

Part B *This part asks for your position on the proposal*

5. What is your position on the proposal?

You can state your position on the proposal as a whole, or any part of it. If you have opinions on different aspects of the proposal then you can be specific about these in the space provided below.

If you require more space, please attach additional pages as necessary. Please ensure you include your name and the EPA proposal reference number 'NSP026' on each additional document.

Position	Support in full	Support in part	Neutral	Oppose in part	Oppose in full	Range of Views
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason including any suggested conditions	See Appendix 1 attached					

6. What decision would you like the Board to make?

Please indicate below what decision you would like the Board of Inquiry to make about this proposal and provide reasons. If you would like to see any changes to the proposal and/or make any suggestions for conditions if it were to be approved then you can include these.

If you require more space, please attach additional pages as necessary. Please ensure you include your name and the EPA proposal reference number 'NSP026' on each additional document.

- Grant
- Decline
- Grant with conditions *(please describe the changes or conditions you would like below)*
- No view
- Other *(please describe the decision you would like below)*

Provide reasons including any changes sought and/or suggested conditions.	<p>See Appendix 1 attached.</p> <p>We request that the date for the start of the hearing be changed to the beginning of the fourth week of January 2014 (20th -) or later, as the indicative date of 13 January is unreasonable</p>
---	---

7. What is your position on the planning matters

The applicant is seeking approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991 for one notice of requirement for a designation and five resource consents. These are referred to as the 'matters'.

If you have a position or opinion on these matters please indicate your position on them and give reasons for that position below.

If you require more space, please attach additional pages as necessary. Please ensure you include your name and the EPA proposal reference number 'NSP026' on each additional document as well as the matter to which the additional pages relate.

Notice of requirement and resource consent applied for under Wellington City Council jurisdiction

- **NSP 13/03.001:** Notice of requirement for the construction, operation and maintenance of State Highway 1 in Wellington City between Paterson Street and Buckle / Taranaki Street and to construct all associated mitigation works.
- **NSP 13/03.002:** Land use consent for sampling, disturbance and change of use of potentially contaminated soil where there is a potential risk to human health.

Resource consents applied for under Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction

- **NSP 13/03.003:** Land use consent for the excavation of bore holes that may intercept groundwater associated with the construction of bridge piles and ground improvement works.
- **NSP 13/03.004:** Water permit for the taking and use of groundwater during excavation of bore holes associated with the construction of bridge piles.
- **NSP 13/03.005:** Discharge permit to discharge contaminants to groundwater associated with the construction of bridge piles and ground improvement works.
- **NSP 12/01.006:** Discharge permit to discharge potentially contaminated groundwater to land including via the reticulated stormwater system where it may enter water.

Set out the matter (listed above), your comments and any changes sought and/or suggested conditions.

The submitter opposes the Notice of Requirement, the designation sought by the Notice of Requirement and the associated Resource Consents sought. The reasons for the submitter's opposition are set out in Appendix 1 attached to this submission.

Part C *This part provides the EPA with information to assist with administration of the hearing*

8. How would you like to receive correspondence?

Formal service of documents will be by way of the EPA website at www.epa.govt.nz.

For efficiency, as well as environmental and cost reasons, the EPA sends out its correspondence via email. We usually provide links to documents on our website rather than emailing documents. This saves people the trouble of downloading large files that they may not want.

We will send all information and correspondence including copies of the draft and final reports to the email address that is provided in Part A of the Submission Form.

If for any reason you cannot receive documents by email please indicate this by ticking the box below. This will ensure that, where possible, paper copies of all information will be sent to you.

If you choose to receive paper copies and wish to speak at the hearing, a lot of information such as evidence, hearing schedules, board directions and reports will need to be posted to you. However it may not always be feasible for paper copies to be made available to you in a timely manner (for example, the hearing schedule may change daily during the hearing).

In some instances, when there is a large volume of information, we may refer you to a location where this documentation is publicly available for inspection, such as a library, even if you indicate a preference for receiving paper copies.

If you prefer to receive hard copies of all the information please tick the box below.

I wish to receive **paper** copies of documents where possible

9. Do you wish to speak at the hearing?

As a submitter you may speak to your submission (and any evidence you may provide) at the hearing. To assist us with planning for the hearing, please advise us below if you are intending to speak.

*If you indicate on your submission that you **do not** want to speak at the hearing, you will not receive further correspondence from us until the draft decision report is sent to you. You can still access all information via our website.*

*If you indicate you **do** wish to speak at the hearing we will contact you prior to the hearing to confirm your intention and how long you will need for your presentation to the Board.*

Many submitters speak on similar topics and issues. If this applies to one or more of your topics of interest then you may consider presenting a joint case at the hearing. If you wish to do this, please indicate this by ticking the box. The Friend of Submitter will be able to assist submitters who are prepared to make joint cases – please refer to the Information Sheet for details on how to contact the Friend of Submitter.

If you do not select an option, we will assume you wish to speak about your submission.

I **do** wish to speak about my / our submission

If others make a similar submission, I / we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

10. Do you intend to provide expert witnesses?

This section only relates to people who want to speak at the Board of Inquiry hearing.

An expert witness is a person who, through training or experience, is a skilled practitioner in a particular subject and is able to give professional evidence on that particular subject. All experts are expected to comply with Environment Court Practice Note 2011 (available at www.justice.govt.nz/courts/environment-court/legislation-and-resources/practice-notes/practice-notes), and be prepared to be cross-examined.

If you consider yourself to be an expert or you intend to provide evidence from expert witnesses please tick the box below.

Yes, I **do have** expert witnesses (please fill out the table below).

If you know the areas of expertise of your expert witnesses and their names then please provide these. This information is for provisional planning purposes only - final confirmation of expert witnesses will not occur until the evidence of the submitters is lodged with the Board.

Name of witness	Area(s) of expertise	Phone number	Email address

The names, areas of expertise and contact particulars of my expert witnesses will be provided to the Board in due course

BASIN BRIDGE PROPOSAL: EPA Ref No: NSP026

Submitter: Mt Victoria Residents' Association Incorporated

Appendix 1: Part B.5 – Reasons for opposing the proposal
Part B.6 – Reasons to decline the proposal
Part B.7 – Comments on planning matters

1. The proposal does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
2. The proposal does not manage the use, development and protection of physical resources, in a way, or at a rate which will enable the people and community of Wellington to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety, while sustaining the potential of physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; safeguarding the life-support and capacity of air, water, soil and eco-systems; and avoiding, remedying or mitigating the adverse effects of the proposal on the environment.
3. The proposal does not recognise and provide for the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, such recognition and provision being a matter of national importance.
4. The proposal does not provide for the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources; the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values; the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment; the finite characteristics of physical resources; and the effects of climate change.
5. The effects on the environment of allowing the requirement will be significant and more than minor and the mitigation proposed will be inadequate to mitigate these adverse effects on the environment.
6. The proposal is inconsistent with the Wellington Regional Plan and with the Wellington City District Plan.
7. The proposal is inconsistent with the Wellington Regional Land Transport Strategy.
8. The proposal is inconsistent with the NZ Urban Design Protocol.
9. Adequate consideration has not been given to alternative sites, routes, or methods of undertaking the work. In particular, adequate consideration has not been given to a proposal comprising the following:

An alternative which maximises the use of the existing road network and retains and improves the function and pivotal role of the existing Basin Reserve Roundabout.

This alternative involves increasing the capacity, efficiency and reliability of the Roundabout and provides opportunities for improved public transport, cycling and walking.

This alternative proposal has been developed by Richard Reid & Associates Ltd and integrates with, reflects and enhances the historic, urban, landscape and open space environment of the Basin Reserve Area, as well as the approaches to and from it.

10. The work and the proposed designation are not reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the requiring authority for which the designation is sought.

In addition to the reasons given above, we urge the Board to decline the proposal for the following reasons.

The proposal does not address the perceived problem

The stated aims of NZTA's proposal are to resolve the conflict between east-west and north-south traffic around the Basin Reserve because it is causing significant congestion and safety problems.

- The problem is overstated - congestion is limited to short periods of time mainly during rush hours; the rest of the time there is no congestion. In addition, NZTA traffic counts in 2012 are below 2008 everywhere around the Basin, including on Ruahine St.
- Most of the aims could be achieved without a flyover and buildings. Firstly, the Buckle St changes will remove the lights at the corners of Sussex and Buckle Sts, and Tory and Buckle Sts, and develop a small parkland on the corner of Buckle St and Cambridge Tce. Secondly, by implementing some aspects of NZTA's proposal such as changing the dropoff zone at St Mark's school, establishing bus lanes round the Basin, establishing clearways on Vivian St at peak times, providing two lanes at the foot of Pirie St. This suggests a more sensible approach is a graduated one.

The proposal is contrary to City Council and Regional Council plans for Wellington city

NZTA's proposal is in contradiction to Wellingtonians' goal of having a people-centred city as set out in *Towards 2040: Smart Capital*. It is contrary to the multi-modal approach that NZTA signed up to in the Ngauranga to Airport Corridor Plan as it does little to enhance walking, cycling and public transport as important modes for people to move around and through Wellington city. It is also contrary to the development of the public transport spine through the central city, the Open Space Access Plan, the climate change programme, and efforts to protect public health and safety.

The proposal has negative effects on heritage of national and local significance

The Minister for the Environment considers the proposal to be one of national significance. She notes it is adjacent to the within the Basin Reserve historic area and international test cricket ground, near historic places such as the Home of Compassion crèche, Government House, the former Mount Cook Police Station, former National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum, and near the National War Memorial Park (Pukeahu). She also states that the proposal "s likely to result in significant and irreversible changes to the urban environment around the Basin Reserve".

The proposal adversely impacts on heritage and social and cultural well-being values of the Basin Reserve including heritage features within the site, its open space aspect, historic view shafts, relationship to other adjacent historic places, and surrounding hills. It is contrary to the spirit of the 1884 Basin Reserve Trust Deed whereby the area is to be held in trust forever for the people of Wellington for the purpose of recreation.

The proposal will also severely impact on historic houses in southern Mt Victoria and their occupants, require demolition of a pre-1890s house, and have detrimental effect on St Joseph's church, a future example of important heritage.

The proposal requires taking Canal Reserve land for roading, land which under the 1873 Town Belt Deed is held in trust for the citizens of Wellington for public recreation.

The proposal has significant negative social and health effects

Technical Report 14 notes that the area comprises several schools (almost 4,000 students attend school in close proximity of the Basin Reserve) as well as residential land uses. Compared with the city as a whole the area has higher numbers of residents who walk or cycle as their primary mode of transport and high pedestrian and cycle movements but limited facilities such as crossing points and cycle lanes. However, despite the proposal's emphasis on improving pedestrian and cycle facilities, there is little real improvement, and silence on how the needs of the disabled will be addressed.

The MVRA is very concerned at the acknowledged negative amenity effects from shading and loss of openness, outlook and pleasantness, particularly on Ellice, Brougham, Paterson, Dufferin and Buckle Sts, and on Kent and Cambridge Tces, and the loss of the small parkland for the one-storey building.

Nothing can mitigate the negative effects of an enormous 11+ metre concrete structure with six sets of huge piers. Contrary to NZTA's claim that the two buildings are mitigations, they in fact will detract even further from the area's amenity value. We are particularly concerned to note (p.8 Technical Report 12) that the dominant effect of the flyover will be transferred to the new building inside the Basin Reserve.

We are extremely concerned at the likely health dangers from the flyover: Although NZTA claims there will be less congestion and therefore no reduction in air quality, analysis of the inner city bypass, for which similar claims were made, indicates more congestion and reduced air quality. Also, the raised road will put pollutants up in the air to be wind-blown into the lungs of the 4,000 school children, residents and others in the immediate area. Exposure to increased traffic pollutants may worsen what evidence suggests is an associated increased respiratory, cardiovascular, and neurogenic diseases.

Construction of the project is expected to take three years. This will have a major adverse impact on many Mt Victoria residents and many other Wellingtonians – noise, dust, disruption of mobility, and on major world event such as the cricket world cup.

The proposal fails to invest in a sustainable, long-term solution to enhancing multi-modal mobility

Part of the attraction of Wellington as a people-centred city, and our point of differentiation from other large New Zealand cities, is our relative lack of alienating motorways and flyovers. We are concerned to see a proposal which wastes very large amounts of public money on a short-term response to a few hours of congestion per week in one direction over a very short distance. Temporary congestion is likely to be just as well addressed via other, much cheaper, means.

A truly future-looking government should be investing in clean, rapid, affordable public transport and better walking and cycling facilities. Encouraging more private vehicle use and more freight by road is a failure of duty of care to the citizens by their government. Giving priority to transport modes other than roads will place less stress on our challenged Wellington environment, go some way to addressing climate change and peak oil concerns, and promote more healthy and safe movement options for Wellingtonians and visitors.