

# **BASIN BRIDGE PROPOSAL – PROPOSED LIST OF CONTESTED ISSUES**

## **PART A – CONTESTED ISSUES AS AGREED BY ALL PARTIES**

### **1. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

- 1.1 What is the appropriate modelling tool to be used, how reliable are the outcomes from each of the available models, and has the NZTA's traffic modelling produced reliable or meaningful outputs in support of its transport proposals
- 1.2 What impact (if any) will traffic changes for the War Memorial Park project have on the traffic modelling
- 1.3 Can similar/sufficient public transport improvements, and the project objectives, reasonably be achieved via a cheaper option, one that is at-grade, and/or one with less negative effects
- 1.4 Is the project (or any other improvements at the Basin) needed, including if the Mt Victoria Tunnel duplication does not proceed. And if the tunnel duplication does proceed, is there any justification for the Basin Bridge project being completed in advance of the duplication upgrade
- 1.5 Should the project be progressed (effectively making SH1 via Vivian St a permanent RoNS) before the future of Vivian St and the related scale of the Karo Drive "Inner City Bypass" are decided
- 1.6 What effects will the project have on public transport, and what upgrade works are required to avoid, remedy or mitigate these
- 1.7 Is the project consistent with the findings of the PT Spine Study, and should the project be considered for approval prior to the PT Spine Study being finalised and adopted by GWRC
- 1.8 Has adequate consideration been given to future public transport infrastructure requirements
- 1.9 Has there been adequate consideration of the project (in quantitative terms) against the RLTS key outcomes
- 1.10 What is the appropriate design speed for the Basin Bridge
- 1.11 Have all traffic safety risks been adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated (particularly at the eastern abutment of the proposed Basin Bridge, for the left slip lane in Paterson Street, for the Ellice Street link road, at the Adelaide Road/Rugby Street intersection and at Pirie Street)
- 1.12 Is the width and configuration (segregation of cyclists and pedestrians vs a fully shared path) on the elevated walking and cycling path appropriate
- 1.13 Will the project have unacceptable effects on private and public transport (including pedestrian travel) during construction
- 1.14 Has the project sufficiently considered north-south traffic, and pedestrian and cycle traffic
- 1.15 Will the project actually reduce congestion

### **2. ECONOMICS**

- 2.1 Has consideration been given to all options which meet the project's objectives in the most economical way (or at least more economically than the current proposal)
- 2.2 Has induced traffic been accurately modelled

- 2.3 Are the BCR calculations appropriate, and based on correct assumptions, such that the BCR provides a proper and useful evidence supporting NZTA's assessment of the project's economic effects
- 2.4 What is the relevance of the BCR to the overall assessment of efficient use of resources
- 2.5 Will the project facilitate or hinder intensity of residential and commercial development along parts of the Wellington City Council's proposed growth spine
- 2.6 Should property/rental value effects be taken into account in the economic evaluation
- 2.7 Should social and environmental disbenefits (and where relevant the mitigation of these disbenefits) be included in the economic evaluation
- 2.8 Have all relevant costs been included in the project budget, and has this been properly reviewed and updated as circumstances have changed
- 2.9 Will the project have unacceptable effects on local businesses (including the independent St Mark's Church School) during construction and once operational

### **3. URBAN DESIGN, LANDSCAPE, VISUAL**

- 3.1 Are the project's urban design, landscape and visual effects positive or negative, or a combination of both, what is the significance of these effects, and can they be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated
- 3.2 What streetscape works are available or required to avoid, remedy or mitigate the project's urban design, landscape design and visual effects around all sides of the Basin Reserve, and to achieve better outcomes for the Ellice Street residents
- 3.3 Does the project provides for appropriate maintenance of Basin Reserve buildings (e.g. the Vance Stand, the Museum Stand)
- 3.4 Is the NZTA's Urban and Landscape Design Framework an appropriate tool for evaluating the project
- 3.5 Will the project limit future development/urban design options within the area and if so, is this a "missed opportunity"
- 3.6 What is the relevance of the project's reference to the "National War Memorial Park"
- 3.7 Are proposed improvements to the landscape and urban design of the area dependent on the project being built
- 3.8 Does the project appropriately reflect the values of local residents, the wider New Zealand public, and visitors to Wellington, New Zealand's capital
- 3.9 Is a more comprehensive/integrated approach to addressing connectivity and enhancing sense of place required
- 3.10 What are the urban design, landscape and visual effects of the Northern Gateway Building, and if screening of the Basin Bridge is appropriate, would this be better achieved by a screen or by the Northern Gateway building
- 3.11 If the Northern Gateway building is found to be appropriate mitigation, what requirements (length, ground and upper level screening, design elements and quality) should apply to the building

#### **4. HERITAGE**

- 4.1 Are the heritage impacts of the War Memorial Park project relevant to this project, and if so, how
- 4.2 Will the project affect heritage values of the Basin Reserve (in its widest setting, and using the ICOMOS definition) and heritage items within the Basin Reserve, and if so, what is the significance of these effects
- 4.3 Will the project affect heritage values and places located outside the Basin Reserve and if so, what is the nature of these effects
- 4.4 What specific mitigation measures (if any) are available, and required, to avoid, remedy or mitigate the project's heritage effects
- 4.5 Will construction of a Northern Gateway building, and its location, scale and bulk, affect heritage values within the Basin Reserve
- 4.6 How significant will effects on the heritage values of the Mt Victoria Inner Residential area be
- 4.7 Is the proposal for relocation of the CS Dempster gate acceptable
- 4.8 Should the project's heritage effects be assessed in accordance with the relevant RPS criteria, and if so, has this been done appropriately

#### **5. CRICKET**

- 5.1 Will the project have unacceptable effects on the use of the Basin Reserve for domestic and international cricket games, both during construction and once operational, by:
  - a. creating visual and noise distractions for players, umpires and spectators (including the TV audience);
  - b. affecting the necessary viewing requirements for batting and fielding (having regard to the specialised ophthalmological conditions and viewing requirements associated with batting and fielding in cricket matches); and
  - c. reducing amenity for spectators (in particular by the project shading ground and seating spaces around the Basin (including the banks), impairing game play visually, altering temperature and potentially air flow, and making game watching a colder and less enjoyable experience)

#### **6. SOCIAL**

- 6.1 Has adequate consideration been given to at-grade alternatives, which may be more socially desirable
- 6.2 Have all access needs been properly provided for (disabled, prams)
- 6.3 Has the loss of park land on Bogart's Corner been adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated
- 6.4 Will there be unacceptable safety/social effects from the area around the Basin Reserve (including but not limited to under the flyover) being cold, shaded, unattractive and a destination for socially disadvantaged people to congregate
- 6.5 Will the area around the Basin Bridge become less safe for children and their parents travelling to and from school/pre-school

6.6 Will the project create unacceptable severance effects, including from blocking and removing views

## **7. NOISE (AND ASSOCIATED HEALTH EFFECTS)**

7.1 Should the WHO guidelines be adopted in respect of the project

7.2 Is there a need for an overriding noise standard in terms of operational noise, or should the requirement be to control noise using the best practicable option

7.3 What are the appropriate conditions to impose regarding the exceedance of noise levels, hours of construction and construction noise levels

## **8. AIR QUALITY (AND ASSOCIATED HEALTH EFFECTS)**

8.1 Where the project will increase traffic congestion and/or vehicle movements on local streets, how will this affect air quality and health, and how will those effects be managed

8.2 What scope of health effects assessment and monitoring should be required for the project by way of conditions

## **9. PUBLIC HEALTH**

9.1 Will the project have unacceptable public health effects, specifically arising from:

a. effects on, and thus of, climate change

b. air pollution

c. morbidity and mortality of increased road traffic accidents

d. rising health care costs of physical inactivity

e. lost health benefits from use of alternative transport solutions

f. lost opportunity costs from inappropriate transport expenditure, including for health services

## **10. WIND**

10.1 Will there be unacceptable effects on users of the Basin Bridge in high/extreme wind events, and if so, will such effects be adequately mitigated (particularly given the urban design/visual constraints in which such mitigation must be developed). For example, are wind barriers required on the bridge for pedestrian/cyclist safety

10.2 Is a wind tunnel test (of the pedestrian/cyclist bridge and Northern Gateway Building) necessary to determine more precisely the level of wind risk

## **11. VIBRATION**

11.1 What is the acceptable maximum vibration level during construction

## **12. ECOLOGY**

12.1 Have the buildings and structures been designed to ensure they don't harbour rats and mice, or in such a way that these species can be easily controlled

12.2 Will the project require removal of any Pohutukawa trees, and if so, will these be replaced

### **13. PLANNING AND CONDITIONS**

- 13.1 Is there sufficient detail on the project to determine whether it will deliver an appropriate balance of improvements to public transport, pedestrian and private car travel required to meet the objectives of the RLTS and RPS
- 13.2 Have alternatives been appropriately and robustly considered
- 13.3 Is the project area an urban environment where some construction effects (noise, dust) are relatively common
- 13.4 What is the scope of the project's positive effects which must be considered
- 13.5 Is the work reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives for which the designation is sought, and is the part of the designation over the Basin Reserve reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the requiring authority
- 13.6 Is the project consistent with the relevant strategic planning framework and documents
- 13.7 What is the scope and significance of the project's amenity effects on the residential properties at 21-23 Ellice Street
- 13.8 Is greater precision required in defining (via the conditions) the matters which must be included in, and the mitigation outcomes that must be achieved by, management plans
- 13.9 Is it appropriate for the conditions to include a "certification by default" process (i.e. conditions DC14, DC31 and DC34)
- 13.10 Is it appropriate for the conditions to contain a dispute resolution condition to deal with "inaction as to the implementation of conditions" (i.e. conditions GB and DC4)
- 13.11 Are the draft conditions sufficiently certain and appropriately enforceable
- 13.12 Should a work programme be provided by NZTA prior to lodgement of Outline Plans
- 13.13 What is the reserve status/classification of the Basin Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977, and how is this relevant/significant to assessment of the project

### **PART B – CONTESTED ISSUES RAISED BY SPECIFIC PARTIES**

#### **14. WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL/BASIN RESERVE TRUST**

##### *Transportation/traffic*

- 14.1 What facilities should be provided for pedestrian desire lines on the north and north-western corners of the Basin Reserve
- 14.2 Is there a need to review the:
  - a. design of the proposed link road between Ellice and Dufferin Streets, with WCC approval of the final detailed design
  - b. radii of the left hand curve of the road from Buckle Street into Cambridge Terrace
  - c. operation of the traffic signals at the intersections of Adelaide Road/Rugby Street, and Kent/Cambridge Terraces and Vivian/Pirie Streets

### *Heritage*

- 14.3 Should the Heritage Management Plan include:
- a. provision for interpretive material about the heritage significance of the Basin Reserve
  - b. full documentation of the removal of the worker's cottage at 28 Ellice Street
  - c. identification of possible physical effects (from vibration, dust, water and physical damage of heritage) from construction on heritage structures
- 14.4 Does the Museum Stand in the Basin Reserve need to be included in the list of structures that require a building condition survey before and after construction
- 14.5 Does the CEMP need to include detailed provision for the cleaning of heritage items in the Basin Reserve
- 14.6 Should there be a requirement for full consultation with WCC in designing heritage mitigation proposals, particularly for the Northern Gateway Building

## **15. SAVE THE BASIN CAMPAIGN INC**

### *Transportation/traffic*

- 15.1 Are the package of improvements encapsulated in the Basin Roundabout Enhancements Option a feasible alternative to the project which can reasonably meet the project objectives (including in the event that duplication of the Mt Victoria Tunnel proceeds), and should it have been included in NZTA's assessment of alternatives

### *Economics*

- 15.2 In relation to NZTA's BCR calculations, should:
- a. the widening of Buckle Street and Karo Drive be included in the do-minimum base case (similar to the inclusion of improvements to Vivian Street eastbound which have been included in the do minimum)
  - b. the project be assessed against the option of low-cost enhancements to the existing Basin Roundabout as well as the base case of doing nothing to the existing roundabout

### *Heritage*

- 15.3 Given the expected adverse effects on heritage, can a heritage management plan, as included in the proposed conditions for the project, provide mitigation for loss of heritage values that would result from the project
- 15.4 Have effects on the setting of the Basin Reserve and of heritage places located outside the Basin Reserve, been adequately assessed
- 15.5 Should an assessment of the project's effect on heritage values be limited to the views to and from the Basin Reserve
- 15.6 Have the RPS and District Plan objectives been properly applied when assessing the impact of the proposed Northern Gateway Building and relocation of the CS Dempster gate in terms of the effects on the heritage values of the Basin Reserve

### *Social*

- 15.7 Has there been adequate consideration of CPTD issues arising from the limited passive surveillance available for users of the proposed continuation of the National War Memorial Park

### *Wind*

- 15.8 Is the railing on the bridge of sufficient height and should it be non-porous to protect cyclist and pedestrians

### *Planning and Conditions*

- 15.9 What is the significance of the lack of any reference to environmental effects and their management in the project objectives
- 15.10 Can an assessment of the proposal's effects on the Basin Reserve be made under the Reserves Act 1977, when there is no Management Plan against which to make that assessment
- 15.11 Will the project's effects be consistent with the objectives and policies of the RPS and District Plan

## **16. MT VICTORIA RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION**

### *Transportation/traffic*

- 16.1 Can the PT Spine objectives be met without the project
- 16.2 Can the project be properly considered before key strategic and detailed planning decisions are made on the PT Spine Study
- 16.3 Can the project be adequately assessed/considered without the development of a PT Spine traffic plan for the roundabout and the approaches to it (for the short, medium and long term)
- 16.4 Has the project been evaluated against the 'City Centre Movement' Infrastructure Analysis provided by Space Syntax for Wellington 2040 Spatial Structure Plan
- 16.5 Has the PT Spine Study been evaluated against the 'City Centre Movement' Infrastructure Analysis provided by Space Syntax for Wellington 2040 Spatial Structure Plan
- 16.6 Can walking and cycling improvements be achieved without the project
- 16.7 Does the project manage traffic congestion at levels that balance the need for access against the ability to provide for peak demands due to community impacts and cost constraints
- 16.8 Should peak hour traffic management be given greater importance than the urban outcome for the city and its citizens
- 16.9 Is the width and configuration (of cyclists and pedestrians as a fully shared path) in accordance with established good practice rather than bare minimum requirements which are inadequate

### *Economics*

- 16.10 Is there any evaluation of the project from the overall economic performance of the city using the methodology commenced in the City Centre Movement Infrastructure Analysis Space Syntax Report for Wellington 2040 Spatial Structure Plan
- 16.11 How will this project promote Wellington's vision as a smart capital and compact city

- 16.12 Have the health and economic impacts of the project on the southern end of Mt Victoria suburb been adequately assessed
- 16.13 Has the potential loss of value of properties been professionally assessed by an independent valuer, will there be appropriate compensation for any loss and has compensation been included in the overall cost of the project
- Urban design, landscape and visual*
- 16.14 Does the traffic plan best meet the project objectives with the least social, community and environmental impacts
- 16.15 Does the traffic plan meet the project objectives and the goals of 'Wellington 2040: Smart Capital'
- 16.16 What is the status and value of the 1840 City Plan within planning documents relevant to the project and what effect will the project have on it
- 16.17 What is the relationship of the project to the historic, existing and intended spatial structure of the city
- 16.18 Will the project facilitate or hinder the spatial continuity of the north-south axis of Kent/Cambridge Terrace and Adelaide Rd
- 16.19 Will the project facilitate or hinder the legibility of the landform and the City Plan
- 16.20 Does the existing roundabout have a place and value within the City Plan as a key organising element for movement in the city
- 16.21 What streetscape works around the Basin Reserve are achievable without the project
- 16.22 Has an at-grade traffic solution been adequately considered by the applicant in terms of its positive or negative urban design, landscape, social, economic and visual effects
- 16.23 If a workable at-grade solution was preferable to all expert witnesses, including NZTA expert witnesses at the urban design/landscape conference, then why was the project not assessed against that criteria in evidence
- 16.24 Can the destruction of the historic scale, coherence and fabric of the southern part of Mt Victoria be avoided
- 16.25 Is the urban design, landscape and visual effects of the Northern Gateway Building positive or negative, or a combination of both
- 16.26 Is the Northern Gateway Building an appropriate form of mitigation
- 16.27 Will the creation of a dominant vehicle open space character throughout the Basin Reserve Historic Area lead to an unsafe, under-used and devalued environment
- 16.28 How can the outer edge definition of the Basin Reserve Roundabout, developed from the historic Sussex Square and which is the only urban space of its type in New Zealand, be preserved and enhanced
- 16.29 Has the project been accurately visualised in the round. Why has a physical model not been made by NZTA when this provides the clearest and most comprehensive overview of the project and its potential effects

16.30 Will the project's significant effects undermine the status, role, place and value of Government House, National War Memorial and War Memorial Park

*Cricket*

16.31 Will the project have unacceptable effects on the use of the Basin Reserve for domestic and international cricket games, both during construction, and once operational, by portraying to a global TV audience that an internationally discredited and disputed transport vision has been built beside an internationally valued cricket ground

*Social*

16.32 Will there be unacceptable safety and social effects by the creation of a large area of vehicle dominated space and 'left over' land

*Air quality*

16.33 How are the greenhouse gas levels reduced when the traffic volume will increase

*Vibration*

16.34 Are the proposed identification measures sufficient to ensure that all owners of property damaged by vibration during construction, and use, are identified and compensated (Note NZTA does not propose the inclusion of all properties liable to vibration damage in its criteria)

**17. ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP**

17.1 Does the proposed designation provide all the legal authority required to enable St Joseph's Church to continue its current operations with the altered parking arrangements proposed, notwithstanding the terms of the resource consent governing the operation of the Church

17.2 Do the conditions ensure adequate parking will be provided for St Joseph's Church during the construction phase

17.3 Do the conditions provide adequate assurance that noise-sensitive activities on the St Joseph's Church site will be appropriately protected from the adverse effects of construction noise

17.4 Do the conditions ensure construction laydown will be managed to ensure an appropriate level of amenity will be preserved on and immediately adjacent to the St Joseph's Church site

**18. REGIONAL WINES AND SPIRITS**

18.1 Do the conditions adequately avoid, remedy or mitigate all the construction effects on RWS' business operations

18.2 Does the proposed car-park layout provide adequate parking, manoeuvring, storage and pedestrian facilities for RWS' business operations

18.3 Does the proposed reconfiguration of the local road network, the State Highway and the access/egress for RWS' car-park provide adequately for RWS' vehicle-based customers

18.4 Does the proposed reconfiguration of the local road network and State Highway provide adequate access for deliveries to and from RWS site by heavy goods vehicles

18.5 Does the Project adversely impact on the visibility of RWS' site

18.6 Is the “Building Under the Bridge” a project or work for which NZTA may give notice of requirement for a designation

18.7 Is the designation in respect of the “Building Under the Bridge” reasonably necessary for achieving the project objectives

**19. CYCLE AWARE WELLINGTON**

19.1 Will the location of the public bus stop on Adelaide Road interfere with proposed cycling facilities on Adelaide Road

**20. ST MARK’S CHURCH SCHOOL**

20.1 Have all effects on the School and the quality of the school’s learning and teaching environment been adequately identified and mitigated, particularly those arising from intermittent vibration, noise, dust, and security during construction, as well as the permanent changes to the views from and of the School

20.2 Has adequate consideration been given to the safety threat to children as young as 5 years old in having to walk past three uncontrolled driveways in order to get to their school bus stop

20.3 Has adequate modelling being done, and conditions agreed, on the impacts on the safe and efficient access of pupils to and from St Mark’s Church School during the construction

20.4 Do the conditions provide adequate assurance that noise-sensitive activities on the St Mark’s Church site (including mid weekday school chapel services and evening worship) will be appropriately protected from the adverse effects of construction noise

**21. KEN BAILEY**

21.1 Has the project appropriately addressed and avoided, remedied or mitigated potential impacts on my apartment in the Grandstand Apartment building. Such effects include:

- a. increased wind effects for my apartment and balcony and external wind noise
- b. traffic and construction noise
- c. substantial loss of view (I will no longer view the basin)
- d. westbound traffic headlights shine directly in my windows
- e. loss of property value

**22. LIZ SPRINGFORD**

*Transportation/traffic*

22.1 Has the project arisen from a sufficiently wide-ranging transport demand management analysis - considering the best combination of transport mode development to minimise costs and emissions and to maximise health

22.2 Has the impact of the project on public and active transport demand been modelled

*Economics*

- 22.3 Have future emission costs scenarios been included in the economic evaluation, especially considering the new global carbon budget (IPCC Assessment Report 5 Working Group 1 September 2013)

*Urban design, landscape, visual*

- 22.4 Will the project create an aesthetic barrier between South Wellington and the rest of the city

*Social*

- 22.5 What consideration has been given to local Wellington residents overall (especially those born since 1960) with adverse climate impacts and ocean acidification arising from any increased emissions

*Public health*

- 22.6 Has consideration been given to the wellbeing and safety of local primary and secondary students: in the short term from extensive construction over three years near large numbers of students congregating around the Basin, in the medium term from transport developments that displace active and public transport, and in the longer term, with the risk of increased emissions this decade tipping changing climate and ocean acidification beyond human management

*Ecology*

- 22.7 What consideration has been given to the reduction in the Wellington region's biodiversity from any increased emissions from this project

Addendum: David Zwartz (dated 17.01.14)

Dear Helen

Because of being away from Wellington on holiday I have only just come to your email.

This means I have missed your 10am deadline, for which I apologise, and will send this also to the Board to meet the 5pm filing time.

My concern is with the adequacy and up-to-datedness of transport information used in the modelling.

I am told by Statistics New Zealand that regional or more detailed information from the 2013 Census will not be available until April 2014.

This is very relevant to the traffic modelling, particularly the information from the Individual Forms on population and Question 39 (about place of work) and Question 41 (about main way of travel to work).

I do not think the Contested issue already listed ("What is the appropriate modelling tool to be used, and how reliable are the outcomes from each of the available models.") is specific enough for my concern.

I would like the following to be added: "How up-to-date and how adequate is the transport information used for the transport modelling?"

Yours sincerely

David Zwartz

## List of Contested Issues to be added to Current List

### Issues applicable generally

\*The issues in this column still need to be added, they have just been partially noted in the list as it is

Not covered in the list of issues	Partially covered in the list of issues*
<b>Construction</b>	
Have the Noise effects during construction been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?	Have the Vibration effects during construction been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all? (under "Vibration")
Have the Light and Noise at Night effects during construction been adequately mitigated?	Is construction period too long and disruptive in general to residents to be acceptable (whether or not they are deemed to live in an area where a degree of disruption is acceptable)? (point 2 under "Planning and Conditions")
Have the Air Quality effects during construction been adequately mitigated?	
Have the Dust effects during construction been adequately mitigated?	
How long is the construction phase actually going to last?	
<b>Operation</b>	
Have the Light and Noise at Night effects during operation been adequately mitigated?	Have the Noise effects during operation been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all? (under "Noise")
Have the Vibration effects during operation been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?	Have the Air Quality effects during operation been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all? (under "Air Quality")
What are the Wind effects during operation (i.e. where will the wind be channelled due to the new flyover structure) and have these been adequately mitigated?	Has the loss of view generally (i.e. green screen and flyover structure) been adequately mitigated? Can it be adequately mitigated at all? (point one under "Urban design, landscape, visual")
Have the Shade effects during operation been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?	Is the Flyover structure too damaging in general to be acceptable for residents of the area, businesses in the area, the Basin reserve and Wellingtonians in general? (point one under "Social")
Have the Dust effects during operation been adequately mitigated?	

### **Issues Applicable to Cricket**

- How noisy will the flyover be from within the Cricket ground?
- Will it be visible in the Cricket ground? Even with the new building in place?
- What are the dust and pollution effects likely to be in the Cricket ground?
- Could this affect the Cricket ground's test match accreditation etc?
- Could this affect the Cricket ground's general atmosphere?
- Could this affect the Cricket ground's historical significance?

### **Issues applicable only to Grandstand Apartments**

#### **Construction**

Have the Noise effects during construction (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all? (We expect to receive a report from an acoustic engineer which asserts that they cannot be adequately mitigated.)

Have the Light at Night effects during construction (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated?

Have the Vibration effects during construction (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Have the Air Quality effects during construction (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Have the Dust effects during construction (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Have the Privacy deprivation effects during construction been adequately mitigated? (i.e. some units at Grandstand Apartments will have living room and bedroom windows approximately 8 metres away from the structure of the flyover as it is constructed) Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Will full and free access to the building be preserved during construction?

Has the loss of tenants during the construction phase and the adverse effects that will have on the Grandstand owner's lives been considered?

Is the construction period too long and disruptive to Grandstand Apartment owners to be acceptable?

What will be the loss in value to the Grandstand Apartments units during construction?

#### **Operation**

Have the Noise effects during operation (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Have the Light at Night effects during operation (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated?

Have the Vibration effects during operation (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Have the Air Quality effects during operation (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Have the Dust effects during operation (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Have the Shade effects during operation (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity i.e. some units in Grandstand Apartments will end up with drastically reduced sunlight) been adequately mitigated? Can they be adequately mitigated at all?

Have the Wind effects during operation (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated?

Has the Privacy deprivation during operation been adequately mitigated?

Has the Loss of View of Cricket Ground for the cricket-loving residents of Grandstand Apartments been considered? Has it been adequately mitigated? Can it be adequately mitigated at all?

Has the Loss of View generally (i.e. green screen and flyover structure blocking out green space and long-range views) (more acute at Grandstand due to proximity) been adequately mitigated? Can it be adequately mitigated at all?

Will full and free access to the building be preserved during operation?

Has the loss of tenants during operation and the adverse effects that will have on the Grandstand owner's lives been considered? Has it been adequately mitigated?

Has the Extreme Proximity of the flyover structure (i.e. some units at Grandstand Apartments will be approximately 8 metres away from the structure of the flyover and just over 4 metres away from the "green screen") been considered? Has it been adequately mitigated? Can it be adequately mitigated at all?

Has the serious Loss of Value of units during operation and the adverse effects that will have on the Grandstand owner's lives been considered? Has it been adequately mitigated?

Is the construction of the flyover too damaging for owners of units in Grandstand Apartments to be acceptable?

What will be the loss in value to the Grandstand Apartments units during operation?