

File ref FTC000030

5 October 2021

Lauren Semple and Rachel Murdoch
Greenwood Roche
PO Box 139
Christchurch 8140

Private Bag 63002
Wellington 6140, New Zealand

Level 10, Grant Thornton House
215 Lambton Quay
Wellington 6011, New Zealand

By email: Lauren@greenwoodroche.com and rmurdoch@greenwoodroche.com

epa.govt.nz
+64 4 916 2426

Tēnā koe

Request for information from the Minister of Health and the Ministry of Health in relation to New Dunedin Hospital – Whakatuputupu (FTC000030) under COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020

The New Dunedin Hospital – Whakatuputupu Expert Consenting Panel (the Panel) has directed the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) to request further information from you under clause 25 of Schedule 6 of the COVID-19 Recovery Act 2020 (the Act), relating to the New Dunedin Hospital – Whakatuputupu consent application.

At the direction of the Panel, The EPA is seeking the following information items as outlined in appendix 1.

In accordance with clause 25 of Schedule 6 of the Act the applicant must

- a) Provide electronic copies of the information or report requested; or
- b) Advise the EPA, with reasons that you decline to provide the information or report requested.

Please provide the further information to the EPA by **Tuesday 19 October 2021**.

If the information requested is not received, the panel must proceed as if the request for further information has been declined.

Please note, the information will be provided to the panel, the application and every person who provided comments on the application/notice of requirement. The information will also be made available on the EPA website.

If you have any questions or further queries, please don't hesitate to contact Gen Hewett, Senior Advisor, on 04 474 5523 or by email gen.hewett@epa.govt.nz.

Nāku noā, na

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Gen Hewett
Senior Advisor

Appendix 1: List of information required from the Ministry of Health and the Minister of Health

1. Acceptance of risk from taking the staging approach. Does the applicant accept that the risk is entirely its own from bringing its Stage 1 application for consideration by the panel, in the absence of any real degree of information being available about Stage 2? The panel asks that question, posing the following strictly hypothetical examples of consequences (among potentially many others). If when a panel (perhaps the same panel) processes Stage 2 and receives information about structures proposed above ground, and determines changes are needed for traffic, urban design, wind, shadowing or other reasons, does the applicant accept that it might have wasted financial resources in building the Stage 1 structures (if consented), only to find some not useable because of changes needed above ground? For instance, portions of buildings re-shaped, upper levels not consented, etc.
2. In similar vein, if Stage 2 includes a Notice of Requirement and the panel considering it questions adequacy of consideration of alternatives by the requiring authority.
3. In light of the above questions, might the applicant prefer to defer consideration of the Stage 1 application at this stage, and bring both stages before a panel contemporaneously, perhaps as one single project?
4. Provide a technical description of the pros and cons of boring all piles and casting in place, including as to duration, sequencing, and cost (in comparison to the BDST method proposed in all places other than for link bridges). Provide also comparative acoustic and vibration outcomes for such an alternative approach, particularly at the most sensitive receiver positions as discussed for the BDST analysis.
5. Provide a comprehensive description of the proposed BDST pile driving methodology that includes hammer weight, blow rate, duration of driving per pile, the set to be achieved and anticipated depths.
6. Provide a description of the duration of piling activity on each of the 3 sites, and proposed sequencing.
7. Provide a full description of the pda methodology together with the resultant sound and vibration outputs. Also, the intended duration and sequencing of the pda activities on the 3 sites.
8. (It is noted by the panel that some of the information sought in 5, 6 and 7 above, is found in the application and relevant attachments, but it is presented in very scattered form and needs to be presented in an orderly and accessible form, and in some respects added to).
9. Referring to section 4.3.3 of the Marshall Day report in Attachment 11 (*Assessment of Construction Noise and Vibration Effects*), and noting that piling within the site may occur closer to the existing hospital's Oncology Department than the test piling, what does the applicant propose for dealing with any problems that could occur for the highly sensitive equipment?
10. Provide a map showing the maximum and any alternative sound and vibration contours, and relevant receiver locations. The base for the map should be that included in Attachments 20 (*Map*

and accompanying list of adjoining properties) and 22 (Schedule of Occupier Information) to the application, incorporating the colour-coded information as well from Figure 1.2 (receiver locations) in Attachment 11 (Assessment of Construction Noise and Vibration Effects).

11. Again, referring to Figure 1.2 (*receiver locations*) in Attachment 11 (*Assessment of Construction Noise and Vibration Effects*); the white-roofed building at the top of the figure is believed to be a University of Otago Hall of residence. Should that be mapped as a receiver location, depending on where the sound and vibration contours land?
12. Referring to Attachment 8 (*Transport Assessment*), Recommended Traffic Management Options including Table 7 and Figure 13, is it acknowledged that the intersection of Frederick Street, George Street and London Street is complex and incorporates multi-faceted signalisation? Does inclusion of this intersection in diversions hold the potential for unreasonable delays in the local traffic circulation system at certain times of the day? Should this be flagged in the TMPs, and should avoidance of the intersection be encouraged?
13. Uncertainties about de-watering. The panel understands that screening for suspended solids will be undertaken prior to discharges to the trade waste network, along with water/oil separation. How is it proposed to deal with oils and contaminated sediments thus extracted?