



Level 4, 18 London Street
PO Box 9041, Hamilton 3240
New Zealand

Phone +64 7 838 0144
Email consultants@bbo.co.nz

17 January 2018

Our Ref: 138900.16
Council Ref: 010.2018.10112.001

Hamilton City Council
Attn: Ian Johnson – Consultant Planner
Private Bag 3010
Hamilton 3240

By Email: ian.johnson@mitchelldaysh.co.nz

Dear Ian,

Response to the s92 Request for Further Information

Primary Response

In response to your letter dated 26 November 2018 with reference to the proposed demolition of the Hamilton Municipal Pools facility we enclose the following information:

- The letter entitled Municipal Pool – Response to “Request for Further Information Notice” prepared by WSP Opus Ltd and dated 14 January 2019.

The formatting of the aforementioned response directly correlates with the numbering used in Councils s92 Request for Further Information.

Additional Matters

In addition to that information, we have also identified matters of clarification and amendment which must be made to the application in order to assist with ease of understanding following the return of this information to the Council. These matters are as follows:

Removal of the Wastewater Line

Section 6.1, Sub-Section entitled “Break-up and Load-out of Materials”: A change of methodology is to be implemented to the enabling works relating to the proposed removal of the wastewater line. As referenced within Response 1 of the attached s92 Further Information Response, the complete removal of the main will not occur within the site and instead sections of the main that are located within the areas of the site identified as Root Protection Zones will be backfilled. All manholes will be capped and backfilled with concrete.

The methodology referenced within Paragraph 3 of that subsection is hereby withdrawn and is to be replaced with the methodology referred to within the response.

Deletion of Volunteered Condition 7

Following the adoption of the revised methodology stated above, the Applicant will avoid the bulk excavation of material within the immediate vicinity of the heritage Band Rotunda structure and accordingly requests that this condition be withdrawn from the application.

Consequential re-numbering will be required to all other subsequent volunteered conditions.

Underground Tank Preservation

Section 8.6, Paragraph 4 of the application references a potential for removal of an underground tank located between the main pool structure and the Victoria Street retaining wall. In response to additional structural observations referenced within Response 4 of the s92 Further Information Response, the removal of the underground tank is not proposed. Accordingly, that paragraph is to be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Overall, we consider that the attached information is sufficient for the processing of the resource consent application to continue and for the public notification of the application to commence.

If you require any further information in relation to the above matters, please do not hesitate to contact us directly.

Yours sincerely,

BLOXAM BURNETT AND OLLIVER



Chris Dawson
PLANNING PROJECT MANAGER



Stephen Gascoigne
PLANNER

cc – Gillian Cockerell - HCC

[K:\138900 HCC Panel Consultants\16 HCC Municipal pools removal\Reporting\s92 Further Information Request\010.2018.10112.001 - Response to s92 Request for Further Information FINAL.docx](#)

14 January 2019

Bloxham Burnett and Olliver
Po Box 9041
Hamilton 3240

Attn.: Chris Dawson, Planning Project Manager

Email: cdawson@bbo.co.nz

Ref: 4000.NZ

Municipal Pool - Response to "Request for further information notice"

Dear Chris

We wish to respond to the request as follows:

1. Protected Trees:
 - a. In regards to obsolete services pipes, we consider it best practice to cap both ends with concrete mass fill at the manhole access points and then remove the unused pipe sections. However, where that would impact on trees, we propose to retain and fill sections in the root zones from outside the dripline with suitable material such as sand or gravel.

2. Existing Retaining Wall:
 - a. We propose a fall height from footpath to the fill batter that is under 1m (the threshold value if exceeded would trigger the requirement for a barrier). For optimum retaining capacity the fill batter would be flush with the existing retaining wall top (i.e. no level difference). The final design will be within these parameters and we confirm the provided cross sections are a correct indication of the proposed.
 - b. The footpath along Victoria street is generally constructed with falls towards the street kerb. We understand the path section along the Municipal Pool was constructed in the same manner. However, it appears the footpath settled towards the pool site, possibly caused by movement of the retaining wall. Cracks running parallel to the wall in the footpath pavement support that observation. The fall towards the street kerb is compromised and less effective. This is an existing condition and could be addressed under Councils standing maintenance regime or as part of the proposed works.

- c. The age of existing pipes is unknown and can't confidently be relied on, hence as a minimum review and likely removal of pipes within the current pool site is proposed as part of the demolition works. Adequate new drainage and connection to the existing intact drainage system will be considered during detailed design.
- d. We confirm that undercutting will have minimal effect on the existing retaining wall stability. This is because, historically we understand that during the pool construction, the same scenario would have occurred and had no impact on the lateral strength of the retaining wall. That said at detailed design stage, the demolition of the existing pool would be proposed to be staged to avoid large open excavations. In addition, we would propose that the contractor monitor the stability of the existing wall, and if required bracing will be installed.

3. Celebrating Age Building:

- a. Refer to response 2a regarding expected settlements. We consider the risk of impact on the piles to be negligible. The basement slab of the Celebrating Age Building is suspended and supported by ground beams founded on deep piles. Therefore, the slab does not rely on ground support.
- b. We will provide detailed information of the retaining wall at the design stage. This may include a shear key.
- c. 2 cone penetration tests (CPTs) were conducted on 19/12/2018 to provide additional subsoil information and inform the liquefaction assessment. The site has a mild risk of liquefaction in the design ULS event and a non-liquefiable crust thick enough to reduce the risk of liquefaction surface expression and liquefied induced differential settlement. Therefore, the risk of liquefaction induced settlement and/or rotation of the proposed cantilever retaining wall is low. The site liquefaction risk is discussed in the geotechnical report and will be addressed further during detailed design.

4. Demolition:

- a. The tank used to hold surplus water of the pool (balance tank) and is filled with soil at present. We assume this has been done to make it safe. The tank is proposed to be retained as its depth in relation to the retaining wall toe is unknown and we consider it the safest option to bury rather than potentially undermine the retaining wall toe by excavation. Excavating would require considering temporary support structure during demolition and ground reinstatement.
- b. We understand that the existing ground surface was higher prior to the construction of the pool. The construction of the pool required the removal of the upper soil to create the levels present today. For this reason, the net increase in load from the proposed fill embankment is negligible, therefore primary consolidation settlements due to the fill placement is expected to be small. The investigation to date indicates no organic soils are present, therefore the risk of secondary settlement is low.

5. Site Stormwater

- a. Yes, the design will consider appropriate draining properties of the fill material to ensure rainwater can soak into the fill.

Regards
For WSP Opus



Oliver Lang
Principal Structural Engineer