



Addendum to Prison Alternative Site Assessment



Prepared for Department of Corrections

9 March 2017

Document Quality Assurance

Bibliographic reference for citation:

Boffa Miskell Limited 2017. *Addendum to Prison Alternative Site Assessment*. Report prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited for Department of Corrections.

Prepared by:	Christine Coste Planner Principal	
Reviewed by:	Sharon Dines Associate Principal Planner	
Status: FINAL	Revision / version: 0	Issue date: 9 March 2017

Use and Reliance

This report has been prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited on the specific instructions of our Client. It is solely for our Client's use for the purpose for which it is intended in accordance with the agreed scope of work. Boffa Miskell does not accept any liability or responsibility in relation to the use of this report contrary to the above, or to any person other than the Client. Any use or reliance by a third party is at that party's own risk. Where information has been supplied by the Client or obtained from other external sources, it has been assumed that it is accurate, without independent verification, unless otherwise indicated. No liability or responsibility is accepted by Boffa Miskell Limited for any errors or omissions to the extent that they arise from inaccurate information provided by the Client or any external source.

Template revision: 20150331 0000

File ref: Addendum_Alt_Assmt_revised.docx

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	2
1.1	Purpose	2
1.2	Background	2
1.3	Additional Development Scenario	3
2.0	Assessment of Alternatives	3
2.1	Assumptions	4
2.2	Methodology	4
2.3	Auckland Prison	4
2.4	Spring Hill Corrections Facility	5
2.5	Waikeria Prison	6
3.0	Conclusion	7

Appendices

Appendix 1: Copies of 2016 Indicative Development Areas at Three Prison Sites

Appendix 2: Letter regarding Social Effects

Appendix 3: Letter regarding Landscape and Visual Effects

Appendix 4: Memorandum regarding Traffic Effects

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This report is an addendum to the Prison Alternatives Assessment which was completed on 30 September 2016. This addendum assesses an additional scenario being the development of a 2,000 prisoner place facility. The need to consider an additional development scenario arose from the Department of Corrections (the Department) requirement to respond earlier than anticipated to an increase in prisoner numbers above that previously forecast. This addendum should be read in conjunction with the earlier Prison Alternatives Assessment report.

1.2 Background

The Prison Alternatives Assessment, dated September 2016, set out the objectives of the Department in establishing a new prison facility and detailed the alternatives assessment undertaken.

Three alternative sites were considered in the assessment which involved further development at the following existing prisons:

- Auckland Prison at Paremoremo;
- Spring Hill Corrections Facility at Hampton Downs; and
- Waikeria Prison, south of Te Awamutu.

The report considered two development scenarios:

- The development of a 1,000 prisoner place facility; and
- The development of a 1,680 prisoner place facility.

The Department determined that there was not sufficient land to accommodate a facility providing 1,680 prisoner places in its preferred 2-storey configuration at Auckland Prison. Accordingly the assessment of this development scenario at Auckland Prison was not progressed.

The alternatives assessment concluded that the proposed scenarios of:

- A 1,000 prisoner place facility at Auckland Prison; or
- A 1,000 or 1,680 prisoner place facility at Waikeria Prison,

could be developed while avoiding, remedying or mitigating significant adverse effects on the environment.

The Department subsequently adopted a proposal for a new 1,500 prisoner place facility at Waikeria Prison as the preferred option and began work on amending the designation at Waikeria to allow for up to 3,000 prisoners to be accommodated on the site. The increase in capacity would enable a new facility for 1,500 prisoners to be built, the operation of existing facilities and provide reserve capacity for future demand if needed.

1.3 Additional Development Scenario

In 2016, the Department developed a Prison Capacity Programme in response to a rising prisoner population and projected future growth. Using the July 2016 Justice Sector Forecast, the Department established that 1,700 additional prisoner places would be required by 2025. The Department's proposed response to meet the predicted capacity shortfall was to increase capacity across three existing prison sites in the Upper North Island through the provision of 80 additional prisoner places via double bunking at Northland Region Corrections Facility by April 2017, 245 prisoner places at Mt Eden Corrections Facility through the construction of a new accommodation block by late 2019, and 1,500 prisoner places through the construction of a new facility at Waikeria Prison to be completed by late 2021. In November 2016, the Government approved the procurement of a 1,500 prisoner facility at Waikeria Prison.

The July 2016 Justice Sector Forecast, used by the Department in the development of its Prison Capacity Programme, has been outstripped by actual growth in the prisoner population. The actual prisoner population as at January 2017 is over 800 above the July 2016 forecast peak for that month. This is in addition to the growth already signalled by the July 2016 forecast. The Department of Corrections is proposing a number of measures in response including the expansion of the proposed facility at Waikeria Prison from 1,500 prisoner places to 2,000. The new facility is to provide for a significant proportion of the predicted capacity shortfall nationwide and is the only major new-build initiative proposed to provide for this shortfall.

The purpose of this addendum to the Prison Alternative Site Assessment is to consider an additional development scenario given the increase in the size of the proposed facility from 1,500 prisoner places to 2,000. This is required to ensure that the Department adequately considers alternatives under section 171(1)(b)(ii) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

This addendum assesses the effects on the environment of developing a facility for 2,000 at the three sites previously identified (Auckland Prison, Spring Hill Corrections Facility and Waikeria Prison).

This addendum should be read in conjunction with the earlier Prison Alternatives Assessment as this sets out the Department's functions and activities required by statute, the objectives to be met by the project and the detailed assessments of alternative sites and development scenarios which were undertaken.

2.0 Assessment of Alternatives

Section 171(1)(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires that when considering a notice of requirement for a designation from a requiring authority, a territorial authority must, subject to Part 2, have particular regard to (amongst other things) whether consideration has been given to alternative sites or methods of undertaking the proposed development if it is likely that the development will have a significant adverse effect on the environment. Accordingly, this addendum outlines an initial assessment of the potential environmental effects at the three sites associated with the development of a facility to accommodate 2,000 prisoners.

The RMA does not, however, direct the requiring authority to consider the full suite of alternatives available for a public work, or to select the best option in assessing the relative

merits of the alternatives identified, but simply needs to be satisfied that adequate consideration has been given to alternatives.

2.1 Assumptions

At each of the three prison sites an indicative development area was identified. A map showing the location of this area was appended to the earlier alternative site assessment report and for ease is appended to this addendum and forms **Appendix 1**. With the increase in the size of the proposed facility, more of the indicative development area will be developed.

The Department has confirmed that the parameters that applied to the development of a facility for 1,680 prisoner places also apply to a facility for 2,000 prisoner places. These parameters include that the maximum building height is 12m (with some exclusions) and the maximum height of the primary physical barrier is 6m.

2.2 Methodology

The alternative site assessment completed in September 2016 was informed by a range of technical specialists who identified and considered the likely effects of two potential development scenarios at three prison sites.

An evaluative framework was used to compare the environmental impacts of the three alternative prison sites relative to each other. The criteria used in the comparative assessment were determined by the potential environmental effects of the development scenarios based on analysis of previous similar projects (such as the Spring Hill Corrections Facility and Auckland South Corrections Facility). This included scoring and rating the effects and then weighting those effects with most impact.

In weighting it was considered that:

- Social, cultural, heritage and archaeology, ecological and landscape and visual effects are those with high potential impact and high probability of occurrence in the context of developing a large prison facility. These effects can be difficult to avoid, remedy or mitigate regardless of where the proposed prison facility is located and have therefore been attributed a higher weighting than other effects.
- Conversely, effects caused by lighting, traffic, noise, water and wastewater can be avoided or mitigated more easily through management techniques.

This addendum builds on the findings of the previous alternative site assessment. The findings of a number of the earlier technical assessments remain unchanged as they are not impacted by an increase in the size of the proposed facility; refer to Tables 1 and 2. Several technical experts were asked to reconsider their assessments where it was possible the assessments may change as a result of the 2,000 prisoner place scenario. **Appendices 2 to 4** contain updated assessments regarding the following effects: landscape and visual effects, social effects and traffic effects to inform the alternative site assessment.

2.3 Auckland Prison

The Department has determined that there is not sufficient land to accommodate a facility providing 2,000 prisoner places in its preferred 2-storey configuration. Accordingly the assessment of this development scenario at Auckland Prison was not progressed.

2.4 Spring Hill Corrections Facility

The indicative development areas for the 1,000 and 1,680 prisoner place facilities at Spring Hill Corrections Facility were shown north-west of the existing facility. The existing facility is located in a contained valley, so both of the options created a prominent addition, particularly the larger option as it involved more landform removal.

Table 2 sets out the effects associated with the development of a 2,000 prisoner place facility in comparison to the earlier assessment of a 1,680 prisoner place facility. As identified in the earlier alternative site assessment, and confirmed in this assessment, the development of a 2,000 prisoner place is not considered to be able to be accommodated without significant landscape effects. When compared to a facility providing 1,680 prisoner places a facility providing 2,000 prisoner places would increase the visual effects from moderate to moderate-high due to the additional buildings required. With regard to traffic effects, the traffic engineers have advised that the increase in traffic volume associated with a larger facility would remain within the “moderate” effect score, although would be at the upper end of that scale.

Table 1: Spring Hill Corrections Facility – Comparison of 2,000 prisoner place facility with the earlier assessment of a 1,680 prisoner place facility

Effect	Likely Effect in Comparison to Assessment of Effects undertaken in 2016.
Social Effects	The social effects are expected to be similar regardless of whether the 1,680 prisoner place or 2,000 prisoner place facility is constructed (see Appendix 2). There will be an increase in staff numbers which will have ongoing social effects of the surrounding community (much of it positive).
Cultural Effects	No change
Heritage and Archaeology Effects	No change
Ecological Effects	Adverse effects from loss of stream occur with both options.
Economic Effects	Positive effects identified with the development of a 1,680 prisoner place facility will increase with the development of a larger facility.
Landscape Effects	In the earlier assessment adverse effects (unmitigated) were considered very high. The effects associated with the development of a larger facility are considered slightly increased (see Appendix 3) as whilst there is more built form, both options involve similar changes to the landform and character. Adverse effects continue to be considered very high.
Visual Effects	In the earlier assessment adverse effects (unmitigated) were considered moderate. As a result of the increase in the size of the built form, effects will be slightly increased to moderate-high (see Appendix 3).
Lighting and Glare	Adverse effects were considered to be moderate. Overall suitable design would ensure compliance with light limits and therefore assuming the same development area, there will be no change in effects

Traffic Effects	The traffic effect associated with the development of a 1,680 prisoner place facility was considered moderate. It was identified that potential conflict with traffic from the adjacent Motorsport Park may lead to the need to provide additional or alternative infrastructure for the prison to manage traffic effects. The traffic engineers consider that the 2,000 prisoner place facility, which will increase traffic volumes, may result in the need to bring forward these works. As explained in Appendix 4 , the traffic engineers consider the effect to be moderate, but increasing towards a major effect if not mitigated.
Noise Effects	Overall a suitable design would ensure compliance with noise limits and therefore assuming the same development area, there will be no change in effects.
Water and Wastewater Effects	As with the earlier assessment it is expected that the Department will need to enter into an agreement with Waikato District Council to enable additional wastewater to be reticulated to the Te Kauwhata plant and that the plant is likely to require upgrading to treat the additional wastewater from the site.

2.5 Waikeria Prison

Table 3 sets out the effects associated with the development of a 2,000 prisoner place facility in comparison to the earlier assessment of a 1,680 prisoner place facility. The technical experts have advised that the environmental effects associated with the two development scenarios are similar and the increase in the size of the facility will not lead to an increase in the magnitude of the effect.

Table 2: Waikeria Prison - Comparison of 2,000 prisoner place facility with the earlier assessment of a 1,680 prisoner place facility

Effect	Likely Effect in Comparison to Assessment of Effects undertaken in 2016.
Social Effects	The social effects are expected to be similar regardless of whether the 1,680 or 2,000 prisoner place facility is constructed (see Appendix 2). The effect is considered to be a moderate adverse effect. There will be an increase in staff numbers which will have ongoing social effects of the surrounding community (much of it positive).
Cultural Effects	No change
Heritage and Archaeology Effects	No change.
Ecological Effects	Adverse effects from loss of wetland occur with both options.
Economic Effects	The 1,680 prisoner place facility had major positive effects and therefore an increase in the size of the facility will increase these beneficial effects.
Landscape Effects	Were considered high for 1,680 prisoner place facility in the previous assessment. A 2,000 prisoner place facility would be more intensive within the identified development area however the rural character

	effects will not be greatly increased (see Appendix 3).
Visual Effects	Adverse effects moderate-high for 1,680 prisoner place facility and considered similar for the 2,000 prisoner place facility. As the assumptions around overall area and height of the proposal would not change, it is considered some additional building in the same area will increase effects but not result in these effects becoming significant (see Appendix 3).
Lighting and Glare	The earlier alternative site assessment found these effects to be moderate and adverse. Overall a suitable design would ensure compliance with light limits and therefore assuming the same development area, there will be no change in effects
Traffic Effects	The earlier assessment found the traffic effects to be moderately adverse. This has been reviewed for the 2,000 prisoner place option (see Appendix 4) and whilst it is acknowledged that queuing and delay at the State Highway 3/Waikeria intersection will increase, the effect is localised and mitigation is available. As such it is still considered to be a moderate effect.
Noise Effects	Overall a suitable design would ensure compliance with noise limits and therefore assuming the same development area, there will be no change in effects
Water and Wastewater Effects	<p>It is expected that the existing water supply will be of a sufficient volume to cater for a larger prison population.</p> <p>As with the earlier assessment it is expected that the Department will need to upgrade or replace the existing wastewater treatment which is nearing the end of its useful life.</p>

3.0 Conclusion

Taking the findings of the earlier alternative site assessment together with the findings of this addendum which considered a facility providing 2,000 prisoner places, Waikeria Prison is the preferred site from an environmental effects perspective.

It is noted that the caveats that applied to the earlier assessment also apply to this addendum. For example the alternatives assessment and addendum have not yet fully explored cultural effects as these need to be identified in consultation with iwi. Therefore it is possible that cultural effects may differ between the sites.




Appendix 1: Copies of 2016 Indicative Development Areas at Three Prison Sites



Option 1 - 1000 Prisoner Prison



Legend

-  Auckland Prison Designation
-  Indicative Site Area
-  Contours 2m Interval

This graphic has been prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited on the specific instructions of our Client. It is solely for our Clients use in accordance with the agreed scope of work. Any use or reliance by a third party is at that party's own risk. Where information has been supplied by the Client or obtained from other external sources, it has been assumed that it is accurate. No liability or responsibility is accepted by Boffa Miskell Limited for any errors or omissions to the extent that they arise from inaccurate information provided by the Client or any external source.






Legend

-  Spring Hill Prison Designation
-  Indicative Site Area
-  Contours 2m Interval

This graphic has been prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited on the specific instructions of our Client. It is solely for our Clients use in accordance with the agreed scope of work. Any use or reliance by a third party is at that party's own risk. Where information has been supplied by the Client or obtained from other external sources, it has been assumed that it is accurate. No liability or responsibility is accepted by Boffa Miskell Limited for any errors or omissions to the extent that they arise from inaccurate information provided by the Client or any external source.



Legend

-  Waikeria Prison Designation
-  Indicative Site Area
-  Contours 1m Interval

Appendix 2: Letter regarding Social Effects

28 February 2017

Department of Corrections
c/- Boffa Miskell

Dear Sharon

This letter sets out an addendum to the earlier *Prison Capacity Phase 2 Alternatives Assessment – Social*, dated 16 August 2016, to address the options for the additional capacity now required.

Methodology and Assumptions

I understand that due to updated projections of demand for prisoner places, the Department needs to provide a 2,000 prisoner place facility to achieve the objective of meeting forecasted 10 year demand. I understand that each of the 2,000 prisoner place alternatives will be located in the same indicative development areas as used for the 1,680 prisoner place facility in the previous alternatives assessment.

The Department has advised that a 2,000 prisoner place facility will not be able to be accommodated at the Auckland Prison location. Therefore, I have considered Springhill and Waikeria only.

Assessment

The social effects are expected to be similar whether a 1000 build, 1,680 build or 2,000 build. While there is a change in magnitude (number of people affected), any positive or negative effects will be triggered by the smaller of the three builds, and the relative uplift to the 1,680 build and 2,000 build is modest.

The only note to add regards prison operation, where staff numbers have now doubled from the 1,000 to 2,000 for Waikeria Prison and Spring Hill Prison. As such, pressure on housing and local services will occur from the modest influx of staff to the surrounding areas, particularly for Waikeria Prison as the nearest large city is approximately 50km away. While many staff will be hired locally, others will migrate to the area. However, the positive contribution staff and families will make to the local communities is also noted, particularly for Waikeria Prison. As such, the previous scoring remains unchanged for both Spring Hill and Waikeria Prison.

Conclusion

Overall, I consider there is little change to the earlier alternatives assessment regarding potential social effects.

Yours sincerely,



Robert Quigley
Director, Quigley and Watts Ltd

Appendix 3: Letter regarding Landscape and Visual Effects

28 February 2017

Department of Corrections
c/- Boffa Miskell

By email: Sharon.Dines@boffamiskell.co.nz



Dear Sharon

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS – FURTHER ANALYSIS FOR PRISON ALTERNATIVES

Further to our discussions, this letter sets out an addendum to our earlier Prison Capacity Alternatives Assessment dated 12 August 2016 to address the options for the additional capacity now required.

Methodology and Assumptions

We understand that due to updated projections of prisoner places demand, the Department needs to provide a 2,000 prisoner place facility to achieve the objective of meeting forecasted 10 year demand. We have assumed the 2,000 prisoner place facility can be accommodated in the same indicative development area for the 1,680 prisoner place option as used in the previous report. We have also assumed that the development will be two storey consistent with the previous report. There will be an increased percentage of building coverage within the area to accommodate the increased scale of the facility.

The Department has advised that a 2,000 prisoner place facility will not be able to be accommodated at the Auckland Prison location. Therefore we have considered Springhill and Waikeria only.

Assessment

The following table sets out analysis of the 2,000 place option in comparison to our earlier 1,680 place assessment.

	Landscape Effects	Visual Effects
Springhill Prison		
1,680 place previously assessed	Very High – would increase dominance of the prison in the landscape and adversely affect rural character.	Moderate – the existing prison is visually discrete and removing parts of the landform and screening to facilitate development would make mitigation more difficult.
Change in effect for 2,000 place facility	Very High - as the new option involves more buildings the effects will be slightly increased.	Moderate-High – as the new option involves more buildings the effects will be slightly increased.
Waikeria Prison		
1,680 place previously assessed	High – the 1,680 facility was considered to have a high adverse effect on landscape character given its increased dominance in the area.	Moderate-High – this option extends the facility further south where it is opened up to more extensive views from the west. However the viewing audiences to the west are well separated from the site and there is good potential for mitigation planting to provide effective screening over time. Viewing audiences to the east are closer to the proposal 500-1000m away.
Change in effects for a 2,000 place facility	High – the 2,000 would slightly increase the degree of adverse effects on rural character due to its larger size, although it is assumed this option would be within the footprint previously assessed. Careful design and mitigation could lessen any increase of effects.	Moderate-High – whilst this option provides for an additional 320 prisoner places than the earlier assessment, it is anticipated that this development will be spread throughout the indicative development area. Intensive development on the eastern side of the development area would have greater effects to the closer viewing audiences to the east. Greater building on the western side could be more readily mitigated from viewing audiences to the west. Assuming development occurs throughout the indicative area the increased option can still be considered Moderate-High.

Conclusion

Overall we consider that there is little change to our earlier assessment on the landscape and visual effects of potential development at these sites. We consider that Waikeria, with the appropriate design and mitigation controls, would avoid significant landscape and visual effects however the Spring Hill site does not provide this opportunity.

If you have any queries or require any further information, please contact the writer on (09) 359 5313 or 027 473 1634.

Yours sincerely

BOFFA MISKELL LTD

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'J Goodwin', with a stylized, flowing script.

John Goodwin
Partner / Landscape Architect

Appendix 4: Memorandum regarding Traffic Effects

Filenote

Job: 14029-4 Department of Corrections: Waikeria Prison

To: Sharon Dines (Boffa Miskell)

From: Don McKenzie, Alasdair McGeachie (TDG)

Date: 6 March 2017

Subject: Addendum to the Prison Capacity Report 12 August 2016

Introduction

In August 2016 TDG produced a letter report summarising a high level examination of the potential traffic effects of various expansion options for three prisons in the upper North Island, specifically Auckland Prison, Springhill Prison and Waikeria Prison.

Having briefly examined the traffic generation related issues the report concluded that the proposed development options had the potential to result in a major adverse effect on the surrounding environment of Auckland Prison, and a minor adverse effect at the other two locations. The adverse effects primarily related to the effects and degradation of service at nearby key intersections.

Subsequent to the production of the August report, the prison expansion options have been revisited, and the scale of development at all three locations revised. This technical memorandum briefly summarises the potential changes in effect due to the revision of the proposed redevelopment programme.

Revised Development Programme

The original development programme proposed the addition of a 1,000-place facility at Auckland Prison, and the option of a 1,000 place or a 1,680-place facility at both Springhill Prison and Waikeria Prison. It is now proposed to investigate the suitability of providing a 2,000 place at Auckland Prison, Waikeria Prison or Springhill Prison.

Changes in Traffic Effects

Auckland Prison

It is understood that a 2,000 place facility could not be accommodated at Auckland Prison.

The August 2016 report identified that the increase in the size (1,000-place) of the proposed facility at Auckland Prison will decrease the level of service at the Dairy Flat Highway / The Avenue intersection, an intersection previously identified as having existing capacity and operational constraints in its current priority controlled form. Overall it was identified that there was potential for a major adverse traffic effect associated with the proposed development. It is considered that this assessment remains valid.



Waikeria Prison

The August 2016 report identified a probable need for infrastructure improvements along Waikeria Road, the access road to the prison, in either the 1,000-place or 1,680-place expansion scenarios.

The key infrastructure improvements tagged were an upgrade to the SH3/ Waikeria Road intersection and the upgrade or replacement of a single lane bridge on Waikeria Road. Similar infrastructure upgrades would be required for the 2,000-place facility (as identified in the March 2017 ITA Report produced by TDG).

It had previously been identified that there are considered to be suitable infrastructure and traffic management responses to the mitigation of the traffic issues associated with the proposed prison development, and in light of these mitigations a moderate adverse effect assessment was made for the 1,000-place and 1,680-place Waikeria scenarios. With respect to the 2,000-place development option while queuing and delay at the SH3 / Waikeria Road intersection is expected to increase above the previously considered levels, it is noted that such congestion is likely to be localised, and of a short-term nature and may be able to be further mitigated by additional operational or infrastructural changes. Accordingly the assessment of a moderate adverse effect remains appropriate.

Springhill Prison

The construction of a 2,000 prisoner place facility at Springhill Prison in preference to the either the 1,000 place or 1,680 place facilities would result in additional levels of traffic generation above those previously assessed. As identified in the August 2016 report, the current consent condition applying to the motorsport park activities whereby access between the Spring Hill site and the Expressway interchange must be able to be completed within “4 minutes” may require the investigation of the provision of additional or alternative infrastructure between the Prison and SH1 to provide enhanced access without compromising the operations of the Motorsport Park.

With the increased levels of traffic generated by the 2,000 place option such a provision may become more critical, or require advancement at an earlier date than would be required with the smaller facility. The option of modifying the resource consent condition is considered problematic, as it related to an activity over which the Department has no direct control or influence.

Overall the traffic effect of a prison expansion is considered to remain at the “Moderate Adverse Effect” level but with a progression nearer to a major effect.

Conclusion

The changes in the proposed development programme for the upper North Island prison are not considered to change in any substantive form the conclusions of the letter report presented by TDG in August 2016.

TDG