment and is specifically identified as a notable receiver. 23 Stamford seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. These conditions should include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings and chattels (at times convenient to Stamford). 24 These conditions should also provide for a precautionary adaptive management regime, where vibration limits start at a relatively low level and would be allowed to increase only if monitoring establishes that there are no problems.</p>
71	71/7	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	<p>Structural vibration effects: 22 Vibration from the construction of the CRL may cause structural or more superficial damage to buildings and chattels. Stamford is located within the construction vibration contour set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment and is specifically identified as a notable receiver. 23 Stamford seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. These conditions should include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings and chattels (at times convenient to Stamford). 24 These conditions should also provide for a precautionary adaptive management regime, where vibration limits start at a relatively low level and would be allowed to increase only if monitoring establishes that there are no problems.</p>

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
71	71/8	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Access: 25 Construction of the CRL would result in significant effects on the road transport network and access to Stamford for public and private transport and pedestrians. These effects include diversions, extended travel times, delays, segregation and increased congestion on public bus operators and users, emergency vehicles, private vehicles, private coach operators and users, cyclists and pedestrians. 26 Stamford seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. 27 The Integrated Transport Assessment for CRL notes that "access to all properties will be maintained, but as noted above, certain movements will not directly be possible, but will be restricted to left in, left out manoeuvres to either the temporary northbound or southbound carriageway along Albert Street." 28 The AEE proposes, as a means of mitigating temporary adverse road transport effects, that: 28.1 The Construction Environmental Management Plan would include how private coach access can be maintained during construction via left in, left out movements to the Stamford on Albert Street. 28.2 Access to the Albert Street entrance area of the Stamford can be maintained in a left in left out arrangement. 28.3 Access to the basement level carparking and service area for the Stamford can be maintained via Mills Lane/Swanson Street (left in/left out). 29 Stamford seeks designation conditions requiring vehicular and pedestrian access to Stamford is available at all times and the maintenance of east / west movements across Albert Street for vehicles and pedestrians . 30 Additionally, to alleviate congestion along Albert Street, Stamford seeks designation conditions requiring truck movements up Albert Street to be restricted. These conditions could require, for example, truck movements up Albert Street to be restricted during peak hours (6:00 to 9:00 and 16:00 to 19:00) on weekdays, where alternative routes are available. Advance notice of construction: 31 Stamford is contractually obliged to provide notice to its guests of any planned construction activity. In order to enable Stamford to fulfill its contractual obligations, Stamford seeks a designation condition requiring 18 months advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1. 32 Stamford also seeks a designation condition requiring at least 30 working days notice of any construction activities, road closures or diversions including the expected duration of the works which would affect Stamford.
71	71/9	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.12 Public amenity / streetscape - construction	Visual amenity: Hoardings: 36 Hoardings would be erected along the Albert Street footpath, leaving a footpath width of 1.5 metres. Given the duration of construction, and the imposing nature of these hoardings, Stamford seeks designation conditions requiring that these hoardings be visually appealing (both at ground level and having regard to the views from above) and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel. Stamford seeks in particular a designation condition requiring that the design of hoardings adjacent to the boundary of its property are agreed by Stamford prior to erection. 37 In addition, appropriate screening by plantings agreed to by Stamford would be necessary to mitigate the impact of the hoardings and construction works areas on Stamford's restaurants, pool / gym area and a number of its rooms which overlook Albert Street.
71	71/10	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Construction: 38 The amenity of Albert Street would be severely reduced during the construction period of the CRL. To mitigate these effects, Stamford seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to undertake urban design rehabilitation works. These rehabilitation works could include an upgrade to the road and footpath along Albert Street, including access to Stamford's hotel.
71	71/11	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.17 Air quality	Air quality: 39 The potential for adverse effects on air quality and measures to avoid them are outlined in the technical report at Appendix 7 to Auckland Transport's notices of requirement. Stamford is concerned about impacts on its guests and on the building itself and seeks designation conditions requiring measures to address any adverse effects. 40 These measures may include, but are not limited to, approved dust suppression methods and the regular cleaning of the exterior of the hotel. Particular consideration should be given to the potential for dust to adversely affect the buildings fresh air supply duct.
71	71/12	attn: Paul Evans	Stamford Plaza	5.20 Economic	Loss of trade: 33 Stamford leases out a number of spaces in the building. Tenants include the Grasshopper Restaurant, Sansui Restaurant, Thai Massage and the Coffee Training School. Construction of the CRL could result in serious adverse economic impacts, as these tenants may discontinue and / or not renew their leases. It is foreseeable that the disruptions caused during the construction phase would also result in loss of trade arising from reduced numbers of hotel guests. 34 Stamford is also concerned that potential damage to the vibrancy and sustainability of the existing businesses in the building (which have taken time to establish) may be irreversible, even after the construction phase. Stamford currently employs over 200 Full Time Equivalent New Zealand staff and contractors in its hospitality and related activities on the property. Many of these jobs may be at stake should irreversible damage be caused to the existing businesses in the building . 35 Accordingly, Stamford seeks designation conditions to mitigate any economic loss, as a result of the likely loss of tenants and guests.
72	72/1	Sherry Reynolds	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	1.22 Neutral, did not care, but requested conditions / amendments - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
72	72/2	Sherry Reynolds	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	5.8 Built heritage	The NZHPT seeks the following decision: The NZHPT wishes to see, in the terms and conditions of the designation and in the supporting documentation, a better indication of the uses to which these assets are to be put, a commitment to their retention or adaptive re-use where possible, and a more stringent assessment of less destructive alternatives where it appears that demolition or substantial alteration of the buildings is likely, commitment to preparation of a conservation plan where adaptive re-use or significant modification is proposed. In particular, the NZHPT wishes to see the project subject to the following modifications. 1. A more explicit consideration of the extent to which each of those buildings that have been identified as built heritage in the Built Heritage Assessment, and as being required for the surface designation in the relevant Notices of Requirement, would be affected by the construction and operation of the project; 2. Where it appears that the project would require significant modification or complete demolition of the building, a more explicit assessment of the need for such works and alternatives which may not require demolition or significant modification; 3. The inclusion of conditions that require preference to be given to adaptive re-use or alternatives that are less destructive of built heritage, and require the preparation of conservation plans to guide modifications to such buildings. 4. The inclusion of a condition requiring consultation with the NZHPT in the preparation of additional assessments and conservation plans.
72	72/3	Sherry Reynolds	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The NZHPT seeks the following decision: The NZHPT wishes to see, in the terms and conditions of the designation and in the supporting documentation, a better indication of the uses to which these assets are to be put, a commitment to their retention or adaptive re-use where possible, and a more stringent assessment of less destructive alternatives where it appears that demolition or substantial alteration of the buildings is likely, commitment to preparation of a conservation plan where adaptive re-use or significant modification is proposed. In particular, the NZHPT wishes to see the project subject to the following modifications. 1. A more explicit consideration of the extent to which each of those buildings that have been identified as built heritage in the Built Heritage Assessment, and as being required for the surface designation in the relevant Notices of Requirement, would be affected by the construction and operation of the project; 2. Where it appears that the project would require significant modification or complete demolition of the building, a more explicit assessment of the need for such works and alternatives which may not require demolition or significant modification; 3. The inclusion of conditions that require preference to be given to adaptive re-use or alternatives that are less destructive of built heritage, and require the preparation of conservation plans to guide modifications to such buildings. 4. The inclusion of a condition requiring consultation with the NZHPT in the preparation of additional assessments and conservation plans.
72	72/4	Sherry Reynolds	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	5.3 Vibration - construction	2 The NZHPT's submission is: 1. Some heritage items, as identified in the Built Heritage Assessment, could be put at risk through vibration and settlement as the tunnels and stations are constructed. These are identified in the Built Heritage Assessment, and are not confined to the areas identified as land to be designated substrata (blues areas) in the various land requirement plans, but also may lie outside the areas subject to the various requirements. It is considered that the conditions for the designation should include more explicit provisions about what is expected of the Environmental Management Plan, Construction Environmental Management Plan and associated Delivery Work Plans, in respect of recording pre-existing conditions, monitoring movement, and the triggering of remedial works. 2. There is a need to involve NZHPT in the drawing up of these protocols. 3. Of particular note are the proposed works underneath the old CPO building, where special construction techniques will be required. The NZHPT through its heritage covenant has a particular role in approving works.
72	72/5	Sherry Reynolds	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	2 The NZHPT's submission is: 1. Some heritage items, as identified in the Built Heritage Assessment, could be put at risk through vibration and settlement as the tunnels and stations are constructed. These are identified in the Built Heritage Assessment, and are not confined to the areas identified as land to be designated substrata (blues areas) in the various land requirement plans, but also may lie outside the areas subject to the various requirements. It is considered that the conditions for the designation should include more explicit provisions about what is expected of the Environmental Management Plan, Construction Environmental Management Plan and associated Delivery Work Plans, in respect of recording pre-existing conditions, monitoring movement, and the triggering of remedial works. 2. There is a need to involve NZHPT in the drawing up of these protocols. The inclusion of a condition that in preparing the Environmental Management Plan, Construction Environmental Management Plan and associated Delivery Work Plans, particular attention will be given to the potential adverse effects of settlement and vibration on heritage buildings, including those within and adjoining the land areas proposed to be designated. This will include baseline condition surveys, a preliminary assessment of the risks faced by the buildings in question, proposals for strengthening the buildings where that is necessary to ensure structural integrity, and proposals for on-going monitoring, the setting of trigger points for remedial action and the making good of any damage on completion. This condition should also include a commitment to consult with NZHPT in respect to works on heritage buildings.
72	72/6	Sherry Reynolds	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	2 The NZHPT's submission is: 1. Some heritage items, as identified in the Built Heritage Assessment, could be put at risk through vibration and settlement as the tunnels and stations are constructed. These are identified in the Built Heritage Assessment, and are not confined to the areas identified as land to be designated substrata (blues areas) in the various land requirement plans, but also may lie outside the areas subject to the various requirements. It is considered that the conditions for the designation should include more explicit provisions about what is expected of the Environmental Management Plan, Construction Environmental Management Plan and associated Delivery Work Plans, in respect of recording pre-existing conditions, monitoring movement, and the triggering of remedial works. 2. There is a need to involve NZHPT in the drawing up of these protocols. The inclusion of a condition that in preparing the Environmental Management Plan, Construction Environmental Management Plan and associated Delivery Work Plans, particular attention will be given to the potential adverse effects of settlement and vibration on heritage buildings, including those within and adjoining the land areas proposed to be designated. This will include baseline condition surveys, a preliminary assessment of the risks faced by the buildings in question, proposals for strengthening the buildings where that is necessary to ensure structural integrity, and proposals for on-going monitoring, the setting of trigger points for remedial action and the making good of any damage on completion.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					This condition should also include a commitment to consult with NZHPT in respect to works on heritage buildings.
72	72/7	Sherry Reynolds	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	6.9 Existing designation	Of particular note are the proposed works underneath the old CPO building. where special construction techniques will be required. The NZHPT through its heritage covenant has a particular role in approving works.
73	73/1	Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	Tram Lease Ltd	1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	4 The company seeks the following recommendation or decision from the unitary authority: 4.1 That the notice of requirement be withdrawn; or 4.2 That the notice of requirement be modified; or 4.3 That conditions be imposed; and 4.4 Such alternative, consequential, or further relief as may be appropriate or necessary to give effect to this submission.
73	73/2	Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	Tram Lease Ltd	5.32 Adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated	3 The company's submission is: 3.1 The notice of requirement is opposed for the following reasons: 3.2 The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the subject site. 3.3 The adverse effects of the designation on the subject site will not be avoided, remedied or mitigated. 3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (a) The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the surrounding road network serving the subject site, and will have an adverse effect on site access. (b) The designation will, if confirmed, prevent reasonable use of the subject site.
73	73/3	Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	Tram Lease Ltd	5.9 Transport - construction	3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (a) The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the surrounding road network serving the subject site, and will have an adverse effect on site access.
73	73/4	Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	Tram Lease Ltd	5.10 Transport - operational	3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (a) The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the surrounding road network serving the subject site, and will have an adverse effect on site access.
73	73/5	Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	Tram Lease Ltd	5.23 Property rights	3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (b) The designation will, if confirmed, prevent reasonable use of the subject site.
73	73/6	Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	Tram Lease Ltd	4.2 RMA policy framework	3.5 The notice of requirement (including the assessment of effects on the environment) does not comply with the relevant statutory and regulatory provisions.
73	73/7	Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	Tram Lease Ltd	3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	3.6 Adequate consideration has not been given to alternative sites, routes or methods of undertaking the work.
73	73/8	Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	Tram Lease Ltd	4.1 Part 2 RMA	3.7 Confirming the designation will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
74	74/1	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	1.9 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 1	6.1 Grasshopper generally supports NOR 1, subject to the concerns described in this submission being addressed by appropriate designation conditions, or the outcomes sought being guaranteed by other means. 6.4 In the absence of designation conditions sufficient to ensure that any construction effects of the CRL Project on Grasshopper are adequately managed to its satisfaction, Grasshopper requests that NOR 1 is withdrawn because it: (a) Is inappropriate and/or unnecessary; (b) Does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; (c) Does not provide for the efficient use and development of natural resources; (d) Is contrary to good resource management practice; and (e) Does not meet the relevant requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), including the purposes and principles under Part 2 of the Act. 6.5 Accordingly, without limiting the scope of this submission, Grasshopper requests that the following concerns be addressed by appropriate designation conditions. If such conditions cannot be imposed on Auckland Transport's designation, then Grasshopper requests that Auckland Council recommends that Auckland Transport withdraw the NOR. 35 These designation conditions (examples of which are specified in more detail above) are as follows: (a) Acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits; (b) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake a pre-construction assessment, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings, as well as an adaptive management approach to vibration effects; (c) Maintenance of vehicular and pedestrian access to Grasshopper at all times, the maintenance of east / west movements across Albert Street and advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure / diversion; (d) Measures to reduce congestion along Albert Street; (e) That Grasshopper would receive advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1; (f) That hoardings are visually appealing and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel and the hoardings and construction areas are appropriately screened by plantings; (g) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake urban design rehabilitation works once construction is completed; (h) Measures to address economic impacts; and (i) Measures to address any adverse air quality effects

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
74	74/2	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	6.2 Although a number of conditions are suggested by Auckland Transport, there is overall very little certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply or measurable outcomes. Rather, the management of adverse effects through conditions is left to be considered under an Environmental Management Framework, which is yet to be written. Grasshopper is very concerned that any management plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NOR 1 would be dealt with through the opportunity for Grasshopper input. 6.3 Grasshopper expects greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for Grasshopper's business and operations.
74	74/3	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	2.3 Consultation	6.2 Although a number of conditions are suggested by Auckland Transport, there is overall very little certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply or measurable outcomes. Rather, the management of adverse effects through conditions is left to be considered under an Environmental Management Framework, which is yet to be written. Grasshopper is very concerned that any management plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NOR 1 would be dealt with through the opportunity for Grasshopper input. 6.3 Grasshopper expects greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for Grasshopper's business and operations.
74	74/4	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	6.3 Grasshopper expects greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for Grasshopper's business and operations. Advance notice of construction: 25 Grasshopper is contractually obliged to provide notice to its guests of any planned construction activity. In order to enable Grasshopper to fulfill its contractual obligations, Grasshopper seeks a designation condition requiring 18 months advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1. 26 Grasshopper also seeks a designation condition requiring at least 30 working days notice of any construction activities, road closures or diversions including the expected duration of the works which would affect Grasshopper. 35 These designation conditions (examples of which are specified in more detail above) are as follows: (a) Acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits; (b) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake a pre-construction assessment, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings, as well as an adaptive management approach to vibration effects; (c) Maintenance of vehicular and pedestrian access to Grasshopper at all times, the maintenance of east / west movements across Albert Street and advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure / diversion; (d) Measures to reduce congestion along Albert Street; (e) That Grasshopper would receive advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1; (f) That hoardings are visually appealing and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel and the hoardings and construction areas are appropriately screened by plantings; (g) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake urban design rehabilitation works once construction is completed; (h) Measures to address economic impacts; and (i) Measures to address any adverse air quality effects
74	74/5	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.1 Noise - construction	Noise effects: 8 Noise arising from construction of the CRL has the potential to create significant disturbance for Grasshopper's guests during both daytime and night-time hours. Given the nature of Grasshopper's clientele (ie corporate / business guests, airline crews, tourists etc) quiet enjoyment during both daytime and night-time hours is essential. The leisure market also requires quiet enjoyment over weekends. 9 The Noise and Vibration Assessment report attached to the CRL Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) identifies noise effects' and suggests criteria for acceptable levels of construction noise. These criteria would apply 7 days a week with no allowance made for different levels over weekends or public holidays. 10 The recommended project criteria at 6.2.1 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment state potential noise limits as follows: 10.1 Daytime (7am - 11pm) limits of db(LA,q) 75; and 10.2 Night time (11pm till 7am) limits of db(LA,q) 60. 11 This noise is measured 1 metre from the facade of the building. According to the Noise and Vibration Assessment, such noise would translate to an internal noise of approximately 45db LA,q for buildings with sealed glazing. 12 The Noise and Vibration Assessment further states that certain activities are predicted to exceed this criterion. Secant piling for example, would result in noise levels of 89 dB LA,q at a 10 metre setback. While the Noise and Vibration Assessment classifies internal noise levels above 55dB LA,q as having a minor effect, these levels are also acknowledged as resulting in annoyance and reduction in work efficiency. Over the long period of construction works, Grasshopper submits that noise would have a significant adverse effect upon both Grasshopper's guests and its employees. 14 Grasshopper has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities on its guests. Consequently, Stamford seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. These conditions could include, for example: 14.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of 10am and 4pm on weekends. 14.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm. 14.3 A prohibition on parking, or unloading from, construction vehicles immediately outside the Grasshopper. 15 Grasshopper also seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to mitigate adverse noise and vibration effects. These conditions could include, for example: 15.1 A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide acoustic insulation for the entire building where exposed to construction noise (for example, double glazing, wall insulation treatment and an alternative revolving door access at all entrance ways) to ensure that the noise standards are met at all times.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
74	74/6	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.3 Vibration - construction	13 Vibration effects may also be experienced by guests and employees of the Grasshopper during construction. The Noise and Vibration Assessment recognises that the adverse effects of construction vibration on building occupants could be significant, especially for buildings identified as notable receivers, which includes the Grasshopper. Adverse effects could range from annoyance, to loss of amenity or inability to undertake work. 14 Grasshopper has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities on its guests. Consequently, Stamford seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. These conditions could include, for example: 14.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of 10am and 4pm on weekends. 14.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm. 14.3 A prohibition on parking, or unloading from, construction vehicles immediately outside the Grasshopper. 15 Grasshopper also seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to mitigate adverse noise and vibration effects. These conditions could include, for example: 15.1 A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide acoustic insulation for the entire building where exposed to construction noise (for example, double glazing, wall insulation treatment and an alternative revolving door access at all entrance ways) to ensure that the noise standards are met at all times. Structural vibration effects: 16 Vibration from the construction of the CRL may cause structural or more superficial damage to buildings and chattels. Grasshopper is located within the construction vibration contour set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment and is specifically identified as a notable receiver. 17 Grasshopper seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. These conditions should include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings and chattels (at times convenient to Grasshopper) 18 These conditions should also provide for a precautionary adaptive management regime, where vibration limits start at a relatively low level and would be allowed to increase only if monitoring establishes that there are no problems.
74	74/7	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	Structural vibration effects: 16 Vibration from the construction of the CRL may cause structural or more superficial damage to buildings and chattels. Grasshopper is located within the construction vibration contour set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment and is specifically identified as a notable receiver. 17 Grasshopper seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. These conditions should include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings and chattels (at times convenient to Grasshopper) 18 These conditions should also provide for a precautionary adaptive management regime, where vibration limits start at a relatively low level and would be allowed to increase only if monitoring establishes that there are no problems.
74	74/8	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Access: 19 Construction of the CRL would result in significant effects on the road transport network and access to Grasshopper for public and private transport and pedestrians. These effects include diversions, extended travel times, delays, segregation and increased congestion on public bus operators and users, emergency vehicles, private vehicles, private coach operators and users, cyclists and pedestrians. 20 Grasshopper seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. 21 The Integrated Transport Assessment for CRL notes that "access to all properties will be maintained, but as noted above, certain movements will not directly be possible, but will be restricted to left in, left out manoeuvres to either the temporary northbound or southbound carriageway along Albert Street." 22 The AEE proposes, as a means of mitigating temporary adverse road transport effects, that: 22.1 The Construction Environmental Management Plan would include how private coach access can be maintained during construction via left in, left out movements to the Grasshopper on Albert Street. 22.2 Access to the Albert Street entrance area of the Stamford can be maintained in a left in left out arrangement. 22.3 Access to the basement level carparking and service area for the Grasshopper can be maintained via Mills Lane / Swanson Street (left in / left out). 23 Grasshopper seeks designation conditions requiring vehicular and pedestrian access to Grasshopper is available at all times and the maintenance of east / west movements across Albert Street for vehicles and pedestrians. 24 Additionally, to alleviate congestion along Albert Street, Grasshopper seeks designation conditions requiring truck movements up Albert Street to be restricted. These conditions could require, for example, truck movements up Albert Street to be restricted during peak hours (6:00 to 9:00 and 16:00 to 19:00) on weekdays, where alternative routes are available. Advance notice of construction: 25 Grasshopper is contractually obliged to provide notice to its guests of any planned construction activity. In order to enable Grasshopper to fulfill its contractual obligations, Grasshopper seeks a designation condition requiring 18 months advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1. 26 Grasshopper also seeks a designation condition requiring at least 30 working days notice of any construction activities, road closures or diversions including the expected duration of the works which would affect Grasshopper.
74	74/9	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.20 Economic	Loss of trade: 27 Construction of the CRL could result in serious adverse economic impacts, It is foreseeable that the disruptions caused during the construction phase would also result in loss of trade arising from reduced numbers of hotel guests. Our main customers are from Stamford hotel. Also lost of tenant (Alo Alo Cafe sub leased from Grasshopper) 28 Grasshopper is also concerned that potential damage to the vibrancy and sustainability of the existing businesses in the building (which have taken time to establish) may be irreversible, even after the construction phase. 29 Accordingly, Grasshopper seeks designation conditions to mitigate any economic loss, as a result of the likely loss of tenants and guests.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
74	74/10	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.12 Public amenity / streetscape - construction	Visual amenity: Hoardings: 30 Hoardings would be erected along the Albert Street footpath, leaving a footpath width of 1.5 metres. Given the duration of construction, and the imposing nature of these hoardings, Grasshopper seeks designation conditions requiring that these hoardings be visually appealing (both at ground level and having regard to the views from above) and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel. Grasshopper seeks in particular a designation condition requiring that the design of hoardings adjacent to the boundary of its property are agreed by Grasshopper prior to erection.
74	74/11	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	31 The amenity of Albert Street would be severely reduced during the construction period of the CRL. To mitigate these effects, Grasshopper seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to undertake urban design rehabilitation works. These rehabilitation works could include an upgrade to the road and footpath along Albert Street, including access to Grasshopper Restaurant.
74	74/12	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Thai Fusion Limited T/A Grasshopper Bar and Restaurant	5.17 Air quality	Air quality: 32 The potential for adverse effects on air quality and measures to avoid them are outlined in the technical report at Appendix 7 to Auckland Transport's notices of requirement. Grasshopper is concerned about impacts on its guests and on the building itself and seeks designation conditions requiring measures to address any adverse effects. 33 These measures may include, but are not limited to, approved dust suppression methods and the regular cleaning of the exterior of the hotel. Particular consideration should be given to the potential for dust to adversely affect the buildings fresh air supply duct.
75	75/1	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	1.9 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 1	6.1 Mai Thai generally supports NOR 1, subject to the concerns described in this submission being addressed by appropriate designation conditions, or the outcomes sought being guaranteed by other means. 6.4 In the absence of designation conditions sufficient to ensure that any construction effects of the CRL Project on Mai Thai are adequately managed to its satisfaction, Mai Thai requests that NOR 1 is withdrawn because it: (a) Is inappropriate and/or unnecessary; (b) Does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; (c) Does not provide for the efficient use and development of natural resources; (d) Is contrary to good resource management practice; and (e) Does not meet the relevant requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), including the purposes and principles under Part 2 of the Act. 6.5 Accordingly, without limiting the scope of this submission, Mai Thai requests that the following concerns be addressed by appropriate designation conditions. If such conditions cannot be imposed on Auckland Transport's designation, then Mai Thai requests that Auckland Council recommends that Auckland Transport withdraw the NOR. 35 These designation conditions (examples of which are specified in more detail above) are as follows: (a) Acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits; (b) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake a pre-construction assessment, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings, as well as an adaptive management approach to vibration effects; (c) Maintenance of vehicular and pedestrian access to Mai Thai at all times, the maintenance of east / west movements across Albert Street / Victoria St, and advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure / diversion; (d) Measures to reduce congestion along Albert Street / Victoria St, (e) That Mai Thai would receive advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1; (f) That hoardings are visually appealing and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel and the hoardings and construction areas are appropriately screened by plantings; (g) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake urban design rehabilitation works once construction is completed; (h) Measures to address economic impacts; and (i) Measures to address any adverse air quality effects.
75	75/2	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	6.1 Mai Thai generally supports NOR 1, subject to the concerns described in this submission being addressed by appropriate designation conditions, or the outcomes sought being guaranteed by other means. 6.2 Although a number of conditions are suggested by Auckland Transport, there is overall very little certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply or measurable outcomes. Rather, the management of adverse effects through conditions is left to be considered under an Environmental Management Framework, which is yet to be written. Mai Thai is very concerned that any management plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NOR 1 would be dealt with through the Resource Management Act's Outline Plan of Works process without an opportunity for Mai Thai input. 6.3 Mai Thai expects greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for Mai Thai's business and operations.
75	75/3	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	2.3 Consultation	6.1 Mai Thai generally supports NOR 1, subject to the concerns described in this submission being addressed by appropriate designation conditions, or the outcomes sought being guaranteed by other means. 6.2 Although a number of conditions are suggested by Auckland Transport, there is overall very little certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply or measurable outcomes. Rather, the management of adverse effects through conditions is left to be considered under an Environmental Management Framework, which is yet to be written. Mai Thai is very concerned that any management plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NOR 1 would be dealt with through the Resource Management Act's Outline Plan of Works process without an opportunity for Mai Thai input.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
75	75/4	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	6.3 Mai Thai expects greater certainty and input regarding the nature of the designation conditions that would apply. This certainty is especially important given the significance and duration of the construction effects of the CRL which would have major implications for Mai Thai's business and operations. 35 These designation conditions (examples of which are specified in more detail above) are as follows: (a) Acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits; (b) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake a pre-construction assessment, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings, as well as an adaptive management approach to vibration effects; (c) Maintenance of vehicular and pedestrian access to Mai Thai at all times, the maintenance of east / west movements across Albert Street / Victoria St, and advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure / diversion; (d) Measures to reduce congestion along Albert Street / Victoria St, (e) That Mai Thai would receive advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1; (f) That hoardings are visually appealing and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel and the hoardings and construction areas are appropriately screened by plantings; (g) A requirement that Auckland Transport undertake urban design rehabilitation works once construction is completed; (h) Measures to address economic impacts; and (i) Measures to address any adverse air quality effects.
75	75/5	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.1 Noise - construction	Noise effects: 8 Noise arising from construction of the CRL has the potential to create significant disturbance for Mai Thai's guests during both daytime and night-time hours. Given the nature of Mai Thais clientele (ie corporate / business guests, airline crews, tourists etc) quiet enjoyment during both daytime and night-time hours is essential. The leisure market also requires quiet enjoyment over weekends. 9 The Noise and Vibration Assessment report attached to the CRL Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) identifies noise effects' and suggests criteria for acceptable levels of construction noise. These criteria would apply 7 days a week with no allowance made for different levels over weekends or public holidays. 10 The recommended project criteria at 6.2.1 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment state potential noise limits as follows: 10.1 Daytime (7am - 11pm) limits of db(L .. q) 75; and 10.2 Night time (11pm till 7am) limits of db(L .. q) 60. 11 This noise is measured 1 metre from the facade of the building. According to the Noise and Vibration Assessment, such noise would translate to an internal noise of approximately 45db LA,q for buildings with sealed glazing. 12 The Noise and Vibration Assessment further states that certain activities are predicted to exceed this criterion. Secant piling for example, would result in noise levels of 89 dB LA,q at a 10 metre setback. While the Noise and Vibration Assessment classifies internal noise levels above 55dB LA,q as having a minor effect, these levels are also acknowledged as resulting in annoyance and reduction in work efficiency. Over the long period of construction works, Mai Thai submits that noise would have a significant adverse effect upon both Mai Thai's guests and its employees. 14 Mai Thai has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities on its guests. Consequently, Stamford seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. These conditions could include, for example: 14.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of IOam and 4pm on weekends. 14.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm. 14.3 A prohibition on parking, or unloading from, construction vehicles immediately outside the Mai Thai. 15 Mai Thai also seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to mitigate adverse noise and vibration effects. These conditions could include, for example: 15.1 A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide acoustic insulation for the entire building where exposed to construction noise (for example, double glazing, wall insulation treatment and an alternative revolving door access at all entrance ways) to ensure that the noise standards are met at all times.
75	75/6	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.3 Vibration - construction	13 Vibration effects may also be experienced by guests and employees of the Mai Thai during construction. The Noise and Vibration Assessment recognises that the adverse effects of construction vibration on building occupants could be significant, especially for buildings identified as notable receivers, which includes the Mai Thai Adverse effects could range from annoyance, to loss of amenity or inability to undertake work. 14 Mai Thai has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities on its guests. Consequently, Stamford seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. These conditions could include, for example: 14.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of IOam and 4pm on weekends. 14.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm. 14.3 A prohibition on parking, or unloading from, construction vehicles immediately outside the Mai Thai. 15 Mai Thai also seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to mitigate adverse noise and vibration effects. These conditions could include, for example: 15.1 A requirement for Auckland Transport to provide acoustic insulation for the entire building where exposed to construction noise (for example, double glazing, wall insulation treatment and an alternative revolving door access at all entrance ways) to ensure that the noise standards are met at all times. Structural vibration effects: 16 Vibration from the construction of the CRL may cause structural or more superficial damage to buildings and chattels. Mai Thai is located within the construction vibration contour set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment and is specifically identified as a notable receiver. 17 Mai Thai seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. These conditions should include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings and chattels (at times convenient to Mai Thai) 18 These conditions should also provide for a precautionary adaptive management regime, where vibration limits start at a relatively low level and would be allowed to increase only if monitoring establishes that there are no problems.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
75	75/7	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	Structural vibration effects: 16 Vibration from the construction of the CRL may cause structural or more superficial damage to buildings and chattels. Mai Thai is located within the construction vibration contour set out in the Noise and Vibration Assessment and is specifically identified as a notable receiver. 17 Mai Thai seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. These conditions should include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings and chattels (at times convenient to Mai Thai) 18 These conditions should also provide for a precautionary adaptive management regime, where vibration limits start at a relatively low level and would be allowed to increase only if monitoring establishes that there are no problems.
75	75/8	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Access: 19 Construction of the CRL would result in significant effects on the road transport network and access to Mai Thai for public and private transport and pedestrians. These effects include diversions, extended travel times, delays, segregation and increased congestion on public bus operators and users, emergency vehicles, private vehicles, private coach operators and users, cyclists and pedestrians. 20 Mai Thai seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects. 21 The Integrated Transport Assessment for CRL notes that "access to all properties will be maintained, but as noted above, certain movements will not directly be possible, but will be restricted to left in, left out manoeuvres to either the temporary northbound or southbound carriageway along Albert Street, Victoria Street." 22 The AEE proposes, as a means of mitigating temporary adverse road transport effects, that: 22.1 The Construction Environmental Management Plan would include how private coach access can be maintained during construction via left in, left out movements to the Mai Thai on Albert Street & Victoria St, 23 Mai Thai seeks designation conditions requiring vehicular and pedestrian access to Mai Thai is available at all times and the maintenance of east / west movements across Albert Street and Victoria St, for vehicles and pedestrians. 24 Additionally, to alleviate congestion along Albert / Victoria Street, Mai Thai seeks designation conditions requiring truck movements up Albert / Victoria Street to be restricted. These conditions could require, for example, truck movements up Albert / Victoria Street to be restricted during peak hours (6:00 to 9:00 and 16:00 to 19:00) on weekdays, where alternative routes are available. Advance notice of construction: 25 Mai Thai is contractually obliged to provide notice to its guests of any planned construction activity. In order to enable Mai Thai to fulfill its contractual obligations, Mai Thai seeks a designation condition requiring 18 months advance notice of construction starting in accordance with NOR 1. 26 Mai Thai also seeks a designation condition requiring at least 30 working days notice of any construction activities, road closures or diversions including the expected duration of the works which would affect Mai Thai.
75	75/9	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.20 Economic	Loss of trade: 27 Construction of the CRL could result in serious adverse economic impacts, It is foreseeable that the disruptions caused during the construction phase would also result in loss of trade arising from reduced numbers of guests around the area. 28 Mai Thai is also concerned that potential damage to the vibrancy and sustainability of the existing businesses in the building (which have taken time to establish) may be irreversible, even after the construction phase. 29 Accordingly, Mai Thai seeks designation conditions to mitigate any economic loss, as a result of the likely loss of guests.
75	75/10	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.12 Public amenity / streetscape - construction	Visual amenity: Hoardings: 30 Hoardings would be erected along the Albert/Victoria Street footpath, leaving a footpath width of 1.5 metres. Given the duration of construction, and the imposing nature of these hoardings, Mai Thai seeks designation conditions requiring that these hoardings be visually appealing (both at ground level and having regard to the views from above) and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel. Mai Thai seeks in particular a designation condition requiring that the design of hoardings adjacent to the boundary of its property are agreed by Mai Thai prior to erection.
75	75/11	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Visual Amenity: Construction: 31 The amenity of Albert Street would be severely reduced during the construction period of the CRL. To mitigate these effects, Mai Thai seeks designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to undertake urban design rehabilitation works. These rehabilitation works could include an upgrade to the road and footpath along Albert / Victoria Street, including access to Mai Thai Restaurant.
75	75/12	Vanvadee Manoonpong	Mai Thai Resturant	5.17 Air quality	Air quality: 32 The potential for adverse effects on air quality and measures to avoid them are outlined in the technical report at Appendix 7 to Auckland Transport's notices of requirement. Mai Thai is concerned about impacts on its guests and on the building itself and seeks designation conditions requiring measures to address any adverse effects. 33 These measures may include, but are not limited to, approved dust suppression methods and the regular cleaning of the exterior of the building. Particular consideration should be given to the potential for dust to adversely affect the buildings fresh air supply duct.
76	76/1	Mike Geale	Cooper and Company	1.22 Neutral, did not care, but requested conditions / amendments - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
76	76/2	Mike Geale	Cooper and Company	5.8 Built heritage	The reasons for my views are: The properties all have heritage designations and in this respect do have specific characteristics that must be carefully reviewed as the CRL design progresses. The impact of the works on the occupants must also be fully understood. Decision sought: That further consideration is given to the potential impact of noise and vibration both during and post construction on the heritage properties and occupants at 10-18 and 20 Customs Street East before the planning and design is finalised. The matters are resolved to the satisfaction of Cooper and Company as manager of the Britomart Group.
76	76/3	Mike Geale	Cooper and Company	5.1 Noise - construction	The reasons for my views are: The properties all have heritage designations and in this respect do have specific characteristics that must be carefully reviewed as the CRL design progresses. The impact of the works on the occupants must also be fully understood. Decision sought: That further consideration is given to the potential impact of noise and vibration both during and post construction on the heritage properties and occupants at 10-18 and 20 Customs Street East before the planning and design is finalised. The matters are resolved to the satisfaction of Cooper and Company as manager of the Britomart Group.
76	76/4	Mike Geale	Cooper and Company	5.2 Noise - operational	The reasons for my views are: The properties all have heritage designations and in this respect do have specific characteristics that must be carefully reviewed as the CRL design progresses. The impact of the works on the occupants must also be fully understood. Decision sought: That further consideration is given to the potential impact of noise and vibration both during and post construction on the heritage properties and occupants at 10-18 and 20 Customs Street East before the planning and design is finalised. The matters are resolved to the satisfaction of Cooper and Company as manager of the Britomart Group.
76	76/5	Mike Geale	Cooper and Company	5.3 Vibration - construction	The reasons for my views are: The properties all have heritage designations and in this respect do have specific characteristics that must be carefully reviewed as the CRL design progresses. The impact of the works on the occupants must also be fully understood. Decision sought: That further consideration is given to the potential impact of noise and vibration both during and post construction on the heritage properties and occupants at 10-18 and 20 Customs Street East before the planning and design is finalised. The matters are resolved to the satisfaction of Cooper and Company as manager of the Britomart Group.
76	76/6	Mike Geale	Cooper and Company	5.4 Vibration - operational	The reasons for my views are: The properties all have heritage designations and in this respect do have specific characteristics that must be carefully reviewed as the CRL design progresses. The impact of the works on the occupants must also be fully understood. Decision sought: That further consideration is given to the potential impact of noise and vibration both during and post construction on the heritage properties and occupants at 10-18 and 20 Customs Street East before the planning and design is finalised. The matters are resolved to the satisfaction of Cooper and Company as manager of the Britomart Group.
77	77/1	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	6 FFL seeks the following recommendation or decision from the territorial authority: (a) That NOR 1-6 be cancelled and withdrawn; (b) That any designation or other approval of the CRL include and be subject to the FFL Land being acquired and FFL's tenants and subtenants being relocated to suitable and appropriate alternative premises as soon as practicable following the designation or other approval of the CRL; (c) That the lapse period be limited to 5 years; and (d) Any further, additional or consequential relief that is either necessary or appropriate to give effect to this submission.
77	77/2	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	4.2 RMA policy framework	5 FFL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (a) FFL is the owner of the FFL Land which is comprises commercial buildings and associated carparking. The FFL Land is currently fully tenanted by two commercial tenants; (b) The FFL Land lies within the surface requirement for NOR 6 and faces complete disruption and destruction as a consequence of the requirement - it appears that one of the proposed rail lines will run through the FFL Land; (c) The effects of NOR 1-6 on the FFL Land have not been assessed in any detail and are only generally referred to in the Assessment of Environmental Effects as part of the general discussion of potential adverse effects including loss of land and buildings; (h) Overall, NOR 1-6 do not achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources as set out in Part 2 of the Act, nor do they satisfy the criteria in section 17 of the Act.
77	77/3	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.21 Environmental management framework	FFL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (d) No detail as to the proposed methods for avoiding, remedying and/or mitigating the adverse effects of the CRL has been provided, but has been left to the creation of environmental management plans under an environment framework that will not be developed or provided until the outline plan stage - well after any affected person may have any involvement in the assessment of the proposed methodologies;
77	77/4	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	FFL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (d) No detail as to the proposed methods for avoiding, remedying and/or mitigating the adverse effects of the CRL has been provided, but has been left to the creation of environmental management plans under an environment framework that will not be developed or provided until the outline plan stage - well after any affected person may have any involvement in the assessment of the proposed methodologies;
77	77/5	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.23 Property rights	FFL opposed NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (e) Current and future plans to improve the FFL Land have already been adversely affected by the prospect of the CRL and now the notification of NOR 1-6. One of FFL's tenants in particular has indicated that it may not renew its existing lease which is due to expire in March 2015 because of the uncertainty created by the CRL;

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
77	77/6	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.20 Economic	FFL opposed NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (e) Current and future plans to improve the FFL Land have already been adversely affected by the prospect of the CRL and now the notification of NOR 1-6. One of FFL's tenants in particular has indicated that it may not renew its existing lease which is due to expire in March 2015 because of the uncertainty created by the CRL;
77	77/7	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.24 Designation lapse period	FFL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (f) The proposed lapse period of 20 years creates an extended period of uncertainty for landowners and tenants including FFL and its tenants and will result in the current and future use of the FFL Land being blighted by the future prospect of NOR 1-6 being given effect to; (g) The reasons given for extending the lapse period to 20 years are insufficient; and FFL seeks the following recommendation or decision from the territorial authority: (c) That the lapse period be limited to 5 years.
77	77/8	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	4.1 Part 2 RMA	FFL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (h) Overall, NOR 1-6 do not achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources as set out in Part 2 of the Act, nor do they satisfy the criteria in section 17 of the Act.
77	77/9	Five Flowers Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	FFL seeks the following recommendation or decision from the territorial authority: (b) That any designation or other approval of the CRL include and be subject to the FFL Land being acquired and FFL's tenants and subtenants being relocated to suitable and appropriate alternative premises as soon as practicable following the designation or other approval of the 'CRL'.
78	78/1	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	6 RL seeks the following recommendation or decision from the territorial authority: (a) That NOR 1-6 be cancelled and withdrawn; (b) That any designation or other approval of the CRL include and be subject to RL being relocated to suitable and appropriate alternative premises as soon as practicable after the designation or other approval of the CRL; (c) That the lapse period be limited to 5 years; and (d) Any further, additional or consequential relief that is either necessary or appropriate to give effect to this submission.
78	78/2	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	4.2 RMA policy framework	RL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (a) RL is the lessee of the Premises which comprises a commercial building and associated carparking; (b) The Premises lie within the surface requirement for NOR 6 and face complete disruption and destruction as a consequence of the requirement - it appears that one of the proposed rail lines will run through the Premises; (c) The effects of NOR 1-6 on the Premises have not been assessed in any detail and are only generally referred to in the Assessment of Environmental Effects as part of the general discussion of potential adverse effects including loss of land and buildings; (h) Overall, NOR 1-6 do not achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources as set out in Part 2 of the Act, nor do they satisfy the criteria in section 17 of the Act.
78	78/3	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.21 Environmental management framework	RL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (d) No detail as to the proposed methods for avoiding, remedying and /or mitigating the adverse effects of the CRL has been provided, but has been left to the creation of environmental management plans under an environment framework that will not be developed or provided until the outline plan stage - well after any affected person may have any involvement in the assessment of the proposed methodologies;
78	78/4	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	RL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (d) No detail as to the proposed methods for avoiding, remedying and /or mitigating the adverse effects of the CRL has been provided, but has been left to the creation of environmental management plans under an environment framework that will not be developed or provided until the outline plan stage - well after any affected person may have any involvement in the assessment of the proposed methodologies;
78	78/5	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.23 Property rights	RL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (e) Current and future plans to improve the Premises have been adversely affected by the prospect of the CRL and now the notification of NOR 1-6. In particular, RL has not proceeded with a proposed fit out due to the uncertainty surrounding the term of its lease;
78	78/6	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.20 Economic	RL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (e) Current and future plans to improve the Premises have been adversely affected by the prospect of the CRL and now the notification of NOR 1-6. In particular, RL has not proceeded with a proposed fit out due to the uncertainty surrounding the term of its lease;
78	78/7	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.24 Designation lapse period	RL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (f) The proposed lapse period of 20 years creates an extended period of uncertainty for landowners and tenants including RL and will result in the current and future use of the Premises being blighted by the future prospect of NOR 1-6 being given effect to; (g) The reasons given for extending the lapse period to 20 years are insufficient; and 6 FFL seeks the following recommendation or decision from the territorial authority: (c) That the lapse period be limited to 5 years; and
78	78/8	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	4.1 Part 2 RMA	RL opposes NOR 1-6 for the following reasons: (h) Overall, NOR 1-6 do not achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources as set out in Part 2 of the Act, nor do they satisfy the criteria in section 17 of the Act.
78	78/9	Radiation Limited	attn: Vicki Toan	5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	6 FFL seeks the following recommendation or decision from the territorial authority: (b) That any designation or other approval of the CRL include and be subject to RL being relocated to suitable and appropriate alternative premises as soon as practicable after the designation or other approval of the CRL;
79	79/1	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV	Attn: Claire Kirman	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	MediaWorks seeks that Notice of Requirement ("NOR") 2, 3 and 6 be declined, but if the Hearings Panel finds that those NORs cannot be declined in isolation, that the Project as a whole be disallowed.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
		Works Limited			
79	79/2	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	1.25 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 2	MediaWorks seeks that Notice of Requirement ("NOR") 2, 3 and 6 be declined, but if the Hearings Panel finds that those NORs cannot be declined in isolation, that the Project as a whole be disallowed.
79	79/3	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	1.26 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 3	MediaWorks seeks that Notice of Requirement ("NOR") 2, 3 and 6 be declined, but if the Hearings Panel finds that those NORs cannot be declined in isolation, that the Project as a whole be disallowed.
79	79/4	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	1.29 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 6	MediaWorks seeks that Notice of Requirement ("NOR") 2, 3 and 6 be declined, but if the Hearings Panel finds that those NORs cannot be declined in isolation, that the Project as a whole be disallowed.
79	79/5	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	5.32 Adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated	1. the submission relates to all the Notices of Requirement in respect of the Project. In that regard, it is noted that the concerns of MediaWorks that are set out below are limited to the adverse effects on the operation of its Studios at 2 and 3 Flower Street, Eden Terrace. For the reasons set out below, MediaWorks considers that the adverse effects of the Project cannot be adequately addressed without the studios being relocated using the equivalent reinstatement provisions of the Public Works Act 1981.
79	79/6	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	4. MediaWorks appreciates that the Project is a major and important investment for the region. At a general level MediaWorks does not oppose the Project, however, the scale and severity of the adverse effects on MediaWorks' activities will be so significant the only appropriate course of action is for Auckland Transport to compensate MediaWorks by way of equivalent reinstatement of the facilities comprised in the Studios pursuant to section 65 of the Public Works Act 1981. In that regard the following is noted: (the whole of sections 4 and 5 are relevant here, but due to size have not been included - see submission). 5. MediaWorks seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: (a) MediaWorks considers that there are significant impediments to the company's continued operation at the Studios if the Project proceeds. For that reason, compensation for the land take and injurious affection alone will be an inadequate response to the Project. Instead, this is an instance where equivalent reinstatement under the Public Works Act 1981 is appropriate. (b) Section 65 of the PWA provides for equivalent reinstatement as follows: "Compensation for land for which no general demand exists (1) Where land that is taken or acquired for a public work was devoted to a purpose of such a nature that there is no general demand or market for land for that purpose, compensation may be assessed on the basis of the reasonable cost of equivalent reinstatement in some other place if the Land Valuation Tribunal or, in the case of any claim not before the Tribunal, the Minister or the local authority, is satisfied that such reinstatement is in good faith intended." (c) In that regard: The purpose of section 65 is to provide an alternative mechanism for determining compensation in special cases (e.g.: hospitals, schools, churches and theatres) where there is no ordinary market because there are no comparable sales of land which are used for the same purpose. In such circumstances, compensation is provided on the basis of the cost of reinstatement (i.e.: rebuilding the facility elsewhere). (ii) The reasonable cost of equivalent reinstatement includes the cost of acquiring substituted premises and of converting them (or of acquiring land and constructing a new facility premises afresh on that land) so that, in the case of a business, the former purpose may be carried on substantially unaltered and undiminished. (d) MediaWorks considers that section 65 is the appropriate provision in this case for the following reasons: (i) The Studios are a very unusual and specialist facility. The site, building design and construction reflect those particular requirements. MediaWorks is satisfied with the performance of its facility and, in the absence of the Project, would have no intention to dispose of the Studios or to replace them. (ii) There is no market for such facilities. There is only one other television broadcaster of similar scale in New Zealand (TVNZ) and that organisation has its own purpose built (and much larger) facilities in the Auckland CBD. (iii) Accordingly, the value of the Studios to MediaWorks is much greater than its value to any third party. (iv) The Project will severely compromise the very characteristics (notably isolation from noise and vibration for broadcasting purposes) that are fundamental to the value of the Studios to MediaWorks. (v) The degree of adverse effect will be such that MediaWorks will be unable to continue to use the Studios during and after construction. (vi) Accordingly, the Project will generate a need for MediaWorks to construct new premises on a new site. It is appropriate that Auckland Transport provide compensation on that basis.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
79	79/7	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	5.1 Noise - construction	(a) The Studios' current location at Flower Street, Eden Terrace allows for television and some radio broadcasting with minimal external noise and vibration disturbance. In that regard: (i) MediaWorks' main studios are located at the lower levels of the building and, whilst it is not apparent from street level, there is a significant part of the building that is underground. (ii) The Studios' location is relatively free from traffic and other noise disturbance. More importantly, however, the building and in particular the studio facilities located within it have been developed in a way that minimises interference by way of vibration. Thus, the facilities are isolated from the relatively low level of disturbance currently found in the area. (iii) The effect of that approach is apparent from the Marshall Day Report ("the Report") (page F1 0) which accompanies Auckland Transport's designation documents, which records that the interior of the Studios currently enjoys "low vibration levels at the logger's limit of sensitivity i. e.: the mean uncontaminated PPV was 0.09 mm/s which is below the threshold of human perception of 0.3 mm/s PPV for a residential receiver". (iv) The construction of the Studios is heavily focused on achieving a quiet environment (i.e.: the operational requirement for the Studios is 25dB) and this has been achieved through the use of heavy lead doors and false walls to ensure sound reverberations are minimised. However, there are no measures in place to control or eliminate vibration and the attendant regenerated noise entering through the floor due to the construction of the tunnel or due to the trains passing through the tunnel and portal.
79	79/8	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	5.2 Noise - operational	(a) The Studios' current location at Flower Street, Eden Terrace allows for television and some radio broadcasting with minimal external noise and vibration disturbance. In that regard: (i) MediaWorks' main studios are located at the lower levels of the building and, whilst it is not apparent from street level, there is a significant part of the building that is underground. (ii) The Studios' location is relatively free from traffic and other noise disturbance. More importantly, however, the building and in particular the studio facilities located within it have been developed in a way that minimises interference by way of vibration. Thus, the facilities are isolated from the relatively low level of disturbance currently found in the area. (iii) The effect of that approach is apparent from the Marshall Day Report ("the Report") (page F1 0) which accompanies Auckland Transport's designation documents, which records that the interior of the Studios currently enjoys "low vibration levels at the logger's limit of sensitivity i. e.: the mean uncontaminated PPV was 0.09 mm/s which is below the threshold of human perception of 0.3 mm/s PPV for a residential receiver". (iv) The construction of the Studios is heavily focused on achieving a quiet environment (i.e.: the operational requirement for the Studios is 25dB) and this has been achieved through the use of heavy lead doors and false walls to ensure sound reverberations are minimised. However, there are no measures in place to control or eliminate vibration and the attendant regenerated noise entering through the floor due to the construction of the tunnel or due to the trains passing through the tunnel and portal.
79	79/9	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	5.3 Vibration - construction	(a) The Studios' current location at Flower Street, Eden Terrace allows for television and some radio broadcasting with minimal external noise and vibration disturbance. In that regard: (i) MediaWorks' main studios are located at the lower levels of the building and, whilst it is not apparent from street level, there is a significant part of the building that is underground. (ii) The Studios' location is relatively free from traffic and other noise disturbance. More importantly, however, the building and in particular the studio facilities located within it have been developed in a way that minimises interference by way of vibration. Thus, the facilities are isolated from the relatively low level of disturbance currently found in the area. (iii) The effect of that approach is apparent from the Marshall Day Report ("the Report") (page F1 0) which accompanies Auckland Transport's designation documents, which records that the interior of the Studios currently enjoys "low vibration levels at the logger's limit of sensitivity i. e.: the mean uncontaminated PPV was 0.09 mm/s which is below the threshold of human perception of 0.3 mm/s PPV for a residential receiver". (b) The Report lists potential issues arising from construction of the Project on MediaWorks including the disturbance of sensitive equipment and interference with the ability to use the Studios with respect to vibration. The Report concludes that: 'The main studio in the TV3 building is on the ground floor, approximately 15 metres from and directly above the CRL tunnels. The predicted vibration level at this distance is approximately 4 mm/s, which would disturb the building occupants and interrupt operations. This issue may be resolved through liaison with TV3, and using alternative construction techniques where practicable. n (emphasis added) (c) MediaWorks considers that the proximity of the works to the Studios will result in a level of vibration and noise that will render the Studios unusable during and after construction. A level of vibration exceeding 0.05 mm/s will equate to regenerated noise levels which will exceed those deemed appropriate for a broadcast studio. The technical reports accompanying the Project predict construction generated vibration levels up to 100 times this value. In addition, MediaWorks understands that the Project will now require blasting in the vicinity of the Studios, which will further impact on the ability to operate a broadcast studio from the Site. As such, the corresponding noise levels from regenerated noise are considered to be unworkable with respect to the continued operation of a broadcast studio from the Site. In that regard, the following is noted: (See submission 79 for full details)
79	79/10	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	5.4 Vibration - operational	(a) The Studios' current location at Flower Street, Eden Terrace allows for television and some radio broadcasting with minimal external noise and vibration disturbance. In that regard: (i) MediaWorks' main studios are located at the lower levels of the building and, whilst it is not apparent from street level, there is a significant part of the building that is underground. (ii) The Studios' location is relatively free from traffic and other noise disturbance. More importantly, however, the building and in particular the studio facilities located within it have been developed in a way that minimises interference by way of vibration. Thus, the facilities are isolated from the relatively low level of disturbance currently found in the area. (iii) The effect of that approach is apparent from the Marshall Day Report ("the Report") (page F1 0) which accompanies Auckland Transport's designation documents, which records that the interior of the Studios currently enjoys "low vibration levels at the logger's limit of sensitivity i. e.: the mean uncontaminated PPV was 0.09 mm/s which is below the threshold of human perception of 0.3 mm/s PPV for a residential receiver". (b) The Report lists potential issues arising from construction of the Project on MediaWorks including the disturbance of sensitive equipment and interference with the ability to use the Studios with respect to vibration. The Report concludes that: 'The main studio in the TV3 building is on the ground floor, approximately 15 metres from and directly above the CRL tunnels. The predicted vibration level at this distance is approximately 4

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					mm/s, which would disturb the building occupants and interrupt operations. This issue may be resolved through liaison with TV3, and using alternative construction techniques where practicable. n (emphasis added) (c) MediaWorks considers that the proximity of the works to the Studios will result in a level of vibration and noise that will render the Studios unusable during and after construction. A level of vibration exceeding 0.05 mm/s will equate to regenerated noise levels which will exceed those deemed appropriate for a broadcast studio. The technical reports accompanying the Project predict construction generated vibration levels up to 100 times this value. In addition, MediaWorks understands that the Project will now require blasting in the vicinity of the Studios, which will further impact on the ability to operate a broadcast studio from the Site. As such, the corresponding noise levels from regenerated noise are considered to be unworkable with respect to the continued operation of a broadcast studio from the Site. In that regard, the following is noted: (See submission 79 for full details)
79	79/11	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	(d) The stated methods in the Report for managing these effects on the MediaWorks' premises include: (i) Avoiding tunneling during studio use. Broadcasting begins at the Studios at 4.30am on weekdays and ceases at 11.30pm. On weekends, broadcasting occurs from 10.00am to 7.00pm. Those hours of operation are critical to the service that MediaWorks offers and they cannot feasibly be reduced. Further, should there be breaking news, the Studios would need to broadcast immediately, which can be at any time of the day or night. This leaves a five hour window in the early morning hours in which construction works can be undertaken without interrupting the ability to broadcast from the Studios. This would need to be subject to a requirement that all construction cease if the Studios needed to be used during this window for a breaking news story. It is of course possible that constraints relating to residential amenity on the area mean that night-time operations have to be constrained or are prohibited during this time. (ii) Alternative construction techniques in the vicinity of the Studios. MediaWorks is not aware of any construction techniques that would overcome the vibration and noise issues that would affect the Studios. More fundamentally, MediaWorks considers that operation of the Project will generate on-going effects, which cannot be mitigated. It is also noted that the Studios will be immediately adjacent to the localised construction hub for the Project, so the potential for disturbance will extend beyond just the completion of the tunneling immediately beneath the Studios. (iii) Temporary relocation of the Studios during times of night noise and vibration. It is a key aspect of MediaWorks' operations and ability to compete in a very sensitive market that its broadcasts are of universally high technical standard. The temporary relocation of the Studios is not technically feasible or operationally desirable. More importantly, it does not address the long term effects that will be generated by the operation of the Project.
79	79/12	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	4.2 RMA policy framework	6. In the absence of the relief sought below, MediaWorks considers the Project: (a) To be contrary to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and otherwise inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991;
79	79/13	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	4.1 Part 2 RMA	6. In the absence of the relief sought below, MediaWorks considers the Project: (b) To be inconsistent with Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the relevant planning instruments;
79	79/14	Mediaworks NZ Limited and TV Works Limited	Attn: Claire Kirman	3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	6. In the absence of the relief sought below, MediaWorks considers the Project: (c) Has given inadequate consideration to alternative sites, routes and methods of undertaking the work given the significant adverse effects on the environment, and in particular the Studios, in terms of Section 168A of the Resource Management Act 1991. In that regard , the Project: (i) Will result in the co-location of incompatible activities, namely the construction and operation of the Project, a short distance from the Studios; (ii) Will generate significant adverse effects (i.e.: noise, vibration and traffic effects) on the amenity of occupiers of the Studios; and (iii) Will in those circumstances impact significantly and adversely on the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing.
80	80/1	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	1.6 Support - NOR 5	We support the CRL project because we recognize that it will provide local and regional benefits, as outlined in the NoR such as enhancing rail travel efficiency and trip reliability for users and increased network resilience by making Britomart a through station. Specifically the Eden Terrace Business Association supports the building of a station (currently called Newton) in Eden Terrace because of the opportunity for residential and business intensification surrounding the stations and recognizing that the station will be a driver for increased economic growth in the area.
80	80/2	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	1.7 Support - NOR 6	We support the CRL project because we recognize that it will provide local and regional benefits, as outlined in the NoR such as enhancing rail travel efficiency and trip reliability for users and increased network resilience by making Britomart a through station. Specifically the Eden Terrace Business Association supports the building of a station (currently called Newton) in Eden Terrace because of the opportunity for residential and business intensification surrounding the stations and recognizing that the station will be a driver for increased economic growth in the area.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
80	80/3	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	2.3 Consultation	The Eden Terrace Business Association is appreciative of the work Auckland Transport has done to date with consultation on the CRL project with property owners, businesses and local residents in the Eden Terrace area. However we believe that continuing to communicate with these key stakeholders leading up to and during construction is vital.
80	80/4	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	5.9 Transport - construction	In particular we wish to see a comprehensive transport management plan put into place to ensure minimum disruption to residents and workers in the area. Also at issue during construction is the loss of public parking (i.e. the Council carpark at the corner of Mt Eden Rd and Symonds Street) and how this can be mitigated.
80	80/5	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	5.23 Property rights	2. Development of a comprehensive urban renewal programme for the Eden Terrace area prior to construction. A large amount of buildings I land is envisaged to be needed for the construction of the CRL, mainly south of the Symonds Street I Mt Eden Rd intersection. Whilst acknowledging the work that Auckland Transport is doing with existing land and business owners, the CRL construction will see the closure of a number of businesses that have been in operation for many years, some even inter-generational. The Eden Terrace Business Association wants to ensure that the redevelopment of land acquired for the CRL in this area continues to contribute to the economy of the area through the reestablishment of suitable businesses after construction and requests the setting up of a working party involving the Economic Development arm of Auckland Council, the Eden Terrace Business Association and other key stakeholders such as the Employers and Manufacturers Assn. to ensure appropriate development post construction.
80	80/6	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	5.20 Economic	2. Development of a comprehensive urban renewal programme for the Eden Terrace area prior to construction. A large amount of buildings I land is envisaged to be needed for the construction of the CRL, mainly south of the Symonds Street I Mt Eden Rd intersection. Whilst acknowledging the work that Auckland Transport is doing with existing land and business owners, the CRL construction will see the closure of a number of businesses that have been in operation for many years, some even inter-generational. The Eden Terrace Business Association wants to ensure that the redevelopment of land acquired for the CRL in this area continues to contribute to the economy of the area through the reestablishment of suitable businesses after construction and requests the setting up of a working party involving the Economic Development arm of Auckland Council, the Eden Terrace Business Association and other key stakeholders such as the Employers and Manufacturers Assn. to ensure appropriate development post construction. Documents included in the NoR signal that "Newton" is a "working name" for the station to be built at the top of Symonds Street and that it will be formally named in the future. The Eden Terrace Business Association is embarking on a major rebranding initiative for the Eden Terrace I Newton I Grafton area and on 16" April will be launching the name "Uptown" to brand the business I residential precinct that encompasses the "Newton" Station. We request Auckland Transport and Auckland Council consult with the Eden Terrace Business Association as we have a strong wish to see this station renamed as "Uptown" and we will outline our reasoning for this and the benefits for Auckland Transport during the hearing process.
80	80/7	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	5.16 Urban design framework	The Eden Terrace Business Association supports the initiative outlined in the Urban Design Framework to reinstate a continuous adaptive building frontage along the road reserve, as part of the redevelopment of land acquired for the CRL, particularly along the top end of Symonds Street. The Eden Terrace Business Association is also keen to be involved when it comes to deciding on things like street furniture I public arts I lighting and planting in and around where the newton Station emerges on Symonds Street to ensure a public space that we can all be proud of.
80	80/8	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	We also seek advice I consideration of how any buildings which will form part of the "Newton" station complex can be earthquake proofed at the same time as development occurs both to ensure compliance with relevant legislation.
80	80/9	Gary Holmes	Eden Terrace Business Association Incorporated	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	4. Business Improvement District Targeted Rate payment. The Eden Terrace Business Improvement District is funded via a targeted rate of \$150 ,000 paid by all businesses within the BID boundary following a successful ballot of businesses in 2012. The targeted rate is collected by Council on behalf of the Association and passed to the Association for it to spend on programmes and initiatives that are agreed by the member businesses. Under current legislation, a Local Authority is not liable to pay a targeted rate for any property it owns itself. Our concern is that with Council I Auckland Transport acquiring significant parcels of land and as a local authority not being liable for the Targeted rate, that the Eden Terrace Business Association will not receive the level of targeted rate it requires to operate or the remaining businesses will have to pay an unfair burden to meet the shortfall. We request Auckland Council to explore ways that this reduction in the amount of targeted rate being collected can be addressed.
81	81/1	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	1.9 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 1	4. Precinct generally supports NoR 1, subject to the concerns described in this submission being addressed by appropriate conditions, or the outcomes sought being guaranteed by other means.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
81	81/2	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	3.4 Whether the designations are reasonably necessary / NOR is an unreasonable burden	9. In the absence of measures sufficient to ensure that any effects of the CRL Project on Precinct's properties and operations, tenants, services and suppliers are adequately managed to its satisfaction, Precinct requests that NoR 1 is withdrawn because it: (a) Is inappropriate and/or unnecessary; Lapse Period 13. AT proposes a lapse period of 20 years for the implementation of the proposed designation. Precinct's concern is that a 20-year lapse period would: (b) create undue uncertainty about the commencement of the project, which would pose excessive and unreasonable risks to Precinct, its shareholders and other stakeholders, including the risks of losing tenants and associated income, indefinitely postponing desirable or planned investment and destroying the capital value of its buildings through, for instance, blighting the properties affected by NoR 1. Precinct also believes the project would pose excessive and unreasonable risks to Precinct's tenants and their businesses.
81	81/3	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	4.1 Part 2 RMA	9. In the absence of measures sufficient to ensure that any effects of the CRL Project on Precinct's properties and operations, tenants, services and suppliers are adequately managed to its satisfaction, Precinct requests that NoR 1 is withdrawn because it: (b) Does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; (c) Does not provide for the efficient use and development of natural resources; (d) Is contrary to good resource management practice; and (e) Does not meet the relevant requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the "RMA"), including the purposes and principles under Part 2 of the RMA.
81	81/4	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	10. NoR 1 contains insufficient detail as to the precise nature and extent of any proposed designation conditions. The only relevant proposed conditions are that the work be undertaken in general accordance with the information provided to support NoR 1, and the implementation of Management Plans under an Environmental Management Framework. Precinct is concerned that any Management Plans and any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of NoR 1 would be dealt with through the RMA's Outline Plan of Works process without an opportunity for input from affected persons, particularly Precinct and its tenants. Given the duration and scale of adverse effects arising from the construction phase of the CRL project, there should be more and better detail and certainty now as to how any effects would be managed. The same consideration should also apply to operational effects, including, in particular, operational vibration. 11. While in support of the CRL overall, Precinct's concerns relate to the matters set out in this submission. In the absence of appropriate measures, including conditions to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, the CRL project would be contrary to the purpose of the RMA, and Precinct requests that Auckland Council recommends that AT withdraw NoR 1. Issues of particular concern to Precinct: 12. Without limiting the generality of the above, the particular issues of concern to Precinct are as follows: (a) Lapse period; (b) Inadequate consideration of alternatives - construction staging and construction methods; (c) Removal/draw back of designation; (d) Noise and vibration effects on building occupants; (e) Structural effects as a result of vibration; (f) Vehicular and pedestrian access; (g) Visual amenity; and (h) Air quality effects.
81	81/5	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.24 Designation lapse period	Lapse Period 13. AT proposes a lapse period of 20 years for the implementation of the proposed designation. Precinct's concern is that a 20-year lapse period would: (a) undermine AT's ability to achieve the project benefits, which include providing a catalyst for inner-city re-development, increasing commuter access and passenger transport capacity to meet sustainable mode share targets, and complementing investment in roads by freeing up space; and (b) create undue uncertainty about the commencement of the project, which would pose excessive and unreasonable risks to Precinct, its shareholders and other stakeholders, including the risks of losing tenants and associated income, indefinitely postponing desirable or planned investment and destroying the capital value of its buildings through, for instance, blighting the properties affected by NoR 1. Precinct also believes the project would pose excessive and unreasonable risks to Precinct's tenants and their businesses. 14. AT estimates the construction period for CRL to be only 5-6 years and that AT intends to lodge applications for resource consents in 2014. Therefore a 20-year lapse period is not required to give effect to construction of the CRL. 15. Accordingly, Precinct submits that a 10-year lapse period would be appropriate in the circumstances.
81	81/6	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives - Construction Staging and Construction Methods 16. Precinct's concern with construction staging relates principally to the use of Worksite G - Downtown Shopping Centre as a temporary construction yard for not only the 15-month period to complete works at that site and the 32-month period to complete the Albert Street section but, potentially, for the whole 5-6-year duration of CRL construction. 17. The Downtown Shopping Centre site sits at the heart of Auckland's city centre - the Engine Room - and generates a significant amount of economic activity. Using such a major property in this location as a construction site would generate excessive, material adverse effects both on adjoining properties and on the wider city centre area. These effects would include visual adverse effects and adverse effects on amenity, particularly resulting from noise, traffic, dust and other construction-related activity. 18. The nature and extent of these material adverse effects would stifle the vitality, viability and success of the Engine Room by, for example, driving businesses to relocate to other CBD areas. Allowing for such effects would also be inconsistent with Auckland Council's aspirations, as set out in the City Centre Masterplan, for Auckland city centre as an international destination, a globally significant centre for business and an exemplar of urban living. 19. AT has not undertaken adequate analysis and consideration of alternative construction yard sites. Alternative sites should provide better value for money, not only in terms of client costs but also wider economic costs, relative to the costs of using the Downtown Shopping Centre site for not only the 15-month period to complete that site but, potentially, for the whole 5-6-year duration of CRL construction. Accordingly, Precinct requests that AT give adequate consideration to alternative sites. 20. Precinct encourages AT to undertake a cost benefit analysis of a Tunnel Boring Machine construction methodology, along the lines proposed by APB&B in their Auckland CBD Rail Link Study of February 2010, in place of the proposed cut and cover methodology for Albert Street. Precinct understands that there are cost-effective engineering solutions for the Tunnel Boring Machine construction methodology in respect of the

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					stormwater pipe located in Albert Street. Precinct believes that such methodology should yield better value for money than the proposed methodology especially when utilised in conjunction with an alternative construction staging site.
81	81/7	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.34 Construction methodology	Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives - Construction Staging and Construction Methods 16. Precinct's concern with construction staging relates principally to the use of Worksite G - Downtown Shopping Centre as a temporary construction yard for not only the is-month period to complete works at that site and the 32-month period to complete the Albert Street section but, potentially, for the whole S-6-year duration of CRL construction. 17. The Downtown Shopping Centre site sits at the heart of Auckland's city centre - the Engine Room - and generates a significant amount of economic activity. Using such a major property in this location as a construction site would generate excessive, material adverse effects both on adjoining properties and on the wider city centre area. These effects would include visual adverse effects and adverse effects on amenity, particularly resulting from noise, traffic, dust and other construction-related activity. 18. The nature and extent of these material adverse effects would stifle the vitality, viability and success of the Engine Room by, for example, driving businesses to relocate to other CBD areas. Allowing for such effects would also be inconsistent with Auckland Council's aspirations, as set out in the City Centre Masterplan, for Auckland city centre as an international destination, a globally significant centre for business and an exemplar of urban living. 19. AT has not undertaken adequate analysis and consideration of alternative construction yard sites. Alternative sites should provide better value for money, not only in terms of client costs but also wider economic costs, relative to the costs of using the Downtown Shopping Centre site for not only the IS-month period to complete that site but, potentially, for the whole S-6-year duration of CRL construction. Accordingly, Precinct requests that AT give adequate consideration to alternative sites. 20. Precinct encourages AT to undertake a cost benefit analysis of a Tunnel Boring Machine construction methodology, along the lines proposed by APB&B in their Auckland CBD Rail Link Study of February 2010, in place of the proposed cut and cover methodology for Albert Street. Precinct understands that there are cost-effective engineering solutions for the Tunnel Boring Machine construction methodology in respect of the stormwater pipe located in Albert Street. Precinct believes that such methodology should yield better value for money than the proposed methodology especially when utilised in conjunction with an alternative construction staging site. Visual Amenity 36. It is likely that AT would erect hoardings along Albert Street footpaths, leaving a footpath width of only 1.5 metres. Given the duration of construction and the adverse impacts on the amenity of Precinct's buildings, Precinct seeks designation conditions requiring AT to: (a) seek opportunities not to use the full width of Albert Street wherever possible, i.e. not restrict the footpaths of Albert Street to 1.5 metres; and (b) ensure that all hoardings are visually appealing and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel.
81	81/9	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	20. Precinct encourages AT to undertake a cost benefit analysis of a Tunnel Boring Machine construction methodology, along the lines proposed by APB&B in their Auckland CBD Rail Link Study of February 2010, in place of the proposed cut and cover methodology for Albert Street. Precinct understands that there are cost-effective engineering solutions for the Tunnel Boring Machine construction methodology in respect of the stormwater pipe located in Albert Street. Precinct believes that such methodology should yield better value for money than the proposed methodology especially when utilised in conjunction with an alternative construction staging site. 40. The designation conditions (examples of which are noted above) that Precinct seeks include, but are not necessarily limited to: (a) Conditions specifying acceptable standards for operational noise and vibration. (b) Conditions specifying acceptable construction noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits and acceptable mitigation measures for any exceedances. (c) Conditions requiring AT to carry out pre-construction assessments, any necessary stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings. (d) Conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any effects on vehicular and pedestrian access to and from Precinct's buildings. (e) Conditions requiring access to all Precinct's properties to be maintained at all times, and advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure/diversion. (f) Conditions requiring approved dust suppression methods, dust monitoring and trigger levels to initiate mitigation measures including the regular cleaning of the exterior of affected properties. 41. Additionally, Precinct seeks: (a) A 10-year lapse period. (b) That adequate consideration is given to alternative sites for a temporary construction yard. (c) That the designation should be drawn back to a sub-strata level as required for the operation and maintenance of the tunnels as soon as practicable after completion of construction of the works in NoR 1.
81	81/10	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.23 Property rights	Removal/Drawback of Designation 21. NoR 1 does not include details of the extent or the timing of removal of the designation from the surface of the Downtown Shopping Centre site. 22. The designation should be drawn back from the surface of the Downtown Shopping Centre site to a sub-strata level as required for the operation and maintenance of the tunnels, so as to enable above-ground development to take place. This should take place as soon as practicable after completion of construction of the works in NoR 1.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
81	81/11	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	Noise and Vibration Effects on Building Occupants 23. Noise and vibration from construction of the CRL project between Britomart and Aotea stations has the potential to create significant disturbance to the occupants of Precinct's buildings, all but one of which abut the route. Although temporary, the nature and large scale of the project (including secant piling) and the location of several of Precinct's buildings in close proximity to the project means occupants of buildings, which include children in the child care facility at the AMP Centre: 29 Customs Street West, would be exposed to these material adverse effects for several years. 24. The Noise and Vibration Assessment recommends project criteria of 75db L,q during day time hours. This noise is measured 1 metre from the facade of the building, and for most of Precinct's properties would translate to an internal noise of approximately 45 db. The Noise and Vibration report further states that certain activities are predicted to exceed this criterion. Secant piling for example, would result in noise levels of 89 dB L,q at a 10m setback. While the Noise and Vibration Assessment classifies internal noise levels above 55dB L" as having a minor effect, these levels are also acknowledged as resulting in annoyance and reduction in work efficiency (even where sealed glazing exists) and over the long period of works would have a significant adverse effect. 25. Similar vibration effects - ranging from annoyance to inability to work - may be experienced by occupants of Precinct's buildings during construction including children in the child care facility at the AMP Centre: 29 Customs Street West. Precinct is also concerned about the absence of any avoidance or mitigation measures of operational rail vibration. 26. Notwithstanding the potential for adverse noise and vibration effects of significant concern to Precinct, AT has provided insufficient detail and no proposed designation conditions for NoR 1 other than a comment in the AEE that a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) would be implemented. A CNVMP and any proposed mitigation measures would be processed through the OPW process without an opportunity for input from affected persons, such as Precinct and its tenants. 27. Due to the potential for material adverse effects of significant concern to Precinct, Precinct seeks designation conditions to appropriately mitigate such effects. Precinct considers such conditions must include, but not be limited to, provisions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits.
81	81/12	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	Noise and Vibration Effects on Building Occupants 23. Noise and vibration from construction of the CRL project between Britomart and Aotea stations has the potential to create significant disturbance to the occupants of Precinct's buildings, all but one of which abut the route. Although temporary, the nature and large scale of the project (including secant piling) and the location of several of Precinct's buildings in close proximity to the project means occupants of buildings, which include children in the child care facility at the AMP Centre: 29 Customs Street West, would be exposed to these material adverse effects for several years. 24. The Noise and Vibration Assessment recommends project criteria of 75db L,q during day time hours. This noise is measured 1 metre from the facade of the building, and for most of Precinct's properties would translate to an internal noise of approximately 45 db. The Noise and Vibration report further states that certain activities are predicted to exceed this criterion. Secant piling for example, would result in noise levels of 89 dB L,q at a 10m setback. While the Noise and Vibration Assessment classifies internal noise levels above 55dB L" as having a minor effect, these levels are also acknowledged as resulting in annoyance and reduction in work efficiency (even where sealed glazing exists) and over the long period of works would have a significant adverse effect. 25. Similar vibration effects - ranging from annoyance to inability to work - may be experienced by occupants of Precinct's buildings during construction including children in the child care facility at the AMP Centre: 29 Customs Street West. Precinct is also concerned about the absence of any avoidance or mitigation measures of operational rail vibration. 26. Notwithstanding the potential for adverse noise and vibration effects of significant concern to Precinct, AT has provided insufficient detail and no proposed designation conditions for NoR 1 other than a comment in the AEE that a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) would be implemented. A CNVMP and any proposed mitigation measures would be processed through the OPW process without an opportunity for input from affected persons, such as Precinct and its tenants. 27. Due to the potential for material adverse effects of significant concern to Precinct, Precinct seeks designation conditions to appropriately mitigate such effects. Precinct considers such conditions must include, but not be limited to, provisions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits. Structural Effects as a Result of Vibration 28. The potential for structural effects on buildings as a result of vibration - mainly from construction - is outlined in AT's notices and the accompanying reports. Several of Precinct's buildings are located within the applicable construction vibration contour and a number of Precinct's properties are specifically identified as notable receivers. However specific buildings have not been assessed. 29. Precinct seeks conditions in the designation requiring measures to mitigate these effects. These conditions should include, but not be limited to, requirements for pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings.
81	81/13	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	Structural Effects as a Result of Vibration 28. The potential for structural effects on buildings as a result of vibration - mainly from construction - is outlined in AT's notices and the accompanying reports. Several of Precinct's buildings are located within the applicable construction vibration contour and a number of Precinct's properties are specifically identified as notable receivers. However specific buildings have not been assessed. 29. Precinct seeks conditions in the designation requiring measures to mitigate these effects. These conditions should include, but not be limited to, requirements for pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
81	81/14	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Structural Effects as a Result of Vibration 28. The potential for structural effects on buildings as a result of vibration - mainly from construction - is outlined in AT's notices and the accompanying reports. Several of Precinct's buildings are located within the applicable construction vibration contour and a number of Precinct's properties are specifically identified as notable receivers. However specific buildings have not been assessed. 29. Precinct seeks conditions in the designation requiring measures to mitigate these effects. These conditions should include, but not be limited to, requirements for pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings. 40. The designation conditions (examples of which are noted above) that Precinct seeks include, but are not necessarily limited to: (a) Conditions specifying acceptable standards for operational noise and vibration. (b) Conditions specifying acceptable construction noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits and acceptable mitigation measures for any exceedances. (c) Conditions requiring AT to carry out pre-construction assessments, any necessary stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings. (d) Conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any effects on vehicular and pedestrian access to and from Precinct's buildings. (e) Conditions requiring access to all Precinct's properties to be maintained at all times, and advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure/diversion. (f) Conditions requiring approved dust suppression methods, dust monitoring and trigger levels to initiate mitigation measures including the regular cleaning of the exterior of affected properties. 41. Additionally, Precinct seeks: (a) A 10-year lapse period. (b) That adequate consideration is given to alternative sites for a temporary construction yard. (c) That the designation should be drawn back to a sub-strata level as required for the operation and maintenance of the tunnels as soon as practicable after completion of construction of the works in NoR 1.
81	81/15	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	Structural Effects as a Result of Vibration 28. The potential for structural effects on buildings as a result of vibration - mainly from construction - is outlined in AT's notices and the accompanying reports. Several of Precinct's buildings are located within the applicable construction vibration contour and a number of Precinct's properties are specifically identified as notable receivers. However specific buildings have not been assessed. 29. Precinct seeks conditions in the designation requiring measures to mitigate these effects. These conditions should include, but not be limited to, requirements for pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings.
81	81/16	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Vehicular and Pedestrian Access 30. CRL construction works within NoR 1 would cause significant adverse effects on the road transport and networks, including disruption to vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movement routes in the vicinity of the CRL project. Of particular concern to Precinct is that these routes are used by Precinct, its tenants and their customers and suppliers and the public for car parking, loading and servicing (including emergency services) and cycle, and pedestrian movements to all of Precinct's buildings. 31. A number of critically important access points for Precinct, its tenants and their customers and suppliers include: (a) loading and servicing to the basement of 21 Queen Street (from Albert Street via the Downtown Shopping Centre), (b) the lobby of 21 Queen Street (on Queen Elizabeth Square), (c) the lobby of 23-29 Albert Street, (d) tenant parking of 151 Queen Street from Mills Lane, and (e) tenant and public parking and servicing of 151 Queen Street from Wyndham Street. 32. Among the more significant adverse effects during the three-year cut-and-cover period of construction would be: (a) loss of access to the basement of 21 Queen Street; (b) loss of emergency access to Queen Elizabeth Square from 21 Queen Street (e.g. in the event of a fire); (c) severe and excessive restrictions to the lobbies of 21 Queen Street and 23-29 Albert Street; (d) significantly reduced accessibility to parking, loading and servicing areas of 23-29 Albert Street (off Federal Street) and 151 Queen Street (off Mills Lane and Wyndham Street); (e) closure of Albert Street between Customs Street and Victoria Street to cross vehicle movements; and (f) reduction of footpath widths along Albert Street to 1.5m. 33. It is unclear whether the important pedestrian movements across Albert Street would even be possible. Further, the use of the Mills Lane access to 151 Queen Street has not been identified in AT's assessment. 34. These restrictions on pedestrian and vehicular access would have significant adverse effects on the occupants of the affected buildings, and on Precinct. 35. Precinct seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any effects on vehicular and pedestrian access to and from Precinct's buildings. Precinct considers such conditions should include, but not be limited to, conditions requiring: (a) access to all of Precinct's properties is maintained at all times (The Integrated Transport Assessment notes that "access to all properties will be maintained"); (b) appropriate loading spaces to be available for all Precinct properties, including Zurich House; (c) pedestrian access commensurate with the current access to be provided for all Precinct properties, including Zurich House; (d) that the intersection of Albert Street and Customs Street West never be closed completely; (e) the provision of footbridges over Albert Street to allow pedestrian access between: (i) AMP Centre and PWC Tower and Queen Street; and (ii) ANZ Centre and Queen Street; (f) advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure / diversion should also be included in the designation; (g) alternative parking (in AT facilities, for example) in the event that access to off-street parking spaces in Precinct buildings is restricted and provision of alternative loading spaces in the event any on-street loading spaces servicing Precinct buildings are unavailable; (h) the removal of early bird parking in AT parking facilities.
81	81/17	Trevor Wairepo	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	5.17 Air quality	Air Quality Effects 37. The potential for adverse effects on air quality and measures to avoid them are outlined in the technical report at Appendix 7 to AT's notices of requirement. Precinct is concerned about impacts on the occupants of its buildings and on the buildings themselves and seeks that measures to address any adverse effects are included as conditions in the designation rather than potentially being addressed (or not) at a later date in an Environmental Management Plan or Construction Environmental Management Plan under the OPW process. 38. These measures may include, but are not limited to, approved dust suppression methods (especially for the children in the child care facility at the AMP Centre: 29 Customs Street West) and the regular cleaning of the exterior of affected properties.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
82	82/1	Rohan McMahon		1.1 Support - NOR All	The proposed City Rail Link is the key to dramatically expanding the future capacity of the Auckland rail system. This in turn is needed to support a projected increase of 1 million people in coming decades. Auckland cannot become the world's most liveable city without the CRL.
83	83/1	Luke Turner		1.1 Support - NOR All	I strongly support the City Rail Link (CRL). Britomart appears to be almost at capacity and something need to be done to ensure that public transport can cope with future growth in this city. The growth of public transport with investment has been encouraging in the last 10 years. The CRL will assist in making the city more liveable by allowing the expansion of the rail network.
83	83/2	Luke Turner		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Any design must truly be future proofed. This means rail to the North Shore should be factored in, with the potential for stations at Albert Park / Auckland University and Wynyard Quarter. Aotea Station: Aotea Station must have good access to Queen Street, including through the walking streets of Elliot Street and Darby Street. It should also have good access to Aotea Square. It should not be difficult for the mobility impaired or elderly to access the station. Karangahape Road Station: Karangahape Road Station should be renamed to K Road Station, to reflect the district, which is more commonly called K Road. Subsequently, the station will more commonly be called K Road Station. Newton Station: There should be a reconsidering of the name Newton Station as not many people identify that area as Newton. Possible suggestions include Eden Terrace or Khyber Pass. The Newton Station, like all stations should have escalators, and not rely solely on elevators. Stations around the world that rely on elevators suffer from either limited usage or long wait times to use elevators. Suitable access spots should be suitably located as the roads are very busy there and with great numbers potentially leaving the station in needs to be safe for people. Potentially some minor details of the route can be changed to be more cost effective. One possible suggestion is to have the route to follow Dominion Road at the southern end until it reaches Karangahape Road relocating Newton Station to Newton Road, so it is midway between Ponsonby Road and 'Symonds Street. This route will mean fewer properties need to be purchased. All stations should have dual tracks, meaning from a single track it will fork on each side of the platform trains can wait allowing a greater capacity on the network with less waiting times. The London Underground suffers from the issue of trains stacking up on lines waiting for platform space because at most stations they do not have dual tracks at platforms. As the CRL joins the Western line, there should be connection to, both, the west and to the east as to allow trains from Newmarket to access the CRL and vice versa.
83	83/3	Luke Turner		6.1 Project funding / economic	Funding should be made available via region wide petrol taxes.
84	84/1	Jamie R Walton		1.1 Support - NOR All	
84	84/2	Jamie R Walton		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	The City Rail Link enables better development / redevelopment of the whole of Auckland (and by extension, the whole of New Zealand), and enables better use of existing and future transport infrastructure.
84	84/3	Jamie R Walton		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	1. To ease the horizontal and vertical alignments of the City Rail Link as much as possible to enable greater acceleration and speeds of trains, thereby maximising throughput capacity for the future (when rolling stock performance may allow improvements in timing and loadings). 2. To retain Mt Eden Station (the main construction worksite for the project) on completion for use for West-South/South-West train service users to access the redeveloped Newton/Eden Terrace area, and specifically: a) lower the North Auckland line in a trench, taking the opportunity to ease its vertical and horizontal alignments and the connections to the City Rail Link route; b) redevelop the area above for Council-owned and -leased mixed-use developments (which can help pay for the construction and operation costs over time), along with public open spaces and amenities, to make that area a nice place to live, work, shop and visit; and c) provide a continuous walkway and cycleway connecting the backstreets immediately to west of Mt Eden Road to provide a pleasant, quiet and safe route to access Mt Eden Village from Mt Eden Station (Mt Eden Road is too busy, loud and smelly from truck and bus fumes). 3. To ensure provision for future rail line to the North Shore, and other areas also.
85	85/1	Dorothy Wilson		1.1 Support - NOR All	
86	86/1	attn: Tim Conder, Planning and Investment Manager	New Zealand Transport Agency	1.1 Support - NOR All	
86	86/2	attn: Tim Conder, Planning and Investment Manager	New Zealand Transport Agency	5.21 Environmental management framework	7. Without limiting the generality of the above the NZTA makes the following specific submission on the proposed Plan modifications and NoR's: Transport system effects The NZTA supports the mitigation of the 'Road Transport and Connectivity effects' identified via a management plan framework (Environmental Management Plan (EMP), Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and subsequent Delivery Work Plans (DWP)) relating to the road network and transportation. To better enable the effects of construction on the wider transport network to be identified and avoided or mitigated, the NZTA considers that the transport sections of the EMP, CEMP and the DWP for 'Road Network and Transportation' should be prepared as a joint process between Auckland Transport and the NZTA prior to lodgement of those documents with any Outline Plan of Work, for the following reasons: - the NZTA and Auckland Transport seek to manage the transport system as a single system. The construction phase of the CRL is going to require very careful management to ensure transport effects on the transport system are minimised; - it is very likely that the State highway network will be needed to help manage traffic movements and alternative routes during construction including to manage movements within the city centre, and to implement the area wide city centre mitigation options; - the need for region wide and transport

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					system wide co-ordination of Travel Demand Management measures; - 'Area wide city centre mitigation' options mentioned include amongst other things the creation of alternative routes and detours and the change in phasing and the operation of traffic signals within the city centre which can have wider flow on effects to the wider transport system; - the potential impact of mitigation measures on freight movements and national economic growth and productivity.
87	87/1	attn:Kevin Sherlock, Business Manager	St Patricks Cathedral	1.9 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 1	Referencing the 'City Rail Link - Summary of Project' attachment accompanying your letter, our submission relates to Notice I - Surface designation, Britomart to Mayoral Drive (PM68 to the Central Area District Plan; specifically, the road reserve of Albert Street, and parts of its intersecting streets (including Swanson and Wyndham Streets). ... Although we are generally in support of the proposed City Rail Link and related Notice(s) of Requirement for Designations, and conscious of the benefits that it will provide to the wider Auckland community, the Cathedral reels that it is important that procedures be put in place pre-construction that will safeguard and protect the structural integrity of the buildings, services and operations that the Cathedral provides to the community of Auckland as well as resident priests, staff, parishioners and visitors alike seven days a week, 365 days of the year.
87	87/2	attn:Kevin Sherlock, Business Manager	St Patricks Cathedral	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The interest of the Roman Catholic Cathedral of St Patrick and St Joseph in Notice I relates to: 1. the proximity of St Patrick's Cathedral, at 1 St Patrick's Square, and St Patrick's Presbytery, at 43 Wyndham Street, to the proposed Albert Street rail corridor; and 2. the potential for detrimental structural (via dewatering/settlement and vibration) and noise effects that the construction of the City Rail Link may have on: a. the two important NZHPT Category I heritage buildings; and b. the ability of the Cathedral to operate and carry out daily services and Masses.
87	87/3	attn:Kevin Sherlock, Business Manager	St Patricks Cathedral	5.8 Built heritage	We note with disappointment that, even though the Cathedral falls within the 200m corridor (100m either side of the indicative centre-line of the CRL), it is not specified in the "City Rail Link - Built Heritage Technical Expert Report" prepared by Salmond Reed Architects. This is a matter which we have brought to Council's attention by earlier notice and in respect of which we continue to reserve our position.
87	87/4	attn:Kevin Sherlock, Business Manager	St Patricks Cathedral	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	These procedures should include, but not necessarily be limited to: Pre-construction condition reports being prepared on the buildings, monitoring during construction and agreed conditions re stop work
87	87/5	attn:Kevin Sherlock, Business Manager	St Patricks Cathedral	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	An obligation by the contractor(s) to inspect and repair any damage that may arise against the pre-construction reports.
87	87/6	attn:Kevin Sherlock, Business Manager	St Patricks Cathedral	5.1 Noise - construction	Being able to advise and agree Mass and/or special event times as they may relate to noise constraints
88	88/1	attn: Peter Treacy General Counsel	Sky City Auckland Limited	1.9 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 1	2. This submission relates to the whole of NoR 1 relating to the area between the Britomart Transport Centre (Britomart) and Albert Street / Mayoral Drive (in the vicinity of the Aotea Centre car parking entrance on Mayoral Drive). 3. The following areas are of particular interest to SKYCITY: (a) the construction of tunnels (including relocation of utility services, reinstatement and enhancement following primary construction and other ancillary construction works); (b) the operation of two rail tunnels; (c) a new rail station located under Albert Street (approximately between Victoria and Wellesley Streets); and (d) ancillary activities associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the CRL. 4. SKYCITY is also interested in the provision of additional underground connections to the Aotea Station. Submitter Position 5. SKYCITY supports the CRL, subject to the concerns described in this submission being addressed and appropriate measures being put in place (such as conditions being imposed or satisfaction provided by other means) to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of construction and operation on SKYCITY's properties and operations. 25. SKYCITY seeks confirmation of NoR 1 subject to appropriate measures being put in place, including conditions (or satisfaction provided by other means) to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of construction and operation of the CRL project on its properties and operations as outlined above.
88	88/2	attn: Peter Treacy General Counsel	Sky City Auckland Limited	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	9. SKYCITY would like to ensure that NoR 1 enables additional underground connections to the Aotea Station. 26. SKYCITY seeks explicit confirmation within NoR 1 that enables additional underground connections to the Aotea Station.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
88	88/3	attn: Peter Treacy General Counsel	Sky City Auckland Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	10. SKY CITY's concerns relate to the impact of the CRL on its properties and operations, including the following matters (as set out in greater detail below): (a) noise and vibration from construction/operation of the CRL project; Noise and Vibration 12. Noise and vibration generating from construction of the CRL project between Britomart and the Aotea Station has the potential to create significant disturbance to SKYCITY's properties and operations, including SKYCITY's Grand Hotel and Convention Centre, SKYCITY's restaurants and other facilities on Albert Street. 13. Although temporary, the scale and nature of the CRL project (including secant piling) and the close proximity of these works to SKYCITY's properties will mean that guests, patrons and staff would be exposed to noise and vibration effects for potentially several years. 14. Notwithstanding the potential for adverse noise and vibration effects, there are no conditions and little detail in NoR 1 (other than reference to the implementation of a CNVMP) to address these effects. The CNVMP and any measures would only be dealt with through the OPW process without an opportunity for input from affected persons. 15. Accordingly, the designation should include further details to provide certainty on these matters, including, but not limited to, noise limits, hours of operation, duration of works at different noise limits and conditions. 16. Noise and vibration from operation of the CRL may also adversely affect SKYCITY's properties and operations. Again, however, there is an absence of detail in the NoR 1 (for example, standards or limits that would be met or appropriate conditions to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects) to enable SKYCITY to sufficiently identify and understand the noise and vibration effects from operation of the CRL.
88	88/4	attn: Peter Treacy General Counsel	Sky City Auckland Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	10. SKY CITY's concerns relate to the impact of the CRL on its properties and operations, including the following matters (as set out in greater detail below):(a) noise and vibration from construction/operation of the CRL project; Noise and Vibration 12. Noise and vibration generating from construction of the CRL project between Britomart and the Aotea Station has the potential to create significant disturbance to SKYCITY's properties and operations, including SKYCITY's Grand Hotel and Convention Centre, SKYCITY's restaurants and other facilities on Albert Street. 13. Although temporary, the scale and nature of the CRL project (including secant piling) and the close proximity of these works to SKYCITY's properties will mean that guests, patrons and staff would be exposed to noise and vibration effects for potentially several years. 14. Notwithstanding the potential for adverse noise and vibration effects, there are no conditions and little detail in NoR 1 (other than reference to the implementation of a CNVMP) to address these effects. The CNVMP and any measures would only be dealt with through the OPW process without an opportunity for input from affected persons. 15. Accordingly, the designation should include further details to provide certainty on these matters, including, but not limited to, noise limits, hours of operation, duration of works at different noise limits and conditions. 16. Noise and vibration from operation of the CRL may also adversely affect SKYCITY's properties and operations. Again, however, there is an absence of detail in the NoR 1 (for example, standards or limits that would be met or appropriate conditions to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects) to enable SKYCITY to sufficiently identify and understand the noise and vibration effects from operation of the CRL.
88	88/5	attn: Peter Treacy General Counsel	Sky City Auckland Limited	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	10. SKY CITY's concerns relate to the impact of the CRL on its properties and operations, including the following matters (as set out in greater detail below): (a) structural effects from construction/operation of the CRL project; Structural 17. The potential for structural effects on buildings as a result of vibration (mainly from construction of the CRL project) is outlined in NoR 1 and accompanying reports. 18. SKYCITY's Grand Hotel and Convention Centre complex is located within the applicable vibration contour. However, specific buildings have not been assessed and no mitigation measures are detailed in NoR 1. 19. Further detail is required on structural matters, including the pre-construction assessment process, regular monitoring of buildings and expedient remediation of any damage to buildings.
88	88/6	attn: Peter Treacy General Counsel	Sky City Auckland Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	10. SKY CITY's concerns relate to the impact of the CRL on its properties and operations, including the following matters (as set out in greater detail below):(a) access during construction of the CRL project; and Access 20. Construction of the proposed tunnels will cause significant disruption to vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movement routes in the vicinity of the CRL project. Public, staff and operational car parking, loading and servicing at the Albert Street entrances of the SKYCITY Grand Hotel and Convention Centre building and cycle and pedestrian movements to all of SKYCITY's buildings will be impacted by access to these routes. 21 . Among the more significant impacts during the three-year cut-and-cover period of construction are the proposed closure of Albert Street (between Customs Street and Victoria Street) to cross vehicle movements and reduction of footpath widths along Albert Street to 1.5m with construction hoardings. It is unclear whether important pedestrian movements across Albert Street will be possible, particularly those associated with the pedestrian through-site link to Federal Street. 22. These proposed restrictions would have a significant impact on SKYCITY's operations and the occupants of other affected buildings. Accordingly, measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects need to be identified and included in the designation.
88	88/7	attn: Peter Treacy General Counsel	Sky City Auckland Limited	5.17 Air quality	10. SKY CITY's concerns relate to the impact of the CRL on its properties and operations, including the following matters (as set out in greater detail below): (a) air quality during construction of the CRL project. Air Quality 23. The potential for adverse effects on air quality and measures to avoid them are outlined in the technical report at Appendix 7 to the notices. 24. SKYCITY is concerned about the impacts of poor air quality on its guests, patrons and buildings and seeks that measures to address the identified effects are included as conditions in the designation rather than potentially being addressed (or not) at a later date in an EMP or CEMP under the outline process.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
89	89/1	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	1.10 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 2	This is a submission on the Notices of Requirement by Auckland Transport (AT) (the Requiring Authority) for the City Rail Link (CRL). The specific Notices of Requirement (NoR) that the submitter submits on are: NoR 2 (substrata designation for 2 tunnels, Mayoral Drive to New North Road); NoR 3 (strata designation for "buffer" land above the NoR 2 tunnels); NoR 4 (surface designation for "Karangahape Station"; NoR 5 (surface designation for "Newton Station"). The specific parts of the application that the submission relates to are : All parts of the NoRs listed above. 3. Samson's submissions are: 3.1 Samson SUPPORTS the CRL, subject to AT and the Council adequately addressing the matters set out in submission points 3.2 - 3.6 below. 3.2 Although the CRL once constructed will be beneficial for businesses in the city and particularly in the vicinity of the stations, there will be significant adverse effects on some businesses during the construction period. 4.1 Samson recognises the significant benefits that the CRL will provide for Auckland. These benefits are well set out in the NoRs and the supporting material. 4.2 Samson is the owner of the following properties which are sought to be designated by the CRL notices: 161 - 165 Symonds Street; 167 - 169 Symonds Street (part of 30 St Benedicts Street) ; 251 - 253 Karangahape Road; 259 - 281 Karangahape Road; 193 Symonds Street; 195-199 Symonds Street; 201 Symonds Street; 203-205 Symonds Street; 207-209 Symonds Street; 211-213 Symonds Street; 30 St Benedicts Street; 30 Mercury Lane (part of 2 Canada Street). 4.3 Samson also owns other properties in the vicinity of the land to be designated and which, although not to be designated, will still be affected by the designations. These properties are: 150-154 Karangahape Road; 259-281 Karangahape Road; 30 Mercury Lane (part of 2 Canada Street); 2 Canada Street; 8 Canada Street. 4.4 Samson acknowledges that the designations overall will be beneficial particularly for businesses in the vicinity of the proposed stations. However, all of the properties listed above will be adversely affected by the designations, for the reasons discussed in 4.5 - 4.20 below.
89	89/2	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	1.11 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 3	This is a submission on the Notices of Requirement by Auckland Transport (AT) (the Requiring Authority) for the City Rail Link (CRL). The specific Notices of Requirement (NoR) that the submitter submits on are: NoR 2 (substrata designation for 2 tunnels, Mayoral Drive to New North Road); NoR 3 (strata designation for "buffer" land above the NoR 2 tunnels); NoR 4 (surface designation for "Karangahape Station"; NoR 5 (surface designation for "Newton Station"). The specific parts of the application that the submission relates to are : All parts of the NoRs listed above. 3. Samson's submissions are: 3.1 Samson SUPPORTS the CRL, subject to AT and the Council adequately addressing the matters set out in submission points 3.2 - 3.6 below. 3.2 Although the CRL once constructed will be beneficial for businesses in the city and particularly in the vicinity of the stations, there will be significant adverse effects on some businesses during the construction period.
89	89/3	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	1.12 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 4	This is a submission on the Notices of Requirement by Auckland Transport (AT) (the Requiring Authority) for the City Rail Link (CRL). The specific Notices of Requirement (NoR) that the submitter submits on are: NoR 2 (substrata designation for 2 tunnels, Mayoral Drive to New North Road); NoR 3 (strata designation for "buffer" land above the NoR 2 tunnels); NoR 4 (surface designation for "Karangahape Station"; NoR 5 (surface designation for "Newton Station"). The specific parts of the application that the submission relates to are : All parts of the NoRs listed above. 3. Samson's submissions are: 3.1 Samson SUPPORTS the CRL, subject to AT and the Council adequately addressing the matters set out in submission points 3.2 - 3.6 below. 3.2 Although the CRL once constructed will be beneficial for businesses in the city and particularly in the vicinity of the stations, there will be significant adverse effects on some businesses during the construction period.
89	89/4	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	1.13 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 5	This is a submission on the Notices of Requirement by Auckland Transport (AT) (the Requiring Authority) for the City Rail Link (CRL). The specific Notices of Requirement (NoR) that the submitter submits on are: NoR 2 (substrata designation for 2 tunnels, Mayoral Drive to New North Road); NoR 3 (strata designation for "buffer" land above the NoR 2 tunnels); NoR 4 (surface designation for "Karangahape Station"; NoR 5 (surface designation for "Newton Station"). The specific parts of the application that the submission relates to are : All parts of the NoRs listed above. 3. Samson's submissions are: 3.1 Samson SUPPORTS the CRL, subject to AT and the Council adequately addressing the matters set out in submission points 3.2 - 3.6 below. 3.2 Although the CRL once constructed will be beneficial for businesses in the city and particularly in the vicinity of the stations, there will be significant adverse effects on some businesses during the construction period.
89	89/5	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	3.3 Specific geotechnical and other engineering reports submitted as part of the CRL Outline Development Plan approval processes should be made available to Samson for peer review at AT's cost. Reasons for submission point 3.3: 4.8 When specific geotechnical and other relevant engineering reports are submitted for the purposes of obtaining Outline Development Plan approvals, the reports should be available to Samson for Samson to obtain its own peer reviews and at AT's cost. This will enable Samson to obtain its own detailed advice on: the specific effects on the structural integrity of Samson's land and buildings; and the impact of the CRL's proposed structural works on the potential for redevelopment of Samson's properties.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
89	89/6	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	3.4 NoR 2 and the supporting information do not provide sufficient certainty as to the shallowest depth of the NoR 2 sub-strata designation, and hence Samson cannot fully ascertain the impact of NoR 2 on its properties. 3.5 NoR 3 and the supporting information do not provide sufficient certainty as to the shallowest depth of the NoR 3 strata or "buffer" designation, and hence Samson cannot fully ascertain the impact of NoR 3 on its properties. Even if the shallowest depth of NoR 3 is only 5 metres below natural ground level, this may have significant adverse effects on the future development potential of the affected Samson properties. 3.6 It appears that: (a) NoR 4, although in part labelled "sub-strata", will in fact relate to surface land and sub-strata below the surface land, to the maximum depth of NoR 2; and (b) there will be no NoR 3-type strata or "buffer" designation in relation to land affected by NoR 4 alone or in combination with NoR 2. This may have significant adverse effects on the future development potential of the affected Samson properties.
89	89/7	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	3.5 NoR 3 and the supporting information do not provide sufficient certainty as to the shallowest depth of the NoR 3 strata or "buffer" designation, and hence Samson cannot fully ascertain the impact of NoR 3 on its properties. Even if the shallowest depth of NoR 3 is only 5 metres below natural ground level, this may have significant adverse effects on the future development potential of the affected Samson properties. 3.6 It appears that: (a) NoR 4, although in part labelled "sub-strata", will in fact relate to surface land and sub-strata below the surface land, to the maximum depth of NoR 2; and (b) there will be no NoR 3-type strata or "buffer" designation in relation to land affected by NoR 4 alone or in combination with NoR 2. This may have significant adverse effects on the future development potential of the affected Samson properties. Reasons for submission point 3.4: 4.9 The only specific reference to the depth of NoR 2 in the vicinity of Samson's properties affected by the designations is in Table 3 - 3 in Part 3 of the Concept Design Report (Appendix 13 of the NoRs). This depth of 33m is from the ground surface to the railway lines in the Karangahape Station, but the information does not provide any more detail about the shallowest depth of NoR 2 or all of the works within it. 4.10 Samson seeks confirmation of the depth so that it can better ascertain the effects on its properties and the impact of the designation on the future development potential of these properties. Reasons for submission point 3.5 4.11 The specific depth of the shallowest point of NoR 3 (the strata land or "buffer" layer) is not clear. The Assessment of Effects on the Environment (Executive Summary) at page 3 states: The CRL NoR relate to: Strata (designation) - means designation of land layer starting 5 metres below the ground surface and the sub-strata designation. This starts at a nominated distance below the surface and extends down to meet the Sub-strata designation (the tunnel envelope);" 4.12 The first sentence indicates that the depth below the ground surface is 5 metres, but the second sentence indicates that the depth is a "nominated distance". It is not clear if the "nominated distance" is fixed at 5 metres or is another depth, or varies according to specific circumstances of the land in question. 4.13 Similarly, part 2 of NoR 3 states : " ... This NoR only relates to the strata soil from 5m beneath the ground, it does not affect the surface ... ", and the cross section in part 4 shows the depth of NoR 3 starting at 5m below the surface, but part 4 also states: " ... In order to provide for surface and some subsurface works to occur without restriction, the protection designation does not apply from Natural Ground Level (NGL) below the surface for a set number of metres (which varies depending on location and whether under road reserve of private property. " 4.20 Also, it is not clear whether the designation over the private land is to remain in place after the CRL is completed or if AT will remove the designation. Samson seeks confirmation of this prior to the designations being confirmed.
89	89/8	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	5.23 Property rights	3.5 NoR 3 and the supporting information do not provide sufficient certainty as to the shallowest depth of the NoR 3 strata or "buffer" designation, and hence Samson cannot fully ascertain the impact of NoR 3 on its properties. Even if the shallowest depth of NoR 3 is only 5 metres below natural ground level, this may have significant adverse effects on the future development potential of the affected Samson properties. 3.6 It appears that: (a) NoR 4, although in part labelled "sub-strata", will in fact relate to surface land and sub-strata below the surface land, to the maximum depth of NoR 2; and (b) there will be no NoR 3-type strata or "buffer" designation in relation to land affected by NoR 4 alone or in combination with NoR 2. This may have significant adverse effects on the future development potential of the affected Samson properties. 4.14 NoR 3 if confirmed will provide AT with the right to comment on, and potentially disrupt, the development aspirations of owners wishing to extend down into the designated strata layer when the re-develop their land. Five metres is about 1.5 levels of basement for a commercial building. Some buildings have basements that in total extend to 20 or more metres in depth. For example, the Iron bank building (150 Karangahape Road east of the Pitt Street intersection), which was completed in 2009, has 6 levels above ground and is constructed to 20m depth. 4.15 Such depths could reach the NoR 2 sub-strata levels containing the tunnels. The presence of the designations could therefore constrain development opportunities above and/or in close proximity to, in particular, the proposed Aotea, Karangahape and Newton stations, which are the three locations where more intensive development is logical. 4.16 Samson seeks confirmation of the depth so that it can better ascertain the effects on its properties and the impact of the designation on the future development potential of these properties. 4.17 Although the NoR at part 5 acknowledges that the provisions of the Public Works Act will allow compensation to be negotiated between AT and the owner, the land affected could be used for some very large and very tall buildings, with substantial and deep basements. Compensation for loss of value if such developments cannot proceed could be difficult to determine and negotiate. Reasons for submission point 3.6: 4.18 NoR 4 will designate the sub-strata layer below some private land, and it appears, from the cross-section diagram in part 4 of NoR 4, that this sub-strata layer extends from the surface to at or below the NoR 2 sub-strata layer (which in this location will contain the tunnels and the Karangahape Station). 4.19 However, there appears to be no NoR 3-type strata or buffer designation proposed under this private land and it appears therefore that this private land will not have a buffer layer between the surface and the sub-strata layer. This will have severe consequences for any future development of sites affected.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
89	89/9	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	4.1 Part 2 RMA	3.7 If the matters in paragraphs 3.2 - 3.6 above are adequately addressed, the designations as prepared will better achieve the sustainable management purpose Resource Management Act 1991 and certain Part 7 principles of the Act. Reasons for submission point 3. 7: 4.21 The designations as notified in the NoRs do not achieve the sustainable management purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 in that: (a) Property owners and tenants cannot provide for their economic well-being during some or all of the CR L construction period ; (b) Adverse effects of the construction on property owners and tenants are not satisfactorily avoided, remedied or mitigated. 4.22 The designations should include conditions to give effect to methods that address these matters, for example: (a) Rates relief; and (b) Measures for ensuring that pedestrian and vehicle access to tenancies are as far as possible maintained and not disrupted during the construction period. 4.23 The designations as notified do not have sufficient regard to matters in section 7 of the Act, including: (a) The use of all relevant resources (including the surface, strata and sub-strata levels, and the private land holdings) may not be efficient (s7(b)) if the designations constrain legitimate development aspirations of property owners and potentially constrain the intensification of development around the station nodes ; and (b) Amenity values (s7(c)) and the quality of the environment (s7(f)) are not maintained during the construction period, and measures to mitigate the adverse effects are necessary;
89	89/10	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	5.20 Economic	Reasons for submission point 3.2: 4.5 A significant adverse effect of the designations will be the disruption to businesses located in premises that are either to be designated or are adjacent to or very close to the designated properties (as set out in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 above), during the construction of the CRL. The construction period is anticipated to be up to six years, but will be less than that for some parts of the CRL. Even if it is less than six years, potentially some businesses - for example retailers on the southern side of Beresford Square - will fail during the construction period because of the loss of foot traffic, loss of direct vehicle access, noise, vibration and dust. 4.6 Further, such premises will be very difficult to lease if they become vacant during the construction period.
89	89/11	Samson Corporation Ltd and Sterling Nominees Ltd	Attn: Cindy Weir and Jeff Brown	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	4.5 A significant adverse effect of the designations will be the disruption to businesses located in premises that are either to be designated or are adjacent to or very close to the designated properties (as set out in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 above), during the construction of the CRL. The construction period is anticipated to be up to six years, but will be less than that for some parts of the CRL. Even if it is less than six years, potentially some businesses - for example retailers on the southern side of Beresford Square - will fail during the construction period because of the loss of foot traffic, loss of direct vehicle access, noise, vibration and dust. 4.6 Further, such premises will be very difficult to lease if they become vacant during the construction period. 4.7 Samson seeks that compensation should be available for the tenants/properties affected, for example some form of rates relief.
90	90/1	Bridgid Kelly	Vector Limited	1.22 Neutral, did not care, but requested conditions / amendments - NOR All	2. Vector is one of New Zealand's largest network infrastructure companies. It has a portfolio of businesses and services delivering electricity, gas, and high-speed broadband voice and data communications primarily in the Auckland region. 3. As a utility operator with assets in the Auckland CBD, Vector is particularly interested in the NoRs insofar as they affect Vector's existing and new assets and the operation of its network: a) prior to the CRL being constructed; b) during construction; and c) once the CRL is operational. Nature of submission 4. Vector is neutral as to whether the CRL project proceeds or not. The intent of this submission is to draw to the Council's attention the implications of designations sought by Auckland Transport on Vector's existing and possible future assets within the proposed route of the CRL and its surrounds. Our objective is to ensure the ongoing security of supply of electricity, gas and telecommunication to and through the CBD. 5. Vector is interested in effects that could arise beyond the CBD as a result of the project. One of the two electricity transmission routes north runs through Vector's Penrose to Hobson Street tunnel which crosses the proposed designation along Mayoral Drive. 6. Vector has a number of assets located within the proposed designation corridor ("affected assets"). These assets are located from ground level to approximately 50m below ground and are, therefore, potentially affected by the surface, strata and substrata designations. 7. Vector representatives have met with Auckland Transport and expect that Vector's concerns can be resolved by way of agreement and conditions on the designation. Unless and until that occurs to Vector's satisfaction, it will need to be involved in the submission and hearing process for the NORs. The matters of concern to Vector are set out below. 20. Vector seeks that any recommendation of the Councilor decision of Auckland Transport on the notice of requirement is consistent and compatible with the Vector's designation and assets. 21. Accordingly, if the consent authority is of a mind to recommend confirmation of the designation then Vector seeks that appropriate conditions are placed on the designation, to the satisfaction of Vector. Vector is able to meet with Auckland Transport to discuss such conditions.
90	90/2	Bridgid Kelly	Vector Limited	5.24 Designation lapse period	8. Auckland Transport is seeking a 20 year lapse period in relation to the designation. Vector does not object to the lapse period or the use of the designation process for a project of this significance. However, 20 years is significant length of time and it is reasonable for Vector to be provided with some flexibility in terms of accessing, maintaining, operating, and installing its assets within the designation corridor during this 20 year period 9. Vector's affected assets include those that are approved by designations, namely : a) Dundonald Street substation (Isthmus District Plan - Reference C08-19) b) Penrose to Hobson Street tunnel (Central Area Plan -Reference 288) 10. As designations, these affected assets have priority over the NoRs for the CRL under section 176 of the RMA; however, this protection does not extend to the remainder of Vector's affected assets which are not designated. For undesignated assets and installing new assets, Vector will instead need to obtain written approval from Auckland Transport prior to commencing any work which may prevent or hinder the CRL designation. 11. Some of Vector's undesignated but affected assets are significant. For example, the Swanson Street tunnel (affected by NoR 1 and located between 30-60m below ground) carries electricity from the Hobson Street substation to Albert Street. While Vector appreciates the need to preserve the CRL corridor, it consider that it would be onerous and impractical to require Vector to obtain Auckland Transport's written approval every time it needed to undertake work or install new assets within the designation corridor (it is not clear what works Auckland Transport will consider as preventing or hindering the CRL project). This is particularly relevant in

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					respect of emergency works and repairs to assets. 12. Vector's electricity and gas assets in existence or partial existence prior to 1 January 1993 have statutory existing works protection provided by the Electricity Act 1992 and Gas Act 1992. Similar provisions also exist in the Telecommunications Act 2001. 13. Vector considers that any further approval required by Auckland Transport must not frustrate these statutory rights. The proposed designation has the potential to adversely effects Vector's day to day business operations for up to twenty years prior to construction commencing.
90	90/3	Bridgid Kelly	Vector Limited	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	14. NoRs 1, 4, 5 and 6 for the CRL recognise the potential for interference with and the need for the relocation of existing network utility services during the construction period. The primary method for avoiding, remedying and mitigating these effects is: "coordination with utility operators to determine the specific location of utilities and methods to avoid, protect or relocate services along with methods to manage accidental damage to utilities". Vector fully supports this statement and considers that it should be extended to NoRs 2 and 3 so as to ensure that potential effects on utilities from, for example, vibration, do not arise.
90	90/4	Bridgid Kelly	Vector Limited	5.34 Construction methodology	15. Further, given the uncertainty about when the CRL will be constructed, Auckland Transport is proposing to finalise the construction methodology as part of the outline plan process. This process does not require Auckland Transport to consult with any party other than the Council. Section 177 of the RMA provides that, where land is subject pre-existing designation, the requiring authority responsible for the later designation must first obtain the written consent of the authority responsible for the earlier designation before acting under its designation. While this gives Vector some comfort in relation to its designated affected assets, section 177 does not assist in relation to Vector's undesignated assets. 16. Vector considers that it should be involved in the outline plan process and that Auckland Transport should be required to obtain confirmation from Vector that the construction methodology proposed will not adversely affect Vector's assets or its ability to operate and maintain its network. Vector considers that a condition to this effect should be included in relation to each designation (ie NoRs 1-6).
90	90/5	Bridgid Kelly	Vector Limited	5.23 Property rights	17. Vector accepts that a more extensive designation is required prior to the construction of the CRL to preserve an adequate area for construction. Vector supports Auckland Transport's statement that "this designation may be drawn back pursuant to section 182 of the RMA to operational requirements" (NoRs 1, 4, 5 and 6); however, Vector considers that this should be a requirement included in the designation conditions rather than left to Auckland Transport's discretion .
90	90/6	Bridgid Kelly	Vector Limited	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	18. In addition, Vector wishes to ensure that any adverse effects on or damage to its assets arising after the construction of the CRL are identified and appropriately remediated. Vector considers that this is best achieved by way of pre and post condition surveys of Vector's assets at Auckland Transport's cost. This concept is already provided for in "nature of conditions to apply" sections of the NoRs which identifies that the Construction Environment Management Plan includes "building condition surveys and monitoring / settlement monitoring". Vector considers that these surveys should occur in relation to its affected assets. The assets Vector is particularly concerned about are the: a) Penrose to Hobson Street tunnel; b) Swanson Street tunnel; c) Dundonald Street substation; and d) Hobson Street substation. 19. In the event that any damage is identified, whether by way of subsidence or not, Auckland Transport should be required to remediate the damage.
91	91/1	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	1.31 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 1) subject to conditions / amendments	4. The specific Notices of Requirement and parts of the Notices of Requirement to which my submission relates are: Notices of Requirement 1, 4, 5 and 6, being those parts of these Notices that affect existing Chorus plant such as cables, ducts, underground chambers and cabinets that may be affected during construction of the CRL, including any effects on the continued provision of service during construction, and any necessary relocation of plant whether temporarily or permanently. 5. My submission is: Chorus does not oppose the principle of the CRL project or its aims. However with respect to there being inadequate assessment and provision made within the Notices of Requirement and related Assessment of Environmental Effects for the protection and relocation of Chorus plant, Chorus opposes in part Notices of Requirement 1, 4, 5 and 6.
91	91/2	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	1.34 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 4) subject to conditions / amendments	4. The specific Notices of Requirement and parts of the Notices of Requirement to which my submission relates are: Notices of Requirement 1, 4, 5 and 6, being those parts of these Notices that affect existing Chorus plant such as cables, ducts, underground chambers and cabinets that may be affected during construction of the CRL, including any effects on the continued provision of service during construction, and any necessary relocation of plant whether temporarily or permanently. 5. My submission is: Chorus does not oppose the principle of the CRL project or its aims. However with respect to there being inadequate assessment and provision made within the Notices of Requirement and related Assessment of Environmental Effects for the protection and relocation of Chorus plant, Chorus opposes in part Notices of Requirement 1, 4, 5 and 6.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
91	91/3	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	1.35 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 5) subject to conditions / amendments	4. The specific Notices of Requirement and parts of the Notices of Requirement to which my submission relates are: Notices of Requirement 1, 4, 5 and 6, being those parts of these Notices that affect existing Chorus plant such as cables, ducts, underground chambers and cabinets that may be affected during construction of the CRL, including any effects on the continued provision of service during construction, and any necessary relocation of plant whether temporarily or permanently. 5. My submission is: Chorus does not oppose the principle of the CRL project or its aims. However with respect to there being inadequate assessment and provision made within the Notices of Requirement and related Assessment of Environmental Effects for the protection and relocation of Chorus plant, Chorus opposes in part Notices of Requirement 1, 4, 5 and 6.
91	91/4	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	1.36 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 6) subject to conditions / amendments	4. The specific Notices of Requirement and parts of the Notices of Requirement to which my submission relates are: Notices of Requirement 1, 4, 5 and 6, being those parts of these Notices that affect existing Chorus plant such as cables, ducts, underground chambers and cabinets that may be affected during construction of the CRL, including any effects on the continued provision of service during construction, and any necessary relocation of plant whether temporarily or permanently. 5. My submission is: Chorus does not oppose the principle of the CRL project or its aims. However with respect to there being inadequate assessment and provision made within the Notices of Requirement and related Assessment of Environmental Effects for the protection and relocation of Chorus plant, Chorus opposes in part Notices of Requirement 1, 4, 5 and 6.
91	91/5	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	5.34 Construction methodology	Construction Issues for Chorus Plant Chorus has a large number of copper and fibre cables and related infrastructure in the proposed excavation footprint of the entire Central Rail Link (CRL). The concentration of cables is greatest in upper Albert Street where cut and cover excavation for the twin tunnels and Aotea Station is planned. In addition a significant number of buried cables cross lower Albert Street, the intersection of Albert Street and Customs Street West and to a lesser extent Lower Queen Street, which will be affected by the proposed works. Auckland Transport's representatives have held some preliminary discussions with Chorus in regard to the possible costs of relocating Chorus plant. While not discussed in the Notices of Requirement or related Assessment of Environmental Effects, Auckland Transport's representatives have verbally indicated that any relocation of services will need to be contained within the designation footprints, and accordingly it has been proposed by Auckland Transport that gantries be used to support Chorus cables in their existing positions while the ground is excavated beneath them. Chorus considers that there is a very high risk for its cables being damaged by the use of gantries. This damage would be very likely to occur in Albert Street because of the age, number, size and location of the cables buried there. Faults to cables in this area would mean telephone and internet service cuts to businesses and residents in the area for a considerable length of time, particularly in upper Albert Street. Although Chorus has not received any information about how Auckland Transport would employ the gantries, it appears a significant number would be required, particularly in Albert Street because of the multiple routes Chorus cables and ducts use to cross Albert Street. Some cables are also routed along the length of Albert Street rather than across it. This would make the use of gantries more problematic because of the considerable length of the cables which would need to be supported. A further problem with the use of gantries is that the Chorus ducts and their cables are not all laid at the same depth and in some case are stacked above each other. Given the weight of the cables and their fragility it would be very difficult for any gantry to support the full length of a stacked section of ducts without the cables stretching to breaking point. Another issue would be dealing with the large concrete chambers ('manholes'), at least one of which is located in the middle of each major intersection. The cable joints that these chambers contain would need additional support and would be very sensitive to damage at the same time as the chamber was being demolished. There is also the practical difficulty of how Chorus staff / contractors would access these joints whilst they are suspended above the cut and cover trench or other excavated areas. While Chorus has concerns about the use of gantries in areas of its network with a high concentration of large or fragile cables, there may be other portions of the CRL route where gantries could be successfully used, although safe access for Chorus staff to maintain, repair or upgrade these lines may still be an issue. Typically this would be where a single duct or pair of ducts containing near new cables were buried beneath the road. However, particularly for upper Albert Street and to a lesser extent Customs Street West, Chorus considers that the best and most appropriate solution is a pre-built alternate route along Mayoral Drive, Federal Street and Wyndham Street due to its comparative practicality and reduced business risk to both Chorus and its customers. These areas largely fall outside of the extent of the proposed designations and thus would require either an alteration to the designation boundaries to facilitate the necessary relocation works, or acquisition of any necessary resource consents to enable this work to proceed.
91	91/6	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	Auckland Transport's representatives have held some preliminary discussions with Chorus in regard to the possible costs of relocating Chorus plant. While not discussed in the Notices of Requirement or related Assessment of Environmental Effects, Auckland Transport's representatives have verbally indicated that any relocation of services will need to be contained within the designation footprints, and accordingly it has been proposed by Auckland Transport that gantries be used to support Chorus cables in their existing positions while the ground is excavated beneath them. Chorus considers that there is a very high risk for its cables being damaged by the use of gantries. This damage would be very likely to occur in Albert Street because of the age, number, size and location of the cables buried there. Faults to cables in this area would mean telephone and internet service cuts to businesses and residents in the area for a considerable length of time, particularly in upper Albert Street. Although Chorus has not received any information about how Auckland Transport would employ the gantries, it appears a significant number would be required, particularly in Albert Street because of the multiple routes Chorus cables and ducts use to cross Albert Street. Some cables are also routed along the length of Albert Street rather than across it. This would make the use of gantries more problematic because of the considerable length of the cables which would need to be supported. A further problem with the use of gantries is that the Chorus ducts and their cables are not all laid at the same depth and in

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					some case are stacked above each other. Given the weight of the cables and their fragility it would be very difficult for any gantry to support the full length of a stacked section of ducts without the cables stretching to breaking point. Another issue would be dealing with the large concrete chambers ('manholes'), at least one of which is located in the middle of each major intersection. The cable joints that these chambers contain would need additional support and would be very sensitive to damage at the same time as the chamber was being demolished. There is also the practical difficulty of how Chorus staff/contractors would access these joints whilst they are suspended above the cut and cover trench or other excavated areas. Accordingly, prior to Chorus being in a position to support the project at the land designation stage, or at least remove its opposition in part, it will require further engagement with Auckland Transport to reach agreement in principal on how relocation of its plant will be addressed during construction, and in particular providing for a pre built alternative route to bypass excavation work at Albert Street and Customs Street West, and agreement in principal as to how the costs for relocation work would be apportioned. It may be possible to address these matters via mechanisms outside of the designation process such as memoranda of understanding/side agreements.
91	91/7	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	2.3 Consultation	Auckland Transport's representatives have held some preliminary discussions with Chorus in regard to the possible costs of relocating Chorus plant. While not discussed in the Notices of Requirement or related Assessment of Environmental Effects, Auckland Transport's representatives have verbally indicated that any relocation of services will need to be contained within the designation footprints, and accordingly it has been proposed by Auckland Transport that gantries be used to support Chorus cables in their existing positions while the ground is excavated beneath them. Chorus considers that there is a very high risk for its cables being damaged by the use of gantries. This damage would be very likely to occur in Albert Street because of the age, number, size and location of the cables buried there. Faults to cables in this area would mean telephone and internet service cuts to businesses and residents in the area for a considerable length of time, particularly in upper Albert Street. The Environmental Management Framework (EMF) proposed in the Notices of Requirement would include a Construction Management Plan (CEMP) including a Delivery Works Plan (DWP) for Utilities. The use of a specific DWP to deal with protecting and relocating utilities is supported. However, in other major projects where a similar strategy has been employed (e.g. Transmission Gully Expressway), detailed engagement had already been undertaken between Chorus and the project team, and there was broad understanding on how protection and relocation of network utilities would be undertaken before Notices of Requirement were submitted and notified. Therefore, in that example there was a high degree of confidence that any issues relating to protection or relocation of Chorus plant could be adequately addressed at the project implementation phase. In this instance, there is concern particularly with the preference for keeping relocated utilities within the designation footprint and the use of gantries (particularly in Albert Street and Customs Street West). Therefore, Chorus does not wish to defer all assessment and consideration of issues relating to protecting and relocation existing utilities to the project implementation stage. Accordingly, prior to Chorus being in a position to support the project at the land designation stage, or at least remove its opposition in part, it will require further engagement with Auckland Transport to reach agreement in principal on how relocation of its plant will be addressed during construction, and in particular providing for a pre built alternative route to bypass excavation work at Albert Street and Customs Street West, and agreement in principal as to how the costs for relocation work would be apportioned. It may be possible to address these matters via mechanisms outside of the designation process such as memoranda of understanding/side agreements.
91	91/8	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Auckland Transport's representatives have held some preliminary discussions with Chorus in regard to the possible costs of relocating Chorus plant. While not discussed in the Notices of Requirement or related Assessment of Environmental Effects, Auckland Transport's representatives have verbally indicated that any relocation of services will need to be contained within the designation footprints, and accordingly it has been proposed by Auckland Transport that gantries be used to support Chorus cables in their existing positions while the ground is excavated beneath them. Chorus considers that there is a very high risk for its cables being damaged by the use of gantries. This damage would be very likely to occur in Albert Street because of the age, number, size and location of the cables buried there. Faults to cables in this area would mean telephone and internet service cuts to businesses and residents in the area for a considerable length of time, particularly in upper Albert Street. Addressing Chorus's Concerns The Environmental Management Framework (EMF) proposed in the Notices of Requirement would include a Construction Management Plan (CEMP) including a Delivery Works Plan (DWP) for Utilities. The use of a specific DWP to deal with protecting and relocating utilities is supported. However, in other major projects where a similar strategy has been employed (e.g. Transmission Gully Expressway), detailed engagement had already been undertaken between Chorus and the project team, and there was broad understanding on how protection and relocation of network utilities would be undertaken before Notices of Requirement were submitted and notified. Therefore, in that example there was a high degree of confidence that any issues relating to protection or relocation of Chorus plant could be adequately addressed at the project implementation phase. In this instance, there is concern particularly with the preference for keeping relocated utilities within the designation footprint and the use of gantries (particularly in Albert Street and Customs Street West). Therefore, Chorus does not wish to defer all assessment and consideration of issues relating to protecting and relocation existing utilities to the project implementation stage. Accordingly, prior to Chorus being in a position to support the project at the land designation stage, or at least remove its opposition in part, it will require further engagement with Auckland Transport to reach agreement in principal on how relocation of its plant will be addressed during construction, and in particular providing for a pre built alternative route to bypass excavation work at Albert Street and Customs Street West, and agreement in principal as to how the costs for relocation work would be apportioned. It may be possible to address these matters via mechanisms outside of the designation process such as memoranda of understanding/side agreements.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
91	91/9	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	There is also the practical difficulty of how Chorus staff / contractors would access these joints whilst they are suspended above the cut and cover trench or other excavated areas. While Chorus has concerns about the use of gantries in areas of its network with a high concentration of large or fragile cables, there may be other portions of the CRL route where gantries could be successfully used, although safe access for Chorus staff to maintain, repair or upgrade these lines may still be an issue. Typically this would be where a single duct or pair of ducts containing near new cables were buried beneath the road. However, particularly for upper Albert Street and to a lesser extent Customs Street West, Chorus considers that the best and most appropriate solution is a pre-built alternate route along Mayoral Drive, Federal Street and Wyndham Street due to its comparative practicality and reduced business risk to both Chorus and its customers. These areas largely fall outside of the extent of the proposed designations and thus would require either an alteration to the designation boundaries to facilitate the necessary relocation works, or acquisition of any necessary resource consents to enable this work to proceed.
91	91/10	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	While Chorus has concerns about the use of gantries in areas of its network with a high concentration of large or fragile cables, there may be other portions of the CRL route where gantries could be successfully used, although safe access for Chorus staff to maintain, repair or upgrade these lines may still be an issue. Typically this would be where a single duct or pair of ducts containing near new cables were buried beneath the road. However, particularly for upper Albert Street and to a lesser extent Customs Street West, Chorus considers that the best and most appropriate solution is a pre-built alternate route along Mayoral Drive, Federal Street and Wyndham Street due to its comparative practicality and reduced business risk to both Chorus and its customers. These areas largely fall outside of the extent of the proposed designations and thus would require either an alteration to the designation boundaries to facilitate the necessary relocation works, or acquisition of any necessary resource consents to enable this work to proceed.
91	91/11	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	5.9 Transport - construction	The construction of the CRL will also present major challenges for operating the road network during construction. As construction of a large duct, cable and underground chamber system along these streets would in itself cause traffic disruption, there is merit in this work being undertaken ahead of construction commencing on the CRL to minimise traffic disruption. There may also be opportunities to undertake some of the required relocation works as other scheduled road upgrade work is undertaken between now and when the CRL is constructed, to avoid unnecessary additional excavation of streets after upgrade works have been undertaken.
91	91/12	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	1.17 Neutral, did not specify - NOR 2	Chorus's submission does not relate to Notices of Requirement 2 and 3, as these Notices affect sub strata areas least five metres below the existing ground level.
91	91/13	Chorus New Zealand	Attn: Mary Barton	1.18 Neutral, did not specify - NOR 3	Chorus's submission does not relate to Notices of Requirement 2 and 3, as these Notices affect sub strata areas least five metres below the existing ground level.
92	92/1	Pam Butler	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	1.1 Support - NOR All	KiwiRail's interest in teh NoRs derives from the fact that: (a) Part of the area proposed to be designated as part of the CRL project is owned by the Crown for railway purposes and administered by KiwiRail (i.e. KiwiRail's interests as "landowner" are affected). This land is shown on NOR 6, where the CRL meets the North Auckland Line (NAL).
92	92/2	Pam Butler	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	3. These benefits include (as stated in the NOR documents);1. Provide for more train movements on the Auckland rail network through unlocking the capacity constraint of Britomart (by developing Britomart into a through station); 2. Provide significant additional capacity to the passenger transport system, in order to meet sustainable mode share targets set by the NZTS and the Auckland RL TS 2010- 2040; 3. Assist in providing additional rail network capacity to support any future extensions of the rail network to the Auckland International Airport and the North Shore, longer term objectives of the Auckland Plan, the RL TS, and the Auckland Transport Plan; 4. Assist in building more resilient regional infrastructure, an objective of the Auckland Plan, the RL TS, the AEDS, the Auckland Sustainability Framework, and the Auckland Transport Plan.
92	92/3	Pam Butler	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	5.36 Existing designations	Kiwi Rail's interest in the NoRs derives from the fact that: (b) The NAL is presently subject to a designation for "railway purposes" (Le. KiwiRail's interests as requiring authority are affected). KiwiRail's approval as requiring authority is required before AT undertakes any works on land subject to its designation. However, KiwiRail is happy to record at this instance that it sees no reason why it could not give its approval in the future on resolution of the detailed engineering interface and property issues.
92	92/4	Pam Butler	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	4.1 Part 2 RMA	KiwiRail's interest in the NoRs derives from the fact that: (d) KiwiRail considers the NOR: (i) To support the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and thus consistent with the purposes and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 ;
92	92/5	Pam Butler	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	4.2 RMA policy framework	KiwiRail's interest in the NoRs derives from the fact that: (d) KiwiRail considers the NOR: (ii) To be consistent with Part 2 of the Act and the relevant planning instruments and with the strategic transport planning documents prepared by the Auckland Council; (iii) Will ensure the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing .

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
93	93/1	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	1.8 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR All	2. The company owns a large historic building(a)1 located at 246 - 254 Karangahape Road, Auckland (the historic building). The building has 3-4 commercial tenancies in the basement and ground floor levels. Above the ground floor there are 4 levels comprising the BK Hostel (that contains approximately 50 rooms). 3. Mrs Cecilia Lo, retired, is one of the directors of the company. The property has been owned by the company for approximately 20 years (and was previously managed by her late husband). Mrs Lo has a significant number of dealings with the tenants and over the passage of time many of the tenants have become her friends. Understandably she is very concerned about the construction of the rail - but stresses that she supports the City Rail Link and believes it would be a positive development for K-Road residents and shoppers generally.
93	93/2	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	4. Given the age of the historic building, it is understood that very little is known about the depth or strength of the foundations (particularly given the underlying soil at K Road). 5. The company is concerned that given the size of the historic building and number of occupants that any movement to the historic building could have a significant impact on it. It seems sensible, given the heritage status of the building, that the company is properly advised of the risks of damage to the historic building, and if damage is possible, that appropriate protocols are put in place to avoid damage (such as testing, monitoring and possibly strengthening - probably before, during and post construction of the rail).
93	93/3	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.8 Built heritage	4. Given the age of the historic building, it is understood that very little is known about the depth or strength of the foundations (particularly given the underlying soil at K Road). 5. The company is concerned that given the size of the historic building and number of occupants that any movement to the historic building could have a significant impact on it. It seems sensible, given the heritage status of the building, that the company is properly advised of the risks of damage to the historic building, and if damage is possible, that appropriate protocols are put in place to avoid damage (such as testing, monitoring and possibly strengthening - probably before, during and post construction of the rail). 8. It is noted that the recent plans show that monitoring is proposed to many neighbouring buildings - but not to the historic building. Presumably Auckland Transport has considered the historic building to have lower risk than those neighbouring buildings. Although I have no engineering qualifications it is noted: a. It is a historic building. b. There are a large number of occupants. Many of the occupants - being students and young in age. c. It is a lot larger than many of the other buildings that are being measured .
93	93/4	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	5. The company is concerned that given the size of the historic building and number of occupants that any movement to the historic building could have a significant impact on it. It seems sensible, given the heritage status of the building, that the company is properly advised of the risks of damage to the historic building, and if damage is possible, that appropriate protocols are put in place to avoid damage (such as testing, monitoring and possibly strengthening - probably before, during and post construction of the rail). 8. It is noted that the recent plans show that monitoring is proposed to many neighbouring buildings - but not to the historic building. Presumably Auckland Transport has considered the historic building to have lower risk than those neighbouring buildings. Although I have no engineering qualifications it is noted: a. It is a historic building. b. There are a large number of occupants. Many of the occupants - being students and young in age. c. It is a lot larger than many of the other buildings that are being measured . 9. Accordingly, the company seeks an following condition in relation to the property: a. Auckland Council agree to reimburse the company for all reasonable fees and disbursements relating to the engagement and commissioning of an independent structural engineer and an independent geotechnical engineer to advise the company in relation to the effects of the City Rail project on the property. That engagement shall cover all of the matters set out in paragraph 7 above.
93	93/5	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	6. Mrs Lo and her advisors have had a number of positive meetings with representatives from Auckland Council on a number of occasions. Nevertheless, the directors of the company do not have the technical expertise to come to view as to the technical engineering information relating to the property. It is submitted it is reasonable for them to have independent advice from engineers that are not connected to the City Rail project.
93	93/6	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	7. Given the testing / monitoring regime that was put in place over many of the buildings that are subject to the Waterview tunnels2 it seems sensible that Auckland Transport reimburse the company for it to engage both an independent structural engineer and an independent geotechnical engineer (as they advise on slightly different aspects of engineering) to advise the company in relation to: a. Any likely structural damage to the historic building from the construction of the City Rail; b. The amount of any structural damage to the historic building and the impact of any such structural damage on the building; c. The parameters of a sensible monitoring regime of the historic building (including pre-construction monitoring, monitoring during construction and possibly separately during active construction), and during post-construction); d. Any strengthening that is required to the historic building; e. The types and kinds of monitors that be put in place and advise of appropriate locations; f. An appropriate code of best-practice/practice note for the monitoring to take place. 9. Accordingly, the company seeks an following condition in relation to the property: a. Auckland Council agree to reimburse the company for all reasonable fees and disbursements relating to the engagement and commissioning of an independent structural engineer and an independent geotechnical engineer to advise the company in relation to the effects of the City Rail project on the property. That engagement shall cover all of the matters set out in paragraph 7 above.
93	93/7	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.1 Noise - construction	10. The company also has a number of concerns relating to the following in relation to the building: Noise - rail stations are to be built on either side of the heritage building.
93	93/8	L and C Holdings Ltd	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.2 Noise - operational	10. The company also has a number of concerns relating to the following in relation to the building: Noise - rail stations are to be built on either side of the heritage building.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
93	93/9	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.17 Air quality	10. The company also has a number of concerns relating to the following in relation to the building: Ventilation issues. Effects of dust during construction.
93	93/10	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.20 Economic	10. The company also has a number of concerns relating to the following in relation to the building: Impact of construction on tenants and the four level hostel above (containing approximately 50 rooms). Significant business interruption and loss of rent.
93	93/11	L and C Holdings Limited	Attn: Adina Thorn	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	11 . Practically the company realises that some disruption is inevitable due to the construction of City Rail Link. It is noted that Mrs La has been advised by Auckland Council that the K-Road end of Mercury Lane will not be closed (to any extent) during construction. Obviously any closing of Mercury Lane would prevent entry/exit to the historic building. Accordingly, the company requests a condition to that effect.
95	95/1	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	1.9 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 1	2 This is a submission on the Auckland Transport's notice of requirement (NOR) for the following designation: 2.1 Designation 68 (NOR 1) for a surface deSignation for works being the City Rail Link (CRL) to be shown as "Rail Purposes for the City Rail Link". 2.2 The work would be undertaken along Albert Street and includes the construction of two rail tunnels and ancillary works. Specific parts of the NOR that this submission relates to: 3 This submission relates to all aspects of NOR 1. Submitter position: 4 The submitter generally supports the NOR, subject to the inclusion of designation conditions that require Auckland Transport to ensure that any construction effects are adequately aVOided, remedied or mitigated or that the outcomes sought are guaranteed by other means. 5 The NOR identifies a number of adverse effects as a result of the works. However, aside from a suggestion that the works be undertaken in general accordance with the information provided to support the NOR, there is minimal certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply. Instead, Auckland Transport proposes that the conditions necessary to manage the adverse environmental effects arising during the construction of the CRL should be considered under an Environmental Management Framework. 6 As a resident and property owner on Albert Street the submitter would like more certainty and input regarding the nature of the conditions likely to apply. This certainty is especially important given the duration of the construction effects and the significant impact they would have on the submitter as a resident.
95	95/2	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	5 The NOR identifies a number of adverse effects as a result of the works. However, aside from a suggestion that the works be undertaken in general accordance with the information provided to support the NOR, there is minimal certainty as to the nature of the conditions likely to apply. Instead, Auckland Transport proposes that the conditions necessary to manage the adverse environmental effects arising during the construction of the CRL should be considered under an Environmental Management Framework. 6 As a resident and property owner on Albert Street the submitter would like more certainty and input regarding the nature of the conditions likely to apply. This certainty is especially important given the duration of the construction effects and the significant impact they would have on the submitter as a resident.
95	95/3	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Decision sought: 36 The submitter seeks the following recommendation from Auckland Council: 36.1 The withdrawal of NOR 1 unless changes to the CRL designation are made and designation conditions included that address the concerns set out above. 37 These designation conditions (examples of which are specified in more detail above) include, but are not limited to: (a) Acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits, including times and days when noisy and / or vibration-inducing construction activities would occur; (b) Measures to mitigate any adverse effects arising from construction noise and vibration; (c) Measures to avoid, remedy and mitigate any structural or superficial damage to the building; (d) Maintenance of pedestrian and vehicular access to Quay West at all times; (e) Maintenance of east-west pedestrian movements across Swanson Street; (f) Measures to reduce traffic, noise, vibration and dust effects of the construction yard; (g) Conditions requiring that hoardings are visually appealing and are subject to review by the Auckland Urban Design Panel and construction areas are appropriately screened by plantings; (h) Measures to address any adverse air quality effects; (i) Measures to address economic impacts; (j) The implementation of a communications and complaints management strategy; and (k) Advance notice of any road closures or diversions, including the expected duration of the closure / diversion.
95	95/4	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.1 Noise - construction	Noise and vibration effects: 9 The submitter has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities. Noise and vibration arising from construction of the CRL have the potential to create significant disturbance for the residents of the Quay West Suites (Quay West), the submitter included. 10 The recommended project criteria in the Noise and Vibration Assessment attached to the CRL Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) identifies noise effects (however, Auckland Transport does not appear to have undertaken any construction noise modeling for construction activities along Albert Street), and suggests daytime noise limits which would apply from 7am until 11pm seven days a week. 11 The recommended project criteria at 6.2.1 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment state potential noise limits as follows: 11.1 Daytime (7am - 11pm) limits of db(LAeq) 75; and 11.2 Night time (11pm till 7am) limits of db(LAeq) 60. 12 However, the conditions in the Draft Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan attached to the Noise and Vibration Assessment note that above ground construction would generally be limited to 6.30am to 8pm Monday to Friday, and 7.30-6pm Saturdays. 13 Construction activity is predicted to exceed both daytime and night-time criteria, with activities such as secant piling resulting in noise levels of 89db at a 10 metre set-back. This translates to an internal noise level of approximately 65 dB LAeq â€¢ The Noise and Vibration Assessment recognises that these noise levels would create difficulty when holding a normal conversation. At night-time, any exceedance of the project criteria (set at 60dB, which translates into an internal noise level of approximately 35dB) would result in noise levels recognised as creating annoyance and sleep disturbance. 14 The submitter disagrees with the recommendation that daytime noise limits should apply until 11pm and considers that 11pm is unacceptably late to be conducting activities resulting in noise levels of 75db (or even greater where the project criteria would be exceeded) outside residential apartments. 15 The Noise and Vibration report recognises that the adverse

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					effects of construction vibration on building occupants could also be significant, especially for buildings identified as notable receivers, which includes Quay West. The results from vibration monitoring undertaken at Quay West show that current vibration levels are below the threshold of human perception for residents . An increase in vibration would therefore have a significant notable effect in the submitter's view. 16 It is important that noise and vibration effects are adequately managed and that appropriate project criteria are developed. Therefore, the submitter seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits, including times and days when noisy and/or vibration-inducing construction activities would occur. These conditions should reflect the need to ensure that residents enjoy reasonable freedom from noisy or intrusive construction activity especially at nighttime and on weekends. 17 These conditions could include, for example : 17.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of 10am and 4pm on weekends. 17.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm on weekdays. 18 The submitter also seeks designation conditions to mitigate adverse effects arising from construction noise and vibration. These conditions could include, for example: 18.1 Acoustic insulation for the building/apartment. 18.2 Air conditioning and a contribution to the cost of electricity. 18.3 An option for relocation to be available at any time when noise and/or vibration limits would be exceeded...
95	95/5	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.3 Vibration - construction	Noise and vibration effects: 9 The submitter has significant concerns regarding the effect of vibration and noisy construction activities. Noise and vibration arising from construction of the CRL have the potential to create significant disturbance for the residents of the Quay West Suites (Quay West), the submitter included. 10 The recommended project criteria in the Noise and Vibration Assessment attached to the CRL Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) identifies noise effects (however, Auckland Transport does not appear to have undertaken any construction noise modeling for construction activities along Albert Street), and suggests daytime noise limits which would apply from 7am until 11pm seven days a week. 11 The recommended project criteria at 6.2.1 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment state potential noise limits as follows: 11.1 Daytime (7am - 11pm) limits of db(LAeq) 75; and 11.2 Night time (11pm till 7am) limits of db(LAeq) 60. 12 However, the conditions in the Draft Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan attached to the Noise and Vibration Assessment note that above ground construction would generally be limited to 6.30am to 8pm Monday to Friday, and 7.30-6pm Saturdays. 13 Construction activity is predicted to exceed both daytime and night-time criteria, with activities such as secant piling resulting in noise levels of 89db at a 10 metre set-back. This translates to an internal noise level of approximately 65 dB LAeq . The Noise and Vibration Assessment recognises that these noise levels would create difficulty when holding a normal conversation. At night-time, any exceedance of the project criteria (set at 60dB, which translates into an internal noise level of approximately 35dB) would result in noise levels recognised as creating annoyance and sleep disturbance. 14 The submitter disagrees with the recommendation that daytime noise limits should apply until 11pm and considers that 11pm is unacceptably late to be conducting activities resulting in noise levels of 75db (or even greater where the project criteria would be exceeded) outside residential apartments. 15 The Noise and Vibration report recognises that the adverse effects of construction vibration on building occupants could also be significant, especially for buildings identified as notable receivers, which includes Quay West. The results from vibration monitoring undertaken at Quay West show that current vibration levels are below the threshold of human perception for residents . An increase in vibration would therefore have a significant notable effect in the submitter's view. 16 It is important that noise and vibration effects are adequately managed and that appropriate project criteria are developed. Therefore, the submitter seeks designation conditions specifying acceptable noise and vibration limits, hours of operation, and the duration of works at different noise and vibration limits, including times and days when noisy and/or vibration-inducing construction activities would occur. These conditions should reflect the need to ensure that residents enjoy reasonable freedom from noisy or intrusive construction activity especially at nighttime and on weekends. 17 These conditions could include, for example : 17.1 A requirement that secant piling would only be undertaken between the hours of 10am and 4pm on weekends. 17.2 A requirement that daytime noise and vibration limits apply between 7.30am and 6pm on weekdays. 18 The submitter also seeks designation conditions to mitigate adverse effects arising from construction noise and vibration. These conditions could include, for example: 18.1 Acoustic insulation for the building/apartment. 18.2 Air conditioning and a contribution to the cost of electricity. 18.3 An option for relocation to be available at any time when noise and/or vibration limits would be exceeded. Alternative accommodation would need to be of a
95	95/6	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	Structural vibration: 19 Construction vibration may cause structural damage to the Quay West building. Quay West is located within the construction vibration risk contour in the Noise and Vibration Assessment as a building that may be at risk of vibration-induced damage from construction machinery. 20 Accordingly, the submitter seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy and mitigate any structural or superficial damage to the building. These conditions could include a pre-construction assessment, stabilisation works, regular monitoring, and expedient remediation of any damage (at times convenient to the submitter).
95	95/7	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.9 Transport - construction	21 The NOR identifies that the construction of the CRL would result in significant effects on the road transport network. These effects include diversions, extended travel times, delays, segregation and increased congestion on public bus operators and users, emergency vehicles, private vehicles, private coach operators and users, cyclists and pedestrians. 22 The submitter seeks designation conditions requiring measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
95	95/8	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	23 In particular, the submitter seeks designation conditions requiring both pedestrian and vehicular access to Quay West to be maintained at all times. The main pedestrian access to Quay West is off Albert Street, and access to the basement carpark is obtained via Mills Lane. The Assessment of Environment Effects states that access to Quay West, including the basement carpark, could be maintained in a left in, left out arrangement. The submitter requests that this assurance is included as a condition on the designation. 24 The submitter works on the west side of Albert Street in the ANZ Centre at 23 Albert Street so east-west pedestrian movement across Albert Street is critical. Consequently, the submitter also requests designation conditions that require east-west pedestrian movements across Swanson Street to be maintained during daytime hours. These conditions should require particular attention to be given to the amenity of any access solution.
95	95/9	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.34 Construction methodology	construction yard: 25 A temporary construction yard is proposed at the site of the former QEII square and the Downtown Shopping Centre. 26 The Concept Design Report states that this area would contain site offices; secure materials storage, and parking for construction vehicles and machinery. A construction yard at this site would have significant impacts on Auckland's waterfront and the amenity of inner city Auckland which the submitter currently enjoys. 27 Auckland Transport does not appear to have undertaken any detailed consideration of alternative construction yard sites. Accordingly, the submitter requests that Auckland Transport give adequate consideration to alternative sites. In the event that Auckland Transport chooses to retain the site, the submitter seeks designation conditions to reduce the traffic, noise, vibration and dust effects of the construction yard. These conditions may include requiring access to the construction yard to be obtained from lower Albert Street rather than from Customs Street West and that site offices and less noisy activities be located along the Customs Street West side of the yard.
95	95/10	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.17 Air quality	Visual amenity - hoardings: 28 Hoardings would be erected along Albert Street, leaving a footpath width of 1.5 metres. These hoardings would have a significant amenity impact on pedestrians and vehicles travelling along Albert Street. The submitter walks along this route to work and looks down onto it from the submitter's apartment. 29 Accordingly, the submitter seeks designation conditions requiring that the hoardings be reviewed by the Auckland Urban Design Panel to ensure that they are visually appealing. The submitter seeks in particular a designation condition requiring that the design of hoardings adjacent to the boundary of the submitter's apartment is subject to the submitter's approval prior to erection . 30 In addition, appropriate screening by plantings would be necessary to mitigate the impact of the hoardings and construction works on the submitter's apartment, which overlooks Albert Street.
95	95/11	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	5.20 Economic	Economic impacts: 33 The submitter is also concerned about the effect that the construction of the CRL would have on the ability to rent out the submitter's apartment. Accordingly, the submitter seeks designation conditions to mitigate any economic loss as a result of loss in rental income.
95	95/12	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	2.3 Consultation	Communication and consultation: 34 The AEE states that a Communications Plan will be developed to support the Environmental Management Plan. In light of the duration of the construction and the significance of the potential adverse construction effects a robust communications and consultation strategy would be essential. It is important that there are designation conditions requiring Auckland Transport to provide relevant information to affected persons and to handle complaints quickly and efficiently. Accordingly, the submitter seeks designation conditions requiring the implementation of a complaints management strategy, providing in particular for a 24 hour contact number, a guaranteed response timeframe and a detailed dispute resolution mechanism. 35 The submitter also seeks designation conditions requiring at least 15 working days notice of any construction activities, road closures or diversions including the expected duration of the works which would affect me as a resident of Quay West.
95	95/13	Penelope Sheerin	attn: Paula Brosnahan	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	construction yard: 25 A temporary construction yard is proposed at the site of the former QEII square and the Downtown Shopping Centre. 26 The Concept Design Report states that this area would contain site offices; secure materials storage, and parking for construction vehicles and machinery. A construction yard at this site would have significant impacts on Auckland's waterfront and the amenity of inner city Auckland which the submitter currently enjoys. 27 Auckland Transport does not appear to have undertaken any detailed consideration of alternative construction yard sites. Accordingly, the submitter requests that Auckland Transport give adequate consideration to alternative sites. In the event that Auckland Transport chooses to retain the site, the submitter seeks designation conditions to reduce the traffic, noise, vibration and dust effects of the construction yard. These conditions may include requiring access to the construction yard to be obtained from lower Albert Street rather than from Customs Street West and that site offices and less noisy activities be located along the Customs Street West side of the yard.
97	97/1	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	1.15 Neutral, did not specify - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
97	97/2	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.8 Built heritage	The Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland is the proprietor of several sites with the potential to be affected by the construction of the City Rail Link. The aerial photographs appended to this submission show the location of these sites, along with the approximate alignment of the City Rail Link designations. These sites are referred to as "the St Patrick's site" and "the St Benedict's site" in this submission and include the following key components: The St Patrick's Site: 1 St Patrick's Square, occupied by the Cathedral of St Patrick and St Joseph 2 51 Patrick's Square (a.k.a. 30 Hobson Street), occupied by Liston House 43 Wyndham Street, occupied by the presbytery for the cathedral The St Benedict's Site: 1, 1A & 1B St Benedict's Street, occupied by St Benedict's Church and presbytery 2 St Benedict's Street, used for a mix of Catholic, commercial and parking activities 3 St Benedict's Street, occupied by a house The Bishop holds most of the above land in trust for the religious and charitable purposes of the Parish of St Patrick and St Joseph and the Parish of St Benedict respectively. The site at 2 St Benedict's Street is held for wider Diocese purposes while the Cathedral of St Patrick and St Joseph is also the Mother Church of the Auckland Diocese. Both sites are occupied by historic buildings that are of great significance to the settlement and history of Auckland and the history and on-going activities of the Catholic Church. In addition, most of the land at 2 St Benedict's Street is vacant. This land represents a prime development opportunity on the edge of the city centre.
97	97/3	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.23 Property rights	The Bishop is concerned that the construction of the City Rail Link will have adverse effects on: The use of the above land and buildings. The further development of parts of the above sites, particularly the land at 2 and 3 St Benedict's Street where redevelopment is a distinct possibility. In particular, the Bishop is concerned with the following aspects of this proposal: The loss of development potential as a result of restrictions on the depth of excavation that may be approved by Auckland Transport for sites under which the City Rail Link passes (particularly on the land at 2 and 3 St Benedict's Street).
97	97/4	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The Bishop is concerned that the construction of the City Rail Link will have adverse effects on: The structural integrity and heritage fabric of the buildings on these sites. In particular, the Bishop is concerned about the following aspects of this proposal: The potential for structural and / superficial damage to the buildings on this land as a result of vibration and ground deformation generated by the construction of the City Rail Link.
97	97/5	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	In particular, the Bishop is concerned about the following aspects of this proposal: The potential for the Albert Street cut and cover work to make it difficult for parishioners to access the cathedral.
97	97/6	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.1 Noise - construction	In particular, the Bishop is concerned about the following aspects of this proposal: The effect of noise and vibration on the use of the cathedral, church and presbyteries during the construction process. In addition, the cathedral, the church and the presbyteries associated with these facilities are places of quiet contemplation and prayer. As a consequence, the effects of noise and vibration may be more keenly felt by occupants of these buildings than the occupants of many other buildings in the area. 5. Sufficiently tight conditions on the designation to: a) Minimise the potential for disruption (particularly as a result of noise, vibration and road closures) to use of the Cathedral of St Patrick and St Joseph and St Benedict's church during construction work. This should include requirements to: 1. Minimise noise and vibration, particularly on Sunday mornings when the main mass of the week is held, and it is reasonable to expect a degree of peace and quiet ~ even in the city. 2. Stage the cut and cover excavation along Albert Street so that no more than one major intersection with Albert Street is closed at a time.
97	97/7	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.3 Vibration - construction	In particular, the Bishop is concerned about the following aspects of this proposal: The effect of noise and vibration on the use of the cathedral, church and presbyteries during the construction process. In addition, the cathedral, the church and the presbyteries associated with these facilities are places of quiet contemplation and prayer. As a consequence, the effects of noise and vibration may be more keenly felt by occupants of these buildings than the occupants of many other buildings in the area. 5. Sufficiently tight conditions on the designation to: a) Minimise the potential for disruption (particularly as a result of noise, vibration and road closures) to use of the Cathedral of St Patrick and St Joseph and St Benedict's church during construction work. This should include requirements to: 1. Minimise noise and vibration, particularly on Sunday mornings when the main mass of the week is held, and it is reasonable to expect a degree of peace and quiet ~ even in the city. 2. Stage the cut and cover excavation along Albert Street so that no more than one major intersection with Albert Street is closed at a time.
97	97/8	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.2 Noise - operational	In particular, the Bishop is concerned about the following aspects of this proposal: The potential for noise and vibration to impact on the use of the cathedral, church and presbyteries following construction, as a result of the operation of the rail network. In addition, the cathedral, the church and the presbyteries associated with these facilities are places of quiet contemplation and prayer. As a consequence, the effects of noise and vibration may be more keenly felt by occupants of these buildings than the occupants of many other buildings in the area.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
97	97/9	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.4 Vibration - operational	In particular, the Bishop is concerned about the following aspects of this proposal: The potential for noise and vibration to impact on the use of the cathedral, church and presbyteries following construction, as a result of the operation of the rail network. In addition, the cathedral, the church and the presbyteries associated with these facilities are places of quiet contemplation and prayer. As a consequence, the effects of noise and vibration may be more keenly felt by occupants of these buildings than the occupants of many other buildings in the area.
97	97/10	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	4.1 Part 2 RMA	The protection of historic heritage from inappropriate development is a matter of national importance under Section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
97	97/11	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	The Bishop acknowledges that the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) submitted as part of the application recognises the potential for adverse effects along the lines identified above and discusses a range of measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate some of those effects (particularly the construction related effects). However, the Bishop is concerned that the AEE does not offer any draft conditions for the Notices of Requirement but instead indicates that these will be offered some time later. Conditions are a key means of establishing the scope of a designation and ensuring that adequate measures will be put in place to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of giving effect to the designation and should be available for potential submitters to submit on. The Bishop acknowledges the potential benefits of the City Rail Link and the inevitability of some temporary adverse effects during the construction of such a major project but seeks to ensure that appropriate measures are put in place to protect the land and buildings (and the use of that land and those buildings) in vicinity of the project. The Bishop would appreciate the opportunity to meet with the technical experts engaged by Auckland Transport to better understand the potential for adverse effects on the land and buildings owned by the Bishop and the conditions that could be put in place to protect those assets and minimise disruption to the on-going use of those buildings. The Bishop acknowledges that the loss of development potential for some of the land within the St Benedict's site will need to be addressed through the Public Works Act process.
97	97/12	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	2.3 Consultation	4. That Auckland Transport be required to implement a communications plan to keep potentially affected parties informed of progress on the project and permit concerns to be raised and promptly addressed by Auckland Transport.
97	97/13	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	The Bishop acknowledges that the loss of development potential for some of the land within the St Benedict's site will need to be addressed through the Public Works Act process. 3. That Auckland Transport be required to pay for an independent panel of experts to provide advice to landowners affected by the project, to assist those landowners during the consultation process for the management plans.
97	97/14	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	4.2 RMA policy framework	1. That the Notices of Requirement be re-notified once draft conditions of consent are submitted by Auckland Transport. Alternatively, when draft conditions of consent are submitted by Auckland Transport, that these be made available to submitters well before the hearing so there is adequate time to discuss those conditions with Auckland transport's technical experts and / or engage independent technical experts to provide feedback on the conditions in advance of the hearing.
97	97/15	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	The Bishop acknowledges that the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) submitted as part of the application recognises the potential for adverse effects along the lines identified above and discusses a range of measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate some of those effects (particularly the construction related effects). However, the Bishop is concerned that the AEE does not offer any draft conditions for the Notices of Requirement but instead indicates that these will be offered some time later. Conditions are a key means of establishing the scope of a designation and ensuring that adequate measures will be put in place to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of giving effect to the designation and should be available for potential submitters to submit on. 1. That the Notices of Requirement be re-notified once draft conditions of consent are submitted by Auckland Transport. Alternatively, when draft conditions of consent are submitted by Auckland Transport, that these be made available to submitters well before the hearing so there is adequate time to discuss those conditions with Auckland transport's technical experts and / or engage independent technical experts to provide feedback on the conditions in advance of the hearing. 5. Sufficiently tight conditions on the designation to: a) Minimise the potential for disruption (particularly as a result of noise, vibration and road closures) to use of the Cathedral of St Patrick and St Joseph and St Benedict's church during construction work. This should include requirements to: 1. Minimise noise and vibration, particularly on Sunday mornings when the main mass of the week is held, and it is reasonable to expect a degree of peace and quiet ~ even in the city. ii. Stage the

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					cut and cover excavation along Albert Street so that no more than one major intersection with Albert Street is closed at a time. b) Minimise the risk of structural and / or superficial damage to buildings in the vicinity of the City Rail Link. This should include a requirement to engage the necessary technical experts to: i. Undertake pre-construction condition surveys of buildings which may be affected by construction activities including vibration (including the buildings on the Bishop's land); ii. Develop site-specific mitigation measures in consultation with the owners and occupiers of potentially affected buildings (including the buildings on the Bishop's land); and iii. Monitor buildings (including precise survey settlement monitoring during and following construction) with the potential to be affected by construction activities (including the buildings on the Bishop's land). c) Require Auckland Transport to amend construction activities and implement additional measures to safeguard buildings during construction if evidence of damage to buildings (especially heritage buildings) becomes apparent. d) Require Auckland Transport to rectify damage to buildings within an appropriate timeframe following construction of the City Rail Link. 6. Such other relief as meets the concerns expressed in this submission.
97	97/16	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.9 Transport - construction	5. Sufficiently tight conditions on the designation to: a) Minimise the potential for disruption (particularly as a result of noise, vibration and road closures) to use of the Cathedral of St Patrick and St Joseph and St Benedict's church during construction work. This should include requirements to: 1. Minimise noise and vibration, particularly on Sunday mornings when the main mass of the week is held, and it is reasonable to expect a degree of peace and quiet ~ even in the city. ii. Stage the cut and cover excavation along Albert Street so that no more than one major intersection with Albert Street is closed at a time.
97	97/17	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.34 Construction methodology	b) Minimise the risk of structural and / or superficial damage to buildings in the vicinity of the City Rail Link. This should include a requirement to engage the necessary technical experts to: i. Undertake pre-construction condition surveys of buildings which may be affected by construction activities including vibration (including the buildings on the Bishop's land); ii. Develop site-specific mitigation measures in consultation with the owners and occupiers of potentially affected buildings (including the buildings on the Bishop's land); and iii. Monitor buildings (including precise survey settlement monitoring during and following construction) with the potential to be affected by construction activities (including the buildings on the Bishop's land). c) Require Auckland Transport to amend construction activities and implement additional measures to safeguard buildings during construction if evidence of damage to buildings (especially heritage buildings) becomes apparent. d) Require Auckland Transport to rectify damage to buildings within an appropriate timeframe following construction of the City Rail Link.
97	97/18	The Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland of the Diocese of Auckland	attn Iain McManus	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	d) Require Auckland Transport to rectify damage to buildings within an appropriate timeframe following construction of the City Rail Link.
98	98/1	attn: Yvonne Legarth	Department of Corrections	1.36 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 6) subject to conditions / amendments	The submitter seeks the following decision from the Auckland Council: 23.0 Recommended that the Notice of Requirement 6 by Auckland Transport for the City Rail Link (proposed plan modification 349 to the Auckland Council Plan, Isthmus Section) be declined. 24.0 Or in the alternative, recommend that conditions are imposed on Notice of Requirement 6 by Auckland Transport for the City Rail Link (proposed plan modification 349 to the Auckland Council Plan, Isthmus Section) to address the matters raised in this submission; specifically the adverse effects identified in paragraph 21.0 and 22.0. 25.0 Consequential amendments to give effect to the above.
98	98/2	attn: Yvonne Legarth	Department of Corrections	5.36 Existing designations	4.0 The entire MECF site, and the historic Mt Eden Prison, is designated as a "Prison" in the Auckland Council Plan - Isthmus Section (designation D08-25). 5.0 Notice of Requirement 6 for the CRL overlaps the existing prison designation D08-25. The Department of Corrections notes that under section 177 of the Resource Management Act 1991, the existing designation for Prison purposes has priority and the written consent of the Minister of Corrections is required before Auckland Transport can give effect to its CRL designation.
98	98/3	attn: Yvonne Legarth	Department of Corrections	5.22 Legal	5.0 Notice of Requirement 6 for the CRL overlaps the existing prison designation D08-25. The Department of Corrections notes that under section 177 of the Resource Management Act 1991, the existing designation for Prison purposes has priority and the written consent of the Minister of Corrections is required before Auckland Transport can give effect to its CRL designation.
98	98/4	attn: Yvonne Legarth	Department of Corrections	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	8.0 The MECF site is subject to the provisions of the Corrections Act 2004 and gazetted for prison purposes. This has implications for access to the site and security matters. Operational Considerations 9.0 The MECF site and the historic Mt Eden Prison is entirely dependent on Lauder Road for access, as its only road frontage. Lauder Road is not a public road, but is part of the Corrections site. The site is otherwise bounded by the rail line on its northern boundary, the motorway on its eastern boundary and by privately owned land and the Auckland Grammar school on its southern boundary. 10.0 From an operational perspective, the MECF has a maximum capacity of 966 prisoners based on current build. It employs approximately 300 staff, with typically 200 staff on site at anyone time. Visitors to the facility typically number 200 a day. 11.0 There are approximately 10,000 prisoner movements to and from the prison annually. This equates to approximately between 100-150 prisoner movements daily. 12.0 Prisoners are transported in either prison vans or buses. Peak prisoner transport time is between 6am and 8pm to service the Courts, although movements may occur at any time. Access is via Lauder Road, and then into the secure perimeter through the sallyport. Police vehicle also access the site. 13.0 It is critical that access to the MECF is maintained 24 hours, 7 days a week. Safe, two-way vehicle movement, with good driver

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					sight lines, is required to ensure easy vehicle movements and to avoid delays. Overhead clearance and manoeuvring widths are required for the large vehicles which access the site. There is insufficient detail in the NOR to be satisfied that the effects on the existing designation and access to the prison have been adequately addressed. 14.0 Underground services to the site are also from Lauder Road. With the MECF dependent on electronic operating systems, and water and wastewater connections. Any break to such services (including accidental) during construction could have a significant impact. 15.0 There is also electronic surveillance equipment at the Lauder Road access (including light and camera poles) which are critical to the operation of the MECF. 21.0 The works could potentially have the following adverse effects on the operation of the MECF, both during construction and ongoing , depending on the design of the new grade-separated crossing and access to the MECF site. These include: (a) Restricting access to the site for prisoner transfers, staff, police and visitors. (b) Causing access delays for vehicles, restricting hours of entry and limiting the type and size of vehicles accessing the site. (c) Restricting access by emergency vehicles, including fire trucks, police and ambulance. (d) Causing safety issues by limiting driver sight lines entering and exiting the site. (e) Diverting public on to land that is subject to the Corrections Act 2004. (f) Impacting on services to the site (including accidentally through construction). (g) Giving rise to dust, which may impact on security equipment and the glass facades of the MECF buildings. (h) Impacting on the safety of staff and Visitors, by allowing the public into the site and impacting on operational security requirements.
98	98/5	attn: Yvonne Legarth	Department of Corrections	5.34 Construction methodology	14.0 Underground services to the site are also from Lauder Road. With the MECF dependent on electronic operating systems, and water and wastewater connections. Any break to such services (including accidental) during construction could have a significant impact. 15.0 There is also electronic surveillance equipment at the Lauder Road access (including light and camera poles) which are critical to the operation of the MECF.
98	98/6	attn: Yvonne Legarth	Department of Corrections	5.35 Health / safety	14.0 Underground services to the site are also from Lauder Road. With the MECF dependent on electronic operating systems, and water and wastewater connections. Any break to such services (including accidental) during construction could have a significant impact. 15.0 There is also electronic surveillance equipment at the Lauder Road access (including light and camera poles) which are critical to the operation of the MECF. 21.0 The works could potentially have the following adverse effects on the operation of the MECF, both during construction and ongoing , depending on the design of the new grade-separated crossing and access to the MECF site. These include: (a) Restricting access to the site for prisoner transfers, staff, police and visitors. (b) Causing access delays for vehicles, restricting hours of entry and limiting the type and size of vehicles accessing the site. (c) Restricting access by emergency vehicles, including fire trucks, police and ambulance. (d) Causing safety issues by limiting driver sight lines entering and exiting the site. (e) Diverting public on to land that is subject to the Corrections Act 2004. (f) Impacting on services to the site (including accidentally through construction). (g) Giving rise to dust, which may impact on security equipment and the glass facades of the MECF buildings. (h) Impacting on the safety of staff and Visitors, by allowing the public into the site and impacting on operational security requirements.
98	98/7	attn: Yvonne Legarth	Department of Corrections	5.23 Property rights	17.0 Although at the present time, no future development is programmed, the 2007 outline plan of works does provide for additional prisoner accommodation. This in turn would mean more prisoner movements, staff and visits. The additional staff and visits would require parking in addition to that provided in the multi-level parking building. Additional development could also require additional services (substations etc) which would logically be placed at the Lauder Road frontage of the site. The area of the site designated by the CRL would be a logical place for extra capacity for parking, or indeed for a future building. Development opportunities are otherwise very limited on the site, with very little space between existing buildings. 22.0 The proposed designation and associated works may have the following other adverse effects on the site. These include: (a) Restricting future development opportunities, particularly where a 20-year time period is sought for the designation. (b) Limiting future re-use opportunities for the historic Mt Eden prison building, by placing restrictions on access and parking.
98	98/8	attn: Yvonne Legarth	Department of Corrections	5.37 Network utilities	14.0 Underground services to the site are also from Lauder Road. With the MECF dependent on electronic operating systems, and water and wastewater connections. Any break to such services (including accidental) during construction could have a significant impact. 15.0 There is also electronic surveillance equipment at the Lauder Road access (including light and camera poles) which are critical to the operation of the MECF.
99	99/1	Trust Management	attn: Amber Tsang:Senior Planner	1.22 Neutral, did not care, but requested conditions / amendments - NOR All	2.3 The notice of requirement is neither supported nor opposed. The submitter wishes to remain neutral.
99	99/2	Trust Management	attn: Amber Tsang:Senior Planner	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	2.2 There is the potential for significant adverse effects resulting from the scale of construction required by the proposal. The submitter seeks clarification on the mitigation proposed and that the conditions imposed will adequately address these potential effects, should the notice of requirement be confirmed .
99	99/3	Trust Management	attn: Amber Tsang:Senior Planner	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	2.2 There is the potential for significant adverse effects resulting from the scale of construction required by the proposal. The submitter seeks clarification on the mitigation proposed and that the conditions imposed will adequately address these potential effects, should the notice of requirement be confirmed .

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
101	101/1	Toko Pihema		1.1 Support - NOR All	I am in support of the efforts and contribution from the Auckland Transport Blog site and contributors. I have followed contributions through the blog and though it may make a sheep I have however cut and pasted Mr Anderson's contribution. Overall I am in support of the CRL opening up Britomart, building an inner city rail loop and getting trains and people moving.
101	101/2	Toko Pihema		3.1 Appropriate solution	-Support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. The EFC will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton - ensuring the capacity of the CRL is fully utilised and also that Grafton Station will continue to play a meaningful role in the rail network. -Support the general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations. Aotea at the heart of midtown, K Road serving an area furthest from the existing rail network and Newton station acting as a catalyst for the growth of an area with enormous development potential. There is an interesting argument to be had around whether construction of the some of the stations should be staged but this consenting process is all about protecting the footprint so issues about sequencing are irrelevant here.
101	101/3	Toko Pihema		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	-Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby & Elliott streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley streets to then go down again to the platforms. -Provision of a second station entrance at Newton station on the eastern side of Symonds Street - to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland.
101	101/4	Toko Pihema		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	-Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it's dug up between Wellesley and Customs streets. If possible we should try to remove the slip lane between Wellesley and Victoria streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state.
102	102/1	Julie Anne Genter MP	Green Party	1.1 Support - NOR All	The Green Party out-of-Parliament office in Auckland is within the NOR 4 Karangahape Station, and on behalf of the Green Party Auckland MPs and staff, I submit that we enthusiastically support the project as a whole and support all the notices of requirement to designate. The city rail link is essential in the further development of a smart, green transport system for Auckland.
102	102/2	Julie Anne Genter MP	Green Party	5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	Following the original business case in 2010, the most recent City Centre Future Access Study and the economic development report undertaken by Enwright Associates, it is clear that the entire region will benefit from the development of the city rail link. Providing fast and frequent rail services not only reduces the pressure on the roads, it gives more Aucklanders a low-carbon option for getting around town. Improving access by rail will also stimulate development in the city centre and around rail hubs, which will lead to increased vibrancy and people-friendly urban communities. Even if we are forced to vacate our new office, it will be with pleasure to welcome progress on this critical piece of infrastructure
103	103/1	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	1.25 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 2	
103	103/2	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	1.28 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 5	
103	103/3	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.20 Economic	1.Avoiding disruption to the business. Maintaining continued access to the shop and offices for both staff and customers. For both pedestrians and customers who drive and park near to the store. 2. Concern over the possible use of Mount Eden Road in Notice of Requirement ID 202 blocking customer access to the store and impacting business operations. 3. Concern over loss of on-street parking on Mount Eden Road and local public carpark facilities. Possible loss of business due to loss of easy access to the store. Especially concerned about the future of the public carpark on the corner of Mt Eden Road and Symonds Street (Notice of Requirement ID 190). Plays significant part in enabling customers to visit the store. Are alternative parking facilities going to be provided? Have the impact of the loss of these parking facilities been assessed? Economic effects on your business of the loss of this parking facility. 4. Concern over potential loss of nearby businesses in the construction yard area in Notice of Requirement 6 that currently provide customers to the shop and surrounding stores. Loss of these customers may cause decline in the economic viability of the business and neighbouring businesses. Therefore a loss of economic vitality of the block of shops the store is located within. 5. Support possible increased economic and social vitality of the area that may result from being located near a station (Notices of Requirement 2, 5 and 6) and a redeveloped urban area (Notice of Requirement 6) in the future. 6. Loss of amenity for the store due to passing construction vehicles. 7. Loss of ease of access for customers due to possible road congestion effects. 7. Possible vibration and noise effects of tunnelling on the (building) from construction and disruption to business. The character building the shop is located in and possible interior damage to the store.
103	103/4	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Avoiding disruption to the business. Maintaining continued access to the shop and offices for both staff and customers. For both pedestrians and customers who drive and park near to the store 7. Concern over the possible use of Mount Eden Road in Notice of Requirement ID 202 blocking customer access to the store and impacting business operations
103	103/5	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.23 Property rights	Effects from construction yard directly across the road from the store (it replaces the existing public carpark, Notice of Requirement 5, Notice of Requirement 10 190): possible visual amenity and blight effects affecting the area, noise and vibration effects of construction and machinery activities affecting shop business operations

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
103	103/6	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	Effects from construction yard directly across the road from the store (it replaces the existing public carpark, Notice of Requirement 5, Notice of Requirement 10 190): possible visual amenity and blight effects affecting the area, noise and vibration effects of construction and machinery activities affecting shop business operations
103	103/7	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	Effects from construction yard directly across the road from the store (it replaces the existing public carpark, Notice of Requirement 5, Notice of Requirement 10 190): possible visual amenity and blight effects affecting the area, noise and vibration effects of construction and machinery activities affecting shop business operations
103	103/8	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	Desiring appropriate redevelopment and reinstatement of the public carpark on the corner of Mt Eden Road and Symonds Street (Notice of Requirement 10 190) after its use as a construction yard.
103	103/9	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.9 Transport - construction	Overall surrounding construction activities from Notices of Requirement 2, 5, and 6. The noise and vibration effects on the store and office arising from construction. The noise and vibration effects of the increase of heavy vehicle movements in the vicinity of the store and office.
103	103/10	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.8 Built heritage	Possible vibration and noise effects of tunnelling on the (building) from construction and disruption to business. The character building the shop is located in and possible interior damage to the store.
103	103/12	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Desiring the reinstatement and improvement of the nearby public areas including footpaths, trees and general streetscape after construction.
103	103/13	Barnaby Marshall	I Love Ugly Limited	5.26 Social impact	Support possible increased economic and social vitality of the area that may result from being located near a station (Notices of Requirement 2, 5 and 6) and a redeveloped urban area (Notice of Requirement 6) in the future.
104	104/1	Roger Power		1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	
104	104/2	Roger Power		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	It was assumed any rail station / access (now referred to as Newton Station) would be located on vacant land situated at the corner of Mt Eden Rd and Symonds St. This land, more or less directly across the road from 257-259 Symonds St, has been used for casual car parking for at least 50 years. At a formal meeting, attended by a solicitor, Auckland Council representatives and myself, it was readily acknowledged that this vacant site had indeed been considered as the obvious site for 'Newton Station'. However, it was stated that due to the cost of relocating a television related operation if that route was chosen, it was decided to opt for the present proposal. I do not know about the 'television proprietors', but as far as I am concerned the 257-259 Symonds St site is and always has been individually owned. Furthermore, whilst not necessarily part of this submission, other property at 11-23 New North Rd (and possibly property in Basque Rd) which as been (Power) family owned for in excess of sixty years, is also affected. In summary, whilst I realise the CRL must proceed, I consider it should be re-routed back to what was apparently the initial preferred one. I certainly should not be disadvantaged by any acquisition, and should there be an early compromise, then I would be prepared to withdraw this submission.
104	104/3	Roger Power		5.20 Economic	Re: 257-259 Symonds Street, Auckland 1010. The subject property was purchased by myself after close involvement and monitoring of the immediate property market over a considerable period of time. To locate such a site is uncommon, and there was the added attribute of the property having been previously consented by Council for a 26 unit development of attractive calibre. Said proposed development did not proceed due to personal circumstances relevant to the then proprietors. At the time of the present acquisition it was realised that the City Rail Link was in the offing and, together with the possibility of enhanced development and capacity (since ??? by recent Auckland Council announcement of proposed usage up to a height of eight storeys) it made this site, virtually at the apex of (greater) Auckland City and situated at the intersection of three major roads, even more attractive and desirable.
104	104/4	Roger Power		5.23 Property rights	Re: 257-259 Symonds Street, Auckland 1010. The subject property was purchased by myself after close involvement and monitoring of the immediate property market over a considerable period of time. To locate such a site is uncommon, and there was the added attribute of the property having been previously consented by Council for a 26 unit development of attractive calibre. Said proposed development did not proceed due to personal circumstances relevant to the then proprietors. At the time of the present acquisition it was realised that the City Rail Link was in the offing and, together with the possibility of enhanced development and capacity (since ??? by recent Auckland Council announcement of proposed usage up to a height of eight storeys) it made this site, virtually at the apex of (greater) Auckland City and situated at the intersection of three major roads, even more attractive and desirable.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
104	104/5	Roger Power		5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Auckland City representatives have made overtures re: acquisition of 257-259 Symonds St, although only after my initiatives to uncover the actual impact on this property. Said overtures have neither resulted in a firm offer for the property, or, alternatively, a substitute property in exchange. In summary, whilst I realise the CRL must proceed, I consider it should be re-routed back to what was apparently the initial preferred one. I certainly should not be disadvantaged by any acquisition, and should there be an early compromise, then I would be prepared to withdraw this submission.
104	104/6	Roger Power		5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	Auckland City representatives have made overtures re: acquisition of 257-259 Symonds St, although only after my initiatives to uncover the actual impact on this property. Said overtures have neither resulted in a firm offer for the property, or, alternatively, a substitute property in exchange.
105	105/1	Qing-Shan Martin Lun		1.1 Support - NOR All	
105	105/2	Qing-Shan Martin Lun		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	Without a major correction to Auckland's transport system - and from all the evidence, underground rail converting Britomart into a through station is the only rational way to do this - it and New Zealand as a whole will become less and less able to compete in the global economy. I grew up in Auckland, went to school and university here, and have now worked in the local software industry for 10 years (I'm 32). I work with a number of talented recent graduates, and I get to hear their plans for the future. Almost every last one is planning on leaving New Zealand at some stage. When you ask them why, the answer is simple: Auckland is not an interesting city. It has a small population, an un-compelling city centre, there isn't much going on, and it lacks employment opportunities. Despite Auckland's recent improvements, I have trouble disagreeing with them. When you ask them where they want to go, the answer is not Wellington, Christchurch, Canberra, Darwin or some leafy village in England. It's: Melbourne, Sydney, London, Tokyo. Big cities full of life and opportunity. When the Google recruiter comes knocking on the virtual doors of my younger colleagues (and they have done), what can I tell them when they ask my advice? I can't with a straight face say, "Well, Sydney and London are great and all, and sure, there are major international software companies there where you have a chance to change the world, but Auckland's got... really nice bush walks! And better weather! And you can listen to talkback radio in your car during your hour long commute to the CBD every day!" The only way we can compete for talent is to allow Auckland to grow into a real international city. It needs to become denser, less dependent on cars and develop a better-than-third-world public transport system (the CRL being the key piece of this). Without these things it's doomed to be a collection of sleepy suburbs forever. With the CRL opening up the capacity of the entire rail network, and combined with the planned high frequency bus system, more people will be able to travel around Auckland on a modern, reliable, frequent system - without the need for a car. Land values around rail stations will increase (as opposed to decrease as they do near motorways), and communities will naturally build up around them. The CBD will come to life as more people can easily and quickly get into the centre without creating miles of gridlock, and the resultant increase in population density will enable more businesses to be established, agglomeration effects magnifying their productivity. I was in the London Transport Museum recently. There was an interesting exhibition on the Underground. I took a picture of an informational plaque which read: "London continued to expand rapidly throughout the 19th century. By 1861 the population of Greater London had grown to just over three million. Over the next 40 years it doubled again. Unlike Paris, a rising proportion of London's population lived in the growing suburbs and not in the centre. Even so, there was never-ending congestion on the streets because everyone still needed access to the central districts. Many creative solutions were proposed above and below ground to keep the great metropolis mobile. Most of these never got off the drawing board." Good thing one finally did. 150 years later, let's hope ours will too.
106	106/1	Patrick Reynolds		1.1 Support - NOR All	I believe this is the vital investment for Auckland's future; to enable the city to grow economically without drowning in congestion. To be able to grow in quality, vitality, and efficiency for the benefit of the entire nation.
106	106/2	Patrick Reynolds		5.10 Transport - operational	Once the New Transit Network is in place over the next few years; the redesigned bus system, integrated ticketing, and the new electric trains, the whole Transit system in Auckland will be struggling to meet demand. The CRL is the 'Killer App' to deliver a huge boost in capacity and utility to the whole city, crucially without adding strain to the road network. It is essentially that we unlock the out of reach capacity of the existing rail network, as it is a currently wasted resource. While it is not a cheap project its value is clearly way above this cost because it will transform both the rail system to a revolutionary utility for the city through its effects across the entire network and the whole idea of Auckland as an urban centre of efficiency and appeal. This is a project that the nation cannot afford to delay.
106	106/3	Patrick Reynolds		2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	I am extremely enthusiastic about the need for this project, the planned route, and the inclusion of the East Facing Connection. I have concerns about design details of the stations. In general I am concerned that they may be based on predictions of passenger numbers that will prove to be too conservative, therefore they risk being too small very quickly. Especially I believe this to be the case for Aotea Station. I am also seeking confirmation that all possible steps are being made in the design of Aotea Station to facilitate connection with a future perpendicular line to Wynyard Quarter and the Shore [please see attached PDF for thoughts on this]

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
106	106/4	Patrick Reynolds		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	It also is important that pedestrian connections through to Elliott and Darby Sts be planned for. Aotea station will quickly overtake Britomart as our busiest station if it is built to facilitate and accommodate the numbers, on its very constrained foot print. It is not clear to me why more use of the site that is currently a car park east of Albert St is not included in the designation, is this because of issues with the site's owner or simply a cost issue? Clearly this is the perfect route through to Queen St, and site for construction use. Also Newton should have ped entrances on both sides of New North Rd, perhaps from a sub street level concourse. The Eastern side in the Council car park looks like an ideal place for an entrance building, being close to social attractors in particular.
107	107/1	Max Robitzsch	IPENZ Transportation Group, Auckland/Northland Branch	1.8 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR All	
107	107/2	Max Robitzsch	IPENZ Transportation Group, Auckland/Northland Branch	5.10 Transport - operational	The IPENZ Transportation Group (Committee of the Auckland / Northland Branch) considers the City Rail Link as a much-needed, transformative and hugely beneficial project for Auckland. With its ability to significantly improve the capacity and functionality of the existing rail network, we expect it to markedly improve public transport across the region, increase the competitiveness and liveability of our city, and protect the sustainability of our transport network, including ensuring more capacity remains on the road network for transport functions that cannot be easily shifted away from private motor vehicles, such as local freight. We consider the discussed Notices of Requirement are the appropriate step to progress and safeguard the eventual implementation of such a complex and extensive transport project, and will provide the required certainty to allow progress on the related design and funding initiatives. We therefore strongly support them. We support retaining the east-facing links at the southern portal as shown, as opposed to earlier concepts of a southern interchange. East-facing links will provide much greater network flexibility. We would like the NOR designs, particularly of course NOR 1, to consider, at least at high level, how a future North Shore rail line would be integrated with the CRL alignment.
107	107/3	Max Robitzsch	IPENZ Transportation Group, Auckland/Northland Branch	5.34 Construction methodology	Regarding NOR 1, we would like the conditions to enable a longer bored tunnel along Albert Street, should further investigation find this feasible. None of the conditions imposed should preclude such an extension of the bored section if this is later found to be feasible. With a tunnel boring machine already required, greater bored length could lead to significant reductions to the transport and community impacts, and potentially construction cost. For clarification, we do not object to cut-and-cover as allowed for in the NORs, where this proves required. Regarding NOR 1, we encourage the conditions to allow the possibility of full closure of some transport links (such as sections of Albert Street), for shorter time periods. [t has been the experience of construction projects in various countries - from weekend rail closures in New Zealand to motorway closures in Germany - that the "short sharp shock" of a full closure over a shorter time can be less problematic for the network than expected, and can bring great benefits in terms of reduced construction timeframes, costs and community (including business) impacts. We encourage the conditions to be flexible in allowing such shorter, more comprehensive closures - while taking into account the most important uses especially by local property owners. It may also be more attractive from a construction management and cost-effectiveness viewpoint to negotiate agreements with local landowners about more comprehensive closures or realignments to property access than try to retain low-quality minimum access for a longer period. It may also be sensible to undertake other city centre transformation projects at the same time as disruption caused by the CRL works, though such coordination (i.e. that various projects have to take place at the same time) should not be mandatory by condition, as this could hinder the CRL project.
107	107/4	Max Robitzsch	IPENZ Transportation Group, Auckland/Northland Branch	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Regarding NOR 1, we encourage the NOR design to reconsider the need for the Crowne Plaza service lane to give directly onto the Wellesley Street West / Albert Street intersection. This layout currently already creates issues for the pedestrian environment in the area, which can only become a greater issue once pedestrian numbers increase markedly due to the nearby "Aotea Station" entrances. Regarding NOR 5, we encourage the NOR design for the "Newton Station" to be adapted to allow for a grade-separated crossing of Symonds Street / New North Road, i.e. the provision of station entrances east of these roads which then allow users to reach the concourse level / lift entrances by passing underneath these arterial roads.
107	107/5	Max Robitzsch	IPENZ Transportation Group, Auckland/Northland Branch	5.24 Designation lapse period	We support the use of longer-than-usual lapsing periods for the NORs, as the size of the project makes the standard lapsing durations less appropriate.
107	107/6	Max Robitzsch	IPENZ Transportation Group, Auckland/Northland Branch	5.8 Built heritage	We support the adaptive re-use (as opposed to demolition) of heritage buildings or otherwise locally valuable buildings as part of station entrances.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
107	107/7	Max Robitzsch	IPENZ Transportation Group, Auckland/Northland Branch	5.16 Urban design framework	In regards to the urban design of train stations and their surroundings, we ask that this consider not only pedestrians, buses and taxis, but also cyclists. In particular, this should include consideration of bike parking, and areas for public bike hire facilities, where passengers using the train to arrive in the inner city can switch to hired bicycles, much extending the range of the stations. In regards to the urban design of train stations and their surroundings, we ask that, criterion MC7 in the Urban Design Framework be changed. With the proposed new stations all being underground, and generally having access via concourses below street level, high-quality underpasses can achieve positive urban design and transport functions, especially as patrons will already have to undergo the level change anyway. While we understand the original intent of this criterion, we think it does not correctly express the benefits that grade-separated crossing / access can provide for underground stations - even though several of the concept station designs in the NOR already envisage such crossings.
107	107/8	Max Robitzsch	IPENZ Transportation Group, Auckland/Northland Branch	5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	We support the creation of pedestrian-friendly station surroundings, even where this requires some level of reduction in car capacity / convenience. This could be via providing traffic-calmed / shared space zones and/or pedestrian priority at crossings.
108	108/1	Thaddeus O'Higgins	Cycle Action Auckland	1.1 Support - NOR All	
108	108/2	Thaddeus O'Higgins	Cycle Action Auckland	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	CAA looks forward to engaging with Auckland Transport on: 1.the CRL as the scheme progresses through the design and consenting process, to ensure cycling is actively considered as part of an inclusive design; accessible by all. 2.The expansion and enrichment of the secure bike parking programme for all stations (city centre or suburban), together with the development of safe and direct cycle routes between stations and local neighbourhoods. Regarding NOR 5, we encourage the NOR design for "New1on Station" to enable station access/egress without having to cross the road, through the use of concourse level/lift entrances at street level and underneath the roads. Such crossings need to provide open, attractive and safe access for all.
108	108/3	Thaddeus O'Higgins	Cycle Action Auckland	5.34 Construction methodology	Regarding NOR 1, construction is inevitably going to be disruptive. In response we seek that in the design of temporary diversion routes, detailed consideration is given to all transport users and modes, including pedestrians and cyclists. This must include ensuring high quality ramps and temporary surfaces, lighting and signage is utilised, and the needs of the elderly, less mobile, disabled or unfamiliar are inclusively designed for, not ignored.
108	108/4	Thaddeus O'Higgins	Cycle Action Auckland	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Regarding NOR 1, construction is inevitably going to be disruptive. In response we seek that in the design of temporary diversion routes, detailed consideration is given to all transport users and modes, including pedestrians and cyclists. This must include ensuring high quality ramps and temporary surfaces, lighting and signage is utilised, and the needs of the elderly, less mobile, disabled or unfamiliar are inclusively designed for, not ignored.
108	108/5	Thaddeus O'Higgins	Cycle Action Auckland	5.16 Urban design framework	We encourage AT to expand and enrich its current secure bike parking programme for all stations (city centre or suburban), together with the development of safe and direct cycle routes between stations and local neighbourhoods. As a consequence of growth in rail demand due to CRL, building extensive car park and rail ride at our suburban rail stations is not the sole answer. The answer is choice and integration, by providing an alternative to the car for the complete trip (e.g. home to work). Only then will we see any true reduction in car use on the network. Regarding urban design of the stations and surrounding areas, this must include pedestrians and cyclists. In particular, this should include consideration of well-located quality and plentiful secure bike parking at both city centre and suburban stations, and opportunity for public bike hire stations, so public can switch from rail to bicycles, much extending the range of the stations on the rail network, and providing an easy alternative to taking bikes on the trains themselves.
108	108/6	Thaddeus O'Higgins	Cycle Action Auckland	5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	A revamped high frequency rail network, with CRL at its core served by modern electric trains calling at integrated and secure stations, will be crucial component to help deal with future growth. However, not many of us live or work at rail stations, so the feeder and onward links to/from all the stations are perhaps even more critical. This is where the bike comes in. We encourage AT to expand and enrich its current secure bike parking programme for all stations (city centre or suburban), together with the development of safe and direct cycle routes between stations and local neighbourhoods. As a consequence of growth in rail demand due to CRL, building extensive car park and rail ride at our suburban rail stations is not the sole answer. The answer is choice and integration, by providing an alternative to the car for the complete trip (e.g. home to work). Only then will we see any true reduction in car use on the network. Similarly we see CRL as a major opportunity for real and substantial road-space reallocation in central Auckland. Auckland Transport must seize the opportunity presented at CRL construction to take road capacity away and then not return it in the same way, but with a switch of emphasis to people not vehicles, as in sustainable and active modes. CAA would be keen to engage with Auckland Transport on this. We consider the Notices of Requirement will enable the scheme to progress and protect the implementation of the CRL, and provide certainty to enable design and funding. We therefore strongly support them. CAA looks forward to engaging with Auckland Transport on: 3.Capitalizing on the major opportunity CRL construction will bring for real and substantial roadspace reallocation in central Auckland, with a switch of emphasis to people not vehicles, as in sustainable and active modes.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
108	108/7	Thaddeus O'Higgins	Cycle Action Auckland	5.10 Transport - operational	A revamped high frequency rail network, with CRL at its core served by modern electric trains calling at integrated and secure stations, will be crucial component to help deal with future growth.
109	109/1	The Dilworth Trust Board	Attn: Aiden Kirby-McLeod	1.36 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 6) subject to conditions / amendments	1. This submission is made in opposition to proposed Plan Modification 349 to the Auckland Council District Plan Operative Auckland City - Isthmus Section 1999, being Notice of Requirement 6 [NoR] for the designation of land for rail purposes generally between New North Road, Mt Eden Road and Boston Road in the north and the North Auckland Line in the south, forming part of the City Rail Link project. 2. The NoR is one of six Notices of Requirement lodged with Auckland Council by Auckland Transport which seek to designate land for the construction, operation and maintenance of the CRL, generally comprising a 3.4km underground passenger railway (including two tracks and three stations) running between Britomart station and the North Auckland Line in the vicinity of Mt Eden station. 3. The specific parts of the notice of requirement that this submission relates to are those parts that affect the surrounding road network serving 51-63 Normanby Road, Mt Eden, Auckland [Site].
109	109/2	The Dilworth Trust Board	Attn: Aiden Kirby-McLeod	4.2 RMA policy framework	7. The Trust Board opposes the NoR for the following reasons: (a) The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the subject site. (b) The adverse effects of the designation on the subject site will not be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
109	109/3	The Dilworth Trust Board	Attn: Aiden Kirby-McLeod	5.9 Transport - construction	7. The Trust Board opposes the NoR for the following reasons: (c) In particular, but without limitation: i. The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the surrounding road network serving the subject site, and will have an adverse effect on site access. ii. The designation will, if confirmed, prevent reasonable use of the subject site.
109	109/5	The Dilworth Trust Board	Attn: Aiden Kirby-McLeod	4.1 Part 2 RMA	7. The Trust Board opposes the NoR for the following reasons: (d) Confirming the designation will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
109	109/6	The Dilworth Trust Board	Attn: Aiden Kirby-McLeod	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	8. The Trust Board seeks the following recommendation or decision from the unitary authority: (a) That the notice of requirement be withdrawn; or (b) That the notice of requirement be modified; or (c) That conditions be imposed; and (d) Such alternative, consequential, or further relief as may be appropriate or necessary to give effect to this submission.
109	109/7	The Dilworth Trust Board	Attn: Aiden Kirby-McLeod	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	8. The Trust Board seeks the following recommendation or decision from the unitary authority: (a) That the notice of requirement be withdrawn; or (b) That the notice of requirement be modified; or (c) That conditions be imposed; and (d) Such alternative, consequential, or further relief as may be appropriate or necessary to give effect to this submission.
109	109/8	The Dilworth Trust Board	Attn: Aiden Kirby-McLeod	5.23 Property rights	7. The Trust Board opposes the NoR for the following reasons: ii. The designation will, if confirmed, prevent reasonable use of the subject site.
110	110/1	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	1.29 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 6	
110	110/2	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	4.2 RMA policy framework	6. The submitters oppose Notice of Requirement 6 because: 6.1. The applicant's AEE is inadequate, particularly as it relates to the Nikau Street area. 6.2. There will be significant adverse effects to the environment from the construction and operation of the CRL, particularly in the Nikau Street area. These adverse effects will last for a considerable period, with activity at and near the main construction site expected to last five to six years (longer than other sites where surface works are proposed). It is anticipated that the surface land will be unavailable for other uses during the construction period. 6.3. The following adverse effects are of particular concern to the submitters: - Uncertainty regarding acquisition - Traffic disruption - Air quality / contamination - Noise - Vibration - Adverse economic effects - Adverse social effects - Adverse health effects - Adverse impacts on the landscape, visual and amenity values.
110	110/3	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.24 Designation lapse period	6.3.1.1. It is unclear when the applicant will acquire the property (if at all). The AEE assumes that all and / buildings required for the project will be acquired and available from the commencement of the construction programme, but that could still be years away. As yet, no decisions have been made regarding timing or funding for the project, and the applicant still needs to obtain resource consents. The extended lapse period the applicant is seeking for the designation (20 years) will cause reticence in investment and development, particularly since sections 176 and 178 of the Resource Management Act 1991 prohibit landowners from doing anything that would prevent or hinder the CRL project. That reticence may create an unattractive environment.
110	110/4	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	6.3.1.2. It is also unclear on what basis the applicant will seek to acquire the property (i.e. whether it will seek to purchase the property or rather to occupy it temporarily).
110	110/5	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.20 Economic	6.3.6. Adverse economic effects - the construction of the CRL will have adverse economic effects. The submitters are reliant on rental income from the property. However, their current tenant is not prepared to commit to a fixed term tenancy while there is uncertainty regarding the project (it currently has a month-to-month tenancy). The submitters expect to have difficulty renting the property prior to acquisition. The designation (and sections 176 and 178 of the Resource Management Act 1991) will limit their development rights prior to acquisition.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
110	110/6	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.1 Noise - construction	6.3.4. Noise - there will be a significant increase in noise during construction (as a result of machinery use, for example). Tunnelling work is expected to be carried out 24 hours per day, seven days per week. There will be excessive noise from equipment and machinery in the main construction site. For example, the TBM tunnel linings will be trucked to the main construction site as required prior to being installed. There will also be excessive noise arising from the connection of the CRL to the NAL, and from the ventilation stacks at the nearby Newton Station.
110	110/7	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.3 Vibration - construction	6.3 .5. Vibration - the use of machinery during construction will also cause vibration. This vibration has the potential to damage buildings, both superficially (cracking plaster, for example) and structurally.
110	110/8	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.9 Transport - construction	6.3.2. Traffic disruption - during construction, there will be adverse impacts on transport in and around Nikau Street including restricted access to properties, extended travel times, delays, uncertainty and increased congestion for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians as a result of: 6.3.2.1. construction vehicles (including trucks) and machinery moving to and from the main construction site (to deliver materials to the site and to transport excavated material from the tunnels, for example); 6.3.2.2. vehicle movements associated with the delivery, assembly and reassembly of the Tunnel Boring Machine (TBM) components; 6.3.2.3. road closures, reductions in road lanes, or controlled/restricted access.
110	110/9	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.7 Contamination	6.3.3. Air quality / contamination - the construction of the CRL is expected to generate dust, adversely affecting air quality and people's health. Dust will be generated by the surface works and excavations associated with the cut and cover construction method. Dust will also be generated in the main construction site, for example from the stockpiling of excavated soil and from a temporary grout mixing plant which is to be located in the main construction yard. Construction activities are also likely to disturb contaminated land (particularly gasworks waste in the Nikau Street area), causing odour and hazardous discharges and adversely affecting human health. There has been industrial activity in the Newton area over the years, making it more likely that the land is contaminated.
110	110/10	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.26 Social impact	6.3 .7. Adverse social effects - the construction will adversely affect the social wellbeing of those in the Nikau Street area, particularly because of the harm caused to their working and living environment, their health (referred to in more detail below), their loss of mobility and restricted access during construction. The adverse social effects are likely to extend for a considerable period given that resource consents have not yet been applied for. The design and consent process will take some time, followed by five to six years of construction.
110	110/11	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.17 Air quality	6.3.3. Air quality / contamination - the construction of the CRL is expected to generate dust, adversely affecting air quality and people's health. Dust will be generated by the surface works and excavations associated with the cut and cover construction method. Dust will also be generated in the main construction site, for example from the stockpiling of excavated soil and from a temporary grout mixing plant which is to be located in the main construction yard. Construction activities are also likely to disturb contaminated land (particularly gasworks waste in the Nikau Street area), causing odour and hazardous discharges and adversely affecting human health. There has been industrial activity in the Newton area over the years, making it more likely that the land is contaminated.
110	110/12	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.35 Health / safety	6.3.8. Adverse health effects - the dust and contaminants from construction are likely to adversely affect people's health. The construction is also likely to cause stress, anxiety, loss of emotional attachments, and feelings of uncertainty.
110	110/13	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.12 Public amenity / streetscape - construction	6.3.9 Adverse impacts on the landscape, visual and amenity values.
110	110/14	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.32 Adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated	6.4. The adverse effects outlined above cannot be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated. In particular, the intangible impacts of land acquisition (e.g. the sense of displacement, loss of emotional attachments, feelings of uncertainty and anxiety) are difficult to mitigate and compensate for.
110	110/15	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	4.1 Part 2 RMA	6.6. The notices of requirement are contrary to sections 5 and 7 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and do not promote the: 6.6.1. sustainable management of natural and physical resources enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety (s 5); 6.6.2. efficient use and development of natural and physical resources (s 7(b)); 6.6.3. maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (s 7(c)); and 6.6.4. maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment (s 7(f)).
110	110/16	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	6.5 The applicant has not adequately considered alternative routes.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
110	110/17	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.23 Property rights	6.3 .1. Uncertainty regarding acquisition 6.3.1.1. It is unclear when the applicant will acquire the property (if at all). The AEE assumes that all and / buildings required for the project will be acquired and available from the commencement of the construction programme, but that could still be years away. As yet, no decisions have been made regarding timing or funding for the project, and the applicant still needs to obtain resource consents. The extended lapse period the applicant is seeking for the designation (20 years) will cause reticence in investment and development, particularly since sections 176 and 178 of the Resource Management Act 1991 prohibit landowners from doing anything that would prevent or hinder the CRL project. That reticence may create an unattractive environment. 6.3.1.2. It is also unclear on what basis the applicant will seek to acquire the property (i.e. whether it will seek to purchase the property or rather to occupy it temporarily). 6.3.1.3. Notice of Requirement 6 notes that: "Upon completion of the CRL this designation may be drawn back (pursuant to section 182 of the RMA) to operational requirements." This suggests that the applicant may not need to purchase the property, but rather to occupy it temporarily. 6.3.1.4. If the applicant acquires the property only temporarily (by lease, for example), the submitters will suffer disruption, relocation (of their tenant) and displacement. When the property is returned to them, they will have to find another tenant. 6.3.1.5. In the event that the property is not acquired (as the designation does not automatically lead to acquisition), nearby properties likely will be - having an adverse impact on the submitters and their tenant(s) who will suffer from traffic disruption, contamination, construction noise and vibration, and adverse economic, health and social effects.
110	110/18	Podium Property Limited	Attn: Phil Shannon	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	6.3 .5. Vibration - the use of machinery during construction will also cause vibration. This vibration has the potential to damage buildings, both superficially (cracking plaster, for example) and structurally.
111	111/1	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	1.8 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR All	41 . The Chamber strongly believe that there is widespread community acceptance of the need to complete the CRL early, and an expectation the project will now proceed at a rapid pace without delay. 42. Accordingly, the Chamber strongly supports the Commissioners taking a decision to support the relevant applications for the notices of requirement to enable the Project's progress towards completion by 2021 . 43. Our main conditions sought relate to ensuring: The most practical and optimum route alignment to service potential users of the rail system. A high level of safety and security, especially in respect of the station infrastructure related to the proposed lift systems and nearby local streets at night; A high level of engineering standard and future-proofing, to enable the route to form part of an extended suburban rail network to serve Auckland's needs for the next century and beyond; A high-level of design and supporting infrastructure, to enable ancillary services at each station, including bus, taxi drop off zones, passenger entry and egress etc. An early hearings process and confirmation of a transparent project timetable for the project with the key milestones that need to be met to achieve its 2021 target finish date.
111	111/2	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	6.1 Project funding / economic	12. In summary, without extending the two rail lines through Britomart into a complete rail loop the station is largely a white elephant in terms of Auckland being able to provide expanded rail commuter services to meet the expected increased patronage demand. It can never run at more than 30 per cent of its potential capacity. That means the \$600 million already sunk in track widening and building the Britomart Station will always deliver a return less than a third of what it would be if the CRL were completed. Similarly the multimillion dollar programme to electrify the existing network and modernise rolling stock won't deliver anywhere near its potential as quickly as it would with the CRL up and running. 13. As a critical step in a long-running Auckland story to give Auckland a modern, integrated land transport network with options, the five-strong Commission is not simply a decision-making forum for deciding six separate applications for notice of requirement. Neither is it set up to decide whether the project proceeds or not; that decision has already been taken and confirmed in the Auckland Plan. It is about quality and timely decisions to enable delivery of the best possible Project outcome for Auckland long-term. 14. The "Project" will extend Auckland's transport system by providing greater choice for commuters and open up urban development opportunities across the city and especially in inner Auckland on a scale comparable to the urban pattern the motorway network and completion of the Harbour Bridge in the early 1960s helped shape. 15. That is, as well as the specific environmental matters the Commissioners have been asked to address (i.e. Notices 1-10-6), the project as a whole has potential to deliver significant wider economic, urban development and macro social benefits to the inner city and communities in suburbs served by rail. Business case and full benefits assessment required 16. The Chamber notes, however, that the specific economic and social benefits of CRL have not yet been assessed and quantified, and there is as yet no business case been prepared to support a funding application. 17. Instead, the benefit-cost assessment undertaken for the recent study that confirmed CRL with some bus service improvements as the best case scenario for addressing the problems of access to inner Auckland was a comparative assessment that looked at a range of options including bus only, including light rail, mobility pods, ferries and multiple bus and rail options. 18. While the comparative BCR for the City Rail Link option would still be more than four times better than the next option of surface bus, the critical point to note is that the study was deSigned to select the best option, not to justify funding . The next step in this process is a detailed business case in which the options will be optimised and the fundability of the project fully worked through in a considered manner. 19. Accordingly, the Chamber recommends that the Commissioners note the absence of a full BCR and qualify any recommendations to provide for the construction , operation and maintenance of the CRL subject to confirmation of the full suite of business case indicators - strategic importance, efficiency, value for money, B-C ratio and Wider Economic Benefits - required to be satisfied for Crown funding of a project that will increase economic productivity and growth.' Affordability 36. A Project Budget of \$2,8 billion has been indicated for the construction phase of the project but as noted above there is no business plan and/or decisions on funding sources for the construction phase, Meanwhile current planning costs for the next three years have been allocated within the Auckland Transport budget. This covers all the elements set out for consideration by the Commissioners, 37. That is, the procurement method and tender process and prices for the tunnel construction won't be known for some time which mean

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
111	111/3	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	5.10 Transport - operational	44. In conclusion, the Chamber wishes the Commissioners to take full cognizance of the fact that the CRL project is strongly aligned with other initiatives in hand to improve the efficiency of the suburban rail network and its services, including the future proofing of Britomart's construction to allow for the extension of rail services through the station, the network's electrification currently under construction, and upgrade of rail stations, signalling and other rail infrastructure across Auckland . Without CRL the return on the full benefits of these improvements will be lost. Also, the project delivers strong travel time savings and related productivity and other economic benefits.
111	111/4	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	20. Overall, the Chamber believes CRL needs to be progressed for the following reasons. It will enable: Many jobs and activity for supplier industries during construction; See "Better Business Cases: Investing for change" document, Treasury, August 2012. Closure on a long period in which Auckland has lagged behind comparable cities such as Brisbane and Melbourne in the provision of an efficient, integrated transport network with real options; Completion of a piece of infrastructure that is vital to linking Auckland together and helping to service our future economic and social success. 45. This is a project that Auckland has wanted and needed for many years . Public surveys are consistent in showing a high level of support for the project. As Auckland seeks to 'catch up' and complete its back-log of urgently needed infrastructure projects, both road and rail to give Auckland the semblance of a modern integration transport network with efficient options, it is vital that Commissioners play, and be seen to play, a constructive role in helping position Auckland to lift its performance and progress as a great city to live and work.
111	111/5	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	6.6 Business case	12. In summary, without extending the two rail lines through Britomart into a complete rail loop the station is largely a white elephant in terms of Auckland being able to provide expanded rail commuter services to meet the expected increased patronage demand. It can never run at more than 30 per cent of its potential capacity. That means the \$600 million already sunk in track widening and building the Britomart Station will always deliver a return less than a third of what it would be if the CRL were completed. Similarly the multimillion dollar programme to electrify the existing network and modernise rolling stock won't deliver anywhere near its potential as quickly as it would with the CRL up and running. 13. As a critical step in a long-running Auckland story to give Auckland a modern, integrated land transport network with options, the five-strong Commission is not simply a decision-making forum for deciding six separate applications for notice of requirement. Neither is it set up to decide whether the project proceeds or not; that decision has already been taken and confirmed in the Auckland Plan. It is about quality and timely decisions to enable delivery of the best possible Project outcome for Auckland long-term. 14. The "Project" will extend Auckland's transport system by providing greater choice for commuters and open up urban development opportunities across the city and especially in inner Auckland on a scale comparable to the urban pattern the motorway network and completion of the Harbour Bridge in the early 1960s helped shape. 15. That is, as well as the specific environmental matters the Commissioners have been asked to address (i.e. Notices 1-10-6), the project as a whole has potential to deliver significant wider economic, urban development and macro social benefits to the inner city and communities in suburbs served by rail. Business case and full benefits assessment required 16. The Chamber notes, however, that the specific economic and social benefits of CRL have not yet been assessed and quantified, and there is as yet no business case been prepared to support a funding application. 17. Instead, the benefit-cost assessment undertaken for the recent study that confirmed CRL with some bus service improvements as the best case scenario for addressing the problems of access to inner Auckland was a comparative assessment that looked at a range of options including bus only, including light rail, mobility pods, ferries and multiple bus and rail options. 18. While the comparative BCR for the City Rail Link option would still be more than four times better than the next option of surface bus, the critical point to note is that the study was deSigned to select the best option, not to justify funding . The next step in this process is a detailed business case in which the options will be optimised and the fundability of the project fully worked through in a considered manner. 19. Accordingly, the Chamber recommends that the Commissioners note the absence of a full BCR and qualify any recommendations to provide for the construction , operation and maintenance of the CRL subject to confirmation of the full suite of business case indicators - strategic importance, efficiency, value for money, B-C ratio and Wider Economic Benefits - required to be satisfied for Crown funding of a project that will increase economic productivity and growth.' 21 . The Chamber notes that the Auckland Plan lists the CRL as one of Auckland's highest priority transport projects, and directs that a detailed business case, planning, route protection, land acquisition and an above-ground land-use plan to support the development and completion of CRL by 2021 (see AP, p. 325). 22. We also note that information supporting the Public Notice indicates that construction will take five and a half years. That is, if this time table is to be achieved all planning, route protection, land acquisition, design and proc
111	111/7	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	4.2 RMA policy framework	43. Our main conditions sought relate to ensuring: An early hearings process and confirmation of a transparent project timetable for the project with the key milestones that need to be met to achieve its 2021 target finish date.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
111	111/8	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Route alignment 29. We note that despite a number of studies on a preferred route since the CRL was first suggested there are persistent concerns on whether the selected route is the best option. The most recent work between 2008 and the present considered several routes which were subject to a rigorous analysis. Evaluation criteria and weightings were proposed, challenged, discussed and agreed, options scored and then a sensitivity analysis was carried out to determine the option proposed in the Public Notice. 30. The route has been reviewed by a number of teams of experts over a number of years. These include ARTA, KiwiRail, Auckland Transport, Auckland Council, at least five international consortia of consultants and many specialist advisers. 31. Nonetheless the Chamber notes particular community concerns have been indicated in respect of whether the route will provide a timely service for access to key areas of inner Auckland, such as Auckland University, UAT and Auckland Hospital. 32. The Chamber supports and recommends that the Commissioners use the hearings process to test the adequacy of the route to adequately serve key areas of the inner city, especially key catchments on the eastern edge of the CBD. Efficiency and safety standard of the stations planned for the route - especially Newton Station (Notice 5) and Karangahape Station (Notice 4) 33. The Chamber notes that the Newton and Karangahape stations will be located at a depth of some 42 and 33 metres respectively and high speed lifts are proposed to bring passengers to the surface. 34. In particular, we strongly recommend there be a specific focus on the social and safety issues associated with the proposal for high speed passenger lifts to service the Newton and Karangahape stations: Adequacy of the lifts to service high numbers of passengers in peak periods; Safety and security for passengers, especially at night and what mitigation around these concerns are proposed; Whether all practical alternatives have been examined. 35. The Chamber also requests the Commissioners satisfy itself that the environmental/ engineering standards of the route will be future-proofed to meet international best practice standards and allow for network expansion to accommodate future growth of Auckland.
111	111/9	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	5.35 Health / safety	43. Our main conditions sought relate to ensuring: A high level of safety and security, especially in respect of the station infrastructure related to the proposed lift systems and nearby local streets at night;
111	111/10	Auckland Chamber of Commerce	Attn: Michael Barnett	5.20 Economic	
112	112/1	Alex Swney	Heart of the City	1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	The specific provisions that my submission relates to: All NORs, but most significantly NOR1 . Heart of the City has previously supported the CRL project subject to shared funding with Government. Developing a better understanding of the construction programme, station designs and outcomes has always been of great interest. After reading the NOR documents provided, our continued support is conditional on receiving better information on transport and place-making plans around stations, particularly the proposed station at Aotea . Some of our commentary will be familiar to Auckland transport and Auckland Council, in particular those parts which question development around the proposed Aotea Station and the lack of a comprehensive street level transport plan and set of projects for the city centre. We: Oppose We would prefer to conditionally support NOR 1 but past experience with other projects has shown that this just gets interpreted as support with all further input ignored. In checking the "oppose" box we wish to record our significant concerns , particularly around the proposed Aotea station at street level.
112	112/2	Alex Swney	Heart of the City	5.10 Transport - operational	We agree that the CRL will convert the Britomart terminus to a through station and will increase the capacity of the whole rail network, will improve access to the city centre, and will create three new stations which, with careful planning and management will favourably change the shape of or city. Largely ignored in the NORs is the intention to turn Wellesley St into a major busway route. The NORs talk about improving Albert St but ignore what is being planned on Wellesley St. It would appear that the development of Wellesley St as a bus corridor is being catalysed by the proposed Aotea station and transport planners' compulsion to turn stations into bus-train interchanges / hubs. That need not happen, particularly in the city centre.
112	112/4	Alex Swney	Heart of the City	5.20 Economic	At this stage, we express our concern relating to the disruption to businesses in the city centre, and note that the NORs do not provide specific information about how the negative effects will be mitigated.
112	112/5	Alex Swney	Heart of the City	6.6 Business case	Furthermore, the investments in the CRL are so large that we should be seeing, published with it, a more comprehensive plan for other streets including Queen, Hobson, Nelson and Cook Streets and Mayoral Drive. We support Aotea being a destination, not a transport-train-bus interchange, and we oppose Auckland Transport's draft plans here. The NOR is silent on this issue but the adverse environmental effects are significant.
112	112/6	Alex Swney	Heart of the City	5.17 Air quality	The supporting papers talk about "providing a sustainable transport solution that minimises environmental impacts, limit(s) visual , air quality and noise effects, contribute(s) to the country's carbon emission targets, and contribute(s) positively to a liveable, vibrant and safe city." It makes no sense to espouse the virtues of improved air quality with electric trains then attract hundreds of diesel buses to a station which is proposed to be the busiest pedestrian point on the network.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
112	112/7	Alex Swney	Heart of the City	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Supporting papers propose "the proposed works are reasonably necessary for achieving these objectives because they provide for a direct rail connection into the centre of the main business district (around Aotea Station), enhancing the attractiveness of the city as a place to work and live." Our proposition is that, having paid so much to improve the attractiveness of the place with a multibillion \$\$\$ electric train investment, we should not be attracting diesel buses to it through the Civic corner on Wellesley St. There are alternative solutions. It is not clear from the NORs that at Aotea station pedestrian entries/exits will be provided on the western side of Mayoral Drive/Albert St (see blue squares in adjacent diagram). This would decrease pedestrian contention at ground level at this intersection. The green line shows the preferred route for a Green Link in the city centre, which would complement the investments in the Aotea station and the Aotea precinct including shared space projects which have been funded by Targeted Rates. Decision requested: that station entry/exit points be considered for the western sides of Mayoral Drive and Albert St
112	112/9	Alex Swney	Heart of the City	6.1 Project funding / economic	We support the CRL subject to a funding contribution from central Government.
113	113/1	Helen Webb	Watercare Services Limited	1.22 Neutral, did not care, but requested conditions / amendments - NOR All	Watercare Services Limited ("Watercare") does not wish to comment on the overall merits of the Notices of Requirement to the Auckland Council District Plan (Central Area and Isthmus Sections) ["NoRs"]. Rather, Watercare seeks relief to ensure that its existing and planned water and wastewater services are appropriately protected and provided for during construction and operation of the proposed City Rail Link.
113	113/2	Helen Webb	Watercare Services Limited	5.35 Health / safety	The City Rail Link will require both temporary and permanent relocation of existing water and wastewater services. These works could impact the continuity of service provided by Watercare to tens of thousands of individuals, business and organisations across Auckland which could have implications for public health. The Link may also impact some of Watercare's planned new infrastructure. 3.2 Water Infrastructure Figure 1 depicts the approximate NoR alignment (red) relative to some of the critical network watermains. The blue line is the Ponsonby Ringmain; the green is the South CBD Main; and yellow is the Parnell Ringmain. Figure 1 demonstrates at least three locations where the proposed rail corridor intersects with the Ponsonby Ringmain (at Customs Street West) and South CBD Main (at Pitt Street and Karangahape Road). The importance of these water supply assets is illustrated by the green Central Area that is served by these lines. The shutting down or diversion of these mains would significantly compromise the water supply for the densely populated Central Area. In addition, the NoRs also intersect/share the same corridor as parts of the Huia No. 2, Epsom No. 2, Mt Eden No. 4, North Shore No.1 mains and affects part of the site containing the Kyber Reservoirs. Collectively, these assets are either critical to or a key part of the water supply services to central Auckland and the eastern part of the North Shore. Therefore, impacts on the operation, maintenance and upgrade of these assets could compromise the water supply for a significant portion of Auckland. 3.3 Wastewater infrastructure Figure 2 depicts the approximate NoR alignment (red) relative to the wastewater trunk network (green). Figure 2 also demonstrates at least one location where the proposed rail corridor intersects with the Orakei Main Sewer (at Victoria Street West). Figure 2: Critical Network Wastewater Trunk Network and the approximate CRL alignment The importance of these trunk wastewater assets is illustrated by the mustard coloured Central Area that are served by this network. Therefore the shutting down, diversion or damage to these trunk mains would significantly compromise the wastewater servicing for the densely populated Central Area. In addition, the NoRs also intersect/share the same corridor as numerous parts of the local wastewater network. Collectively, these assets are either critical to or a key part of the wastewater services to central Auckland. Therefore impacts on the operation, maintenance and upgrade of these assets could compromise the health and wellbeing for a significant portion of Auckland.
113	113/3	Helen Webb	Watercare Services Limited	2.3 Consultation	Watercare is concerned that without proper consultation and consideration by Auckland Transport the proposed works will adversely affect the operation, maintenance, and appropriate upgrading of the existing water and wastewater service infrastructure (and may conflict with new infrastructure that Watercare is planning). The concerns raised and relief sought in this submission are consistent with those raised with Auckland Transport (and its agents) prior to notification. 4.1 Consultation and Information Watercare requests that prior to the commencement of the hearing, the applicant formally consult with Watercare and provide the necessary design and construction / access methodology information to enable Watercare to determine the extent of impact on its existing and planned assets. This information must include but is not limited to: a) The spatial levels of the proposed designations (including the dimensional extent of air space and subsurface restrictions); b) The levels of built infrastructure (including the location and alignment of tunnels, tracks, stations and associated structures) and construction zones; c) Preliminary staging and construction methodologies (including building demolition and sequencing to understand service demands); d) Preliminary identification of conflict with all existing utilities proximate to Watercare assets and proposed service relocation/cost recovery process; e) Asset protection and access measures; f) Proposed Requiring Authority/Corridor Access Request process (including specified exclusions); g) 3D concept information; h) The detention, treatment and disposal of groundwater, i.e., pumping and disposal to stormwater/trade waste.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
113	113/4	Helen Webb	Watercare Services Limited	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	<p>3.1 Watercare Infrastructure Networks The NoRs propose that an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be drafted and implemented as part of the proposal. It is also proposed that draft conditions are prepared and provided to the Council at a later date. The Assessment of Environmental Effects ("AEE") acknowledges the presence of existing network utility services within the proposed footprint of the NoRs, including Watercare's Orakei Main Sewer (intersecting the alignment at Victoria Street West and Albert Street) and various bulk water supply infrastructure (the branch of the South CBD Main on Pitt Street and Huia 2 watermain along Nikau Street, Eden Terrace). The AEE also identifies that the Pitt Street branch main will require diversion due to its location within the footprint of the proposed Karangahape Station. However, other than general statements about necessary diversions, available clearances and the provision of 'adequate support and protection during construction' there is no particular consideration of Watercare assets located within or immediately adjacent to the proposed rail corridor. Further, there is no consideration of how the NoRs, as proposed, would restrict day-to-day maintenance and operation of utilities within the rail corridor (Le. the requirement to obtain Requiring Authority Approval pursuant to section 176 of the Resource Management Act 1991 [the "Act"]). There is no detailed analysis in the NoRs or AEE in relation to existing or proposed Watercare assets. There is no cross and long sectional information (to scale) nor any specific conclusions about the effects on infrastructure in the AEE. Further, no conditions are offered in relation to the protection of and security of access to infrastructure assets and their corridors. It is essential to the efficient and effective operation of Watercare's systems and to the determination of the extent of adverse effects on its networks and customers that Watercare is provided with the necessary design and construction information in order to be able to quantify and respond to the following concerns: (a) Asset Operation, Maintenance and Protection-The proposed works (including the timing and proposed construction methodologies) are likely to restrict / prevent Watercare's ability to access the existing wastewater and water network. It is essential that Watercare's (i) ability to operate, maintain, upgrade and protect its existing infrastructure is not compromised and (ii) 24 hour access to its assets is maintained. (b) Relocation of Existing Services-The proposed works are likely to necessitate the requirement to relocate parts of the existing Watercare transmission/conveyance networks and the existing local network in and around the proposed rail corridor. There are significant costs, physical constraints and service considerations associated with re-routing - which in some cases may be unviable. It is essential that Watercare is able to specifically identify where service re-routing would be required and assess the technical and financial impact of these diversions. (c) Potential Impact on Future/Planned PrOjects-Based on the preliminary NoR information, Watercare confirms that the proposed rail corridor conflicts with several planned upgrade projects - including but not limited to the upgrades to the Huia 2 connection line and the Khyber 2 Reservoir. However, the extent to which these projects are impacted is unknown due to insufficient design and construction information available. It is essential that Watercare is able to specifically identify what future / planned projects are impacted and if they remain viable.</p>
113	113/5	Helen Webb	Watercare Services Limited	5.34 Construction methodology	<p>a) Asset Operation, Maintenance and Protection-The proposed works (including the timing and proposed construction methodologies) are likely to restrict / prevent Watercare's ability to access the existing wastewater and water network. It is essential that Watercare's (i) ability to operate, maintain, upgrade and protect its existing infrastructure is not compromised and (ii) 24 hour access to its assets is maintained.</p>
113	113/6	Helen Webb	Watercare Services Limited	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	<p>a) Asset Operation, Maintenance and Protection-The proposed works (including the timing and proposed construction methodologies) are likely to restrict / prevent Watercare's ability to access the existing wastewater and water network. It is essential that Watercare's (i) ability to operate, maintain, upgrade and protect its existing infrastructure is not compromised and (ii) 24 hour access to its assets is maintained. 4.3 Conditions Sought If the NoRs are confirmed, Watercare requests that appropriately worded conditions are imposed to Watercare's satisfaction that recognise and take account of: the potential for works to damage Watercare's infrastructure, and to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects on that infrastructure (including protection measures); Watercare's requirement for 24 hour access to its assets for the purpose of operations and maintenance, rehabilitation and renewal of existing assets; the need to investigate and recover costs associated with the relocation of services in a timely manner; an efficient Requiring Authority approval process. Watercare requests that Auckland Council does not recommend confirmation of the NoRs unless conditions are attached to the designations ensuring that Watercare's ability to operate, maintain or upgrade its assets is not unduly restricted or prevented during planning, construction and post construction phases of the project. The preliminary wording of conditions that would achieve this are proposed at Attachment 1. The proposed conditions at Attachment 1 generally accord with the relief sought at section 4.2 and the conditions developed by various Network Utility Operators and Auckland Transport in drafting the Protocol on the use of Designations within Auckland's local Road Network (the 'Protocol'). Although the Protocol has not yet been finalised the preliminary conditions at Attachment 1 reflect the in depth discussions carried out between parties. 5. Consequential Relief Watercare also seeks such further, other, or consequential relief to the proposed private plan change provisions that is necessary or appropriate to give effect to its concerns outlined in this submission. Attachment 1: Conditions Sought by Watercare Services Limited The following is preliminary wording of conditions that could achieve the outcomes sought by the requested modifications to the Notices of Requirement. It is intended that the following conditions could be used as a 'starting point' for the re-drafting of appropriately worded conditions. Phase 1 - Planning: Conditions xx - yy apply in the planning phase prior to construction: Access by others: 1. That the Requiring Authority must allow the repair and on-going maintenance of existing assets and access for Network Utility Operators to undertake emergency and urgent works on assets located within the designated rail corridor without the need for Requiring Authority Approval pursuant to section 176 of the Resource Management Act 1991 . For the purposes of condition (1), "Emergency works" means works defined in section 330(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 or Section 6.22.1 of the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to the Transport Corridors (November 2011). 2. That where a Requiring Authority approval is requested pursuant to section 176 of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to the installation of new assets or the upgrade existing assets, the Requiring Authority must observe the principles</p>

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					and procedures applying to the Corridor Manager as set out in the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors (November 2011). Phase 2 - Construction: Conditions xx - yy apply in the construction phase2 when the designation (or parts of the designation) is in the construction phase (i.e. from the time the Requiring Authority takes occupation of all or part of a section of the rail corridor
113	113/7	Helen Webb	Watercare Services Limited	5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	(b) Relocation of Existing Services-The proposed works are likely to necessitate the requirement to relocate parts of the existing Watercare transmission/conveyance networks and the existing local network in and around the proposed rail corridor. There are significant costs, physical constraints and service considerations associated with re-routing - which in some cases may be unviable. It is essential that Watercare is able to specifically identify where service re-routing would be required and assess the technical and financial impact of these diversions.
113	113/8	Helen Webb	Watercare Services Limited	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	4.2 Amendment to the Notices of Requirement: Watercare requests that prior to the commencement of the hearing, the applicant amends the NoRs to specify the following changes and offer appropriately worded conditions (preliminary wording of suggested conditions are offered at Appendix 1). Table not shown:
114	114/1	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
114	114/2	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	Construction Traffic and Access Access points to Area A yard have not been specified but it would appear that Ngahura Street, Ruru Street or Flower Street would be the primary options. Which of is these is selected/how they are managed will have a significant impact on the impacts received at the subject site. Provision of "plans" to manage future effects is a widely used tool to cater for specific large scale projects. However the reality remains that there is no detailed information for adjacent property owners to consider. The detailed day to day operation of the site (eg. traffic volumes, access locations to Area A, access to the subject site, perimeter fencing, parking, earthworks location and duration etc) will be critical to the operation and ongoing commercial viability of the subject site given its proximity to a key works site (Area A). Noise It is noted that the Marshall Day Acoustics Report (Appendix G, Figure 7) shows the subject site as being inside the proposed NOR area. It appears unlikely that this will alter the conclusions of the Marshall Day report but confirmation of this would be helpful. Consultation NOR Volume 3, Environmental Management Framework (EMF) outlines the proposed structure under which a variety of other 'sub-documents' will set out methods to avoid remedy or mitigate potential effects of the proposal. Key documents within the EMF include: Road Network and Transportation Delivery Works Plan (RNTWP) which will manage traffic and transport network effects. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) managing specific construction effects. Construction Noise and Vibration Management (CNVMP) managing noise and vibration effects from construction. It is recognised that the proposal is more of a 'route protection' proposal than a project where work commencement is eminent; this is reflected further in that the 'regional' permits are not concurrently sought, funding for the overall project is not available and that a 20 year time frame for the designation has been sought. Provision of "plans" to manage future effects is a widely used tool to cater for specific large scale projects. However the reality remains that there is no detailed information for adjacent property owners to consider. The detailed day to day operation of the site (eg. traffic volumes, access locations to Area A, access to the subject site, perimeter fencing, parking, earthworks location and duration etc) will be critical to the operation and ongoing commercial viability of the subject site given its proximity to a key works site (Area A). Decision requested: Construction Traffic and Access Clarification as to the primary location to Area A is sought. Confirmation that access to the subject site will be available at all times (especially evenings and weekends when events are hosted) is required.
114	114/3	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	5.9 Transport - construction	It is noted (Traffic Impact Assessment, Page 88) that Ngahura Street is proposed to be "closed" (assumingly to the public) during construction. Section 9.5.8 of the Traffic Impact Assessment (page 83) also states that: The closure of Ngahura Street Is not expected to affect vericular traffic, as all the properties on tlis cul -de-sac are understood to be req Li red for the tulnel construction area. This is not correct. No assessment has been made of the potential effects of access on the subject site or it appears the properties at 98-110 and 112 New North Road which both have (in addition to vehicle assess from New North Road) parking and vehicle entries from Ngahura Street.
114	114/4	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	It is noted (Traffic Impact Assessment, Page 88) that Ngahura Street is proposed to be "closed" (assumingly to the public) during construction. Section 9.5.8 of the Traffic Impact Assessment (page 83) also states that: The closure of Ngahura Street Is not expected to affect vericular traffic, as all the properties on tlis cul -de-sac are understood to be req Li red for the tulnel construction area. This is not correct. No assessment has been made of the potential effects of access on the subject site or it appears the properties at 98-110 and 112 New North Road which both have (in addition to vehicle assess from New North Road) parking and vehicle entries from Ngahura Street.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
114	114/5	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	5.34 Construction methodology	It is noted (Traffic Impact Assessment, Page 88) that Ngahura Street is proposed to be "closed" (assumingly to the public) during construction. Section 9.5.8 of the Traffic Impact Assessment (page 83) also states that: The closure of Ngahura Street is not expected to affect vericular traffic, as all the properties on this cul -de-sac are understood to be req Li red for the tunnel construction area. This is not correct. No assessment has been made of the potential effects of access on the subject site or it appears the properties at 98-110 and 112 New North Road which both have (in addition to vehicle assess from New North Road) parking and vehicle entries from Ngahura Street. Provision of "plans" to manage future effects is a widely used tool to cater for specific large scale projects. However the reality remains that there is no detailed information for adjacent property owners to consider. The detailed day to day operation of the site (eg. traffic volumes, access locations to Area A, access to the subject site, perimeter fencing, parking, earthworks location and duration etc) will be critical to the operation and ongoing commercial viability of the subject site given its proximity to a key works site (Area A). Decision requested: Consultation ABA requests consultation with regards to the CEMP and RTNWP (as they relate to the subject site) prior to the documents being finalised and Outline Plan of Works lodged with Council.
114	114/6	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	5.20 Economic	Provision of "plans" to manage future effects is a widely used tool to cater for specific large scale projects. However the reality remains that there is no detailed information for adjacent property owners to consider. The detailed day to day operation of the site (eg. traffic volumes, access locations to Area A, access to the subject site, perimeter fencing, parking, earthworks location and duration etc) will be critical to the operation and ongoing commercial viability of the subject site given its proximity to a key works site (Area A).
114	114/7	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	2.3 Consultation	The EMF documentation preparation process provide no process for input into RNTWP, CEMP or CNVMP Plans by adjoining land owners and the OPW is not subject to notification/approval of adjoining affected land owners/occupiers. It is noted that a Communications Plans is also proposed to disseminate information internally and externally. However there is no specific proposal to consult with directly adjoining property owners in relation to the CEMP, RTNWP or CNVMP. Decision requested: Consultation ABA requests consultation with regards to the CEMP and RTNWP (as they relate to the subject site) prior to the documents being finalised and Outline Plan of Works lodged with Council.
114	114/8	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	Vibration The subject building is a brick and block structure with lightweight timber framed roofing. The effects of construction traffic are currently unknown potentially significant volumes of heavy vehicles may exit Area A in close proximity to the subject site. Decision requested: Vibration ABA requests a pre-construction survey be undertaken on the building prior to works.
114	114/9	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	Vibration The subject building is a brick and block structure with lightweight timber framed roofing. The effects of construction traffic are currently unknown potentially significant volumes of heavy vehicles may exit Area A in close proximity to the subject site. Decision requested: Vibration ABA requests a pre-construction survey be undertaken on the building prior to works.
114	114/10	Auckland Boxing Association	C/O- Eclipse Group Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	Noise It is noted that the Marshall Day Acoustics Report (Appendix G, Figure 7) shows the subject site as being inside the proposed NOR area. It appears unlikely that this will alter the conclusions of the Marshall Day report but confirmation of this would be helpful. Decision requested: Noise Confirmation that the recommendations of Marshall Day report are not altered when the correct NOR boundary is applied.
115	115/1	David Belgrave		1.1 Support - NOR All	
115	115/2	David Belgrave		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	Auckland doesn't work as a city. The only way Auckland will be a successful place to live is if it can reduce it's auto dependence. Sprawl is not sort of environment I would like to raise children in. We need better public transport and a proper rail system. The CRL will be crucial to making the rail system work.
115	115/3	David Belgrave		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby & Elliott streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley streets to then go down again to the platform. Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it's dug up between Wellesley and Customs streets. If possible we should try to remove the slip lane between Wellesley and Victoria streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state,
116	116/1	Tenham Investments Limited	Attn: Graeme Hart	1.24 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 1	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
116	116/2	Tenham Investments Limited	Attn: Graeme Hart	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	a. Vehicular access to the internal parking areas of 148 Quay Street is taken from Tyler Street. We currently own, or have the use of, 5 car parks in this building. The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) prepared by Flow Transportation Consultants notes that there will be at least partial closure of Tyler Street or Galway Street over a period of three and a half years (section 9.3 page 67 of the ITA). It is noted that private vehicles are recorded as lower priority in terms of movement (section 2.2 page 7 of the ITA), and no mention can be found with regard to maintenance of private vehicle crossings in either the Assessment of Effects or the ITA that accompanied the NoR. Tenham Investments Limited wishes to ensure that vehicular access to the building will be maintained during the construction period, or suitable other measures agreed. 7. The specific relief Tenham Investments Limited seeks is as follows: a. Modification of the NoR to maintain vehicular access to the parking areas at 148 Quay Street at all times;
116	116/3	Tenham Investments Limited	Attn: Graeme Hart	5.3 Vibration - construction	b. The noise and vibration report prepared by Marshall Day is very general, and not specific to effects on 148 Quay Street. Tenham Investments Limited is concerned about effects on internal amenity during the construction timeframe, especially because for works around 148 Quay Street there appears to be no opportunity to establish noise barriers. c. Tenham Investments Limited is also concerned about any vibration effects on the building and how dust will be managed. The building will need to be regularly cleaned during this period. 7. The specific relief Tenham Investments Limited seeks is as follows: b. Modification of the NoR to include specific details relating to noise, dust and vibration control, (including surveying pre, during, and post construction and cleaning) and indemnification agreements with regard to the building at 148 Quay Street;
116	116/4	Tenham Investments Limited	Attn: Graeme Hart	5.1 Noise - construction	b. The noise and vibration report prepared by Marshall Day is very general, and not specific to effects on 148 Quay Street. Tenham Investments Limited is concerned about effects on internal amenity during the construction timeframe, especially because for works around 148 Quay Street there appears to be no opportunity to establish noise barriers. c. Tenham Investments Limited is also concerned about any vibration effects on the building and how dust will be managed. The building will need to be regularly cleaned during this period. 7. The specific relief Tenham Investments Limited seeks is as follows: b. Modification of the NoR to include specific details relating to noise, dust and vibration control, (including surveying pre, during, and post construction and cleaning) and indemnification agreements with regard to the building at 148 Quay Street;
116	116/5	Tenham Investments Limited	Attn: Graeme Hart	5.17 Air quality	c. Tenham Investments Limited is also concerned about any vibration effects on the building and how dust will be managed. The building will need to be regularly cleaned during this period. 7. The specific relief Tenham Investments Limited seeks is as follows: b. Modification of the NoR to include specific details relating to noise, dust and vibration control, (including surveying pre, during, and post construction and cleaning) and indemnification agreements with regard to the building at 148 Quay Street;
116	116/6	Tenham Investments Limited	Attn: Graeme Hart	5.34 Construction methodology	d. At face value, the three and half year time frame for construction works for this sector of the City Rail Loop seems excessive, we are concerned about the impact on our access and our business. 7. The specific relief Tenham Investments Limited seeks is as follows: c. Reinvestigation of the construction methodology to reduce construction times and consequent effects on neighbouring businesses; and
117	117/1	Body Corporate 401541	attn: Doug Wilson	1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	
117	117/2	Body Corporate 401541	attn: Doug Wilson	5.1 Noise - construction	The notices of requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents.
117	117/4	Body Corporate 401541	attn: Doug Wilson	5.20 Economic	The notices of requirement will: (b) detrimentally affect tenancies and income therefrom in the building.
117	117/5	Body Corporate 401541	attn: Doug Wilson	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The notices of requirement will: (c) potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
117	117/6	Body Corporate 401541	attn: Doug Wilson	5.17 Air quality	The notices of requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents.
117	117/7	Body Corporate 401541	attn: Doug Wilson	5.35 Health / safety	The notices of requirement will: (c) potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
118	118/1	Angela Bull	Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited	1.22 Neutral, did not care, but requested conditions / amendments - NOR All	I. This submission is made in relation to proposed Plan Modification 68 to the Auckland Council District Plan Operative Auckland City - Central Area Section 2005, being Notice of Requirement 1 ["the NoR"] for the designation of land for rail purposes between Britomart and Mayoral Drive, forming part of the City Rail Link ("CRL") project. 2. The NoR is one of six Notices of Requirement lodged with Auckland Council by Auckland Transport which seek to designate land for the construction, operation and maintenance of the CRL, generally comprising a 3.4km underground passenger railway (including two tracks and three stations) running between Britomart station and the North Auckland Line in the vicinity of Mt Eden station. 3. While Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited ("Foodstuffs") is not opposed to the CRL project, it is opposed to any aspect of the NOR that may adversely affect its supermarket operation at 125 Queen Street. Of particular concern are potential effects on access to the supermarket for service vehicles and customers, and vibration effects from construction activities.
118	118/2	Angela Bull	Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	3. While Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited ["Foodstuffs"] is not opposed to the CRL project, it is opposed to any aspect of the NOR that may adversely affect its supermarket operation at 125 Queen Street. Of particular concern are potential effects on access to the supermarket for service vehicles and customers, and vibration effects from construction activities. 10. In addition, Foodstuffs is concerned that the trenching of Albert Street will create a physical barrier for pedestrians wishing to cross Albert Street in the vicinity of Swanson Street, thereby inhibiting the ability for a proportion of their customer base to access the supermarket.
118	118/3	Angela Bull	Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited	5.9 Transport - construction	Transport Effects 7. A 'cut and cover' methodology is proposed for the construction of rail tunnels within the Albert Street road reserve. This work is to be staged over a 2 to 3 year timeframe. Construction is to be managed so as to maintain one lane of traffic in each direction along Albert Street and it is proposed that access to properties adjoining Albert Street will be maintained throughout the construction period, albeit restricted to left in/left out manoeuvres. The nature of the work is such that vehicle movement across Albert Street will not be possible between Customs Street and Victoria Street during the cut and cover period of construction. 8. Having regard to the nature of the construction works required along Albert Street, Foodstuffs is concerned that the significant extent of construction works proposed will jeopardise the timely delivery of goods required daily for the supermarket operation. 9. The 'hierarchy of movement priority', suggested within the Integrated Transport Assessment to guide the management of various modes of transport within the city centre during construction, places the highest priority on pedestrian and public transport movements, followed by service and delivery vehicles, with private vehicle movements given the lowest priority. Given the critical nature of daily deliveries to the New World supermarket, Foodstuffs seeks that the movement priority list be amended to provide equal importance to those deliveries as to pedestrian and public transport movements.
118	118/4	Angela Bull	Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	Vibration effects 11. The construction vibration 'contour' analysis undertaken by Marshall Day and reported in the supporting Noise and Vibration Assessment illustrates that 125 Queen Street will be positioned outside of the area potentially subject to a level of vibration that may result in building damage. Nevertheless, Foodstuffs is concerned that damage may occur to the building fabric and to fixtures and fittings in the New World Supermarket. 12. An equivalent 'contour' analysis of the area anticipated to be subject to level of vibration that may adversely affect occupants of nearby buildings ('human response') has not been provided but it is stated in the Noise and Vibration Assessment that the vibration effects will be "imperceptible" approximately 200 metres away from the source. Furthermore, occupants on lower floors will receive higher vibration levels than those on upper levels. 13. Given that the New World supermarket is located within the basement level of a building located within 100 metres of the proposed vibration source, the vibration effects of the proposed cut and cover construction could potentially result in damage to the building fabric and to store fixtures and fittings, and unacceptable adverse effects on the safety and comfort of staff and customers of the supermarket.
118	118/5	Angela Bull	Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited	5.34 Construction methodology	Construction Management 14. The primary method proposed to mitigate adverse effects such as those of concern to Foodstuffs is by way of a Construction Environment Management Plan (along with a number of associated Delivery Work Plans). These are to be provided to Auckland Council as part of the Outline Plan of Works 20 days prior to the commencement of construction. The Outline Plan of Works process does not require consultation with potentially affected owners and occupiers of buildings in the vicinity of the proposed works. There is, therefore, no certainty that Foodstuffs input to the Construction Environment Management Plan, nor its approval of measures to address its concerns, will be sought. 15. Foodstuffs seeks an assurance that the applicant will be required to undertake appropriate and meaningful consultation with them as an affected party and that the Foodstuffs approval will be required on matters potentially affecting the operation of the New World supermarket.
118	118/6	Angela Bull	Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited	2.3 Consultation	4. Foodstuffs has not been consulted by Auckland Transport in relation to the NoR. Construction Management 14. The primary method proposed to mitigate adverse effects such as those of concern to Foodstuffs is by way of a Construction Environment Management Plan (along with a number of associated Delivery Work Plans). These are to be provided to Auckland Council as part of the Outline Plan of Works 20 days prior to the commencement of construction. The Outline Plan of Works process does not require consultation with potentially affected owners and occupiers of buildings in the vicinity of the proposed works. There is, therefore, no certainty that Foodstuffs input to the Construction Environment Management Plan, nor its approval of measures to address its concerns, will be sought. 15. Foodstuffs seeks an assurance that the applicant will be required to undertake appropriate and meaningful consultation with them as an affected party and that the Foodstuffs approval will be required on matters potentially affecting the operation of the New World supermarket. Decision Sought 16. In the event that the Application is granted, Foodstuffs seeks conditions attached to the designation for the CRL project requiring that: Foodstuffs is to be consulted on mitigation measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the operation of its New World supermarket at 125 Queen Street arising from the construction works along Albert Street;

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					Compensation arrangements are to be agreed with Foodstuffs that will apply in the event that the operation of the New World supermarket is adversely affected by the works; and The relevant sections of the Outline Plan of Works and subsidiary documents will be subject to the approval of Foodstuffs.
118	118/7	Angela Bull	Foodstuffs (Auckland) Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Decision Sought 16. In the event that the Application is granted, Foodstuffs seeks conditions attached to the designation for the CRL project requiring that: Compensation arrangements are to be agreed with Foodstuffs that will apply in the event that the operation of the New World supermarket is adversely affected by the works; and
119	119/1	Cameron Pinches	The Campaign for Better Transport	1.1 Support - NOR All	The Campaign for Better Transport (CBT) is an incorporated society that advocates for better transport options in the Auckland region. At the time of writing, the CBT has 52 financial members. The CBT is a voluntary organisation and is politically independent. SUMMARY The Campaign for Better Transport (CBT) enthusiastically and wholeheartedly supports the Notices of Requirement 1 to 6 (NoR 1-6) under section 168(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) which seek to designate land in central Auckland for the construction, maintenance and operation of the City Rail Link (CRL).
119	119/3	Cameron Pinches	The Campaign for Better Transport	3.1 Appropriate solution	
119	119/4	Cameron Pinches	The Campaign for Better Transport	4.1 Part 2 RMA	The CBT recognises that these adverse effects will be significant, particularly for the commuters and for residents and business owners. Certainly there is a human cost borne by people forced to move and in some cases sell their properties. But as stated previously the CBT believes that the benefits of the project as listed in section 1.8 of the supporting document, "CRL NoR: Assessment of Effects on the Environment", page 21 and itemised below as RN 1-7 are so compelling, realistic and sustainable that the project meets the test of Part 2 of the RMA (purpose and principles), Section 5 and that there is full justification for it proceeding. The CBT accepts that there has been a robust and comprehensive consideration of alternatives both to the concept of an underground rail link between Britomart and Mt Eden and alternate designs and alignments to the one being proposed by NoR 1-6. It is accepted that the 2010 study and the 2012 study review do satisfy the requirement of the RMA Section 171(1)b that "adequate consideration has been given to alternative Sites, routes, or methods of undertaking the works"
119	119/5	Cameron Pinches	The Campaign for Better Transport	5.9 Transport - construction	EFFECTS AND MITIGATION The CBT's response to the effects and mitigation topic for N of R 1-6 as detailed in Section 7 of the supporting document, Volume 3: 'City Rail link N of R: Assessment on the Environment' (AEE), pages 112-217 is as follows: Tables excluded from summary
120	120/1	BWT Investments Limited	attn:Vern Warren	1.28 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 5	
120	120/2	BWT Investments Limited	attn:Vern Warren	5.20 Economic	a) The submitter is the owner of the property at 224 Symonds Street. b) This property immediately adjoins the designation boundary and is directly opposite the proposed location of the Newton station. c) The premises are currently occupied by the Squid Row restaurant, the Cartel Bar and 2 media tenants. Continued viability of those businesses, or in other words the ability to continue to carry out legitimate activities on the site and within the building are totally dependent on continued high standard of access, stability of the building, and adherence in the vicinity of the property to district plan noise standards. d) Potential adverse effects of this property during construction of the City Rail Loop and the Newton station in particular, have not been documented in sufficient detail for those effects to be known or understood. Assessment of effects appears to be primarily limited to land within the NOR boundaries with scant consideration of adverse effects on properties outside those boundaries.
120	120/3	BWT Investments Limited	attn:Vern Warren	4.2 RMA policy framework	e) Insufficient information has been provided with respect to effects on the environment outside the NOR boundaries or consistency with the objectives, policies and rules of the district plan for the adjoining zones to enable the Council to perform its duties under section 171 (a) and (b). j) Details of many aspects of the potential construction effects appear to have been left for more detailed consideration at the Outline Plan stage. Unless more detailed analysis of the concerns and potential adverse effects on the environment listed above are carried out and considered at the NOR stage, there will be no opportunity for the submitter to be involved in the consideration of adverse effects directly on his property or on potential mitigation measures. k) Unless further analysis referred to in (c) to (j) above is available for consideration at a hearing of the NOR, the Council will have no basis for suggesting conditions on the NOR to avoid remedy or mitigate these adverse effects, and the submitter will be in a similar position. 1) The submitter generally supports the concept of the City Rail Loop once constructed and in operation. However, the submitter strongly considers that the NOR should not be approved unless or until adequate information is provided about the concerns raised to enable the submitter to

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
					make competent representations at the hearing of the NOR. If adequate information is not forthcoming, the Council should recommend that the NOR be withdrawn. 2. Decision sought: (a) That, under s.92 of the Act, the Council request the Requiring Authority to provide further information with respect to the matters raised in this submission; and (b) The hearing of the NOR submissions be deferred until adequate further information on these matters has been provided, or (c) Council recommend that NOR be withdrawn
120	120/4	BWT Investments Limited	attn:Vern Warren	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	f) There will be significant adverse effects on access to this property due to partial or full closing or closings of Symonds Street adjacent to or in the vicinity of the the property. However, no indication has been given about potential timing or duration of such closings, or what kind of alternative access will be provided.
120	120/5	BWT Investments Limited	attn:Vern Warren	5.3 Vibration - construction	g) There is potential for significant adverse vibration effects on the submitter's property during construction and no analysis appears to be carried out on that potential effect.
120	120/6	BWT Investments Limited	attn:Vern Warren	5.1 Noise - construction	h) There is potential for significant adverse noise effects on the splitters property during construction and no analysis appears have been carried out on that potential effect.
120	120/7	BWT Investments Limited	attn:Vern Warren	4.1 Part 2 RMA	i) From the combination of the foregoing concerns there is significant potential for the legitimate activities carried out on the site to be significantly interrupted or permanently damaged in a way that would be contrary to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act, 1991.
120	120/8	BWT Investments Limited	attn:Vern Warren	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	j) Details of many aspects of the potential construction effects appear to have been left for more detailed consideration at the Outline Plan stage. Unless more detailed analysis of the concerns and potential adverse effects on the environment listed above are carried out and considered at the NOR stage, there will be no opportunity for the submitter to be involved in the consideration of adverse effects directly on his property or on potential mitigation measures. k) Unless further analysis referred to in (c) to (j) above is available for consideration at a hearing of the NOR, the Council will have no basis for suggesting conditions on the NOR to avoid remedy or mitigate these adverse effects, and the submitter will be in a similar position. 1) The submitter generally supports the concept of the City Rail Loop once constructed and in operation. However, the submitter strongly considers that the NOR should not be approved unless or until adequate information is provided about the concerns raised to enable the submitter to make competent representations at the hearing of the NOR. If adequate information is not forthcoming, the Council should recommend that the NOR be withdrawn. 2. Decision sought: (a) That, under s.92 of the Act, the Council request the Requiring Authority to provide further information with respect to the matters raised in this submission; and (b) The hearing of the NOR submissions be deferred until adequate further information on these matters has been provided, or (c) Council recommend that NOR be withdrawn
121	121/1	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	1.32 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 2) subject to conditions / amendments	
121	121/2	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	1.33 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 3) subject to conditions / amendments	
121	121/3	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	1.34 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 4) subject to conditions / amendments	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
121	121/4	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	1. The first of these concerns regards our earthquake status. We understand that the George Court Building is not earthquake prone in that it is above the 33% threshold and has been assessed by Council as in the 40%-50% range. Given its age we need to be exceedingly careful to maintain the structural integrity of the building and we will naturally oppose any activity that mayor could in any way impair the structural integrity of the building. We are not engineers and would be grateful for Council's research and investigations into whether the tunnel - in construction or operation or simply the presence of the tunnel being there - could have any impact on the structure of our building, either through weakening of the building itself or weakening of the soil structure below. We have all heard of instances where underground activity has a direct impact on structures above, for instance the natural gas 'fracking' in other countries. Closer to home - the recent round of house subsidence in Waihi near the Martha Gold Mine - tells us that the mere presence of tunnels can cause issues further down the line. We are also generally aware that weakening can be caused by something of large and of short duration - such as blasting- or it can be due to repetitive small impacts such as vibration over a long period of time. We would expect to be able to receive assurance from Council that the tunnel would have no impact on the structure of our building. Given the important built heritage of the George Court Building and the pre-eminence of earthquake zoning issues in New Zealand following the Christchurch earthquake, we believe that special consideration needs to be given to our concerns on this. We welcome a dialogue with Council.
121	121/5	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	5.8 Built heritage	We would expect to be able to receive assurance from Council that the tunnel would have no impact on the structure of our building. Given the important built heritage of the George Court Building and the pre-eminence of earthquake zoning issues in New Zealand following the Christchurch earthquake, we believe that special consideration needs to be given to our concerns on this. We welcome a dialogue with Council.
121	121/6	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	5.1 Noise - construction	2. We have noise concerns with regard to the vibration both during the building and during its ongoing operation. Even with the 'vibration reducing tracks', we would like to know if Council can provide us with research to mitigate our concerns about permanent noise disruption. For instance, are there other buildings with tracks at a similar distance below the ground that Council is aware of, and what are the measured noise levels for those buildings. Likewise, during construction, what is the expected noise level.
121	121/7	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	5.2 Noise - operational	2. We have noise concerns with regard to the vibration both during the building and during its ongoing operation. Even with the 'vibration reducing tracks', we would like to know if Council can provide us with research to mitigate our concerns about permanent noise disruption. For instance, are there other buildings with tracks at a similar distance below the ground that Council is aware of, and what are the measured noise levels for those buildings. Likewise, during construction, what is the expected noise level. 3. We have separate noise concerns about the ventilation shaft, which will exit at street level at 9 Mercury Lane, directly facing the longest side of our building and across a narrow road. We would be grateful if Council can provide us with research about the ongoing noise levels expected from this structure, and we would like to be provided with a detailed plan of the ventilation shaft structure before we decide what, if any, objection we wish to make.
121	121/8	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	5.9 Transport - construction	4. We would like to understand if there are any other associated plans in the general area that may impact our owners, for instance vehicle drop off/parking associated with the Karangahape Station. We would also like to know where the various entrances to the station might be located and if there are plans for this, we would like a copy.
121	121/9	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	5.10 Transport - operational	4. We would like to understand if there are any other associated plans in the general area that may impact our owners, for instance vehicle drop off/parking associated with the Karangahape Station. We would also like to know where the various entrances to the station might be located and if there are plans for this, we would like a copy.
121	121/10	Body Corporate 182621 George Court Bulding	attn: Anthony Segedin	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	In summary, we are at this point seeking greater clarity on the potential impacts of the proposed City Rail Link on our heritage building. We welcome your response and dialogue to assure ourselves and our owners that the structure of our building and our enjoyment of it will not be impaired.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
122	122/1	Ministry of Justice	Attn: Matthew Kerr-Ridge	1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	The Ministry opposes the Notices of Requirement; The Ministry has property located at 65-71 Albert Street, Auckland, which is adjacent to the proposed designation of Notice of Requirement 1. This houses the Auckland Departmental Building and the Auckland District Court, and the Ministry has a statutory obligation to ensure the function of this civil institution. The proposed works have the potential to impede the function and security of the Auckland District Court in the following ways: Access and transport disruption, particularly during the open trenching of Albert Street, Noise, vibration, dust and other construction related disturbances including to its sensitive recording equipment, Interference with key infrastructure elements (power, water, phone/internet); Safety and security in and around the Auckland District Court building particularly in regard to the high security nature of operations at the Auckland District Court Building damage as a result of excavation. Overall it is considered that the proposed works associated with Notice of Requirement 1 will potentially adversely affect the Ministry's ability to operate the Auckland District Court at Albert Street. It is imperative that the function of the Auckland District Court be accommodated in the consideration of Auckland Transports Notices of Requirement. The Auckland District Court is critical to justice services as 23% of all District Court Jury trials, 13% of all Criminal Summary and 35% of Civil cases are dealt with in this court.
122	122/2	Ministry of Justice	Attn: Matthew Kerr-Ridge	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	The Ministry seeks the following assurances and conditions from the territorial authority: Assurance from Auckland Council that access and transportation will not be affected in a way which will impede access to the Auckland District Council building
122	122/3	Ministry of Justice	Attn: Matthew Kerr-Ridge	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The Ministry seeks the following assurances and conditions from the territorial authority: Assurance from Auckland Council that the risk of building damage to the Auckland District court building at 65-71 Albert Street as a result of construction is negligible and the necessary provisions are in place to ensure damage to the Ministry's assets is avoided. In the event that any damage is incurred the Auckland Council will at its own cost remedy any such damage and will throughout the works take out adequate insurance for the same including business interruption insurance. Given the unique operating requirements of the Auckland District Court including sensitive recording equipment, it is critical that a Site Specific Construction Management Plan be developed to mitigate noise, vibration, dust and other construction related disturbances and to first agree solutions with the Ministry of Justice for these issues
122	122/4	Ministry of Justice	Attn: Matthew Kerr-Ridge	5.3 Vibration - construction	The Ministry seeks the following assurances and conditions from the territorial authority: Assurance from Auckland Council that the risk of building damage to the Auckland District court building at 65-71 Albert Street as a result of construction is negligible and the necessary provisions are in place to ensure damage to the Ministry's assets is avoided. In the event that any damage is incurred the Auckland Council will at its own cost remedy any such damage and will throughout the works take out adequate insurance for the same including business interruption insurance. Given the unique operating requirements of the Auckland District Court including sensitive recording equipment, it is critical that a Site Specific Construction Management Plan be developed to mitigate noise, vibration, dust and other construction related disturbances and to first agree solutions with the Ministry of Justice for these issues
122	122/5	Ministry of Justice	Attn: Matthew Kerr-Ridge	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	The Ministry seeks the following assurances and conditions from the territorial authority: Assurance from Auckland Council that the risk of building damage to the Auckland District court building at 65-71 Albert Street as a result of construction is negligible and the necessary provisions are in place to ensure damage to the Ministry's assets is avoided. In the event that any damage is incurred the Auckland Council will at its own cost remedy any such damage and will throughout the works take out adequate insurance for the same including business interruption insurance. Given the unique operating requirements of the Auckland District Court including sensitive recording equipment, it is critical that a Site Specific Construction Management Plan be developed to mitigate noise, vibration, dust and other construction related disturbances and to first agree solutions with the Ministry of Justice for these issues
122	122/6	Ministry of Justice	Attn: Matthew Kerr-Ridge	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	The Ministry seeks the following assurances and conditions from the territorial authority: Assurance from Auckland Council that the risk of building damage to the Auckland District court building at 65-71 Albert Street as a result of construction is negligible and the necessary provisions are in place to ensure damage to the Ministry's assets is avoided. In the event that any damage is incurred the Auckland Council will at its own cost remedy any such damage and will throughout the works take out adequate insurance for the same including business interruption insurance. Given the unique operating requirements of the Auckland District Court including sensitive recording equipment, it is critical that a Site Specific Construction Management Plan be developed to mitigate noise, vibration, dust and other construction related disturbances and to first agree solutions with the Ministry of Justice for these issues, Conditions to assure that access to key infrastructure networks will not be affected in a manner which disrupts the function of the Auckland District Court and requirement that the Ministry be contacted regarding any temporary infrastructure network outages well in advance to ensure the Ministry can make the necessary provisions to accommodate these events, Conditions which accommodate the security requirements of Auckland District Court in the Site Specific Construction Management Plan, and assurance from Auckland Council that security of the Ministry's operations at 65-71 Albert Street will not be impeded by the proposed works.
123	123/1	Julie Stout	Urban Auckland	1.1 Support - NOR All	Urban Auckland wholeheartedly support the City Rail Link as set out in the Auckland Plan as the top transformative act for Auckland City's future. We support the project as a whole, and endorse the Eastern Facing Connections rather than the Western Interchange. We support the general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
124	124/1	Jeffrey van Vosselen	The Langham	1.12 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 4	
124	124/2	Jeffrey van Vosselen	The Langham	3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	We propose that there should be an additional exit at the corner of Karangahape Road and Queen Street.
125	125/1	Ryan Bradley		1.1 Support - NOR All	It will improve the public transport (train) network for Auckland by allowing more capacity through the city and new stations in good central locations. It will allow land use in the vicinity of the new stations to be intensified in line with the Auckland Plan.
126	126/1	Terence J Brown		1.32 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 2) subject to conditions / amendments	That a decision on the designation be deferred subject to further consideration of a loop / link operation that is fully beneficial to future PT options. That the applications to build the Newton tunnel as proposed be declined.
126	126/2	Terence J Brown		1.33 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 3) subject to conditions / amendments	That a decision on the designation be deferred subject to further consideration of a loop / link operation that is fully beneficial to future PT options. That the applications to build the Newton tunnel as proposed be declined.
126	126/3	Terence J Brown		1.35 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 5) subject to conditions / amendments	That a decision on the designation be deferred subject to further consideration of a loop / link operation that is fully beneficial to future PT options. That the applications to build the Newton tunnel as proposed be declined.
126	126/4	Terence J Brown		1.36 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 6) subject to conditions / amendments	That a decision on the designation be deferred subject to further consideration of a loop / link operation that is fully beneficial to future PT options. That the applications to build the Newton tunnel as proposed be declined.
126	126/5	Terence J Brown		3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	The construction of the rail tunnel under Symonds Street and the connection of the CRL to the NAL is not conducive to a sustainable transport solution (an objective). No provision is made for good bus / rail transfer, particularly at Aotea Station at Wellesley / Victoria Street. The triangulation of the CRL onto the NAL is poorly scoped and time inefficiencies for train operations will be an outcome. The proposed plan does not meet the future proof for expected growth criteria or give full consideration of the need to have associated plans to ensure the railway network as a whole within the city centre is operationally effective. The project objectives have not been met with the designation plans. Placing the Newton Station under the intersection of 3 primary arterials will negatively impact the provision of good and services to an expanded central area. The rail location as proposed in original report would allow PT and general urban services to be better placed. The Britomart Station remains constrained by the 2 track entry from the east. The use of the tunnels as a link rather than a loop as stated by (??) at IPENZ presentation would not generate efficiencies. The downgrading of Mt Eden Station (inside the triangulation) removes a significant walk up capacity and removes the ability to consider efficient bus / train transfers. The potential to have bus services terminate outside the CBD may be removed. If the train is to serve as an inner city distributor as outlined, the services MUST include a loop as well as a link function. There are insufficient stations between Newmarket and Britomart to generate a functional passenger service. Parnell Station as proposed is NOT sufficient. The system proposed totally eliminates the effective use of (???) (Eastern Line) passengers from getting into the other city stops without transferring to western and central line services. All of these factors mean that the tunnel does NOT meet the objectives of maximizing benefits of existing and proposed investment in transport. • An additional factor is the absence of high quality train / bus interchange for North Shore patronage. The plans should include provision for subterranean bus-stops above the rail at Wellesley and Victoria Streets. It is essential that the inner-CBD is de-bused by providing better loading and unloading and (??) layup of services on city streets. The use of the large Waterview tunnel boring machine was dismissed by AT personnel. There may be some very significant future benefits that could be achieved by considering a double-decker tunnel. These are now common around the world for vehicles although not sure about rail. A single 14m tunnel rather than 2 6.4m bores may be an option that would relieve a lot of the potential negative impacts of separated tunnels on adjacent landuse. This would be completely in line with Objective 1 future proof for expected growth.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
126	126/6	Terence J Brown		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The construction of the rail tunnel under Symonds Street and the connection of the CRL to the NAL is not conducive to a sustainable transport solution• (an objective) No provision is made for good bus / rail transfer, particularly at Aotea Station at Wellesley / Victoria Street. The triangulation• of the CRL onto the NAL is poorly scoped and time inefficiencies for train operations will be an outcome. The proposed plan does not meet the future proof for expected growth• criteria or give full consideration of the need to have associated plans to ensure the railway network as a whole within the city centre is operationally effective. The project objectives have not been met with the designation plans. Placing the Newton Station under the intersection of 3 primary arterials will negatively impact the provision of good and services to an expanded central area. The rail location as proposed in original report would allow PT and general urban services to be better placed. The Britomart Station remains constrained by the 2 track entry from the east. The use of the tunnels as a link• rather than a loop• as stated by (??) at IPENZ presentation would not generate efficiencies. The downgrading of Mt Eden Station (inside the triangulation) removes a significant walk up• capacity and removes the ability to consider efficient bus / train transfers. The potential to have bus services terminate outside the CBD may be removed. If the train is to serve as an inner city distributor as outlined, the services MUST include a loop as well as a link function. There are insufficient stations between Newmarket and Britomart to generate a functional passenger service. Parnell Station as proposed is NOT sufficient. The system proposed totally eliminates the effective use of (???) (Eastern Line) passengers from getting into the other city stops without transferring to western and central line services. All of these factors mean that the tunnel does NOT meet the objectives of maximizing benefits of existing and proposed investment in transport.• An additional factor is the absence of high quality train / bus interchange for North Shore patronage. The plans should include provision for subterranean bus-stops above the rail at Wellesley and Victoria Streets. It is essential that the inner-CBD is de-bused• by providing better loading and unloading and (??) layup of services on city streets. The use of the large Waterview tunnel boring machine was dismissed by AT personnel. There may be some very significant future benefits that could be achieved by considering a double-decker• tunnel. These are now common around the world for vehicles although not sure about rail. A single 14m tunnel rather than 2 6.4m bores may be an option that would relieve a lot of the potential negative impacts of separated tunnels on adjacent landuse. This would be completely in line with Objective 1 future proof for expected growth• .
127	127/1	John C Quinn		1.1 Support - NOR All	
128	128/1	Yuyuan Song		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
129	129/1	Helen L Page		1.1 Support - NOR All	
130	130/1	Benjamin J McIntyre		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
130	130/2	Benjamin J McIntyre		6.6 Business case	Too much to invest on 19th Century Transport and Technology in a city which has population too small to sustain it. Go ahead with electrification of existing lines and modernizing stock but put a hold on any line extensions for at least 10 years or when the existing lines generate a profit.
131	131/1	Ismail Zahir		1.1 Support - NOR All	
132	132/1	Sarah Young		1.1 Support - NOR All	
133	133/1	Glen McCabe		1.1 Support - NOR All	
134	134/1	Craig S Conner		1.1 Support - NOR All	
135	135/1	Konini M Napa		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	I do not agree that a new railway loop would improve our transport service. The extra expense and work would be very too costly for working people and our childrens children.
135	135/3	Konini M Napa		6.6 Business case	Too expensive and hard work. I and many friends do not like being in closed-up areas or underground. I do not like to think my children will pay for something they didn't ask for.
136	136/1	Tracey F Ironside		1.1 Support - NOR All	
137	137/1	CJM Investments Limited	attn: Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	1.36 Oppose / withdraw, or if confirmed, (NOR 6) subject to conditions / amendments	4. The company seeks the following recommendation or decision from the unitary authority: 4.1 That the notice of requirement be withdrawn; or 4.2 That the notice of requirement be modified; or 4.3 That conditions be imposed; and 4.4 Such alternative, consequential, or further relief as may be appropriate or necessary to give effect to this submission.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
137	137/2	CJM Investments Limited	attn: Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	5.9 Transport - construction	3.4(a) The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect that surrounding road network serving the subject site, and will have an adverse effect on site access.
137	137/3	CJM Investments Limited	attn: Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	5.23 Property rights	3.4(b) The designation will, if confirmed, prevent reasonable use of the subject site.
137	137/4	CJM Investments Limited	attn: Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	4.2 RMA policy framework	3.5 The notice of requirement (including the assessment of effects on the environment) does not comply with relevant statutory and regulatory provisions.
137	137/5	CJM Investments Limited	attn: Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	4.1 Part 2 RMA	3.7 Confirming the designation will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
137	137/6	CJM Investments Limited	attn: Trevor Daya-Winterbottom	3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	3.6 Adequate consideration has not been given to alternative sites, routes or methods of undertaking the work.
138	138/1	John R Fryer	House of Knives	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
138	138/4	John R Fryer	House of Knives	5.9 Transport - construction	Roads Concern that construction activity brings chaos to the area and our customers, cannot or will not seek us out when roads are closed. Parking The Auckland Transport are not known to be able to police parking now - around construction works effectively. During this period, they own the project - so who will police them?
138	138/6	John R Fryer	House of Knives	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Roads Concern that construction activity brings chaos to the area and our customers, cannot or will not seek us out when roads are closed.
138	138/7	John R Fryer	House of Knives	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	Buildings I have expressed concern about the state of our buildings prior to any work being done to be bench marked. So if / when we get problems from construction that there will be no arguments and repairs will be carried out at no costs!!!
138	138/8	John R Fryer	House of Knives	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Buildings I have expressed concern about the state of our buildings prior to any work being done to be bench marked. So if / when we get problems from construction that there will be no arguments and repairs will be carried out at no costs!!!
138	138/9	John R Fryer	House of Knives	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	Buildings I have expressed concern about the state of our buildings prior to any work being done to be bench marked. So if / when we get problems from construction that there will be no arguments and repairs will be carried out at no costs!!!
138	138/10	John R Fryer	House of Knives	5.20 Economic	
138	138/11	John R Fryer	House of Knives	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Rates / Taxes Our businesses will suffer because of a number of reasons around construction... it has been reported in other projects - i.e. Greenlane. During construction period, no rates, targeted or otherwise should be paid.
139	139/1	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	1.26 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 3	I submit this opposition in my capacity as General Manager for Blackstone Group, which manages the Chatham Hotel and Residential Apartments in Pitt Street. Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, The Chatham to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same.
139	139/2	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.9 Transport - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
139	139/3	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
139	139/4	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.20 Economic	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
139	139/5	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.2 Noise - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
139	139/6	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.4 Vibration - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
139	139/7	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property. Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, The Chatham to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same.
140	140/1	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	1.25 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 2	I submit this opposition in my capacity at General Manager for Blackstone Group, which manages The Chatham Hotel and Residential Apartments in Pitt Street. Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, The Chatham to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same.
140	140/2	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 2. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 3. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
140	140/3	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 2. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 3. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
140	140/4	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.20 Economic	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 2. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 3. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
140	140/5	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 2. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 3. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
140	140/6	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.2 Noise - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 2. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 3. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
140	140/7	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.4 Vibration - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 2. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 3. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
140	140/8	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, The Chatham to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same.
141	141/1	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	1.24 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 1	I submit this opposition in my capacity as General Manager for Blackstone Group, which manages Chifley Suites located in Albert Street. Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, Chifley Suites to be compensated for all direct and consequential loss of income during the entire construction phase per this Notice.
141	141/2	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.9 Transport - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of Chifley Suites due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 4. Consequential loss of income due to above mentioned items detaching customers from visiting the hotel. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.
141	141/3	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of Chifley Suites due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 4. Consequential loss of income due to above mentioned items detaching customers from visiting the hotel. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
141	141/4	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of Chifley Suites due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 4. Consequential loss of income due to above mentioned items detaching customers from visiting the hotel. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.
141	141/5	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of Chifley Suites due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 4. Consequential loss of income due to above mentioned items detaching customers from visiting the hotel. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.
141	141/6	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.20 Economic	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of Chifley Suites due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 4. Consequential loss of income due to above mentioned items detaching customers from visiting the hotel. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.
141	141/7	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, Chifley Suites to be compensated for all direct and consequential loss of income during the entire construction phase per this Notice.
141	141/8	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of Chifley Suites due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 4. Consequential loss of income due to above mentioned items detaching customers from visiting the hotel. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.
142	142/1	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	1.26 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 3	I submit this opposition in my capacity as Director of 70 Pitt Street Limited, which owns The Chatham Hotel and Residential Apartments in Pitt Street. Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, 70 Pitt Street Limited to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same.
142	142/2	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.9 Transport - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and/or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and /or choosing to invest in the property.
142	142/3	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and/or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and /or choosing to invest in the property.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
142	142/4	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and /or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and /or choosing to invest in the property.
142	142/5	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and /or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and /or choosing to invest in the property.
142	142/6	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.20 Economic	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and /or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and /or choosing to invest in the property.
142	142/7	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, 70 Pitt Street Limited to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same.
142	142/8	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and /or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and /or choosing to invest in the property.
143	143/1	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	1.25 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 2	I submit this opposition in my capacity as Director of 70 Pitt Street Limited, which owns The Chatham Hotel and Residential Apartments in Pitt Street. Decision sought: 1. We proposed that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, 70 Pitt Street Limited to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same. 3. Further to the above, 70 Pitt Street Limited owns the sub-strata land directly beneath The Chatham, in the location of the proposed tunnel. Should Council therefore decide to proceed with the proposed development, compensation will be sought by 70 Pitt Street Limited for Council's use of this land.
143	143/2	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.9 Transport - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. 4. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham, causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
143	143/3	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building.
143	143/4	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
143	143/5	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building.
143	143/6	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.20 Economic	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building.
143	143/7	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	The proposed process contemplated under this Notice would be to the detriment of The Chatham due to the following reasons: 1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building.
143	143/8	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, 70 Pitt Street Limited to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same. 3. Further to the above, 70 Pitt Street Limited owns the sub-strata land directly beneath The Chatham, in the location of the proposed tunnel. Should Council therefore decide to proceed with the proposed development, compensation will be sought by 70 Pitt Street Limited for Council's use of the said land.
144	144/1	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	1.24 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 1	Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, 74 Albert Street Limited to be compensated for all direct and consequential loss of income during the entire construction phase per this Notice.
144	144/2	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.9 Transport - construction	1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel.
144	144/3	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel.
144	144/4	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing hotel customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.
144	144/5	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing hotel customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.
144	144/6	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.20 Economic	1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel. 2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing hotel customers occupying the hotel. 3. Subsequent to the above, construction works and / or machinery disturbing hotel customers due to unacceptable noise levels. 4. Consequential loss of income due to above mentioned items deterring customers from visiting the hotel. 5. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of the hotel by causing further ongoing noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting Chifley Suites.
144	144/7	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Decision sought: 1. We propose that Council rejects the planned rail link in terms of this Notice. 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, 74 Albert Street Limited to be compensated for all direct and consequential loss of income during the entire construction phase per this Notice.
144	144/8	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers from reaching the hotel.
145	145/1	Robert S Lawton		1.1 Support - NOR All	I have no details specifically about any particular notice, my desire is for my children, my grand-children and all their off-spring to have the opportunity to be part of an integrated city in which they can move around and grow.
146	146/1	Rosza Majsa		1.1 Support - NOR All	
147	147/1	John Morrow		1.1 Support - NOR All	
147	147/2	John Morrow		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I recommend that during this designation phase, you also designate an area at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to allow for access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby. I expect this level entrance being the most utilised entrance of all Aotea as it would provide the most convenient way to access the station from the heart of the city. Please also consider a second station at Newton Station to Symonds Street. This will reduce the bottleneck that i expect to see there.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
147	147/3	John Morrow		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the proposed alignment of the route and the location of the three stations. I am especially pleased with the proposed Aotea Station location, and although I have some recommendations below, this station will play incredibly important role in the Auckland's transport system as a whole. I absolutely support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. This will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton - ensuring the capacity of the CRL is fully utilised.
148	148/1	Wayne Bartlett		1.1 Support - NOR All	
149	149/1	Jym Clark		1.8 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR All	
149	149/2	Jym Clark		2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	1. Further details to be sought on the process for re-instating the streetscape of Albert Street after covering off the tunnel. 2. Provide information on how stations will be future proofed to provide additional portal access as required.
149	149/3	Jym Clark		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	3. Designate land between the future Aotea Station and Queen St to provide level access to the station from Queen Street.
149	149/4	Jym Clark		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	
150	150/1	Ian Hansen		1.1 Support - NOR All	
151	151/1	Rhys G Jones		1.1 Support - NOR All	The rest of this submission should be seen in the context of this overall support: in short, the proposals are sound and the necessary consents should be granted. Further, i support the general alignment of the route and the proposed location of the three stations.
151	151/2	Rhys G Jones		3.1 Appropriate solution	Further, i support the general alignment of the route and the proposed location of the three stations. I support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. This would allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton - ensuring the capacity of the City Rail Link is fully utilised. It would also provide the best future solution for Grafton Station, which (with the development of the University of Auckland's Newmarket Campus, among other things) is likely to become one of the busiest stations in the entire network. It is critical to get it right at this important stage in the planning.
152	152/1	Gemma Hayes		1.8 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR All	
152	152/2	Gemma Hayes		5.8 Built heritage	I am concerned about losing the character of K'Rd, and a potential loss of the heritage building along this street. The buildings along K'Rd that may be affected by gentrification should be scheduled and protected as heritage items within the unitary plan as part of the CRL designation conditions.
152	152/4	Gemma Hayes		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I think that a second station entrance at Newton station on the eastern side of Symonds Street should be provided.
153	153/1	Ross D Galloway		1.1 Support - NOR All	
154	154/1	Matthew Triggs		1.1 Support - NOR All	I support the CRL and the notices of requirement in general. Commencement of construction of the CRL cannot start soon enough for those of us who use the western line.
154	154/2	Matthew Triggs		3.1 Appropriate solution	I strongly support the decision to retain the east facing connection rather than the inner west interchange. The EFC will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton - ensuring the capacity of the CRL is fully utilised and also that Grafton Station will continue to play and meaningful role in the rail network. I support the general alignment of the route and the location of the three new stations. Aotea at the heart of midtown, K Road serving an area furthest from the existing rail network and Newton station acting as a catalyst for the growth of an area with enormous development potential.
155	155/1	Ben Lenihan		1.1 Support - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
155	155/2	Ben Lenihan		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the proposed general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations. Aotea at the heart of midtown, K Road serving an area furthest from the existing rail network and Newton station acting as a catalyst for the growth of an area with enormous development potential.
155	155/3	Ben Lenihan		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley Streets to then go down again to the platforms. Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it is dug up between Wellesley and Customs Streets. Remove the slip lane between Wellesley and Victoria Streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state. Provision of a second station entrance at Newton Station on the eastern side of Symonds Street to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland.
155	155/4	Ben Lenihan		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it is dug up between Wellesley and Customs Streets. Remove the slip lane between Wellesley and Victoria Streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state.
156	156/1	Matthias Dallmeier		1.1 Support - NOR All	
156	156/2	Matthias Dallmeier		3.1 Appropriate solution	An east-facing connection on the Southern end of the CRL is preferable to an interchange station. All other stations should be built as proposed.
157	157/1	Ben Curran		1.1 Support - NOR All	
157	157/2	Ben Curran		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the plan in general though I would prefer, to the east facing link between Newton and Grafton Stations rather than the interchange on the Western line.
157	157/3	Ben Curran		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The location of the station is good, though i would ask for exits from the Newton Station on both sides of Symonds Street.
158	158/1	Ian Milne		1.1 Support - NOR All	The CRL will open up the rail network and allow for significant improvements in frequencies. The addition of three new stations will also significantly improve the catchment within the CBD. Together this should have the effect of reducing the number of cars on the road. Without the CRL the gridlock on the motorways and traffic within the city will further increase.
158	158/2	Ian Milne		3.1 Appropriate solution	The CRL must include a Eastern Connection. I support the general alignment of the route and the location of the stations.
159	159/1	Andrew Rumsby		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
159	159/2	Andrew Rumsby		1.5 Support - NOR 4	
159	159/3	Andrew Rumsby		1.6 Support - NOR 5	
159	159/4	Andrew Rumsby		1.7 Support - NOR 6	
159	159/5	Andrew Rumsby		5.8 Built heritage	I believe that the Newton / K Road areas have their own unique character and that the stations and replacement buildings should conform to the cultural environment of these parts of Auckland. K Road is one of the few remaining places that still feels like CBD that i remember as a kid. I think the old Auckland feel of this area is an advantage and should be preserved as much as possible. The buildings that replace the ones being demolished keep in the character of the areas
160	160/1	Stephen Ridley		1.1 Support - NOR All	
160	160/2	Stephen Ridley		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	It would be good to have an area designated at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Street for an entrance so that people can access this using Darby Street off Queen Street. I would see this as a great way to link the Aotea Station into Queen Street at ground level rather than having to go up either Wellesley or Victoria Streets.
161	161/1	Sol Roberts		1.1 Support - NOR All	I believe the CRL is a crucial project to help make Auckland an even better place to live than it already is. It will allow for much better use of the existing rail network and help provide capacity for increased use of rail in Auckland. It will also help with urban regeneration in large parts of the central city and areas around train station across the network.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
161	161/2	Sol Roberts		3.1 Appropriate solution	The east facing connection at the Mt Eden / Newton end of the CRL is an important component of realising the full benefits of the project and is far preferable to the Inner West Interchange which was at one stage proposed.
162	162/1	Andrew Walters		1.1 Support - NOR All	
162	162/2	Andrew Walters		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the East Facing Connection at Mt Eden and I oppose the Inner West Interchange. The IWI has too many compromises and will negatively impact on both efficiency and effectiveness of the CRL. The EFC will positively impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of the CRL.
162	162/3	Andrew Walters		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley Streets to then go down again to the platforms. Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it is dug up between Wellesley and Customs Streets. Remove the slip lane between Wellesley and Victoria Streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state. Provision of a second station entrance at Newton Station on the eastern side of Symonds Street to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland.
162	162/4	Andrew Walters		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	
163	163/1	Lennart Nout		1.1 Support - NOR All	
163	163/2	Lennart Nout		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designation of land for an extra entry to Aotea Station from Queen Street, avoiding having to walk up the Victoria Street and then back down. Designation of land for an extra entry to Newton Station, to increase the catchment of the station and provide for proper pedestrian access from all directions.
163	163/3	Lennart Nout		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Improve Albert Street after construction has been completed including footpaths and less focus on cars.
164	164/1	Greg M Nikoloff		1.1 Support - NOR All	
164	164/2	Greg M Nikoloff		3.1 Appropriate solution	The retention of the East Facing Interchange is preferred / wanted over the Inner-West Interchange option. Allowance must be made for future cross-harbour rail links terminating or passing through Aotea Station and interlinks must be made so that CRL and future harbour rail links are joined up at least one station even if the lines are on separate levels.
164	164/3	Greg M Nikoloff		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley Streets to then go down again to the platforms. Provision of a second station entrance at Newton Station on the eastern side of Symonds Street to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station is a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland.
164	164/4	Greg M Nikoloff		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it is dug up between Wellesley and Customs Streets. If possible we should try to remove the slip lane between Wellesley and Victoria Streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state.
165	165/1	Ngaire Reardon		1.1 Support - NOR All	
166	166/1	Edward Walsh		1.2 Support - NOR 1	
167	167/1	Dr Bevan A Jenkins		1.1 Support - NOR All	
168	168/1	Alexander van der Voorn		1.1 Support - NOR All	
169	169/1	Dr Martin Waigun		1.1 Support - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
170	170/1	Gerald A Williams		1.1 Support - NOR All	
171	171/1	Christopher S M Oxner		1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	
171	171/2	Christopher S M Oxner		2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	That investigation be done to acknowledge that an underground station was built as part of Sir Dove-Myer Robinson's Inner City Rail Loop back in 1969, underneath the ASB building at 300 Queen Street.
171	171/3	Christopher S M Oxner		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	That the link start at the Ferry Buildings, then go to the old central station (below 300 Queen Street) then to Grafton or Parnell.
172	172/1	Shelly Dunmore, Sustainable Business Manager	ASB Bank Limited	1.1 Support - NOR All	
172	172/2	Shelly Dunmore, Sustainable Business Manager	ASB Bank Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	ASB support the City Rail Link project for the following reasons: - We believe is will help to east traffic congestion. - It offers a transport option for our ASB people and the growing number of workers in the wider CBD area.
172	172/3	Shelly Dunmore, Sustainable Business Manager	ASB Bank Limited	5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	ASB support the City Rail Link project for the following reasons: - It has the potential to enhance Auckland CBD growth and vitality
173	173/1	Sean No Name supplied		1.1 Support - NOR All	
174	174/1	Sudhvir Singh		1.1 Support - NOR All	As a resident on Symonds Street near the designated route, I understand there will obviously be some disruption during the construction phase, however I absolutely support this short term disruption doe to the long term benefits to the entire region.
174	174/2	Sudhvir Singh		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection at the expense of the Inner West Interchange. I work in Grafton at Auckland Hospital and have seen first hand the benefits of this relatively new station especially for staff and visitors to the hospital and medical school. This connection will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton. I absolutely support the alignment of the route and the location of the three stations.
174	174/3	Sudhvir Singh		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	In regards to how to improve the designation, I suggest: - As a local resident, provision of a second station entrance at Newton Station on the eastern side of Symonds Street (where my building is) will be hugely beneficial to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland. - Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby " rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley Street to then go down again to the platforms.
174	174/4	Sudhvir Singh		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it is dug up between Wellesley and Customs Streets. If possible we should try to remove the slip lane between Wellesley and Victoria Streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state.
174	174/5	Sudhvir Singh		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	This is a transformational project for the Auckland Region, as identified in the Auckland Plan. It will unlock the entire rail network, allowing expansion, as well as reducing carbon emissions, improving health and promoting jobs and development.
175	175/1	Rene Lange		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the current plans for the CRL including the number and locations of three stations as currently planned. I support the inclusion of the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. I encourage the council to proceed with the CRL without delay

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
176	176/1	Hanno Schoonrand		1.1 Support - NOR All	
177	177/1	Sean Scanlen		1.1 Support - NOR All	
177	177/2	Sean Scanlen		3.1 Appropriate solution	I wish to state my general support for the entire city rail link project and the proposed alignment of the route. I support the east-facing connection rather than the inner-west interchange
177	177/3	Sean Scanlen		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Efforts should be made to ease access to Queen St from Aotea Station. Pedestrian improvements should also be made to the streets surrounding the stations.
178	178/1	Kris Bainbridge		1.1 Support - NOR All	
178	178/2	Kris Bainbridge		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the East Facing Connection rather than the ill considered Inner West Interchange. We already see how poorly Newmarket performs in this interchange role, it would be madness to repeat that mistake all over again in the name of penny pinching.
178	178/3	Kris Bainbridge		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby & Elliott streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley streets to then go down again to the platforms Provision of a second station entrance at Newton station on the eastern side of Symonds Street - to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland
178	178/4	Kris Bainbridge		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	As chunks of Albert St are to be cut and cover, we should take the chance to rebuild the street afterwards in a far higher quality manner. Can we remove the slip lanes? Can we improve pedestrian amenities? Can we improve the entire streetscape?
179	179/1	Elisabeth Laird		1.1 Support - NOR All	The CRL is required to open up the rail network. A high frequency and flexible rail network is necessary to support Auckland's growth and ensure that Auckland is a very livable city. The Auckland Plan highlights the CRL as Auckland's number one priority transport project.
179	179/2	Elisabeth Laird		3.1 Appropriate solution	The CRL should be granted the necessary consents. I support the general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations. Aotea in the busy midtown area, K Road serving an area furthest from the existing rail network and Newton station acting as a catalyst for the growth of an area with enormous development potential. The council should definitely retain the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. The East Facing Connection will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton - ensuring the capacity of the CRL is fully utilised and also that Grafton Station will continue to play a meaningful role in the rail network.
179	179/3	Elisabeth Laird		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby & Elliott streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley streets to then go down again to the platforms. The council should also provide further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it's dug up between Wellesley and Customs streets. There are many improvements that could be made to this street. The council should make provision for a second station entrance at Newton station on the eastern side of Symonds Street - to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland .
180	180/1	Paul Marr and Margoth Ortega Jaime		1.1 Support - NOR All	We would like to offer our support to the CRL plan and the contribution that it will make to helping improve Auckland's transport issues. We have lived in many large cities around the world and seen many good public transport systems, such as in London, Madrid and New York. In all of these places you have public transport systems that the majority of people use and support, because they are reliable, affordable and provide an integrated city wide solution. Because of this, people do not see the need to use other methods of transport such as private cars. Auckland currently has a major problem with it's public transport system and the attitude of people in Auckland to using public transport. The current system is just not reliable or affordable for what it offers, so people will not get out of their cars and use it. We are therefore pleased that the council is looking at ideas such as the CRL to massively improve the cities public transport system, as without plans like these the city will come to a halt very soon. But the CRL system does need to be affordable to users, it needs to have fares that attract people to use it and provide regular services and link up with other parts of the public transport network in a way the people can see will benefit them, and provide an alternative to private car usage. We hope that the CRL plan can come to life and provide Auckland with the basis along with other plans, to help massively improve the public transport system in the city and finally move away from such high private motor vehicle usage
181	181/1	Dion J Pitman		1.1 Support - NOR All	Auckland needs better public transport. by building the CRL. capacity is increased. therefore more trains can be run. It also means a faster journey for passengers, particularly those travelling from the Western Line.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
181	181/2	Dion J Pitman		3.1 Appropriate solution	I also support the locations for the stations at Newton, K'Rd and Aotea. These locations provide the optimal locations for transfer to bus services as well as being close to all major employers in the area. I support retaining the East Facing connection - the Inner West Interchange is not needed. Passangers travelling to Newmarket can change at Newton. It is important that trains from the CRL can either head out west or to Newmarket after leaving Newton. This option also ensures that Grafton Station remains relevant.
181	181/3	Dion J Pitman		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby & Elliott streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley streets to then go down again to the platforms. Council needs to work with the owners of this site to ensure that this access to Aotea Station will be accounted for. Need to take into account future platforms for a North Shore Line underneath Wellesley Street. A second entrance for the Newton Station on the eastern side of Symonds Street by the corner of Symonds Street and Mt Eden Rd. This station needs as many exits as possible since the main way of accessing the station will be through Elevators. I propose that if the Chinese Community Centre is to be demolished, then it should be relocated to a new premises above any building built for the Newton Station. An entrance for Newton Station should be considered at the site of the Mt Eden Station if that station is to be demolished. An underground passageway would go from Mt Eden Station to Newton Station
182	182/1	Chris White		1.1 Support - NOR All	
182	182/2	Chris White		3.1 Appropriate solution	In particular I support the East facing connection at the Mt Eden end of the tunnel as I think an Inner West Interchange would have a negative impact on an important part of the network including Grafton station and those wanting to travel to Newmarket from the West
182	182/3	Chris White		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I would like care to be taken in the planning of Aotea station to ensure that a future line from the North Shore could stop there.
182	182/4	Chris White		6.6 Business case	While it may seem expensive it massively increases the value of the rest of the network and makes the current investment in electrification far more valuable. We've spent too long thinking too small and only doing half the job. Just look at the two most important public transport developments in recent years. The Britomart station development which was shortsighted in only having two tracks and is now at capacity years before it was expected; and the Northern Busway which despite not being a proper busway for much of its route was massively successful but is now being limited by the corner cutting that took place when planning it If we just built things properly at the start we wouldn't have these issues.
182	182/5	Chris White		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	The CRL is in my opinion the most important project in Auckland's near future and is required to kick start increase patronage and development of the rail network. We can't continue to develop without improving our public transport infrastructure and rail is the only real option for achieving this.
183	183/1	Aaron Gray		1.1 Support - NOR All	
183	183/2	Aaron Gray		3.1 Appropriate solution	The decision of the east facing connection at Mt Eden is highly supported over the Inner West Interchange. This will allow for more efficient and effective routes to be utilised.
183	183/3	Aaron Gray		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The designation should overall be approved. However, some consideration should be included in this designation notice of requirement about future incorporation of a rail line from North Shore at the Aotea station. The Aotea station could also be further analysed for the allowance of a entrance closer to Queen St (minimising the vertical distance required to be covered by patrons).
184	184/1	Joseph Erceg		1.1 Support - NOR All	Complete support for this project. A key piece of infrastructure for Auckland's economic future. It can't be built quick enough.
184	184/2	Joseph Erceg		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I believe there may not be enough entrances for future development especially around Aotea station which will be a very busy station. Would prefer an entrance at this station that is not so much of a hike up Victoria St Wellesley St from Queen St. Queen St and the university will be key destinations. Key future developments need to have provision for their impacts on pedestrian numbers eg Aotea entertainment precinct, SkyCity convention centre. Newton station should have an entrance on the other side of the street to avoid having to cross the road at lights. K Rd's station entrance should have an entrance as close to Ponsonby Rd as possible. Provision should be made to improve the streetscape on Albert St once recovered.
185	185/1	Bryce Pearce		1.1 Support - NOR All	
185	185/2	Bryce Pearce		3.1 Appropriate solution	The CRL is a must for Auckland. The eastern link is also very important
185	185/3	Bryce Pearce		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The one change I would like to see is an additional entrance at the Grafton (Khyber Pass) station.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
186	186/1	Leah Firth		1.29 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 6	
186	186/2	Leah Firth		5.1 Noise - construction	The noise/filth of nearly 24/7 construction on the doorstep Ongoing noiselvibrations/amenity for the residents compared to what is currently experienced.
186	186/3	Leah Firth		5.3 Vibration - construction	It appears from the plans contained in your NOR6 that the vehicle access into Korari Square off Ruru St will be the only road that will carryall of the construction trucks. We understand that the construction yard will be on the opposite side of Korari Square The vibrations and potential damage to the building itself and will be operating 24/7. The specific provision that my submission relates to is that the cumulative impact of the construction noise, vehicle movements and other construction impacts will significantly impact the current amenity enjoyed by the residents in Korari Square.
186	186/4	Leah Firth		5.9 Transport - construction	It appears from the plans contained in your NOR6 that the vehicle access into Korari Square off Ruru St will be the only road that will carryall of the construction trucks. We understand that the construction yard will be on the opposite side of Korari Square and will be operating 24/7. The specific provision that my submission relates to is that the cumulative impact of the construction noise, vehicle movements and other construction impacts will significantly impact the current amenity enjoyed by the residents in Korari Square.
186	186/5	Leah Firth		5.17 Air quality	It appears from the plans contained in your NOR6 that the vehicle access into Korari Square off Ruru St will be the only road that will carryall of the construction trucks. We understand that the construction yard will be on the opposite side of Korari Square and will be operating 24/7. The specific provision that my submission relates to is that the cumulative impact of the construction noise, vehicle movements and other construction impacts will significantly impact the current amenity enjoyed by the residents in Korari Square.
186	186/6	Leah Firth		5.20 Economic	I believe the cumulative effect on my rental property (10 Ruru Street) of six years of construction will be disastrous. 10 Ruru St is a collection of 31 townhouses known as Korari Square. The existing access for these townhouses is off Ruru St. These are all residential units and are a combination of owner/occupier and tenanted units. We own number 25 which is a tenanted unit at present. It appears from the plans contained in your NOR6 that the vehicle access into Korari Square off Ruru St will be the only road that will carryall of the construction trucks. We understand that the construction yard will be on the opposite side of Korari Square and will be operating 24/7. The specific provision that my submission relates to is that the cumulative impact of the construction noise, vehicle movements and other construction impacts will significantly impact the current amenity enjoyed by the residents in Korari Square. I believe the cumulative impact of the works on Korari Square will be significant. The construction noise, construction traffic and other construction impacts over this very long period will make living in any of the townhouses in Korari square unpleasant. It is difficult to image how this level of cumulative impact could be mitigated so as not to impact the CRL as a project. I would welcome any approach to purchase or lease the property during the construction period. Failing that, the impact of the works on the properties within the 31 townhouses within 10 Ruru St needs to be mitigated so particularly out of normal construction hours so as not to impact the current amenity and quiet enjoyment of the properties in the evenings, through the night and weekends.
186	186/7	Leah Firth		5.28 Mitigation - monetary	It is difficult to image how this level of cumulative impact could be mitigated so as not to impact the CRL as a project. I would welcome any approach to purchase or lease the property during the construction period.
186	186/8	Leah Firth		5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	the impact of the works on the properties within the 31 townhouses within 10 Ruru St needs to be mitigated so particularly out of normal construction hours so as not to impact the current amenity and quiet enjoyment of the properties in the evenings, through the night and weekends.
186	186/9	Leah Firth		5.35 Health / safety	The safety of following laden trucks up the hill, entering into this traffic stream, truck spillage
187	187/1	Simon Vincent		1.1 Support - NOR All	The CRL is a necessity if the Auckland plan is to be a success. The link will have far reaching benefits for all Aucklanders, NZ and visitors.
188	188/1	Andrew Surgenor		1.1 Support - NOR All	
189	189/1	Emily Beatson		1.1 Support - NOR All	Well overdue. Have travelled for seven years to come back to Auckland where public transport is abysmal. Come on Auckland it needs to be easier and better
190	190/1	Michael Jongeneel		1.1 Support - NOR All	
190	190/2	Michael Jongeneel		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I'd like to see the designation extended westward from the proposed Aotea station to provide a pedestrian access to the station from Elliot St.
191	191/1	Jeroen de Vries		1.1 Support - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
191	191/2	Jeroen de Vries		3.1 Appropriate solution	In terms of the details of the project, I support the proposed plans for the route and construction. I also support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection element of the project, as this ensures that the Mt Eden - Grafton - Newmarket line will be able to continue serve the area with appropriate frequencies. This is especially relevant considering the University of Auckland's plans to open a new campus on Khyber Pass Road.
191	191/3	Jeroen de Vries		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	One potential improvement I can mention is the issue of the station entrance for the proposed Newton station. I submit that plans for a single entrance to this station will limit the capacity of the station, and so a entrance on Symonds Street's eastern side should be planned. Overall, I see the CRL as the cornerstone project the a plan to make a Auckland more connected and efficient place to live. I dream of a city where the 20th century norms of suburbanisation and auto-dependence will be replaced with close-knit and sustainable communities which that enjoy quality living standards for all.
191	191/4	Jeroen de Vries		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	The CRL forms the next logical step in this positive expansion. The project will revolutionise the public transport experience of all Aucklanders and promises a faster and more efficient service. The CRL will greatly assist the regeneration of the CBD, but its regional benefits are also pronounced. The Auckland Plan identifies the CRL as a key project for Auckland's growth, signalling that the project needs the full support of all relevant parties.
192	192/1	John R Wood		1.1 Support - NOR All	I believe that the CRL will provide an efficient way of transporting people around the city helping alleviate the congestion caused by buses and cars. I am particularly excited that at some future date rail from the North Shore will join this link removing the very tedious, traffic clogged trip that is the bus trip from the city.
193	193/1	Glenn Brisbane		1.1 Support - NOR All	Without the CRL the public rail system is severely truncated at Britomart Station creating a future transport bottleneck as well as preventing the opening up of the whole inner city from harbour to Newton to fast,frequent rail services to most parts of the city.
194	194/1	Paul Arthur		1.1 Support - NOR All	
194	194/2	Paul Arthur		3.1 Appropriate solution	1. General support for the CRL project 2. Support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. 3. Support the general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations. Aotea at the heart of midtown, K Road serving an area furthest from the existing rail network and Newton station acting as a catalyst for the growth of an area with enormous development potential.
195	195/1	Warrick Flower		1.1 Support - NOR All	
195	195/2	Warrick Flower		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support recent changes to confirm the eastern link and eliminate the western interchange station.
195	195/3	Warrick Flower		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	That an entrance be incorporated and designated to Aotea station through the existing car park to the frontage at 7 Elliot Street, to allow easier access from Queen Street.
196	196/1	Jon B Reeves		1.1 Support - NOR All	
196	196/2	Jon B Reeves		5.10 Transport - operational	The Waikato region will benefit as it will free up platform space at the congested Britomart station. This will allow for Waikato commuter train services to operate directly into the Auckland CBD, again reducing the need for private motorists to drive on the Auckland motorway network.
196	196/3	Jon B Reeves		5.28 Mitigation - monetary	The council commits to buying all affected buildings immediately on the CRL corridor required for construction of the project.
196	196/4	Jon B Reeves		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	The council informs the Waikato Regional Council, Hamilton City Council and Waikato District Council of the benefits the CRL will offer their regions.
197	197/1	Anthony Duncan	Duncan Guy Properties	1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	
197	197/2	Anthony Duncan	Duncan Guy Properties	5.1 Noise - construction	The notices of requirement will create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents
197	197/3	Anthony Duncan	Duncan Guy Properties	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The notices of requirement will potentially detrimentally effect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers
197	197/4	Anthony Duncan	Duncan Guy Properties	5.17 Air quality	The notices of requirement will create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
197	197/5	Anthony Duncan	Duncan Guy Properties	5.20 Economic	The notices of requirement will detrimentally effect tenancies and income there from our property
197	197/6	Anthony Duncan	Duncan Guy Properties	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Imposing conditions mitigating the effects set out above including following proper consultation with Duncan Guy Properties, and the Eclipse Body Corporate (401501)
197	197/7	Anthony Duncan	Duncan Guy Properties	5.35 Health / safety	The notices of requirement will potentially detrimentally effect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers
198	198/1	Stephen Davis		1.1 Support - NOR All	I strongly support the City Rail Link. I have some suggestions for changes, but I will still strongly support the project without them.
198	198/2	Stephen Davis		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the choice to build east and west facing links at Mount Eden, rather than just the western link and an interchange station . Building both links future-proofs the network for a large array of possible service patterns, and can't be added in later. It also makes good use of Grafton Station, in what will be a key redevelopment area with the new Auckland University campus. I support the number and location of stations, which is a good tradeoff between speed and coverage. K Rd and Newton stations especially will have the power to encourage plenty of redevelopment around them.
198	198/3	Stephen Davis		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The designation for the Aotea Station under Albert St should be expanded to include an entrance at the corner of Darby and Elliot Streets, through what is currently a surface carpark on the corner of Albert and Victoria. This will allow roughly level access from Queen St, which is of course a key pedestrian area. The designation for Aotea Station should also include provision for future platforms for a North Shore rail service, so passengers can interchange at Aotea station. As the platforms would probably be underneath the CRL platforms, they need to be protected before construction. This would also include provision for a larger concourse area, and separate escalators to the North Shore platforms that would not conflict with passengers waiting on the CRL platforms. The designation for Newton Station should include a below-ground concourse , and access from both the currently planned entrance, and a second entrance on the eastern side of Symonds Street. If possible, given the extremely deep location of the station, and the steep hill to the south where much of the catchment lies, thought should be given to a third pedestrian entrance from near the eastern rail portal, which could come in beside the rail tunnel. The designation for the cut-and-cover construction of the rail tunnels below Albert St should include provision for reconstructing the street afterwards - using the opportunity to provide wider footpaths, corners that are not so widely flared, and only one traffic lane + one bus-only lane in each direction.
198	198/4	Stephen Davis		4.3 Auckland Council population growth	Auckland has a rapidly growing population, and needs to keep growing a strong central city. This means growing our capacity to move people in and out. Motorways and carparks cannot provide the sort of compact and vibrant city centre Auckland needs, even if they weren't more expensive than the CRL project. Only public transport can move large numbers of people without destroying the very place they are trying to move to. As the council's City Centre Future to bypass road congestion.
199	199/1	Robert P Webb		1.1 Support - NOR All	Project will allow the existing rail system to approach it's full potential and provide for the future expansion of this system. It is vital that an alternative to the transport system to that which presently exists in Auckland be provided. I am very concerned that the Central Government will work to sabotage this proposal.
199	199/2	Robert P Webb		3.1 Appropriate solution	Please ENSURE that the East Facing Connection towards Grafton Station DOES NOT GET DELETED to allow the proposed growth in this area to be appropriately served.
199	199/3	Robert P Webb		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Please consider the provision of two pedestrian connections directly from Queen Street to the proposed Aotea Station with the intention of their providing as near as possible to level access from Queen Street rather than requiring pedestrians ex Queen Street to walk up to Albert Street before descending to Aotea Station.
200	200/1	Robert Lane		1.1 Support - NOR All	Auckland needs to increase the efficiency and capacity of its rail passenger system. The Central Rail Link is an excellent idea providing better access to the CBD and improving the capacity of the whole network
201	201/1	Adam Weller		1.1 Support - NOR All	
201	201/2	Adam Weller		3.1 Appropriate solution	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
201	201/3	Adam Weller		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	1) I don't understand why the Aotea station has been designated on the shops on the Cnr of Albert & Victoria streets and not onto the waste of space that is the car park on the opposite cnr. I would strongly suggest this needs to be changed. 2) Why there is no designation plan to have an exit from Aotea station on Queen street or Elliot st. A single tunnel, considering that station is underground anyway to a main exit near queen street would give the station a great flow of people plus be a lot easier for people using the station without having to go up the hill and then down into the station. 3) I have concerns about the church which is in the desingated land for K'rd station. 4) Is there no entrance for K'rd Station on K'rd itself? If I am reading the information correctly this looks rather limiting. 5) Why only 1 entrance for Newton station, there must be room on the other end?, also the other end is the more pedestrian friendly area 6) I know Newton station is deep, but I have walked stairs especially down in stations in Europe which are deeper. I think there should be at least 1 set of stairs for general use - it may not get a lot of use but it will get used and is a much safer addition for an emergency.
201	201/4	Adam Weller		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	In line with these other improvements, I hope Albert street is improved from its current look to a much better pedestrian area like Queen street has become once it is put back in place.
201	201/5	Adam Weller		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	I look forward for the vast improvements that will arise from the new buildings that will go up in downtown and around Newton after the work, not to mention the huge benefits the CRL itself will bring.
202	202/1	Samuel Hood		1.1 Support - NOR All	This project is crucial to the successful development of Auckland and I believe it must be completed as soon as possible as outlined by the Auckland Plan.
202	202/2	Samuel Hood		3.1 Appropriate solution	The designated route appears to be a logical and well developed route, with all station locations in ideal locations. I believe that the designated eastern connection at the Mount Eden end of the tunnel is critical to unlocking the full potential of this project
202	202/3	Samuel Hood		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I believe that it is critical that land between Albert street and the Darby/Elliot street intersection be included in the notice of requirement. This land would enable the construction of what would I believe be the most direct and flat connection between the platforms of Aotea Station and Queen Street. I believe that any such station entrance in this vicinity would have a measurable effect on patronage due to increased profile and ease of access for the station.
203	203/1	Benjamin L Wilshere		1.1 Support - NOR All	I believe the City Rail Link is the most important infrastructure project for driving Auckland's economic growth going forward. I believe it is the most important step in creating a world-class transport system.
203	203/2	Benjamin L Wilshere		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	1. A site should be designated at the corner of Elliot and Victoria streets, to allow access onto Darby street from Aotea station. I believe that this will increase the connectivity of the station for users heading to Queen street - particularly students who may travel to this station, then head along Victoria street to the university; these students represent a significant amount of PT patronage. 2. Further information on how the reconstruction of Albert Street will take place; will there be any traffic calming measures, or bus priority, on the replaced road? 3. I believe a second Newton station entrance should be placed on the eastern side of symonds street; this will become a busy station in the future and this will relieve pressure on the station entrances.
204	204/1	Abhishek Reddy		1.1 Support - NOR All	As a resident and working person who already relies on walking, cycling and public transportation to travel both within the local envelope of the proposed CRL, and to connect to the rest of the city, the particular designation in these PMs is significant to me.
204	204/2	Abhishek Reddy		3.1 Appropriate solution	I would likely use all three of the new CRL stations, and broadly support their locations. In particular, the connection to the NAL eastwards of Mt Eden Station is most appropriate. I am satisfied that alternatives have been explored and that the proposed alignment is practically the best option. As a neighbour as well as likely frequent user, the referenced UDF for the area around stations is of particular importance, and I am also satisfied that its direction is basically adequate.
204	204/3	Abhishek Reddy		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	However, it is not immediately clear how the quality of pedestrian access will be measured, and therefore how accessible each station will be. In particular, will Newton Station have sufficient linkages with Symonds Street; and will Aotea Station be directly linked to Elliot and Darby Streets? Additionally, with reference to NoR 1 (5), as a daily user of the grade-separated lane between Albert Street and Durham Lane, I would prefer that it were removed entirely; the heritage public toilet and its wall will not be missed, given that it is already overwhelmed by the large surrounding car parking structures
205	205/1	Martin Lee		1.1 Support - NOR All	I support this project. I think it is important to have a better train network than we do now, and that having the Central Rail Link will help towards that. We need all 3 stations
205	205/2	Martin Lee		3.1 Appropriate solution	Please consider retaining the East Facing Connection.
205	205/3	Martin Lee		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Please also consider designating an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby & Elliott streets and the entrance to Aotea Station.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
206	206/1	Brad Jenkins		1.1 Support - NOR All	I have general support for the overall plan - completion of this project is essential to developing the potential of the public transport network in Auckland , combating further traffic issues, continuing to revitalise the CBO and surrounds, and moving Auckland towards it's goal of being a world class city
206	206/2	Brad Jenkins		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. The EFC will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton - ensuring the capacity of the CRL is fully utilised and also that Grafton Station will continue to play a meaningful role in the rail network. * I support the general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations.
207	207/1	Stuart Donovan		1.1 Support - NOR All	
207	207/2	Stuart Donovan		3.1 Appropriate solution	The preferred alignment seems to be logical and appropriate. Auckland Council and Auckland Transport's team appear to have done an excellent job of ensuring the NoR minimises disruption to affected properties
207	207/3	Stuart Donovan		5.9 Transport - construction	The only condition I would like to see incorporated into the NoR is that the works are done in such a way that does not unduly impact on the bus network. It's important that during the construction period. when some roads are closed to general traffic. that access for buses is preserved.
207	207/4	Stuart Donovan		5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	The only condition I would like to see incorporated into the NoR is that the works are done in such a way that does not unduly impact on the bus network. It's important that during the construction period. when some roads are closed to general traffic. that access for buses is preserved.
207	207/5	Stuart Donovan		5.34 Construction methodology	The only condition I would like to see incorporated into the NoR is that the works are done in such a way that does not unduly impact on the bus network. It's important that during the construction period. when some roads are closed to general traffic. that access for buses is preserved.
208	208/1	Christina van Boheman		1.1 Support - NOR All	
209	209/1	Errol B Anderson		1.1 Support - NOR All	
209	209/2	Errol B Anderson		3.1 Appropriate solution	The East Facing Connection should be retained .as it will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton, which will not occur with the Inner West Interchange.
209	209/3	Errol B Anderson		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The Aotea Station should have an entrance from Queen St I Darby St so that there is pedestrianfriendly level access. Land should be secured now to ensure this. The Newton Station should have a second entrance from the eastern side of Symonds Sl. Providing a single station entrance is not best practice, and appears very short-sighted.
210	210/1	Jeremy Budd		1.1 Support - NOR All	
210	210/2	Jeremy Budd		5.19 Sustainability	To unlock Auckland's potential to grow into an internationally competitive city. To help minimise urban sprawl. Help work towards reduced carbon emissions and air pollution. Provides the base for expansion of the rail network to essential places like the airport.
211	211/1	Anna Stove	GlaxoSmithKline NZ Limited	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The specific provision of the plan change/modification that my submission relates to: The location and proximity of Zurich House to the proposed works. GlaxoSmithKline NZ Ltd is a tenant of Zurich House requests communication on all information impacting Zurich House including at risk building status, access rights, health and safety of employees and leasee protection
211	211/2	Anna Stove	GlaxoSmithKline NZ Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	The specific provision of the plan change/modification that my submission relates to: The location and proximity of Zurich House to the proposed works. GlaxoSmithKline NZ Ltd is a tenant of Zurich House requests communication on all information impacting Zurich House including at risk building status, access rights, health and safety of employees and leasee protection
211	211/3	Anna Stove	GlaxoSmithKline NZ Limited	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	The specific provision of the plan change/modification that my submission relates to: The location and proximity of Zurich House to the proposed works. GlaxoSmithKline NZ Ltd is a tenant of Zurich House requests communication on all information impacting Zurich House including at risk building status, access rights, health and safety of employees and leasee protection
211	211/4	Anna Stove	GlaxoSmithKline NZ Limited	5.35 Health / safety	The specific provision of the plan change/modification that my submission relates to: The location and proximity of Zurich House to the proposed works. GlaxoSmithKline NZ Ltd is a tenant of Zurich House requests communication on all information impacting Zurich House including at risk building status, access rights, health and safety of employees and leasee protection
211	211/5	Anna Stove	GlaxoSmithKline NZ Limited	1.1 Support - NOR All	
212	212/1	Rhys Williams		1.1 Support - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
212	212/2	Rhys Williams		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the CRL The CRL has the potential to transform the city center of Auckland and greatly improve the infrastructure over the whole urban area of Auckland . Britomart will soon be a severe restraint on the capabilities of the train network. The CRL is an elegant way to remove this bottleneck and replace it with a line that allows even greater access to areas of high employment and high-density living in the city center. The access the current station positions provide is the best solution and alignment for the CRL given the distribution of destinations in the city center.
212	212/3	Rhys Williams		5.16 Urban design framework	It is important that the entrances to the stations are visible at ground level from areas that are frequented by pedestrians (e.g. Queen St for Aotea Station). There should be multiple entrances for each station and clear signs for each entrance. The council (and Auckland Transport) must ensure that the area around each station and along the CRL route much have high pedestrian amenity with priority given to pedestrian movement. Cycle facilities will also ensure a station that is accessible to a wide range of potential users.
212	212/4	Rhys Williams		5.19 Sustainability	The CRL enables further extension of the train network allowing for a more sustainable and higher quality urban form for Auckland. As a result, more people will be able to access a quality RTN link near their homes and businesses. This provides more options to citizens and increases the redundancy of the whole transport system
212	212/5	Rhys Williams		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	The Council (and Auckland Transport) must also consult with businesses in the area to identify ways the maximise the benefits of the CRL for local businesses in the city center in terms of the connection to stations from high-value attractions such as SkyCity and the art galleries on K Road. Such consultation is required to make the most of such an ambitious infrastructure project.
213	213/1	Evelyn Tham		1.8 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR All	
213	213/2	Evelyn Tham		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I support the project however i feel there is no need to install the Aotea and the K-Road station. This is because they are within walking distances and could be adequately supported by teh current bus services.
214	214/1	George Lane		1.1 Support - NOR All	
215	215/1	Barry C Palmer		1.1 Support - NOR All	I support in total the rail link. It is imperative that it goes ahead to alleviate traffic congestion and gridlock.
216	216/1	Stephen O'Sullivan		1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	
216	216/2	Stephen O'Sullivan		5.1 Noise - construction	The notices of requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents.
216	216/3	Stephen O'Sullivan		5.17 Air quality	The notices of requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents.
216	216/4	Stephen O'Sullivan		5.20 Economic	The notices of requirement will: (b) detrimentally affect tenancies and income therefrom in the building.
216	216/5	Stephen O'Sullivan		5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The notices of requirement will: (c) Potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers. (d) Potential issues with ground settlement at later date will affect building structure.
216	216/6	Stephen O'Sullivan		5.35 Health / safety	The notices of requirement will: (c) Potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
216	216/7	Stephen O'Sullivan		5.6 Structural - tunnels	The notices of requirement will: (d) Potential issues with ground settlement at later date will affect building structure.
216	216/8	Stephen O'Sullivan		5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Decision sought: (1) Declining the Notices of Requirement; or (2) Imposing conditions mitigating the effects set out above including following proper consultation with Body Corporate 401501.
217	217/1	Ellen Laan		1.1 Support - NOR All	
217	217/2	Ellen Laan		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the construction of all necessary infrastructure at the northern end of the CRL to enable trains to travel either west or east without having to perform any manoeuvring at an interchange station.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
218	218/1	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
218	218/2	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	5.32 Adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated	3.3 The adverse effects of the designation on the subject site will not be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
218	218/3	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	5.9 Transport - construction	3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (a) The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the surrounding road network serving the subject site, and will have an adverse effect on access.
218	218/4	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	5.10 Transport - operational	3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (a) The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the surrounding road network serving the subject site, and will have an adverse effect on access.
218	218/5	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	5.23 Property rights	3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (b) The designation will, if confirmed, prevent reasonable use of the subject site. (c) Our company has leased the building from 2011 till 2017 with right of renewal. This was the only reason the company purchased the business as a going concern at this location.
218	218/6	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (a) The designation will, if confirmed, adversely affect the surrounding road network serving the subject site, and will have an adverse effect on access.
218	218/7	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	3.6 Adequate consideration has not been given to alternative sites, routes or methods of undertaking the work.
218	218/8	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	4.1 Part 2 RMA	3.7 Confirming the designation will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
218	218/9	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	4.2 RMA policy framework	3.5 The notice of requirement (including the assessment of effects on the environment) does not comply with relevant statutory and regulatory provisions.
218	218/10	Diane Sherwin and John Varouhas	Perfect Spine Limited T/A BTS Gym and Chirolift	5.20 Economic	3.4 In particular, but without limitation: (d) A business loan was entered into with our house as collateral against the loan. Should be business be jeopardised by potential relocation or building works our ability to repay the mortgage would be severely harmed and our house may be sold to recover the loan. (e) A substantial portion of the business loan amount was for goodwill as opposed to stock and plant. A gym has been at this location since 2000. Our clients for BTS Gym and Chirofit attend the facility due to its location (our surveys support this) and most of the business goodwill is lost if we have to move. (f) Not only do we have gym and chiropractic clients in the facility but Personal Trainers and a Massage Therapist with established business goodwill which will also be in jeopardy if they were to have to move.
219	219/1	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	1.1 Support - NOR All	1.2 We support the City Rail Link from the perspective that the proposed Karangahape Rd station will facilitate community access to and from the Karangahape Rd precinct and has the potential to enhance the local environment.
219	219/2	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	5.26 Social impact	2.1 Our facilities are used by a number of community organisations in addition to our own workshopping congregations. Some groups (such as Alcoholics Anonymous meetings) seek a degree of privacy, while other (such as our congregation during Sunday services) appreciate a reasonably quiet environment.
219	219/3	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
219	219/4	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	2.2 We ask that appropriate pedestrian and vehicle access to our facilities be maintained at all times, particularly during our normal house of operation (6:30am to 11:pm). This will be particularly important during the construction phase. 2.3 We ask that reasonable noise control limits be specified on Sundays during the project's construction phase. 5.2 The City Rail Link construction and operation plans notified to date provide detailed protection provisions, which we fully support. We ask that we be fully consulted regarding the implementation of these protection measures under the Outline Development Plans and Construction and Environmental Management Plans to enable us to share our existing extensive data in relation to these buildings, for the benefit of all parties and to allow us to accurately assess the specific effects of the construction plans on our buildings.
219	219/5	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	5.1 Noise - construction	2.3 We ask that reasonable noise control limits be specified on Sundays during the project's construction phase.
219	219/6	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	5.16 Urban design framework	3.1 The current toilets directly opposite Pitt St Church in Beresford St are contained in a small discreet modern capsule, which unfortunately is so small discreet and modern that it is often not recognised as a toilet. Our property is the frequent beneficiary of the resulting unwelcome public imperative. 3.2 We would ask that care be given to the provision of clearly identifiable and accessible facilities at the street level as part of the Beresford St development, as envisaged in the Urban Design Framework.
219	219/7	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	4.1 We share open pedestrian space opposite Beresford St (footpath, seating and paved areas in front of Pitt St Church and Wesley Bi-Centenary Hall). This has recently been established as a bus stop for the City Link service. Previous Council plans to enhance this environment for pedestrians (paving and so on) did not eventuate. 4.2 We ask that careful consideration be given to the transport linkages between rail and bus and associated facilities (seating and shelter for example) at this location, and that we be fully consulted to ensure we maximise the opportunity to enhance this shared use space around our historic buildings.
219	219/8	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	5.8 Built heritage	5.1 Both Pitt St Methodist Church and Pitt St Buildings are significant historic heritage buildings. Both are earthquake-prone and we have to date completed extensive research regarding their history, condition and conservation. This is on-going, and our conservation plans are constantly being revised to accommodate changing national and local property requirements - recently the earthquake-prone requirements and now City Rail Link plans. Our concerns relate to the current fragility of these buildings. 5.2 The City Rail Link construction and operation plans notified to date provide detailed protection provisions, which we fully support. We ask that we be fully consulted regarding the implementation of these protection measures under the Outline Development Plans and Construction and Environmental Management Plans to enable us to share our existing extensive data in relation to these buildings, for the benefit of all parties and to allow us to accurately assess the specific effects of the construction plans on our buildings.
219	219/9	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	2.3 Consultation	5.2 The City Rail Link construction and operation plans notified to date provide detailed protection provisions, which we fully support. We ask that we be fully consulted regarding the implementation of these protection measures under the Outline Development Plans and Construction and Environmental Management Plans to enable us to share our existing extensive data in relation to these buildings, for the benefit of all parties and to allow us to accurately assess the specific effects of the construction plans on our buildings. 6.1 We note the frequent reference to consultation plans within the notices received. We acknowledge the positive contact to date with Auckland Transport and Auckland Council staff, particularly in relation to our own longer-term plans for our historic and earthquake-prone buildings. 6.2 We ask for continuing regular consultation on all matters likely to affect our properties and their use.
219	219/10	David Davies	Auckland Methodist Central Parish	5.34 Construction methodology	5.2 The City Rail Link construction and operation plans notified to date provide detailed protection provisions, which we fully support. We ask that we be fully consulted regarding the implementation of these protection measures under the Outline Development Plans and Construction and Environmental Management Plans to enable us to share our existing extensive data in relation to these buildings, for the benefit of all parties and to allow us to accurately assess the specific effects of the construction plans on our buildings.
220	220/1	Aaron D Sills		1.1 Support - NOR All	
221	221/1	Ximena Reyes	Bear Park Mt Eden	1.14 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 6	
221	221/2	Ximena Reyes	Bear Park Mt Eden	5.1 Noise - construction	11. A particularly sensitive period of the day is when the children are sleeping, generally between 11.30-3pm. In light of the need for these children to enjoy an adequate sleep, Bear Park considers that significantly reduced noise levels should be applied during the hours of 11 :30-3:00 for all work within 500 metres of Bear Park.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
221	221/3	Ximena Reyes	Bear Park Mt Eden	5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	13. Bear Park requests that: (a) Appropriate conditions are imposed to control dust and for industry best practice measures to be included within the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP"); (b) Appropriate conditions are imposed to control the level of construction noise; (c) Notwithstanding the level of construction noise permitted by the existing District Plan, reduced noise limits are imposed during the hours of 11 :30-3:00 in order to enable the children to obtain adequate sleep; this might require a total cessation of work during those hours or a limit on noisy activities within 500metres of Bear Park during those hours. (d) There shall be no rock breaking or drilling occurring at all during the hours of 11 :30-3:00, except with the specific agreement of Bear Park; (e) A consent condition is inserted that requires Auckland Transport to construct an acoustic fence along the southern boundary of the designated area adjacent to 13 Akiraho Street and 9 Fenton Street. This fence will assist to reduce dust and noise experienced by Bear Park. The height and design of that fence are to be discussed and agreed between Bear Park and Auckland Transport and installed prior to any construction work commencing within the area covered by NOR 6. If technically possible the fence shall be transparent or with windows so that children can observe the construction activities in progress. (f) As proposed in the NOR, the CEMP shall incorporate a series of site specific mitigation measures for the Bear Park, developed and agreed in consultation with Bear Park. Vibration 16. Bear Park requests that: (a) Auckland Transport is required to adopt all reasonable and practicable measures to minimise vibration effects, especially during the period of time from 11 :30-3:00, Monday to Friday. (b) As proposed in the NOR, Council imposes conditions regarding : (i) Pre-construction condition survey of Bear Park's building ; (ii) Monitoring of Bear Park's building at regular intervals during the construction works. (iii) Amending construction activities, or implementing measures to safeguard buildings as required during construction; and (c) Rectifying residual damage to Bear Park's building after construction. Access 18. Bear Park requests that: (a) Access to Fenton Street through the property at 13 Akiraho Street is maintained for as long as possible, and the time such access is restricted shall be minimised; (b) Access is maintained at all times to Mount Eden Train Station from Mount Eden Road; and (e) The traffic management measures adopted will maintain access to Akiraho Street from Mount Eden Road, at all times. 19. Although it is not proposed to shut Mount Eden Train station, Bear Park would oppose any such closure. Consultation 24. Accordingly, Bear Park requests that: (a) As proposed in the NOR, Auckland Transport undertakes and maintains communication with affected persons, such as Bear Park, through an effective Communications Plan; (b) The Communications Plan must contain information about the construction programme, access restrictions, traffic management measures and progress; (c) The Plan should be sent to affected parties in writing and electronically; (d) The Plan must provide timely information, at least one month prior to any travel restrictions or changes in the construction programme; (e) If the Mount Eden Train Station is to be closed, the on dates and alternative train stations / public transport our staff and parents can access must be included in the Plan. We would need to inform parents with plenty of notice to make arrangements. We rely on this form of transport and it is one of the reasons why some of our parents choose to bring their children here.
221	221/4	Ximena Reyes	Bear Park Mt Eden	5.3 Vibration - construction	14. The proposal will involve significant drilling and tunneling and the NOR notes the potential for "tactile vibration effects". 15. Bear Park occupies a converted church building that needs some restoration and so may be more sensitive to vibration effects. We are also concerned about health and safety of our staff and children from the vibration. 16. Bear Park requests that: (a) Auckland Transport is required to adopt all reasonable and practicable measures to minimise vibration effects, especially during the period of time from 11 :30-3:00, Monday to Friday. (b) As proposed in the NOR, Council imposes conditions regarding : (i) Pre-construction condition survey of Bear Park's building ; (ii) Monitoring of Bear Park's building at regular intervals during the construction works. (iii) Amending construction activities, or implementing measures to safeguard buildings as required during construction; and (c) Rectifying residual damage to Bear Park's building after construction.
221	221/5	Ximena Reyes	Bear Park Mt Eden	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Access to Bear Park 17. Bear Park children and staff travel to and from the centre by a number of methods, primarily private motor vehicle but also train and bus. The vast majority of parents and staff access Bear Park along Akiraho Street and so the intersection of Mount Eden and Akiraho Street is of critical importance to accessing the centre. In addition a number of teachers access Fenton St through the neighbour's car park as we have been allowed to do since the centre opened 12 years ago. 18. Bear Park requests that: (a) Access to Fenton Street through the property at 13 Akiraho Street is maintained for as long as possible, and the time such access is restricted shall be minimised; (b) Access is maintained at all times to Mount Eden Train Station from Mount Eden Road; and (e) The traffic management measures adopted will maintain access to Akiraho Street from Mount Eden Road, at all times. 19. Although it is not proposed to shut Mount Eden Train station, Bear Park would oppose any such closure.
221	221/6	Ximena Reyes	Bear Park Mt Eden	5.31 Mitigation - relocation / re-establishment	Continuity of services 20. The proposal includes potential interference with and relocation of existing services. 21. Bear Park has recently had our footpaths redone and had problems with the road works bursting the pipes. It left us with no running water for several hours which almost saw us closing the centre. This would have meant organizing 75 children to be picked up. Water facilities are vital as we rely on this for food and hygiene. Portaloos and other alternatives will not be suitable. 22. Bear Park requests that the CEMP includes a requirement that essential services such as power, water and sewage are maintained to Bear Park (and indeed other business in Akiraho Street) at all times during business hours.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
221	221/7	Ximena Reyes	Bear Park Mt Eden	2.3 Consultation	Communication 23. Given the scale of potential disruption caused by the CRL and the magnitude of effects it is critical that there is clear, timely and informative communication. This will allow Bear Park parents and staff to anticipate and adjust to potential disruptions 24. Accordingly, Bear Park requests that: (a) As proposed in the NOR, Auckland Transport undertakes and maintains communication with affected persons, such as Bear Park, through an effective Communications Plan; (b) The Communications Plan must contain information about the construction programme, access restrictions, traffic management measures and progress; (c) The Plan should be sent to affected parties in writing and electronically; (d) The Plan must provide timely information, at least one month prior to any travel restrictions or changes in the construction programme; (e) If the Mount Eden Train Station is to be closed, the on dates and alternative train stations / public transport our staff and parents can access must be included in the Plan. We would need to inform parents with plenty of notice to make arrangements. We rely on this form of transport and it is one of the reasons why some of our parents choose to bring their children here.
221	221/8	Ximena Reyes	Bear Park Mt Eden	5.17 Air quality	12. In a similar way to noise, staff and children will be potentially exposed to dust created from the construction effects. This is especially the case for the preschool children and staff who work and play outside in close proximity to the tracks. 13. Bear Park requests that: (a) Appropriate conditions are imposed to control dust and for industry best practice measures to be included within the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP").
222	222/1	Brendan Doherty		1.1 Support - NOR All	
222	222/2	Brendan Doherty		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Street and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley Street to the go down again to the platforms. Provision of a second station entrance at Newton Station on the eastern side of Symonds St - to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland.
222	222/3	Brendan Doherty		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it is dug up between Wellesley and Customs Streets. If possible we should try to remove the slop lane between Wellesley and Victoria Streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state.
223	223/1	David Madsen		1.1 Support - NOR All	
223	223/2	David Madsen		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. The East Facing Connection will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton - ensuring the capacity of the CRL is fully utilised and also that Grafton Station will continue to play a meaningful role in the rail network. I support the general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations...
223	223/3	David Madsen		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley Streets to then go down again to the platforms. Provision / designation of a second station entrance at Newton station on the eastern side of Symonds Street - to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station, this would increase the station pedestrian access.
223	223/4	David Madsen		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Remove the slip lane between Wellesley and Vitoria when Albert Street is rebuilt between Wellesley and Customs Streets and improve the quality of all footpaths along all of Albert Street, e.g. width, tree planting, pedestrian seating areas, foot traffic street crossings, pedal bike stands, etc
224	224/1	Adam Jarvis		1.1 Support - NOR All	
224	224/2	Adam Jarvis		3.1 Appropriate solution	Construction of the CRL, with retention of the east facing connection, to ensure the full capacity of the rail link is utilised.
225	225/1	Edward Bennett		1.7 Support - NOR 6	
225	225/2	Edward Bennett		5.3 Vibration - construction	The absence of the 1870s brick residence at 81 Mt Eden Road from the lists of built heritage potentially affected by Vibration and Settlement. This building is not that noticeable but it is one of the oldest structures in the area and it would be a pity if it is of interest but has been inadvertently overlooked. I would like this building included or at least investigated.
225	225/3	Edward Bennett		5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The absence of the 1870s brick residence at 81 Mt Eden Road from the lists of built heritage potentially affected by Vibration and Settlement. This building is not that noticeable but it is one of the oldest structures in the area and it would be a pity if it is of interest but has been inadvertently overlooked. I would like this building included or at least investigated.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
225	225/4	Edward Bennett		5.8 Built heritage	The absence of the 1870s brick residence at 81 Mt Eden Road from the lists of built heritage potentially affected by Vibration and Settlement. This building is not that noticeable but it is one of the oldest structures in the area and it would be a pity if it is of interest but has been inadvertently overlooked. I would like this building included or at least investigated.
226	226/1	Alan P Stamp		1.24 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 1	
226	226/2	Alan P Stamp		5.1 Noise - construction	Reduction of noise. Support 24 hour working day to reduce inconvenience.
226	226/3	Alan P Stamp		5.10 Transport - operational	Reduction of traffic congestion.
226	226/4	Alan P Stamp		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Tunnelling up Albert Street.
226	226/5	Alan P Stamp		5.34 Construction methodology	Support 24 hour working day to reduce inconvenience.
226	226/6	Alan P Stamp		5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	If access is not guaranteed then request secure parking be provided by Auckland Transport within 800 meters of ferry building. Current car park at Quay West.
226	226/7	Alan P Stamp		5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	If access is not guaranteed then request secure parking be provided by Auckland Transport within 800 meters of ferry building. Current car park at Quay West.
227	227/1	Nicholas B Dravitzki		1.1 Support - NOR All	
227	227/2	Nicholas B Dravitzki		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the proposal to retain the east facing connection rather than the inner west interchange. I support the proposed route and the location of the 3 stations.
228	228/1	Liane Zimmerman		1.1 Support - NOR All	
229	229/1	Christopher J Braxton		1.1 Support - NOR All	
230	230/1	Sandra Jenkins		1.8 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR All	
230	230/2	Sandra Jenkins		5.1 Noise - construction	We are residents in Manhattan Apartment 10A, 105 Albert Street. We wish to ensure safe pedestrian and vehicle access to our building and for construction noise to be limited to daytime hours. We need to be able to rest in the evening - construction should not be permitted when residents are wanting to sleep. Residents should be permitted to relax and rest during the evenings.
230	230/3	Sandra Jenkins		5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	We are residents in Manhattan Apartment 10A, 105 Albert Street. We wish to ensure safe pedestrian and vehicle access to our building and for construction noise to be limited to daytime hours.
230	230/4	Sandra Jenkins		5.34 Construction methodology	We are residents in Manhattan Apartment 10A, 105 Albert Street. We wish to ensure safe pedestrian and vehicle access to our building and for construction noise to be limited to daytime hours. We need to be able to rest in the evening - construction should not be permitted when residents are wanting to sleep. Residents should be permitted to relax and rest during the evenings.
230	230/5	Sandra Jenkins		5.19 Sustainability	We accept that the plan to build the CRL is forward thinking and necessary for a sustainable future for Auckland City. We want to ensure that provisions are made during the construction phase to ensure the well being of residents who live in the area.
230	230/6	Sandra Jenkins		2.3 Consultation	We wish to ensure that residents will be informed of progress through an effective communication system such as a stakeholders committee where stakeholders have an opportunity to share concerns and inform decision during the pre and construction and post phases.
230	230/7	Sandra Jenkins		5.35 Health / safety	We need to know that there will be effective risk management systems in place - to identify hazards for pedestrians to manage traffic effectively.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
230	230/8	Sandra Jenkins		5.9 Transport - construction	We need to know that there will be effective risk management systems in place - to identify hazards for pedestrians and manage traffic effectively.
231	231/1	Matt Lowrie		1.1 Support - NOR All	
231	231/2	Matt Lowrie		3.1 Appropriate solution	Further i support the proposed route as well as the retention of the east facing link to maximise future potential operating patterns.
231	231/3	Matt Lowrie		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The council should require a designation through the currently empty site that is bordered by Albert St, Victoria St and Elliott St, effectively an extension of recently upgraded Darby St which would provide a perfect entrance to the station from Queen Street. It is also imperative that all of the entrances to the stations are designed to allow extremely high pedestrian flows, much higher than what is catered for in the modeling. Projections about rail patronage have historically underestimated demand and i believe that the same mistake is occurring with the CRL. This need to apply not just to the CRL but also to any potential connection to a North Shore line. At the Newton Station provision should be made to at the very least create a pedestrian connection under Symonds Street to the site of the car park on the corner of Symonds Street and New North Rd. Having only one station entrance is a recipe for creating a bottleneck so helping to spread the load will be vital while also making things easier for those traveling to the east of the station.
232	232/1	Ry Tweedie-Cullen		1.1 Support - NOR All	
232	232/2	Ry Tweedie-Cullen		3.1 Appropriate solution	Support the decision to retain the East Facing Connection rather than the Inner West Interchange. The EFC will allow a direct link between Newton and Grafton - ensuring the capacity of the CRL is fully utilised and also that Grafton Station will continue to play a meaningful role in the rail network. Support the general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations... There is an interesting argument to be had around whether construction of some of the stations should be staged but this consenting process is all about protecting the footprint so issues about sequencing are irrelevant here.
232	232/3	Ry Tweedie-Cullen		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby Street - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley Street to the go down again to the platforms. Provision of a second station entrance at Newton Station on the eastern side of Symonds Street - to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland.
232	232/4	Ry Tweedie-Cullen		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it is dug up between and Victoria streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state.
233	233/1	Harminder Singh		1.1 Support - NOR All	
233	233/2	Harminder Singh		3.1 Appropriate solution	I would like the Council to approve these plans, keeping in mind these issues: (a) the East Facing Connection should be retained, rather than the Inner West Interchange; (b) the general alignment of the route and the location of the three stations is supported.
233	233/3	Harminder Singh		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	Designate an area across the site at the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets to ensure future access between the corner of Darby and Elliott Streets and the entrance to Aotea Station. This will enable a level entrance to the station from Queen Street along Darby Street - rather than unnecessarily forcing people to climb up Victoria or Wellesley Street to the go down again to the platforms. Provision of a second station entrance at Newton Station on the eastern side of Symonds Street - to relieve pressure on what would otherwise be just the one entrance to this station in a not particularly pedestrian friendly part of Auckland.
233	233/4	Harminder Singh		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	Require further information about how Albert Street will be rebuilt after it is dug up between and Victoria streets and also improve the quality of footpaths along all of Albert Street from their current embarrassing state.
234	234/1	Ashraf El Khatib	Ash Net Limited	1.24 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 1	
234	234/2	Ashraf El Khatib	Ash Net Limited	5.20 Economic	I am the owner of a business at 69 Victoria Street West, Auckland. The business trades as Ash Net Internet Cafe. Following the designation my business is now unsaleable, and any good will i have developed since setting up in February 2009 has been eroded completely. The effect on my business and personal and employee wellbeing will be and is massive. Already by the designation being in existence i have suffered complete loss of good will in my business.
234	234/3	Ashraf El Khatib	Ash Net Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	I am generally in support of having a better public transport system for Auckland, but feel that i should be compensated by Auckland Council for bearing a great financial cost - the loss of my business, my employees' jobs, and my livelihood. This s the reason for my submission.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
235	235/1	Colen A Harris		1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	
235	235/2	Colen A Harris		5.1 Noise - construction	The notices of requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents
235	235/3	Colen A Harris		5.17 Air quality	The notices of requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents
235	235/4	Colen A Harris		5.20 Economic	The notices of requirement will: (b) detrimentally affect tenancies and income therefrom in the building.
235	235/5	Colen A Harris		5.35 Health / safety	The notices of requirement will: (c)potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
235	235/6	Colen A Harris		5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Decision sought: 1. Declining the Notice of Requirement; or 2. Imposing conditions mitigating the effects as set out above including following proper consultation with Body Corporate 401501.
236	236/1	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	4. This submission is in Objection, until such time as adequate assessment of effects information has been provided and mutual agreements addressing mitigation of those affects are in place, at which point it may then be possible to offer Support to the project. (6) Similarly construction of Aotea Station and demolition of the existing block of commercial buildings on the corner of Vitoria and Albert Streets (immediately next door to Albert Plaza) to make way for the station access via underground escalators and construction of a new building to house 'mechanical plant'... these components all have potential constructional and operational adverse effects on Albert Plaza that will also need to be planned for and mitigated.
236	236/2	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	2.3 Consultation	2. James Kirkpatrick Limited (Kirpatrick's) is the owner of Albert Plaza, an 11 storey commercial office tower at 87-89 Albert Street immediately adjoining both the proposed route and Aotea Station. Kirkpatrick's do not wish to comment on the chosen route per say, not the economic feasibility or sensibility of the undertaking. However, the Notice of Requirement suggests Kirkpatrick's will be a significantly affected party by the proposal and wish to make it quite clear that they require to be an 'informed party' at all times during this process.
236	236/3	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	2.1 Consistency / clarification of application	3. Kirkpatrick's have limited their submission to concerns about Albert Plaza and the Tenants who conduct their business within Albert Plaza. By virtue of the information available and provided by the Applicant, the submission is 'course grained' in nature and can only be refined when the Applicant engages and more detailed information becomes available as to how the proposal impacts upon the building and business. 9. Settlement The applicant has produced settlement contour modeling, that indicates a greater than 15mm differential settlement expectation across the Albert Plaza building floor plate. This has not been accompanied by professional information indicating what effect this is going to have; - Will the effect of the settlement be magnified laterally by thirteen stories of height (including the two basement floors)? - Will the differential stresses introduced into the window frames and glazing members, waterproof membrane surfaces and other rigid fixtures that form part of the building structure be affected? - There implications for the operation of the lifts and other mechanical services? - Are the structure columns of the building capable of supporting the introduced bending moments and still maintain earthquake and other 'factors and safety'? - Is this going to lead to a general 'loss of foundation bearing' by deeper undermining of the foundations? 15. Vent stacks on the 'mechanical plant building' Large vent stacks are proposed to be incorporated into the 'plant building' immediately next door to Albert Plaza. Kirkpatrick's have no idea how big (tall) and what diameter these extraction fans are proposed to be or if they will emit dangerous extraction gases, cause noise and vibration, or have a poor visual amenity. 15. Vent stacks on the 'mechanical plant building' Large vent stacks are proposed to be incorporated into the 'plant building' immediately next door to Albert Plaza. Kirkpatrick's have no idea how big (tall) and what diameter these extraction fans are proposed to be or if they will emit dangerous extraction gases, cause noise and vibration, or have a poor visual amenity.
236	236/4	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.34 Construction methodology	6. The proposed Auckland Corridor Rail Route in front of the Kirkpatrick building is intended to be twin track 'open cut' trench excavation. Whilst Kirkpatrick's would prefer an underground tunnel solution as it is likely to be less disruptive, however we understand the Applicant will have good reasons for adopting this open cut method. Clearly adoption of this method could lead to unintended consequences that affect Albert Plaza, and these will have to be managed. 13. Demolition of adjoining buildings Existing buildings on the corner of Albert and Victoria Streets, immediately next door to Albert Plaza, are intended to be demolished and substantial foundation excavation and construction conducted. Kirkpatrick's wish to ensure the Applicant is aware of all incumbent risks are well managed. - Demolition, falling debris. - Noise, vibration, dust. - Potential loss of car parking. - Kirkpatrick Tenant'loss of quiet enjoyment'.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
236	236/5	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	7 Access Kirkpatricks need unrestricted 24 hour access to the front of the building for pedestrian traffic and underground parking. Albert Plaza is fully tenanted, the tenant portfolio includes a number of International School activities, a Restaurant on the ground floor, music recording studio, with reasonable large numbers of people constantly coming and going. - There are two underground levels of car parking that require unrestricted access and given the entrances are already 'rather tight' some thought will be necessary to determine how that will be functionally achieved and in a safe manner. - If full continued access is unable to be provided then the Applicant will need to arrange alternative acceptable and credible parking to the satisfaction of the leases. - We have leases that need to be honoured with Tenants 'right to quiet enjoyment' (covered further below). - All access has to be clear (free of mud & slurry), safe and meet the necessary Health and Safety obligations. - If access results in mud & slurry being carried into Albert Plaza and / or the basement then provision to regularly 'wash and clean' the affected areas has to be made.
236	236/6	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	8 Vibration and Loss of Support Kirkpatricks are of course very concerned to ensure that the proposed construction operations do not lead to a situation where loss of building support occurs. During the excavation process, the use of mechanical construction equipment, including hydraulic rock breakers will introduce vibration, ground shaking, dewatering will be necessary to drain ground water (which can lead to piping and change the ground bearing characteristics under Albert Plaza) all leading to a potential loss of support. - Are the excavations gong below Albert Plaza building foundations and is underpinning being contemplated. - Is the proposal intended to be anchored into or 'bear' against Albert Plaza building foundations (bearing against could transit additional construction and operational vibration into the building)? - Tenants have sensitive electronic equipment that does not respond well to noise, vibration or dust (music recording studio, computer servers). 15. Vent stacks on the 'mechanical plant building' Large vent stacks are proposed to be incorporated into the 'plant building' immediately next door to Albert Plaza. Kirkpatricks have no idea how big (tall) and what diameter these extraction fans are proposed to be or if they will emit dangerous extraction gases, cause noise and vibration, or have a poor visual amenity.
236	236/7	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	8 Vibration and Loss of Support Kirkpatricks are of course very concerned to ensure that the proposed construction operations do not lead to a situation where loss of building support occurs. During the excavation process, the use of mechanical construction equipment, including hydraulic rock breakers will introduce vibration, ground shaking, dewatering will be necessary to drain ground water (which can lead to piping and change the ground bearing characteristics under Albert Plaza) all leading to a potential loss of support. - Are the excavations gong below Albert Plaza building foundations and is underpinning being contemplated. - Is the proposal intended to be anchored into or 'bear' against Albert Plaza building foundations (bearing against could transit additional construction and operational vibration into the building)? - Tenants have sensitive electronic equipment that does not respond well to noise, vibration or dust (music recording studio, computer servers). 9. Settlement The applicant has produced settlement contour modeling, that indicates a greater than 15mm differential settlement expectation across the Albert Plaza building floor plate. This has not been accompanied by professional information indicating what effect this is going to have; - Will the effect of the settlement be magnified laterally by thirteen stories of height (including the two basement floors)? - Will the differential stresses introduced into the window frames and glazing members, waterproof membrane surfaces and other rigid fixtures that form part of the building structure be affected? - There implications for the operation of the lifts and other mechanical services? - Are the structure columns of the building capable of supporting the introduced bending moments and still maintain earthquake and other 'factors and safety'? - Is this going to lead to a general 'loss of foundation bearing' by deeper undermining of the foundations?
236	236/8	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.6 Structural - tunnels	9. Settlement The applicant has produced settlement contour modeling, that indicates a greater than 15mm differential settlement expectation across the Albert Plaza building floor plate. This has not been accompanied by professional information indicating what effect this is going to have; - Will the effect of the settlement be magnified laterally by thirteen stories of height (including the two basement floors)? - Will the differential stresses introduced into the window frames and glazing members, waterproof membrane surfaces and other rigid fixtures that form part of the building structure be affected? - There implications for the operation of the lifts and other mechanical services? - Are the structure columns of the building capable of supporting the introduced bending moments and still maintain earthquake and other 'factors and safety'? - Is this going to lead to a general 'loss of foundation bearing' by deeper undermining of the foundations?
236	236/9	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.20 Economic	10. Interruption of business services The building has various services that require retention of uninterrupted supply and failure to do so would likely see Kirkpatricks receive claims from Tenants for compensation. - Stormwater sump pumps in the lower basement level car parks leading to flooded parking areas. - Electrical power for lighting, lifts, air con, computer servers, electronic doors, remote security services. Most of the electrical components do not respond well to power surges and uncommanded closer (computer systems) so there could be permanent damage. - The Fire Service is connected to a monitored alarm, false alarms have to be responded to and are costly. Callouts will occur if there is extended loss of power, drop in water pressure or breaks in the communications cables. - Telecommunication failure would cause significant paralysis of Tenant business. 16. Business Impact There is a very real likelihood that the disruption to our Tenant business will result in Tenancies not being renewed.
236	236/10	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	11. Noise It is likely there will be elevated and different noise levels above that currently experienced and for longer durations. 15. Vent stacks on the 'mechanical plant building' Large vent stacks are proposed to be incorporated into the 'plant building' immediately next door to Albert Plaza. Kirkpatricks have no idea how big (tall) and what diameter these extraction fans are proposed to be or if they will emit dangerous extraction gases, cause noise and vibration, or have a poor visual amenity.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
236	236/11	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	12. Business disruption Kirkpatrick current insurance policy premiums for All Risk Building and Public Liability would rise for the duration of the proposed activity and there will likely be policy exclusions and maximum sum insured limitations. There is a clear expectation that the Applicant would be responsible for picking up any increase in premium, risk and shortfall. 18. Tenant non renewal Tenants have clear lease expectations. The Applicant is expected to enter into an agreement with Kirkpatrick's to cover all and any loss of business and Tenant non renewal that may be attributed to the Applicant's activities. 19. Payment of costs The Applicant is expected to meet all costs including but not limited to legal / accounting representation and fees arising in connection with the underground rail / legal agreements between AT and Council / matters arising from Tenant activation of lease release clauses. The Applicant is expected to meet all material costs and disruption arising from interruption of service supply in whatsoever form that may occur (interruption of service supply, water, telecommunications, computer links and services, remote monitoring of buildings, computer controlled services, electrical).
236	236/12	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.29 Mitigation - for damage	12. Business disruption Kirkpatrick current insurance policy premiums for All Risk Building and Public Liability would rise for the duration of the proposed activity and there will likely be policy exclusions and maximum sum insured limitations. There is a clear expectation that the Applicant would be responsible for picking up any increase in premium, risk and shortfall. 17 Insurance Kirkpatrick's require that the Applicant carry adequate, full and complete all risk and public liability insurance for the project and to cover Albert Plaza as well. Kirkpatrick's insurers have indicated the existing policies for Albert Plaza may well fact increased premiums in line with the increased risk and that there may be a reduction or limitation on all works associated with the Auckland Rail Corridor due to the unknown risk profile. Determination of final insurance policy would rely on the Applicant supplying sufficient detail at the appropriate time. Irrespective, the Applicant is expected to have policies capable of covering any increased premiums and reduced cover.
236	236/13	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	14. Passage of trains The passage of trains is likely to result in noise and vibration transmission to the building. Kirkpatrick's need to be assured that full mitigation will occur so that sensitive equipment within the building is not damaged or made less reliable, and that there is no intrusion upon the Tenants right to 'quiet enjoyment'.
236	236/14	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.16 Urban design framework	15. Vent stacks on the 'mechanical plant building' Large vent stacks are proposed to be incorporated into the 'plant building' immediately next door to Albert Plaza. Kirkpatrick's have no idea how big (tall) and what diameter these extraction fans are proposed to be or if they will emit dangerous extraction gases, cause noise and vibration, or have a poor visual amenity.
236	236/15	Lloyd Morris	James Kirkpatrick Limited	5.17 Air quality	15. Vent stacks on the 'mechanical plant building' Large vent stacks are proposed to be incorporated into the 'plant building' immediately next door to Albert Plaza. Kirkpatrick's have no idea how big (tall) and what diameter these extraction fans are proposed to be or if they will emit dangerous extraction gases, cause noise and vibration, or have a poor visual amenity.
237	237/1	R W Elder	R W Elder Ltd	1.37 Late submission	
237	237/2	R W Elder	R W Elder Ltd	1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	Decision sought: (1) Declining the Notice of Requirement; or (2) Imposing conditions mitigating the effects set out above including following proper consultation with Body Corporate 401501.
237	237/3	R W Elder	R W Elder Ltd	5.1 Noise - construction	The Notices of Requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents.
237	237/4	R W Elder	R W Elder Ltd	5.17 Air quality	The Notices of Requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents.
237	237/5	R W Elder	R W Elder Ltd	5.20 Economic	The notices of requirement will: (b) detrimentally affect tenancies and income therefrom in the building.
237	237/6	R W Elder	R W Elder Ltd	5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The notices of requirement will: (c) potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
237	237/7	R W Elder	R W Elder Ltd	5.35 Health / safety	The notices of requirement will: (c) potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
238	238/1	D F Betts		1.37 Late submission	
238	238/2	D F Betts		1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	Decision sought: (1) Declining the Notice of Requirement. (2) Imposing conditions mitigating the effects set out above including following proper consultation with Body Corporate 401501.
238	238/3	D F Betts		5.1 Noise - construction	The Notices of Requirement will: (a) Create noise and air pollution to the detriment of the building residents.
238	238/4	D F Betts		5.17 Air quality	The Notices of Requirement will: (a) Create noise and air pollution to the detriment of the building residents.
238	238/5	D F Betts		5.20 Economic	The Notices of Requirement will: (b) Detrimentially affect tenancies and income therefrom in the building.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
238	238/6	D F Betts		5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The Notices of Requirement will: (c) Potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
238	238/7	D F Betts		5.35 Health / safety	The notices of requirement will: (c) potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
239	239/1	Murray Dobson: Head of Property	Westpac New Zealand Limited	1.37 Late submission	
239	239/2	Murray Dobson: Head of Property	Westpac New Zealand Limited	1.1 Support - NOR All	We believe the proposed addition to the City Rail Link (CRL) from Britomart to Mt Eden and the associated changes in designation will be a positive step for the Auckland rail network and commuters using this form of transport, and as such requires further investigation. There are a number of benefits outlined in the overview document. As an alignment with the Westpac business the following are supported: * Increase commuter access to the City. * Increase accessibility to help drive economic growth. Provide a catalyst for inner city redevelopment by creating new major transport hubs. Assist in reducing regional carbon emissions.
240	240/1	Margaret L Main		1.14 Support, subject to conditions / amendments - NOR 6	
240	240/2	Margaret L Main		5.1 Noise - construction	I am happy to support the proposed City Rail Link as it will be most beneficial for our city. However, due to the construction zone being right on the perimeter of our properties, we wish to ensure that proper attention is given to such areas as noise control at night, access to and from Ruru Street, appropriate noise / vibration barriers provided between our properties and the construction zone and ongoing consultation with the owners as to what plans are in place. We are also concerned that parking in the area will be greatly reduced during the period of construction as street parking is already at a premium this will cause quite a lot of disruption to owners, tenants and visitors. Decision sought: Correct plans in place to ensure that contractors adhere to the rules around noise and vibration.
240	240/3	Margaret L Main		5.3 Vibration - construction	I am happy to support the proposed City Rail Link as it will be most beneficial for our city. However, due to the construction zone being right on the perimeter of our properties, we wish to ensure that proper attention is given to such areas as noise control at night, access to and from Ruru Street, appropriate noise / vibration barriers provided between our properties and the construction zone and ongoing consultation with the owners as to what plans are in place. Decision sought: Correct plans in place to ensure that contractors adhere to the rules around noise and vibration.
240	240/4	Margaret L Main		5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	I am happy to support the proposed City Rail Link as it will be most beneficial for our city. However, due to the construction zone being right on the perimeter of our properties, we wish to ensure that proper attention is given to such areas as noise control at night, access to and from Ruru Street, appropriate noise / vibration barriers provided between our properties and the construction zone and ongoing consultation with the owners as to what plans are in place. We are also concerned about the proposed number of truck movements an hour (estimated at 60 per hour) and would be keen to see these spread out through various access points.
240	240/5	Margaret L Main		2.3 Consultation	We would expect to be involved in consultation with Auckland Transport and the Council about the design and use of the surrounding area once the construction process is complete.
240	240/6	Margaret L Main		5.12 Public amenity / streetscape - construction	A robust plan in place to manage the area both before and after construction in terms of the visual 'focus'. We would expect to be involved in consultation with Auckland Transport and the Council about the design and use of the surrounding area once the construction process is complete.
240	240/7	Margaret L Main		5.13 Public amenity / streetscape - post-construction	A robust plan in place to manage the area both before and after construction in terms of the visual 'focus'. We would expect to be involved in consultation with Auckland Transport and the Council about the design and use of the surrounding area once the construction process is complete.
240	240/8	Margaret L Main		1.37 Late submission	
240	240/9	Margaret L Main		5.9 Transport - construction	We are also concerned about the proposed number of truck movements an hour (estimated at 60 per hour) and would be keen to see these spread out through various access points.
240	240/10	Margaret L Main		5.20 Economic	It is believed that there may be issues getting tenants into the properties at full rent over the construction period and that some long term tenants may decide to move out during this time. Having already gone through 'rent issues' when the property was being fixed through 'leaky home syndrome', this has the potential to cause more stress to owners. We are also concerned about what could happen to the area if, prior to construction commencing, the surrounding business tenants decide to move out - this could mean a deterioration of buildings and the potential for such things as damage to buildings, graffiti, and a rise in crime. We are not keen to find ourselves living in 'a slum' style area.

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
240	240/11	Margaret L Main		5.26 Social impact	We are also concerned about what could happen to the area if, prior to construction commencing, the surrounding business tenants decide to move out - this could mean a deterioration of buildings and the potential for such things as damage to buildings, graffiti, and a rise in crime. We are not keen to find ourselves living in 'a slum' style area.
241	241/1	Thomas M Collins		1.37 Late submission	
241	241/2	Thomas M Collins		1.1 Support - NOR All	
242	242/1	Damian Guptill		1.37 Late submission	
242	242/2	Damian Guptill		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
242	242/3	Damian Guptill		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	The tunnel is not straight. If you are going to the effort of building an underground tunnel at great expense then building it straight from the bottom of town to the connecting lines. And should the line be extended in the future where will it go, there doesn't seem to be a clear path. I'd suggest run the line straight from Dominion Rd in line as an underground extension of Dominion Rd, with an underground bus / train hub where the existing rail line crosses Dominion Rd, then in the future extend the rail line under the length of Dominion Rd. Why doesn't the loop include Mt Eden Station? Has the tunnel been future proofed? Will this tunnel be in the way of any future tunnels, subway, motorway or other? New York City has ten abandoned stations and many kilometres of disused tunnels because with the developing subway system they were put in the wrong place. A full subway plan of Auckland so all the future tunnels and station are known well in advance (eg. 100 years of rough drafting (eg lines on maps) ideally an underground grid layed North / South and East / West and 20 years of exact detailing down to the last pipe and electrical cable.
243	243/1	Robert S Lawton		1.1 Support - NOR All	
243	243/2	Robert S Lawton		5.38 Positive effects / opportunities	We need the rail loop to increase the rail capacity to and from the port. If the port capacity is to increase i think it will be impractical to only move containers during the night. While most of the urban lines have been double tracked, it is highly likely that at least one route between the port and heading south (and possibly even to the north and west) will need a dedicated freight line.
244	244/1	Robert S Lawton		1.1 Support - NOR All	
245	245/1	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	1.27 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 4	
245	245/2	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building.
245	245/3	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham.
245	245/4	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.20 Economic	3. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham. causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
245	245/5	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham. causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
245	245/6	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.2 Noise - operational	4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham. causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
245	245/7	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham.
245	245/8	John R Abel-Pattinson	70 Pitt Street Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Decision sought: 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, 70 Pitt Street Limited to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same.
246	246/1	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	1.27 Oppose / withdraw - NOR 4	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
246	246/2	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	1. Adversely affecting traffic flow in the surrounding area and prohibiting customers and residents from reaching the building.
246	246/3	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.1 Noise - construction	2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham.
246	246/4	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.3 Vibration - construction	2. Noise levels and vibrations due to construction activity reaching unacceptable levels and disturbing customers and residents of The Chatham.
246	246/5	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.20 Economic	3. Subsequent to the above, construction workers and / or machinery disturbing customers and residents. Consequential loss of income and possible de-valuation of the building due to the above mentioned items. 4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham. causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
246	246/6	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.10 Transport - operational	4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham. causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
246	246/7	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.2 Noise - operational	4. In the event the said rail link is completed, traffic on the rail line will be to the detriment of The Chatham. causing further on-going noise and vibration levels, again deterring customers from visiting the hotel and / or choosing to invest in the property.
246	246/8	Christopher J McIntosh	Blackstone Group Limited	5.28 Mitigation - monetary	Decision sought: 2. In the alternative, should Council proceed with the proposed development, The Chatham to be compensated for all direct and consequential losses as a result of the same.
247	247/1	Ben Dearlove		1.1 Support - NOR All	
248	248/1	Theresa Walsh		1.1 Support - NOR All	
249	249/1	Goran Stojanovic	East Family Trust	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
249	249/2	Goran Stojanovic	East Family Trust	5.1 Noise - construction	My family trust owns 18 East Street. It is an old villa which we have completely renovated 8 months ago. We believe that the work which will take place underground will have great impact on the property as there will be drilling, digging, noise, dust etc on all levels (???) to our wooden property. Besides that also number 20 East Street, a property next door to us will be used for construction purposes. So the house will be surrounded by construction, noise, dust, drilling, shaking etc...which will be a complete disaster for our tenants and us as the property owners. The tenants will surely not want to live in such an environment.
249	249/3	Goran Stojanovic	East Family Trust	5.17 Air quality	My family trust owns 18 East Street. It is an old villa which we have completely renovated 8 months ago. We believe that the work which will take place underground will have great impact on the property as there will be drilling, digging, noise, dust etc on all levels (???) to our wooden property. Besides that also number 20 East Street, a property next door to us will be used for construction purposes. So the house will be surrounded by construction, noise, dust, drilling, shaking etc...which will be a complete disaster for our tenants and us as the property owners. The tenants will surely not want to live in such an environment.
249	249/4	Goran Stojanovic	East Family Trust	5.20 Economic	My family trust owns 18 East Street. It is an old villa which we have completely renovated 8 months ago. We believe that the work which will take place underground will have great impact on the property as there will be drilling, digging, noise, dust etc on all levels (???) to our wooden property. Besides that also number 20 East Street, a property next door to us will be used for construction purposes. So the house will be surrounded by construction, noise, dust, drilling, shaking etc...which will be a complete disaster for our tenants and us as the property owners. The tenants will surely not want to live in such an environment. We ask that Council to take into account all of the above, and to invite us to explain how these issues could be remedied for us. This property returns very good rent for us and any interruption would affect our income.
249	249/5	Goran Stojanovic	East Family Trust	5.3 Vibration - construction	My family trust owns 18 East Street. It is an old villa which we have completely renovated 8 months ago. We believe that the work which will take place underground will have great impact on the property as there will be drilling, digging, noise, dust etc on all levels (???) to our wooden property. Besides that also number 20 East Street, a property next door to us will be used for construction purposes. So the house will be surrounded by construction, noise, dust, drilling, shaking etc...which will be a complete disaster for our tenants and us as the property owners. The tenants will surely not want to live in such an environment.
249	249/6	Goran Stojanovic	East Family Trust	2.3 Consultation	We ask that Council to take into account all of the above, and to invite us to explain how these issues could be remedied for us. This property returns very good rent for us and any interruption would affect our income.
250	250/1	Oliver Hoffman		1.1 Support - NOR All	
251	251/1	Brian Murphy		1.1 Support - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
251	251/2	Brian Murphy		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the east facing connection option which retains capacity and usage options for the rail network. The general proposal of stations to be built is good.
252	252/1	Margaret Y Joseph		1.15 Neutral, did not specify - NOR All	I approve of the City Rail Link but i am concerned there foes not appea to be any bus / train / car / park for commuters. I feel a park and ride carparks should be made available in New Lynn and suburbs, then more people would use the train / bus service.
253	253/1	Sara J Cairney		1.1 Support - NOR All	
254	254/1	Cornelius Blank		1.1 Support - NOR All	
254	254/2	Cornelius Blank		3.1 Appropriate solution	I support the general alignment of the route and location of all three stations. i support the decision to retain the east facing connection that allows a direct link between Newton and Grafton. it is important this is done properly now to ensure full capacity is possible on the CRL.
254	254/3	Cornelius Blank		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	An important improvement would be a designated area across the vacant lot on the corner of Elliott and Victoria Streets. This would allow a potential level entrance to the station from Queen Street via Darby Street, and link in very well with the shared space and any future high-rise and retail development on the site.
255	255/1	Joshua Ramsay		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
256	256/1	Sandra Taseu	Rainbow Family Trust	1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	We seek that the Council takes adequate measures to (??) that the activity of the workshop is uninterrupted and remains pleasant for the tenants / workers and the (??) same goes for access, noise, dust etc.. or else assures that adequate (...?).
256	256/2	Sandra Taseu	Rainbow Family Trust	5.25 Building access / car park access during construction	Our property is used as a (mechanical workshop??). It is (??) for uninterrupted access to be allowed for the vehicles going in and out from workshop and passing customers to (??) clearly see our premises as the business depends on this.
256	256/3	Sandra Taseu	Rainbow Family Trust	5.20 Economic	Our property is used as a (mechanical workshop??). It is (??) for uninterrupted access to be allowed for the vehicles going in and out from workshop and passing customers to (??) clearly see our premises as the business depends on this.
256	256/4	Sandra Taseu	Rainbow Family Trust	5.1 Noise - construction	Also, we accept there to be (??) noise to be disturbing us and our clients from the construction activity.
256	256/5	Sandra Taseu	Rainbow Family Trust	5.17 Air quality	We seek that the Council takes adequate measures to (??) that the activity of the workshop is uninterrupted and remains pleasant for the tenants / workers and the (??) same goes for access, noise, dust etc.. or else assures that adequate (...?).
257	257/1	Victor D Brandt		1.30 Oppose / withdraw, of if confirmed, (NOR All) subject to conditions / amendments	
257	257/2	Victor D Brandt		5.1 Noise - construction	The Notices of Requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents.
257	257/3	Victor D Brandt		5.17 Air quality	The Notices of Requirement will: (a) create noise and air pollution to the detriment of building residents.
257	257/4	Victor D Brandt		5.20 Economic	The notices of requirement will: (b) detrimentally affect tenancies and income therefore in teh building.
257	257/5	Victor D Brandt		5.5 Structural - individual buildings	The notices of requirement will: (c) potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
257	257/7	Victor D Brandt		5.30 Mitigation - preventative / conditions	Decision sought: (2) Imposing conditions mitigating the effects set out above including following proper consultation with Body Corporate 401501.
257	257/8	Victor D Brandt		5.35 Health / safety	The notices of requirement will: (c) potentially detrimentally affect the building structure, exterior and health and safety of occupiers.
257	257/9	Victor D Brandt		2.3 Consultation	Decision sought: (2) Imposing conditions mitigating the effects set out above including following proper consultation with Body Corporate 401501.
258	258/1	Tournament Group	C/- James Brown	1.1 Support - NOR All	

City Rail Link - Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Sub Matter	Submitter Name	Organisation Name	Topic Description	Summary
259	259/1	John Hipkins		1.23 Oppose / withdraw - NOR All	
259	259/2	John Hipkins		3.2 Inadequate consideration, costs / risks	It appears Auckland Council / Auckland Transport have ignored "letters to the editor" on the less expensive option of an overground tram / train option as now applies in many cities world-wide. At Auckland Council / Auckland Transport / The mayor totally ignore the fact that ratepayers rely on their car for the quickest "point to point" travel - to and from work etc. Try taking public transport from say Torbay to St Heliers. Bus / ferry / then / bus & VV. We are not London / New York / Sydney (populations). (9) Mr Brown / his 'inner circle' delude themselves by thinking that the CRL will solve Auckland's road congestion. It won't. Like Los Angeles, Aucklanders rely on their car, for home to work. Cr. Brewer confirms that "more improvements to the motorway network etc (Herald 8/3). The Mayor thinks that "gridlock" will be solved by his tunnel. He is dreaming. Even Sydney and London, with great rail systems, have road congestion. The Mayor / Council think the can educate drivers to switch to rail / bus / cycle or walk. They are wrong, they bully us.
259	259/3	John Hipkins		3.3 Alternative locations, sites or methods sought	I do this, for Auckland Council's consideration that 'overground' is a more practical option to a 3.4 km mainly underground rail tunnel from Britomart to Me Eden with 3 new city stations. (6) My alternative suggestion to the CRL is, as in London, consider an overground rail link. The underground stations below ground are at depths of: Aotea, 13m, Karangahape: 33m and Newton 42m. Compare to London's deepest is 58.5m (Hampstead). 210 surface properties will be used for access. I also queries with Auckland Transport the rocky volcanic nature in Auckland. (7) We / I discussed using Quay Street for Overground rail and to convert Albert / Hobson St to one way combined rail / car use with no car parking for 'kerbside' rail / tram use. This is the trend in London / Dublin / Salzburg, a point I tried to make to Mr Brown in Takapuna last year.
259	259/5	John Hipkins		5.10 Transport - operational	9) Mr Brown / his 'inner circle' delude themselves by thinking that the CRL will solve Auckland's road congestion. It won't. Like Los Angeles, Aucklanders rely on their car, for home to work. Cr. Brewer confirms that "more improvements to the motorway network etc (Herald 8/3). The Mayor thinks that "gridlock" will be solved by his tunnel. He is dreaming. Even Sydney and London, with great rail systems, have road congestion. The Mayor / Council think the can educate drivers to switch to rail / bus / cycle or walk. They are wrong, they bully us.
259	259/6	John Hipkins		5.6 Structural - tunnels	I am also concerned at the volcanic rock nature in Auckland.
259	259/7	John Hipkins		6.1 Project funding / economic	(2) The cost of \$2.86 Billion for the rail underground / loop, in the present tight economy is unsustainable for both Aucklanders / all NZ taxpayers...especially senior citizens. ... The effect on future debt levels is overlooked...
259	259/8	John Hipkins		6.6 Business case	(1) I'm totally opposed to Mayor Brown's determination to get Government support to compete with other cities' similar underground rail systems. At this point I mentioned that the Mayor overlooks National's problems with Earthquakes / Pike River / failed finance companies / the treaty settlement process, and much more.