

From: Pamela Santos  
 To: Sarah Wilson  
 Cc: SarC@cs: Name Long  
 Subject: RE: BUN60435935 - Visual Simulation confirmation (s92 request)  
 Date: Monday, 3 February 2025 12:28:30 pm  
 Attachments: Foodstuffs, Mookitoko Instrumentation Plan 1 (revised) 1101194.pdf

Hi Sarah

Further to the comprehensive revised and updated information including the letter with responses to the formal s92 dated 13 December 2024, we provide the following additional two items for the public notification of the application:

- Additional visual simulation from the Hobson Street / Fanshawe Street intersection – refer to onedrive link [DTC Substantive](#)
- Response to groundwater queries below and attached.

Item	s92 Comment	Action/ response	Further s92 comment	Action/ response	
122	Ground anchors	It is noted that the proposed basement wall for Design Section 2 and Design Section 3 – Option 2 is dependant on ground anchors. Please provide written approval from Auckland Transport for the ground anchor installation within the road reserves of Customs Street West and Hobson Street.	The report has been updated to include the D-Wall option with internal propping (i.e. that developed for the northern side) as an alternative option for Section 2 and Section 3 as feasible retention options for the construction of the basement. There are constructability benefits with using ground anchors for Section 2 and Section 3, and discussions with Auckland Transport are currently underway to obtain approval for encroachment into the road reserve.	The response indicates that the report has been updated to include a diaphragm wall as a potential retention option for Retaining Wall Sections 2 and 3, however the assessment of effects does not address this. Please confirm that the effects of the alternative retention option will be less than those currently assessed.	We confirm that the alternative retention option (i.e. an internally propped DWall as an alternative to ground anchor tie-back) results in a better or equal to effects assessed and outlined in Table 4.13 and Table 4.14 of the geotechnical and groundwater assessment.
127	CM&IP	Please consider adding the following to the Construction Monitoring and Instrumentation Plan or provide justification as to why they are not required: i. A groundwater monitoring piezometer (MW05) near the south-eastern corner of the site to monitor the effects of groundwater mounding. ii. Additional ground settlement pins beyond the northern and eastern site boundaries. iii. Settlement pins on the Lower Hobson Street flyover structure	i. MW02 is moved closer to the SE corner of the site. It is not considered that an additional groundwater monitoring well to be needed at this stage. ii. Additional ground settlement pins on the northern and eastern side boundaries are provided. It is not considered that ground survey pins are needed east of existing HSBC and AON buildings. iii. Building survey pins along the Lower Hobson St flyover structure have been allowed for.	The response to Query 127 i. and ii. is considered to be SATISFACTORY. The response to Query 127 iii. is considered to be PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY.  We consider that ground settlement pins should be installed beyond northern and eastern site boundaries at the approximate locations shown on the attached markup.  Please include these on the draft construction monitoring and instrumentation plan, appended to the draft GSMCP.	We have adjusted the Construction Monitoring Instrumentation Plan as suggested by the reviewer. Please find the updated plan attached.
132	Revise levels	It is noted that the Inclinator alarm trigger levels, provided in Table 4.1 of the GSMCP, are higher than the assessed retaining wall deflections (e.g. 35 mm Alarm level vs 24 mm predicted deflection). Please revise the alarm and alert levels to reflect the maximum assessed retaining wall deflection which is the basis for the assessment of effects on neighbouring buildings/structures.	Noted. The Alert and Alarm level for the inclinometer have been updated.	The response to Query 132 is considered to be PARTIALLY SATISFACTORY.  We note that the inclinometer alert and alarm values have been updated as requested, however the northern boundary retaining wall pin alert and alarm values, of 15 mm and 20 mm respectively, far exceed the predicted wall deflection of approximately 9 mm.  Please revise the Alert and Alarm values for the 'Top of wall along northern boundary', provided in Table 4.1 of the draft GSMCP, to reflect the maximum assessed retaining wall deflection which is the basis for the assessment of effects on neighbouring buildings/structures.	We do not agree with the suggestion to revise the Alert and Alarm levels for the 'Top of wall along northern boundary' to match the wall deflection assessed for Section 1.  Our assessment of effect was based on the wall deflection from the design section and sensitivity analyses to consider potential variability in stiffness of the soil. The Alert and Alarm levels deflections that we have set at the top of the northern boundary wall result in the total and differential settlements that we have outlined in Table 4.13 of our report and is consistent with the assessed effect of very low due to ground settlement.  Our assessed effect considers that the structures near the northern boundary are either supported on deep foundations (i.e. the main tower for the MSocial building is on pile foundation to rock) or extend below ground level (such as the lift pit for the MSocial building), with the front of house structure for MSocial greater than 15m from the northern boundary of the Downtown West basement.

Ngā mihi | Kind regards,

PAMELA SANTOS  
 Senior Associate  
 021 306 026  
[PamelaS@barker.co.nz](mailto:PamelaS@barker.co.nz)  
[barker.co.nz](http://barker.co.nz)

This email and any attachments are confidential. They may contain privileged information or copyright material. If you are not an intended recipient, please do not read, copy, use or disclose the contents without authorisation and we request you delete it and contact us at once by return email.

From: Sarah Wilson <sarah.wilson@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>  
 Sent: Wednesday, 22 January 2025 2:10 pm  
 To: Pamela Santos <PamelaS@barker.co.nz>  
 Subject: BUN60435935 - Visual Simulation confirmation (s92 request)

Hi Pamela,

Further to our conversation last week and our discussion just now, please take this email as confirmation that a Visual Simulation remains an outstanding request in relation to item 67 on the original s92 letter which read:

Item 67. Please provide a visual simulation from the Hobson Street / Fanshawe Street intersection (as requested during the pre-application engagement – refer to the below snippet from the 18/08/23 request):

As a follow up point – item 84 of the s92 request would benefit from being updated given the provision of this visual simulation will mean that the image (R) should be updated with the new vis sim image (refer to page 45 of the Isthmus Landscape Assessment). This will ensure that the analysis is based on correct methodology (as there will be a vis sim available). The analysis at paragraphs 128-132 may need to be updated in the event the vis sim changes the assessment in the view of the author. It is recommended this be updated for consistency.

Public notification will not be held up with respect of item 84.

Ngā mihi | Kind regards,

Sarah Wilson | Senior Planner  
 Division of Planning & Resource Consents | City Centre Team  
 Mobile: 027 3527379  
 135 Albert Street, Auckland Central

Note: My work pattern is a 32 hour week across Monday to Thursday inclusive. I do not work on Fridays, however I will respond to any emails and phone messages that come through on the following Monday.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.