

5 February, 2015

Urban Perspectives Ltd  
PO Box 9042  
Marion Square  
Wellington 6141

Service Request No's: 319386 & 320128  
File Reference: 1014791

Attention: Alistair Aburn

Dear Alistair,

***Request for Further Information Pursuant to Section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991***

**RE: North Kumutoto Precinct Project**

Pursuant to Section 92(1) of the Act, Wellington City Council would like to request further information in relation to the North Kumutoto Precinct Project. The Council makes this request following the close of submissions.

**Proposal One: Construction of a five-storey commercial building on Site 10**

**Application 1:**

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Applicant:            | Site 10 Redevelopment Limited Partnership                   |
| Site Address:         | 10 Waterloo Quay, Wellington                                |
| Consent Type:         | Land Use  |
| Service Request No:   | 319386  |
| Approx Map Reference: | NZTM: 1749052.5428483                                       |
| Legal Description:    | Pt Lot 102 DP 65083, Pt Lot 1 DP 363596 & Pt Lot 9 DP 65083 |

**Proposal Two: Development of public open space(s)**

**Application 3:**

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Applicant:            | Wellington City Council  |
| Site Address:         | 59 Customhouse Quay, Wellington  |
| Consent Type:         | Land Use   |
| Service Request No:   | 320128   |
| Approx Map Reference: | NZTM: 1748989.5428345  |
| Legal Description:    | Pt Lot 1 DP 66836, Pt Lot 1 DP 64676 and a portion of adjoining legal road (Waterloo Quay), Part Harbour Bed (SO 34581) and Part Wellington Harbour (Port Nicholson) |

I am writing in relation to the above applications sought from the Wellington City Council which relate to the North Kumutoto Precinct Project (Applications 1 and 3). Under section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), the Wellington City Council (the Council) requests further information in relation to these applications.

### Requested information:

The further information required is detailed below. This will help the Council to better understand your proposed activity, its effect on the environment, and the ways any adverse effects on the environment might be mitigated.

### **Urban Design:**

1. Please provide details of the proposed architectural articulation and materials for the building.
2. Please provide Part elevations (or 3D drawings) of sectional parts of the building.

Note: the drawings/images provided with the application are at a large scale. Part elevations (or 3D drawings) will need to clearly demonstrate materials and architectural treatments and relevant details to assist in testing these attribute in relation to design criteria. Elevations shown show fine detail and texture (including panel joints and texture that will be seen), which will be important in close range views. The intended approach should be indicated and it is suggested that this should include:

- a. Indicative glazing treatments – approach, colour, type.
  - b. Composition and/or texture of planar wall elements.
  - c. Indication of glazing system.
  - d. Fixed large format shutters on the southern podium.
  - e. Soffit materials.
3. Please provide cross-sectional information on the effect of proposed diagonal braces within the Waterloo Quay colonnade.
  4. Please provide shading diagrams and accompanying description/analysis which demonstrates and describes the extent of shadow cast by the building on the Whitmore Plaza in the Summer and Winter Solstices; and, Autumn and Spring Equinoxes.

Note: This should be NZST during the winter months, and daylight saving time as applicable, and should be on a drawing that shows the intended Whitmore Plaza layout. The purpose is to determine the relation of shading to Whitmore Plaza at the times when this space is most likely to be occupied.

5. Please provide details on the extent of ground floor that is publicly accessible or open space. This calculation should include:
  - a. The extent of the building (in area (m<sup>2</sup>) terms) at ground (as described by the building perimeter line on RC1.02-A: comprising: i) Lobbies; ii) Tenancies (yellow); iii) Creative business units (orange); iv) Other (back of house) internal space including service access, stairs and lifts; and v) Public open space (the diagonal through link, overhang and colonnades).
  - b. Extent of the ground floor internal space (in area (m<sup>2</sup>) terms) occupied by: i) Lobbies; ii) Tenancies (yellow); iii) Creative business units (orange); iv) Other (back of house) internal space including service access, stairs and lifts;
  - c. The extent of the site area of publicly accessible or open space (the diagonal through link, overhang and colonnades etc.)



6. Please provide details of the site boundaries (established by the WCC brief) overlaid on a plan to be able to determine the relation of overhangs and setbacks to that boundary.
7. Please provide details/elevations of the proposed covered walkway at the Waterloo Quay edge of Site 9, including materials, composition and aesthetic treatment.
8. Please provide details of how the wharf edge will be treated (as seen in section 2, drawing 2.041 revD) as well as the edge of lower deck (as seen on section 2, drawing 2.040 revD). In particular, please clarify how the edge is to be defined from the other space adjoining?
9. Please provide an elevation of the Toll booth as would present to Whitmore Plaza, and in particular how this might open north to Whitmore Plaza.

### **Traffic and Vehicle Parking:**

10. Please provide full details of the intersections (and approaches) and the pedestrian crossing facilities on across Customhouse Quay, north of Whitmore Street. These details should include lane widths, dimensions and turning paths and other relevant details which assist in their operation.
11. Please clarify whether the new footpath to be provided alongside Site 9 (between the Whitmore Street gates and Waring Taylor Street) will be within legal road or within a private site (please indicate the site boundary of the proposed plan).
12. Please provide details of the proposed modifications to the traffic lanes along Customhouse Quay (see Figure 3 of the Traffic Report by TDG). This should include the lane width(s), footpath width, truck turning paths and other relevant details which assist in its function.
13. Please provide Traffic Engineering advice on how pedestrian safety (and that of other users) will be maintained through the use of the 'shared space'. Please explain how speed will be controlled, detail any distinguishing features (surface treatment, speedbumps etc).
14. Please provide details of the input data, phase timing and output etc, used for the traffic modelling presented. Council Traffic Advisors wish to review this material.
15. Please provide details of how any parallel movements from the adjoining Centreport Land will interact with the new shared access lane.
16. Please provide details of the altered car park layout for Site 9 (including any subsequent hard/soft landscaping changes).
17. Please explain what measures will be implemented to ensure that vehicles exiting the parking ramp will not compromise public safety. These could include measures to warn pedestrians along the building edge of exiting vehicles (via an audible and/or visual system), as well as signal controls for users of the one-way ramp for entry and exit.

Note: Council's Traffic Advisor has suggested that speed bumps should be installed near the exit of the commercial building to ensure that this is a low-speed environment.

18. Please provide tracking paths for larger service vehicles (semi-trailer and a large rigid truck) turning into and out of the intersection with the narrowing of the entry and exit at Customhouse Quay.
19. Please provide details of how the internal roading network is to be controlled, including interactions with users of Site 9.
20. Please provide details of the width of the proposed public footpath adjoining Site 10.
21. Please provide dimensions of the types of vehicles servicing this development (eg rubbish trucks, furniture removal). Please clarify whether **all** tenancies will have access to the servicing area and how any shared arrangement will be managed. Are there other servicing areas publicly available as an alternative space if the internal loading area is occupied?

Note: It is likely that any service vehicle parked adjacent to the building will block the access lane and therefore, all servicing must be undertaken on-site.

22. Please provide details on how users of the service dock will enter from, and exit onto the shared access lane safely (including tracking curves).
23. Please provide details of the proposed gradient(s) into the basement level.
24. Please provide details of how all required Emergency Service Vehicles will be able to continue using the shared space (where required).

#### **Contaminated Material:**

25. Please provide a revised Ground Contamination Statement (or supplementary statement) which provides a response to the matters outlined within the attached letter by URS Limited, dated 16 January 2014<sup>1</sup> (attached to this letter). URS Ltd have undertaken a 'peer review' of the application in relation to matters of the proposal/application concerning contaminated land and the storage of hazardous substances. Specifically, I make reference to Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 of the letter by URS.
26. Please provide advice/comment in relation to the adequacy and effectiveness (in the opinion of an appropriately qualified and experienced practitioner) of the Draft Contaminated Soil Management Plan in light of, and in response to, the comments made by URS Ltd under Section 3 of the attached letter.

#### **Heritage:**

27. Please provide details of proposed treatment of various historic gates (including reconfiguring entranceways, lighting and planting in the vicinity of them) including details of where they are to be altered, moved, retained or restored. Please provide an assessment as to what impact such changes may have on historic heritage values and the interpretation of this portion of the Wellington Waterfront Area.

---

<sup>1</sup> I note that this report is incorrectly dated and was received by the Council 16 January 2015, as opposed to 16 January 2014 as outlined on the document attached.

28. Please provide an assessment (from a Heritage perspective) of the impacts of the Toll Booth Building that is to be situated within the public space – (e.g. what is the rationale behind this? What effect does this have on the historic heritage landscape and its readability in this area?
29. The Architectural Design Report identifies that consideration of historic heritage items and their setting has informed design and materials of the proposed new building. Please clarify/explain to what extent and provide an assessment of how the new building contributes to the historic heritage value individual items and the area as a whole.

### **Construction Management:**

30. Please provide details of the intended road closures which will be required during construction and the alternative routes for pedestrians using Waterloo Quay.
31. Please advise whether any over-dimension loads will be required and, if so, how their transportation will be catered for.  
Note: previously transportation of other large over-dimension loads (e.g. wind turbine blades) required the entire space within the intersection including overhanging the footpath during its transportation.
32. Please provide the figures and diagrams referred to in the Traffic Design Group Report (there appears to be some figures missing).
33. Please advise whether an adequate on-site queuing area is to be provided during the construction phases, or whether queuing of heavy vehicles will be required on Waterloo Quay.

### Responding to this request:

Pursuant to section 92A(1) of the Act, ***within 15 working days*** of the date of this letter you must either:

- provide the requested information; or
- provide written confirmation that you can not provide the requested information within the time frame, but do intend to provide it; or
- provide written confirmation that you do not agree to provide the requested information.

The processing of your application has been put on hold from 9 February 2015 and any time taken by you to provide all required information is excluded from any time limits for processing your application. Specifically, I note that the 20 working days the Council has to prepare a Section 87F Report to the Environment Court.

If you can not provide the requested information within this time frame, but do intend to provide it, then please provide:

- written confirmation that you can provide it
- the likely date that you will be able to provide it by, and
- any constraints that you may have on not being able to provide it within the set time frame.

The Council will then set a revised time frame for the information to be provided and provide this to you in writing.

If you have provided all the requested information, then we will consider its adequacy and make a decision on the scope of this.

If you require any further clarification or would like to discuss this matter, please contact me on the number below.

Yours sincerely,



**Ryan O'Leary**  
Senior Consents Planner  
Wellington City Council  
Telephone 801 3670

Delegated Code: 9





16 January 2014

Ryan O'Leary  
Senior Consent Planner  
City Planning and Design  
Wellington City Council  
PO Box 2199  
Wellington 6140

Project No. 42792610

Dear Ryan

**Subject:** Contaminated Land and HSNO Advice Related to Land Use Consent Application at 10 Waterloo Quay – SR No: 319386

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This letter summarises our review of information related to contaminated land and the proposed storage of hazardous substances (diesel fuel) at Site 10 (subject site). This review was undertaken on behalf of Wellington City Council (WCC) by URS New Zealand (URS) in relation to a Resource (Land Use) consent application at 10 Waterloo Quay, SR No. 319386 (Site 10).

Resource (Land Use) consent application SR 319386 is for the following:

- the construction of a five-level commercial building on Site 10
- earthworks associated with the development of Site 10 and for the use of potentially contaminated land
- on-site storage of diesel fuel

The focus of this review is the contaminated land and storage of diesel fuel aspects of the resource consent application for Site 10 as described in the following documents provided by Wellington City Council:

- *Proposed Development of the North Kumutoto Precinct, Wellington Waterfront, Assessment of Environmental Effects*, Urban Perspectives Ltd, November 2014 (AEE)
- *Ground Contamination Assessment Wellington Waterfront Sites 8, 9 10*, Tonkin and Taylor, October 2014 (Ground Contamination Assessment)
- *Sites 8, 9 10 Contaminated Site Management Plan (Draft)*, Tonkin and Taylor, October 2014 (Draft CSMP)
- *Site 10 — Proposed Emergency Generator and Fuel Storage*, AECOM New Zealand Ltd, 16 September 2014 (Fuel Storage Letter)

URS New Zealand Limited  
Level 4, Lambton House, 160 Lambton Quay  
Wellington 6011  
PO Box 3367, Wellington 6140  
New Zealand  
T: 64 4 496 3750  
F: 64 4 496 3755  
www.urscorp.co.nz

Page 1 of 8

The scope of this letter is to review the information in the documents listed above, and to provide comments regarding the proposed contaminated land management and the storage of hazardous substances at the subject site.

## 2 REVIEW OF GROUND CONTAMINATION ASSESSMENT

### 2.1 Summary

In general we consider that there is sufficient detail in the Ground Contamination Assessment to demonstrate that Site 10 is suitable for the proposed land use subject to the following:

- Site 10 basement area and foundation soils are removed off-site for disposal.
- An appropriate methodology is developed and implemented to assess areas and depth horizons not covered in this investigation, including all soils greater than 3 m deep (maximum proposed basement excavation depth is approximately 3.7 m with deeper foundations) and the northern portion of the site (depth greater than 1.2 m), which was inaccessible during the investigation due the presence of a concrete slab.
- Confirmation sampling and laboratory analysis of samples is undertaken at the Site 10 basement excavation base and sidewalls to demonstrate that remaining soils are suitable for the proposed land use.

We do not consider that there is sufficient detail in the Ground Contamination Assessment to allow for separation of soils suitable for direct disposal at a cleanfill site from those requiring disposal at landfill. We consider that either additional assessment is required or that excavated material is stockpiled on site, pending assessment for off-site disposal.

We also do not consider that Site 10 shallow soils (less than 1 m deep) have been adequately assessed for the presence of asbestos containing materials (ACM).

We have not reviewed the groundwater assessment/management or regional consenting aspects of the Ground Contamination Assessment.

Our specific comments on the Ground Contamination Assessment are provided below.

### 2.2 Section 6.3 QA/QC: Site 10 Sampling

Reference is made to soil and groundwater duplicate sample results provided in Table C.6. However, Table C.6 appears only to summarise the groundwater duplicate sample results. The laboratory analytical results included in Appendix C do indicate that four duplicate samples ('Duplicate 1' through 'Duplicate 4') were analysed. Since the duplicate and original sample pairs have not been identified in the Ground Contamination Assessment, we cannot assess the reproducibility of the results; however, the analytical results are generally low and therefore their omission is unlikely to have a material effect on the assessment unless they were duplicates of those samples that were considered to be 'clean' by Tonkin and Taylor. We recommend that the duplicate and original sample results be identified and considered in the assessment.



### 2.3 Section 6.5 Soil Management

For the purposes of managing (off-site disposal) of soil, this section of the Ground Contamination Assessment divides the site into three zones with various depth horizons per zone.

Overall, we do not consider that there is sufficient detail presented in the Ground Contamination Assessment to fully determine whether the assigned zones or depth horizons are appropriate. We also consider that some of the conclusions drawn in this section are not correct or without substantiation:

- Zone 1 (sampling locations WS8 and WS9), 0-1m depth, is described as clean; however, no samples of this material were collected or analysed.
- Zone 2 (sampling locations WS2, WS4, WS5, WS6 and WS7), 0-0.75 m depth, is described as clean; however, only one sample of this material was collected and analysed (WS2 at 0.6 m), and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) (Table C.3) and metals (Table C.2) concentrations greater than the background concentrations were reported.
- Zone 2 (sampling locations WS2, WS4, WS5, WS6 and WS7), 2.75 m to 3 m depth, is described as clean; however, both samples analysed from this depth range exhibited PAH concentrations greater than background.

A source of asbestos was identified as potentially resulting from the demolition of asbestos roofing material at a former shed located at Site 10 (Section 4 of the Ground Contamination Assessment). Although it is not described in the Ground Contamination Assessment it would appear that sampling and analysis for asbestos was targeted on cement or plaster materials encountered during the investigation. Asbestos was confirmed in two relatively shallow samples, both less than 1 m deep, collected from Zone 3 (the north end of Site 10). No other shallow samples were analysed for asbestos. Overall we do not consider that there is sufficient density of samples or targeting of shallow soils to identify asbestos contamination resulting from demolition of the former shed. Given that the site is currently covered by asphalt, it is not possible to visually identify potential ACM in surface soils. As a result it may be better to defer assessment of shallow soils until such time as the asphalt is removed and a visual assessment of the surface soils can be undertaken, with focused sampling and analysis of suspect ACM.

### 2.4 Appendix C, Table C.1, C.2 and C.3

The 'background' soil concentrations presented in these tables are inconsistent, for example the background lead concentration in Table C.1 is reported as 79 mg/kg; whereas, in Table C.2 it is reported as 180 mg/kg. This is possibly due to selection of different soil types for the background concentrations presented in Table C.2. In addition, the identification of concentrations greater than background via bold formatting is inconsistent with a number of concentrations greater than background not identified correctly.

Although unlikely to have a material effect on the overall Ground Contamination Assessment, we recommend that these tables be updated with consistent background concentrations and that the assessment against these revised background concentrations be reviewed to determine any such potential material effects.

### **3 REVIEW OF DRAFT CSMP**

Our comments on the Draft CSMP are provided below. We have not reviewed the groundwater management aspects of the Draft CSMP or the health and safety plan (Section 8) as these are not relevant to the land use consent.

#### **3.1 Section 3.3 Contamination**

As discussed in our review of the Ground Contamination Assessment, we do not consider that dividing the site into three soil management zones has been substantiated; we note that the Ground Contamination Assessment report itself comments on the heterogeneity of the soils encountered. Therefore, we recommend that this section of the Draft CSMP be modified accordingly.

#### **3.2 Section 4.1 Removal of asbestos containing material (Site 10)**

We do not consider that there has been sufficient assessment for the presence of ACM in shallow soils (less than 1 m deep). Therefore, we recommend that this section be modified to require additional assessment of surface soils when the asphalt is removed for the development works and a visual assessment of the surface soils can be undertaken with focused sampling and analysis of suspect ACM.

#### **3.3 Section 4.2 Excavation of Remainder of Site 10 Basement**

We do not consider the proposed soil management zones appropriate for determining disposal locations for soil (i.e. cleanfill or landfill disposal). We recommend that this section of the Draft CSMP be modified to provide for further characterisation either by additional in-ground sampling or stockpiling, sampling and analysis (characterisation) of soils prior to off-site disposal at cleanfill.

There has been no characterisation of soil at depths greater than 3 m deep and we recommend that this section be modified to require that soils excavated from this depth be stockpiled and characterised for off-site disposal. We also recommend that this section be modified to require validation sampling of the excavation base and sidewalls to assess/confirm the suitability of the remaining soil for the proposed land use.

#### **3.4 Section 5.2 Unforeseen contamination procedures**

We recommend that this section be modified to specifically address encountering unforeseen ACM.

#### **3.5 Section 5.4 Asbestos-containing soil removal procedures (Zone 3)**

We recommend that this section be modified to cover shallow soils (less than 1 m deep) across the whole site, until such time as the presence or absence of ACM in shallow soils outside of Zone 3 has been assessed.

#### **3.6 Section 5.5 Contaminated soil removal**

We recommend that reference to soil management zones be removed.



### **3.7 Section 5.10 Excavation sampling procedures**

We do not consider that there has been sufficient characterisation of soils for disposal at cleanfill nor has there been characterisation of soils at depths greater than 3 m. We recommend that the first sentence of this section be deleted and the remainder of the section modified accordingly.

### **3.8 Section 6.1 Dust Control Procedures**

We recommend that this section be modified to remove the references to soil management zones.

### **3.9 Section 7 Air Quality Monitoring**

We recommend that this section be developed further to reflect the actual conditions and methodology utilised to remove ACM contaminated soil from the site. We recommend that this updated plan be reviewed by a suitably qualified and experienced approved asbestos remover or consultant. This plan should be submitted to Council for review and approval prior to conducting the ACM contaminated soil removal.

### **3.10 Section 10.2 Post Remediation Validation**

We recommend that this section be modified to require post excavation validation sampling of the base and sidewalls of excavations deeper than 3 m.

## **4 REVIEW OF FUEL STORAGE LETTER**

Our review of the Fuel Storage Letter is provided below. We have not reviewed the engine exhaust aspects of the letter.

We consider that in addition to the four hour fire rating of the fuel storage tank and secondary containment requirements listed in the letter, the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (HSNO) requires that the room and doors in which the generator is located also have a four hour fire rating.

The HSNO stationary containment certificate is required prior to filling not at completion of the works.

## **5 RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS**

Below are recommended conditions of consent:

- (a) Off-site disposal of contaminated soil and material shall be at a facility licensed to accept such materials. Characterisation of soils for disposal purposes shall be in accordance with the receiving facility requirements.
- (b) The suitability of soil/material for disposal at a cleanfill shall be confirmed through sampling and analysis of samples (characterisation) prior to off-site disposal. This characterisation shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified environmental practitioner.



- (c) Offsite transport of soil shall comply with the relevant requirements of Land Transport Rule 45001/1 (Land Transport Rule: Dangerous Goods 2005), NZS 5433 and the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996.
- (d) Excavation and removal of asbestos containing materials/soils shall be in accordance with the *Asbestos - New Zealand guidelines for the management and removal of asbestos (3rd Edition)* prepared by New Zealand Demolition and Asbestos Association (NZDAA) and the legislation controlling asbestos works described therein.
- (e) An asbestos removal plan, including an air quality monitoring plan, shall be prepared by a suitably qualified person. The plan shall be in accordance with *Asbestos - New Zealand guidelines for the management and removal of asbestos (3rd Edition)*. The asbestos removal plan shall be submitted to the <position>, Wellington City Council for approval prior to conducting asbestos removal works.
- (f) Restricted asbestos work shall be carried out either by a person who holds a Department of Labour Certificate of Competence or is under the direct supervision of a person who holds a Department of Labour Certificate of Competence.
- (g) Excavation bases and sidewalls at depths greater than 3 m shall be sampled and characterised by a suitably qualified environmental practitioner to assess the suitability of those soils to remain on site.
- (h) A Contaminated Site Management Plan (CSMP) shall be submitted to the <position>, Wellington City Council for approval prior to conducting ground disturbance works at the Site. The CSMP shall be based on the draft CSMP lodged as part of the consent application and shall be updated to reflect the proposed works methodology.
- (i) A report shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced contaminated land practitioner and submitted to the <position>, Wellington City Council within three months of completion of the contaminated land aspect of the works. The report shall include the following:
- Documentation of any assessments, including laboratory analytical results, undertaken as to the suitability of any contaminated soil/material to remain on site.
  - Documentation of additional sampling undertaken to characterise soils for off-site disposal.
  - Documentation of air quality monitoring results for asbestos.
  - Documentation of any off-site disposal of contaminated soil/material, including quantities, dates, and disposal locations.
- (j) Fuel storage facilities associated with the generator shall be in accordance with the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act. A copy of the HSNO stationary containment certificate shall be submitted to the <position>, Wellington City Council for information.



**6 CLOSURE**

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or comments about this letter. We would be willing to meet with you and/or the applicant prior to a hearing to clarify/address any matters that may arise.

Yours sincerely  
**URS New Zealand Limited**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "G. Haldane", is positioned above the name and title of Greg Haldane.

Greg Haldane  
Principal Civil Engineer

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "K. Tearney", is positioned above the name and title of Kevin Tearney.

Kevin Tearney  
Senior Principal



URS New Zealand (URS) has prepared this report in accordance with the usual care and thoroughness of the consulting profession for the use of Wellington City Council and only those third parties who have been authorised in writing by URS to rely on this Report.

It is based on generally accepted practices and standards at the time it was prepared. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report.

It is prepared in accordance with the scope of work and for the purpose outlined in the contract Resource Consent Advice, Contaminated Site, dated 24 June 2014, Variation 1 (Site 10, 10 Waterloo Quay - SR No: 319386), dated 22 December 2014.

Where this Report indicates that information has been provided to URS by third parties, URS has made no independent verification of this information except as expressly stated in the Report. URS assumes no liability for any inaccuracies in or omissions to that information.

This Report was prepared between 12 January and 16 January 2014 and is based on the information reviewed at the time of preparation. URS disclaims responsibility for any changes that may have occurred after this time.

This Report should be read in full. No responsibility is accepted for use of any part of this report in any other context or for any other purpose or by third parties. This Report does not purport to give legal advice. Legal advice can only be given by qualified legal practitioners.

Except as required by law, no third party may use or rely on this Report unless otherwise agreed by URS in writing. Where such agreement is provided, URS will provide a letter of reliance to the agreed third party in the form required by URS.

To the extent permitted by law, URS expressly disclaims and excludes liability for any loss, damage, cost or expenses suffered by any third party relating to or resulting from the use of, or reliance on, any information contained in this Report. URS does not admit that any action, liability or claim may exist or be available to any third party.

Except as specifically stated in this section, URS does not authorise the use of this Report by any third party.

It is the responsibility of third parties to independently make inquiries or seek advice in relation to their particular requirements and proposed use of the site.

Any estimates of potential costs which have been provided are presented as estimates only as at the date of the Report. Any cost estimates that have been provided may therefore vary from actual costs at the time of expenditure.