

28 November 2017

Todd Whittaker  
Planning Consultant  
Gisborne District Council  
PO Box 747  
Gisborne 4040

Dear Todd,

**Re: Eastland Port Ltd: Wharves 6 & 7 Redevelopment: Resource Consent Applications**

Further to your letter of 10 November and our subsequent telephone discussion. We provide the following response to the requests for further information.

**1. Noise Emissions from the Redeveloped Wharf Areas**

Attached is a memo from Malcolm Hunt responding to the bullet point queries.

The information requested in the second and third bullet points regarding the likely higher utilisation of Wharf 7, including possibly by larger vessels, as a result of the wharf redevelopment, was generally provided in Malcolm Hunt's noise assessment report. We note that Section 8.5 of the report has slightly misinterpreted some information in the WorleyParsons engineering report on the possible increase in port capacity. This matter is explained further in Malcolm's memo, although as set out in it, and below, is of very little noise effects consequence.

Marty Bayley, from Eastland Port, has advised that the port currently sees approximately 150 log vessels a year and not 230 a year, as indicated in Section 8.5 of the Noise AEE. The higher figure is a prediction based on the completed Twin Berth project, which includes the yet to be undertaken Wharf 8 and breakwater redevelopment, along with a likely associated reclamation.

Section 8.5 of the Hunt report and the attached Hunt memo, confirm that as result of the Wharf 7 redevelopment, some additional usage of it is expected and at times there is expected to be some ongoing non-compliance with the noise emission standards applying to 'essential port activities' within the Port Management zone (i.e. the 'site'). However, as the report notes, the continuing non-compliance within the port itself is historical and simply related to the errors in the port noise contours in the Tairawhiti Plan, that need to be amended.

Eastland Port are keen to initiate a plan change with the Council, to correct the port noise contour anomalies. Setting this aside, a result of the Wharf 7 redevelopment, the Hunt report and memo predict full compliance with the current noise emissions standards (for both 'essential port activities' and non-essential port activities') beyond the port boundary, including the nearby Commercial Amenity or Residential zoned properties ('adjacent land').

Marty and Malcolm advise that the port utilisation model did not specifically account for larger log vessels because this is unlikely. Marty advises that most vessels are around 180m in length, with some around 200m, being the likely foreseeable maximum. Even if the maximum vessel length did increase marginally it is unlikely to impact on noise levels because the rate of log loading is expected to remain the same, but simply take longer. The rate of log loading is related to the land based storage capacity, which is quite limited at the port. In this regard (and as noted above) Eastland Port are investigating a reclamation as part of the Wharf 8 and breakwater upgrade project. So, for the immediate future the restricted logyard space at the port will continue to serve as a constraint on vessel loading operations at Wharf 7.

Malcolm's memo does not specifically cover the Wharf 6 redevelopment. As noted in Section 2.2 of the AEE the Wharf 6 redevelopment is simply intended to better accommodate the two port company tugs, including a purpose built refuelling facility. It will also better serve the current fishing fleet. This component of the project will result in more effective utilisation of the wharf, but is not expected to have any significant impact on noise emissions from these craft.

The above matters are effectively dealt with through the proposed conditions (see item 5 below), which set noise emission standards and monitoring. The proposed conditions are drawn from those attached to the Wharfside logyard consents. They are as follows:

- No. 41: Noise Management Plan- Same as Condition 28;
- No. 42: Essential Port Activities - Same as Condition 30;
- No. 43: Non-Essential Port Activities (Amenity Commercial Zone) –Same as Condition 31;
- No. 44: Non -Essential Port Activities (Heritage & Reserve Zones)- Same as Condition 32;
- No. 45: Noise Monitoring -Same as Condition 29.

## **2. Possible Site Contamination**

The amount of fill expected to be removed from behind the existing sheet pile walls at both wharves is outlined in Section 2.3 of the 4Sight AEE and Sections 2.1 and 3.1 of the WorleyParsons engineering report. For Wharf 6 the estimated volume is approximately 7,250m<sup>2</sup> and for Wharf 7 it is approximately 2,660m<sup>3</sup>.

The areas to be excavated are located beneath thick concrete wharf slabs. Although the Wharf 6 area is adjacent to the Wharfside logyard it is not expected to be contaminated to any significant extent from log storage or other activities.

A 2016 4Sight Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) of the logyard site found one small 'hotspot' of petroleum hydrocarbon contamination in the south-western corner, likely to have come from parked machinery. Remediation of the 'hotspot' is planned in accordance with the resource consent conditions for the logyard redevelopment project.

The soils in the Wharf 6 and 7 areas are to be sampled and tested once they are uncovered.

We have amended the land use consent application form to include the possibility of the earthworks involving some contaminated soils. Also, we have proposed a set of consent conditions to address the site investigation and other matters. The proposed consent conditions require that any contaminated material be remediated on site or disposed of at the local Tonlyn disposal facility.

### **3. Marine & Coastal Area Act Consultation Responses**

We have not had any responses from the three iwi and whanau organisations we contacted before lodgement of the applications with the Council. We have recently sent the organisations a reminder email, along with advice that the Council will be publicly notifying the applications, a copy of which is attached.

### **4. Construction and Operational Traffic**

The construction traffic associated with the redevelopment project is outlined in Sections 2 and 6 of the Worley Parsons engineering report and Sections 2.9 and 4.9 of the 4Sight AEE. As noted 28-30 return truck trips (or 56-60 total movements) per day are expected for the Wharf 6 redevelopment and around 50 return truck trips (100 total movements) per day are expected for the Wharf 7 redevelopment. The trucks are expected to enter and exit the site from either the Rakaiatane Rd or the Esplanade.

The available Council traffic count information for Rakaiatane Rd (from late 2013) indicates traffic movements in the order of 1,500-1,730 per day, of which 34-39% involve heavy vehicles. If most of the construction traffic (56-100 movements/day) uses this road then it will equate to only 4-7% of the existing daily total traffic.

We are not aware of any Council traffic count information on the Esplanade. It is not used by logging trucks. As such there will should be no associated effects on port related traffic efficiency or safety. The Wainui Rd intersection has a traffic island that caters well for traffic entering and exiting to the east and west.

The construction traffic is expected to 'overlap' with some of the logging and other port operational traffic. However, both Rakaiatane Rd and the Esplanade have well maintained two-way sealed carriageways, along with associated roadside parking and pedestrian footpath facilities. They are expected to accommodate the construction traffic over the short period of time involved.

The adjacent properties at the northern ends of the two roads closest to the CBD are primarily of a commercial/industrial nature with a good standard of vehicle crossings. They are not expected to be adversely affected in terms of traffic safety or efficiency. Although the southern section of the road adjoins the Titirangi (Kaiti Hill) Reserve, vehicle access to the reserve is obtained from Parau Rd (to the east) and Kaiti Beach Rd (to the south). As such no adverse traffic safety or other effects are expected.

The proposed Construction Management Plan (CMP) will have a traffic management component.

It will include a requirement to liaise with the Council (as reserve managers) and the Rakaiatane Rd and Esplanade property/business owners regarding the expected use of the road during the construction traffic period. It will also highlight the need to put in place any necessary temporary traffic management measures, such as signage, as a result of this liaison.

## **5. Proposed Conditions**

Attached are a set of proposed conditions, as requested. The conditions cover all of the matters listed in Section 6.10 of the AEE, with the exception of dredge disposal ground monitoring. As noted this matter is being investigated by MetOceans as part of the current maintenance dredging consent conditions and expected to be completed in the next month or two. We will advise further on these proposed consent conditions, once the MetOceans report is to hand.

Most of the proposed conditions are drawn from other Eastland Port resource consents and in this regard hopefully fairly self-explanatory. We have specifically covered the crayfish settlement device mitigation measures. We are happy to discuss any aspects of them with you.

## **6. Notification and Joint Processing of Applications**

Marty and I are comfortable with the expected notification of the applications and their expected joint processing with the slipway redevelopment applications. We would appreciate a copy of the notification decisions for our respective records when they are available. The joint notification and processing of the applications will be much more cost effective.

We trust the above response covers everything. If you have any queries do not hesitate to contact me.



### **Max Dunn**

Principal Planning and Policy Consultant

**4Sight Consulting**

### Attachments

Malcolm Hunt memo

Amended RC form

Follow up email to iwi and whanau

Applicants proposed consent conditions

### Copies –by email

Marty Bayley, David Aubourg, Malcolm Hunt, Mark Poynter, Nigel Mather