

Verbal Submission on Alteration to Notice of Requirement A67

Ernest Ross Needham

Introduction

My name Ernest Ross Needham known as Ross, I have been a resident of Hamilton for more than 60 years and the Waikato for 85. I have lived at 1/17 Ruakiwi Road for 22 years. I would like to thank the commissioners for the opportunity to briefly speak with you today in respect to my submission lodged on this matter. This submission is also reflected in comments made to the Reserves Act reclassification hearing held separately.

Outcome sought

Hamilton City Council not alter the nature and scope of Designation

Commentary

In making these comments and submissions I fully understand that there is limited chance the Council will not continue with the Designation changes and construction of the Reservoirs. With a tight timeframe and access to a cash windfall from the Government this project seems inevitable. The impacts on residents will in general take second place.

In making my submission, and comments, I hope they are received in the way they are intended and not seen as just a complaining neighbour. It has been a difficult time for me through the last 6-8 months trying to engage in this process and understand the Resource Management Act, Reserve Act, and all the highly technical information, which there has been piles of.

These processes have caused me concern and has impacted my wellbeing.

Concerns

To reiterate my concerns. I object to the Alteration and Reserve Classification change as the proposed activity is of a scale and impact out of character with the current environment and lake park amenity. Specially my concerns as submitted include:

- Inadequate meaningful consultation
- Existing Lake Character impacts

- Visual Outlook Impacts
- Loss of Established Trees
- Impact on the Existing Reservoir Heritage Character
- Noise
- Vibration and integrity of my home
- Traffic
- General Construction Effects
- Lack of convincing need for the project in this location

I have read the piles of information in the various reports as best I am able and reiterate some points:

Need

The need for both reservoirs is questionable and the driver for the project and timeframes seems to be a funding window rather than project merit.

Staging

The construction of the first reservoir versus the second has never been adequately explained – I assume it is easier and cheaper albeit a lot closer to impacted Neighbours. Why can't Reservoir 2 be constructed first?

Visual

It seems all the experts agreed there will be direct impacts on my property and the wider reserve but there is some mitigation proposed, including the Corten steel curtain as a buffer. I simply don't have the expertise to assess all the information, but two massive reservoirs can't really be mitigated in any meaningful way by walking tracks and shrubs. In assessing the impact some reliance on a fanciful Reservoir that could in theory be built within the existing Designation envelope appears to have been used to justify the impact on visual amenity and character changes. I'm really not sure how real this is given the size needs and the associated equipment and buildings the project appears to need.

True Quote - See Attached

Consultation

Throughout this process I have raised concerns about the nature of consultation and lack of willingness to directly engage with me directly. This is despite several invitations to visit my property. The landscape people seem to have relied on simulations and models. Pretty disappointing as a resident of Hamilton for over 60 years.

Traffic

I have made comments on traffic and notice there are various reports on this with some suggestions about trip generation controls (ie carpooling). Anyone who has ever been on to a construction site or building site will know there is no control of the number and behaviour of drivers, where they park and how they conduct themselves. How will sub-contractors be asked to park and meet and travel together. This will be an absolute ute car convention.

Noise

My lay understanding of the various reports that I have read seem to suggest that that during large concrete pours and piling we just have to put up with noise even though its exceeding construction noise standards. What's the point of having these standards if the Council can ignore them? Is the government funding the justifying exceedance of these standards?

Vibration

Again, there are various reports on this saying it meets various standards so it should be ok. One report indicates some form of pre and post construction survey could be done to assess damage (presumably to my house). There didn't seem to be any indication of what would be done about it if there is.

Enforcement of Conditions

The various reports seem to rely heavily on the effectiveness of the Construction Management plan and conditions of the Designation. I note the requirements for communication to neighbours during construction, how real is this. My concerns are about the effectiveness of the conditions and enforcement of them.

- How rigorous is the monitoring of the contractor? Is the CEO of Council really going to enforce conditions and then prosecute themselves as Requiring Authority when significant government funding is at risk?
- How motivated will Council and contractor be to monitor and enforce travel, noise, vibrations, hours of operation?
- How motivated will the contractor be to comply if they have significant financial penalties for delay. Will they simple operate outside the Construction Plan and rules?
- Enforcement of reparation and damage to my home, do I have to prosecute the contractor or Council to get this done? How long will this take? How much will it cost me?
- This whole situation really sets me up as having to hold Council to account, this is not something I should have to do at my stage in life.

Summary

I remain in opposition to the proposed changes to the site. I am not trying to stop progress, however as a bundle of issues collectively it means I am going to be impacted by

- Noise
- Vibration
- Traffic

Not really what I need or wanted at 85years old. And there will be an impact on the wider environment

- Significant adverse visual changes
- Loss of open space and amenity

Thank you for your time taking to listen to my submission.

*Pages 1, 2, 3 Attached (PDF) AT TIMES
DURING PRESENTATION*

← AIRWAY to the street

①

~~Handwritten scribble~~

34. Another submitter, Mr Ernest Needham, is the closest of those who have submitted to the proposed reservoir development, his home being located on the southeast corner of the Ruakiwi Road / Clarence Street intersection at 17 Ruakiwi Road. While not directly concerned with effects on historic heritage, Mr Needham (at page three of his submission) raises concerns with the proposed removal of trees 30 and 30a which are in close proximity to the heritage water tower as he considers that these trees "aid in buffering structures".

Quote
Added →

35. Retaining trees 30 and 30a would keep the existing heritage water tower partially screened from surrounding locations, including from Mr Needham's home across Ruakiwi Road. However, removing these trees would assist in opening up the heritage water tower to wider views from Ruakiwi Road and from across the lake itself; enhancing its historic heritage values and the public benefit arising from them.

I cannot see how the proposed removal of tree 30 has any significant adverse effect on Mr Needham's amenity as tree 30 is on the opposite side of the heritage water tower to Mr Needham's home and as the heritage water tower would be between tree 30 and his property any adverse effects arising from the removal of tree 30 would be imperceptible from Mr Needham's location (refer Figures 4 and 5 below).

Figure 3 (below) identifies tree 30 and tree 30a (arrowed), while the extract from the *Existing Trees to be Removed* Diagram (Figure 4) provides context of the location of these trees and the heritage water tower to Mr Needham's property. The view is however not taken from Mr Needham's property, but taken from the west side of Ruakiwi Road approximately opposite Mr Needham's property. Figure 5 (below) provides before and after views towards the heritage water tower as seen from Mr Needham's property (image courtesy of Edwards White Architects).

2

MULTIPLE CONSULTATIONS IS MENTIONED

ONLY 2 BRIEF MEETINGS/CONSULTATIONS WITH ONLY ONE OF THE 19 SUBMITTERS OF REQUIRING EVIDENCE

I REFER TO ONE SUBMITTER EVIDENCE PAGE 29 ITEM 100
HE STATED

AT THE TIME OF PREPARING MY ASSESEMENT IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO VISIT THE PROPERTY . HIS REPORT IS FROM PHOTOGRAPHS

I do not agree with his stated opinions ESPECIALLY THOSE
IN TWO PAGES HE WROTE ABOUT MY PROPERTY AND THE VISUAL EFFECTS

HE STATES

IN MY OPINION THE END OF THE BALCONY VIEW REPRESENTS A WORST CASE SCENIARIO AND IS NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MAJORITY VIEWS FROM THE FIRST FLOOR LIVING SPACES .

ALL VIEWS ARE THE WORST CASE ,

3

THE EAST END VIEW IS JUST AS WORST

HE STATES THE CHANGE IN OUTLOOK WILL BE PERMANENT RESULTING IN MODERATE TO HIGH VISUAL EFFECT THE LANDSCAPE MODERATE VISUAL EFFECT PARTICULARLY DURING CONSTRUCTION AND FOR 5 TO 7 YEARS AFTER COMPLETION .

THOUGH THE EFFECTS FROM THE FIRST FLOOR LIVING AREAS WILL BE LESS SIGNIFICANT .

MOST OF FIRST FLOOR VIEWS WILL BE HIGHLY IMPACTED

THE VISUAL EFFECT IN HIS OPINION WILL BE MODERATE E FROM MOST OF MY FIRST FLOOR LIVING AREAS

THIS ASSESSMENT FROM A PERSON WHO HAS NOT EVEN BEEN INSIDE MY FIRST FLOOR LIVING SPACES OR BALCONY

T3 pages added ad lib during the presentation