

From: [Hamilton, Catherine](#)
To: [Shannon Watson](#)
Cc: [Head, Jeremy](#); [Dan Kellow \(InTouch\)](#)
Subject: RE: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path
Date: Wednesday, 12 February 2020 9:59:49 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)

Hello Shannon,

Thank you for your response.

I would like to spend some time speaking to Jeremy before responding by Friday.

There is definitely a strong link between landscape/visual and recreation amenity. The creation of a quality recreation experience, especially in a natural setting, is enhanced by the visual and landscape experience afforded to the user.

In my opinion the BSUDP falls a bit short of providing a robust framework for recreation amenity outcomes. See further comments below.

Cheers

Catherine

Catherine Hamilton
 Technical Principal - Landscape Architecture



T: +64 9 353 2960
 M: +64 27 244 7849
Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com

WSP
 The Westhaven
 100 Beaumont Street
 Auckland 1010
 New Zealand

wsp.com/nz



From: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 12 February 2020 8:35 AM
To: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>
Cc: Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>; Dan Kellow (InTouch) <dan.kellow@huttcity.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

Thanks for this Catherine.

Do you consider that the current LUDP framework does not provide for effects on recreation amenity to be considered alongside those of landscape/visual amenity (current framework in italics below)? **Jeremy**, your thoughts here would also be useful. It appears there is more interaction than I previously realised between recreation amenity and visual amenity and these elements I feel need to be reflected in the relevant conditions – i.e. mitigation/design for effects on recreation amenity need to be reflected in the LUDP and visual amenity effects need to be more clearly reflected in conditions related to recreational amenity. Or, the management plan framework broadened to cover both elements together.

28. The LUDP shall include Bay Specific Urban Design Plans (BSUDPs) for each bay within the Project area, which integrate the Project's permanent works into the coastal environment and with the adjacent land.

29. The BSUDPs will specifically address the detailed design of the Project in the specific bay location for the benefit of pedestrians, cyclists and others using the local road network, including:

- (a) Seawall structures such as curved concrete walls, revetments and combination concrete wall and revetment, in terms of their scale and materials and fit in the landscape and including transition zones between seawall types. This includes considering opportunities to incorporate texture and depressions into the seawalls and the reuse of colonised rock material, where practicable;
- (b) Beach access including all steps and ramps and associated handrails where required and including their surface treatment and handrails where required;
- (c) Treatment of stormwater structures at the coastal interface;
- (d) Penguin related structures including penguin passage elements, ramps and nests;
- (e) Planting treatment;
- (f) Treatment of existing trees;
- (g) Treatment of existing landscape features;
- (h) Beach nourishment; and
- (i) Signage and storyboards.

Do you think there is value in seeking to extend the scope of the LUDP to cover recreational amenity and user experience as well? Or do you think they should remain separate but we could mimic the BSUDP framework and create a separate sub-set for recreation and user experience? **Yes, in my opinion creating a sub-set would attribute more importance to recreation values** If we were to do this what parameters or criteria would you recommend be addressed? **I will give more consideration to these. The trick is to frame up qualitative factors (which are sometimes less tangible) that contribute to a quality recreation experience. E.g. a calm atmosphere allows for quiet enjoyment of the natural setting.**

As an example, would the below suit?

As part of detailed design, in consultation with HCC and GWRC, the consent holder shall create Bay Specific Recreation Enhancement Plans BSREP (or similar) for all areas where beach loss is to occur. The BSREP shall identify specific designs for each bay that would reflect the unique characteristics of that location and would show how the qualities of that space are retained and enhanced, taking into account current and predicted future recreation use as a result of the shared path. Factors to be taken into account during preparation of the BSREP shall include:

- (a) Design and area of space available for recreation amenity enjoyment/activities
- (b) Design and orientation of features and spaces
- (c) Design of access points
- (d) Retention, enhancement or treatment of natural features (trees, rocky shore elements)
- (e) Refuge and seating opportunities.

I agree in principle, especially the focus on design – the best outcomes will be design-led.

Beach grooming

Just an FYI but Dr Iain Dawe GWRCs coastal processes expert has confirmed he is relatively confident that beach nourishment will be successful because he is confident that the eastern bays have reached equilibrium (off-shore sediment transport processes have lost energy previously transporting sediment to Eastbourne and southern beaches). If undertaken correctly with appropriate material, Dr Dawe considers that any nourishment material deposited at the respective bays will remain with the confines of the relevant bays in which the nourishment will take place. Dr Dawe is recommending additional conditions related to monitoring and reporting and locking the applicant into re-nourishment if nourishment material is uplifted. **Thanks, that is reassuring**

Refuges

With regard to refuges, the applicant has agreed to accept/propose a condition relating to design and frequency of refuges, to be informed by appropriate modelling. See below from Memorandum 4 to the s92 request. **This is good**

<p>Chapter 5 5.1 – 5.7</p>	<p>August 2019 Further consideration</p>	<p>5.1 – Relief areas – a condition as recommended by Catherine Hamilton will be included - "As part of detailed design, in consultation with HCC, the consent holder will/shall deliberately design relief areas along the project. Relief areas shall be supported by appropriate modelling to inform both the frequency and size of relief areas."</p> <p>Remaining points raised 5.2 – 5.7 are addressed in sections 2 and 3 of this memo.</p>
--------------------------------	--	--

I previously understood that the addition of this condition would alleviate your concern regarding the provision of suitable refuges/rest points? **Yes, this is the case. Frequency and size are fundamental considerations. Perhaps I am jumping ahead, but the point Jeremy and I are making is also to do with design. The quality of space created at the refuges is important in order for them to facilitate a good recreation experience. The expanded LUDP is picking up on this.** It appears there is also cross-over or a lot of interaction between recreation amenity and visual amenity and these elements I feel need to be reflected in the relevant conditions – i.e. mitigation/design for effects on recreation amenity need to be reflected in the LUDP and visual amenity effects need to be reflected in conditions related to recreational amenity.

Interested in both yours and Jeremy's thoughts on all of the above

Thanks

Shannon Watson
Environmental Planner

GHD
Proudly employee owned
T: +64 04 474 7330 | V: 517330 | F: 04 472 0833 | E: shannon.watson@ghd.com
Level 2, Grant Thornton House, 215 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6011 | www.ghd.com

Connect



[WATER](#) | [ENERGY & RESOURCES](#) | [ENVIRONMENT](#) | [PROPERTY & BUILDINGS](#) | [TRANSPORTATION](#)

Please consider our environment before printing this email

From: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 11 February 2020 5:36 PM
To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>
Cc: Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>
Subject: RE: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

Thanks Shannon. You have been working hard on this.

Further comments as follows:

Mitigation of beach loss

With regard to effects on recreation amenity due to loss of beach and user experience and opportunities to mitigate such loss. I recommend that each location where beach loss would occur needs to be considered in its own right based on the specific characteristics of that location. A one-size-fits-all approach is not likely to result in the best outcomes.

A site specific design for each location would show how the qualities of that space are retained and enhanced where possible, taking into account current and predicted recreation use. Factors include size, orientation, views, access points, trees, rocky shore elements, seating opportunities.

Beach Grooming

The proposal identifies beach grooming which, if sustained, would be a good mitigation measure. It would need to be shown that such grooming will be sustained and not eroded due to increasing storm surges (climate change) and changing coastal dynamics. Coastal processes is not my area of expertise but I do advise that this be carefully considered in regard to mitigation.

Refuges

A mitigation measure that would enhance the recreation amenity of both the pathway and the beaches is the provision of well-spaced/ adequately-sized refuges. Some of these can be man-made and still have a natural character. See below exemplar of refuge area that has both urban elements and natural shore edge elements.

Regards

Catherine



Catherine Hamilton
Technical Principal - Landscape Architecture



T: +64 9 353 2960
M: +64 27 244 7849
Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com

WSP
The Westhaven
100 Beaumont Street
Auckland 1010
New Zealand

wsp.com/nz



From: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 11 February 2020 9:53 AM
To: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>
Cc: Ainslee Brown <Ainslee.Brown@govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

Hi Catherine

Welcome back, hope everything is a bit more settled in your world and your family are keeping well under the circumstances.

Thanks for this, I look forward to receiving your thoughts. When commenting on effects on recreation amenity due to loss of beach and user experience it would helpful if you could advise of/suggest other forms of mitigation you might consider appropriate in this situation to alleviate these effects, to help my own thinking.

Ainslee, can you please get a full copy of submissions to Catherine Hamilton somehow, she is still having issues accessing the full submissions folder. Maybe you could set this up separately for Catherine?

Thanks
Shannon

From: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>
Sent: Monday, 10 February 2020 8:05 PM
To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>
Cc: Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>; Lee Sang, Deb <Deborah.LeeSang@wsp.com>
Subject: RE: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

Hi Shannon,

I'm just letting you know I will provide you with preliminary feedback tomorrow ahead of my memo on Friday. The main thrust of my feedback will remain unchanged from my review because the path width (a key concern) remains unchanged in the application.

Effects on recreation amenity due to loss of beach and effects on user experience will be in line with my earlier comments.

The proposal does now have a barrier fence along some sections, which is likely to have both positive and negative effects on recreation amenity (quite apart from the safety implications). As shown in the photomontages, the fence will provide opportunities to stop, dwell and rest against the handrail to take in the view. This will be positive for the sauntering recreational user, but negative for the faster commuters who will encounter more obstacles.

The barrier fence could have a psychological (and potentially real) effect of trapping users against the live lane should there be congestion. This effect would be exacerbated in the narrower sections.

I also intend to provide case studies to demonstrate my key points relating to path width and its correlation to recreation use and enjoyment.

I am relying on the summary of submissions as I was not able to access the SharePoint with the full submissions for some reason. Is this acceptable to you?

Regards

Catherine

Catherine Hamilton
Technical Principal - Landscape Architecture



T: +64 9 353 2960
M: +64 27 244 7849
Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com

WSP
The Westhaven
100 Beaumont Street
Auckland 1010
New Zealand

wsp.com/nz



Shaping
the future
of Aotearoa
since 1870

From: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>

Sent: Wednesday, 22 January 2020 4:44 PM

To: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>

Subject: RE: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

The hearing definitely won't be in February, and unlikely to be March as well. More likely April or May. Getting thoughts together early though still of significant benefit to all I think to keep things front of mind. Can then be updated as applicant progresses design work and responds to concerns raised in submissions.

From: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>

Sent: Wednesday, 22 January 2020 3:19 PM

To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>

Subject: RE: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

Thanks Shannon.

I realise you don't have the dates for the hearing. Given you are looking for initial responses by 14 Feb, would it be safe to assume the hearing won't be in February? Just sorting out other commitments.

Cheers

Catherine

Catherine Hamilton
Technical Principal - Landscape Architecture



T: +64 9 353 2960
M: +64 27 244 7849
Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com

WSP
The Westhaven
100 Beaumont Street
Auckland 1010
New Zealand

wsp.com/nz

From: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>

Sent: Wednesday, 22 January 2020 2:58 PM

To: Ainslee Brown <Ainslee.Brown@gw.govt.nz>

Cc: Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>; Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>

Subject: FW: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

Can you look into access for the Opus contractors please.

Thanks

From: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>

Sent: Wednesday, 22 January 2020 2:56 PM

To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>

Cc: Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>

Subject: RE: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

Hello Shannon.

Thanks for your really clear instructions below and the great summary. I'm starting to have a look at this (and yes, I can see in colour)

I can't get on to the share point to see the submissions – I am using the external contractor link. Can you assist me please?

Cheers

Catherine

That didn't work

We're sorry, but Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com can't be found in the greaterwellington-my.sharepoint.com directory. Please try again later, while we try to automatically fix this for you.

Here are a few ideas:

- Click here to sign in with a different account to this site.
This will sign you out of all other Office 365 services that you're signed into at this time.
- If you're using this account on another site and don't want to sign out, start your browser in Private Browsing mode for this site ([show me how](#)).

If that doesn't help, contact your support team and include these technical details:

Correlation ID: 10d22d9f-d0ab-b000-6ca0-cc0bed9462a0
Date and Time: 1/21/2020 5:53:21 PM
URL: https://greaterwellington-my.sharepoint.com/personal/ainslee_brown_govt_nz_ljyouhu/15/guestaccess.aspx?
e=drRAu6share-EminBmpXGZb7EFAeghlW0bVv1etN803j0XCJ0PG5fw
User: Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com
Issue Type: User not in directory.

Catherine Hamilton
Technical Principal - Landscape Architecture



T: +64 9 353 2960
M: +64 27 244 7849
Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com

WSP
The Westhaven
100 Beaumont Street
Auckland 1010
New Zealand

wsp.com/nz

From: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>

Sent: Tuesday, 21 January 2020 12:47 PM

To: david@transportconsultant.co.nz; Megan Oliver <Megan.Oliver@gw.govt.nz>; Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>; Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>; Iain Dawe <Iain.Dawe@gw.govt.nz>; Sharyn Westlake <Sharyn.Westlake@gw.govt.nz>; roger.uys@gw.govt.nz

Cc: Jo Frances <Jo.Frances@gw.govt.nz>; Dan Kellow (InTouch) <dan.kellow@huttcity.govt.nz>; Parvati Rotherham <Parvati.Rotherham@huttcity.govt.nz>; Michelle Conland <Michelle.Conland@gw.govt.nz>

Subject: Email to experts directing summary of evidence preparation for Eastern Bays Shared Path

Importance: High

Afternoon all

I have now completed pulling out the submission points on the Eastern Bays Shared Path which we believe require an expert response (attached). As you are all aware there is a lot of cross over between the themes and the environmental effects of the project generally (implications of path width on user safety, ecology values, recreation amenity or user experience, sea level rise, natural character etc.), so for clarity **we have given you each a colour to draw your attention to the submissions (or themes) relevant to your area of expertise** where we require you to provide a formal response.

The colours for the respective experts are (I hope none of you are colour blind):

David Wanty (transport/traffic matters and safety)

Megan Oliver (inter/sub-tidal ecology)

Jeremy Head (natural character/visual amenity)

Iain Dawe (beach renourishment, sea level rise and alternative design features (rock rip rap islands))

Iain Dawe and Sharyn Westlake (seawall design and sea level rise)

Catherine Hamilton and David Wanty (path width)

Roger (penguins and coastal avifauna)

Catherine Hamilton (effects on recreation amenity due to loss of beach and effects on user experience)

What I am hoping for from each of you is detailed comments (or a memo) outlining what your evidence is likely to say (before formal evidence is received to alleviate potential timing conflicts) such that I can progress with the majority of my s42A hearing report. I imagine this summary can then form the basis for your formal evidence. A template of the format/content to be included in your formal expert evidence, to guide your summary, is attached for your information.

I would like each of you to address your comments on the proposal in the following manner:

- Comments on the application as lodged and your comments on the various further information responses and how your understanding of the proposal and original concerns may or may not have been addressed by the applicant (i.e. comments on lodged application and those on further information prepared and amalgamated/covered together so that these effectively are read as overall comments on the application as it stood when notified)
- Submissions – responding to the relevant points raised in submissions relating to your area of expertise

I am requesting this so that all comments from the relevant experts related to their area of expertise can be found in one place and submitters and the hearing panel can see how the proposal and the relevant experts concerns may have evolved as the application has progressed, given the numerous memorandums and further information received.

Application documents and copies of submissions

Application documents and the further information responses (essentially all information related to the application up to notification) can be found here: <https://www.gw.govt.nz/EasternBaysSharedPath>

A copy of the full submissions can be found here:

Internal: https://greaterwellington-my.sharepoint.com/:f/g/personal/ainslee_brown_govt_nz/FinmBmpIXG7Hs7FFAegniW0BxYvbtN803jtrXCjJoPGGfw?e=drRAIc (will work for any GW staff)

External staff (contractors): https://greaterwellington-my.sharepoint.com/:f/g/personal/ainslee_brown_govt_nz/FinmBmpIXG7Hs7FFAegniW0BxYvbtN803jtrXCjJoPGGfw?e=drRAIc

These are numbered in accordance with the submitter numbers in the attached Summary of Submissions.

Things to consider

1. We are comfortable for your evidence/summary to be relatively succinct, and refer back to the relevant sections of the application or further information as appropriate. The evidence/summary needs to clearly state what the issues are, and what your view/assessment is, but you can refer back to the application reports or further information when describing some of the detail.
2. Please ensure that your evidence/summary is consistent with any comments you have made since the application was lodged and your section 92 responses, including insofar as some aspects or your understanding of the proposal might have moved on slightly as the application has progressed. If your view of the proposal has changed since providing comments please detail why this has changed and what your assessment of the proposal is now.
3. If there are areas where your evidence/summary will need to be consistent with that of another expert, please check in with each other directly (and let us know) to ensure the statements will be consistent.
4. Related to that, if you think you will need to recommend other or additional mitigation measures that are not yet captured **PLEASE LET US KNOW ASAP** so we can raise these with the applicant.

Responses to certain submissions

The following submissions do not require detailed comments as part of your summary but having your thoughts on these would be helpful and you need to be prepared to comment at the hearing:

- Submission #53
- Submission #63
- Submission #66
- Submission #151
- Submission #152
- Submission #174

Additional matters:

In addition, there are some elements coming out of the submissions which were touched on during the consideration of the application (pre-notification) which I feel still need to be 'closed-out'. These include:

Catherine Hamilton

- You raised concerns over beach renourishment being proposed as mitigation for loss of beach space (and therefore loss of recreational amenity) with uncertainty over its success. After reviewing Iain's comments on the application as lodged and further discussion with Iain regarding beach nourishment and coastal processes I was comfortable enough that Iain was satisfied that beach renourishment would be successful (noting that risk could be further mitigated if ongoing beach renourishment was incorporated into the proposal as contingency in the event of failure) and therefore this was not included in the original further information request. After reviewing Iain Dawes comments on the application and submissions I would like you to comment on whether you are satisfied that effects of beach loss can be appropriately addressed by beach renourishment at the affected beaches. (Happy for you to discuss with Iain directly or wait for his response below)
- If you are not comfortable with beach renourishment as the mitigation for loss of recreation amenity due to loss of beach what are the likely effects and how else might these be able to be mitigated?
- Are there any known examples of 2.5m wide shared paths and 3.5m wide shared paths (to provide visual context) that we can draw upon.

Sharyn Westlake

- Can you please comment on the suitability of the seawall design to resist scour at the base/toe and for further adaptation in future (i.e. add-ons and building up) and what you consider might be required for such adaptation to be successful. What will be required to successfully upgrade the seawall in future – extent of infill? would raising the road level likely be required?

Iain Dawe

- Can you please make a qualified comment on the likely success of beach nourishment as proposed (i.e will the material used for renourishment remain in place to the extent necessary to consider it successful) and any recommendations that could be adopted by the applicant to further enhance the likelihood of successful renourishment. Again, noting that at this stage HCC have not offered to undertake ongoing renourishment of the beaches.

Megan Oliver/Roger Ulys

- Do you think we need a draft CEMP prior to the hearing to provide more certainty that effects during construction can be managed? Megan we discussed this before the further information request and you didn't think it was necessary because there was enough information in the application information to show how effects will be managed, but Forest and Bird have expressed that one should be provided (to demonstrate how avoidance will be achieved as per NZCPS).
- Penguin/coastal avifauna mitigation/offsetting package is being progressed by the applicant in the background. The applicant is seeking to get alignment from GWRC/DoC/Forest and Bird and the local penguin experts (Sally Bain/Mike Rumble) on the proposed approach prior to the hearing.

Safety barriers

- We are seeking advice on the minimum width/height/standard for any safety railings which may be required and whether these are in fact legally required under the Building Act or if there are other standards that come in to play given it is a shared path. This will give us more of an understanding of the bulk and scale of the safety barrier and what this might mean for further constraining the shared path width where a barrier is required and effects on natural character and the eastern bays landscape. We are also seeking confirmation from the applicant on the length of barrier that they think is required as there is currently disagreement between the applicant and our assessment of the required length.

To be completed by

Can you please provide an initial response (your summary) by COB Friday 14 February 2020 (17/18 working days (depending on where in the country you are)). However, it would be appreciated that if coming out of the submissions or the points identified above you notice any gaps or you are uncomfortable with something, you inform us ASAP so we can work out if we need to commission further reports or request a formal response from the applicant.

Expert workshop

I am also hoping to arrange a joint expert meeting/conference call in early February so all of GWRC's experts can come together to workshop the proposal as it stands, discuss potential trade-offs that could be made and the potential alternatives so that we have put some thought into this if questions are asked by commissioners (i.e what are the implications if the path is extended slightly further seaward) would the mitigation/offset package proposed still be acceptable, what are the likely implications on the design etc.

Please give myself or Dan Kellow a call if you have any questions or concerns.

Kind regards

Shannon Watson
Environmental Planner

GHD
Proudly employee owned
T: +64 (0)4 474 7330 | F: 04 472 0833 | E: shannon.watson@ghd.com
Level 2, Grant Thornton House, 215 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6011 | www.ghd.com

Connect



[WATER](#) | [ENERGY & RESOURCES](#) | [ENVIRONMENT](#) | [PROPERTY & BUILDINGS](#) | [TRANSPORTATION](#)

Please consider our environment before printing this email

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately, and please delete it; you should not copy it or use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. GHD and its affiliates reserve the right to monitor and modify all email communications through their networks.

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

[Water Resources Management](#)

[This e-mail has been scanned for viruses](#)

[This e-mail has been scanned for viruses](#)

[This e-mail has been scanned for viruses](#)

[This e-mail has been scanned for viruses](#)

[This e-mail has been scanned for viruses](#)