

File No: WGN200083
24 September 2019

Wellington Water Limited
C/o Helen Anderson
Jacobs New Zealand Limited
Level 3, 86 Customhouse Quay
Wellington 6011

By email: helen.anderson@jacobs.com

Dear Helen

Commissioning of a report under section 92(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991

Thank you for lodging your application for a notice of requirement and resource consent to undertake stream improvement works located within the Pinehaven Stream with Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) and Upper Hutt City Council (UHCC), which we received on 19 September 2019.

I am writing to formally notify you that GWRC and UHCC are commissioning a peer review of the flood model, Flood Hazard Assessment, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Terrestrial Ecology Assessment and also an assessment from a Traffic Engineer, under section 92(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

In accordance with section 92(2), the consent authority may commission a report on any matter relating to an application if (a) – (c) apply.

- a) We consider the activity may have a significant adverse environmental effect on flood risk, water quality, ecology and traffic safety (for the reasons described below);
- b) The applicant has been notified before the reports have been commissioned; and
- c) The applicant has not refused to the commissioning of the report under section 92B(1).

Reason for wanting to commission a review

Section 92(3) states the consent authority must notify the applicant of its reasons for wanting to commission a report under subsection (2). The reasons for wanting to commission the reports are given below.

- Flood model and Flood Hazard Assessment – to determine whether the model is suitable for providing flood predictions and for use in an assessment of environmental effects; and the

Flood Hazard Assessment is adequate and correct in regards to effects of the proposed works on flooding.

- Erosion and Sediment Control Plan – to determine whether the proposed construction, erosion and sediment control methodologies are appropriate and the best practicable option for the proposed works at this location and advise on the level of effects from the instream works.
- Terrestrial ecology – to determine the ecological effects from vegetation removal and whether the proposed mitigation measures reduce these effects to an acceptable level.
- Traffic – to determine the traffic effects from the proposed site works and access points are acceptable and whether any mitigation measures are required to reduce these effects.

Who will conduct the review

We have engaged the following experts to conduct the reviews:

- Flood model and Flood Hazard Assessment (for GWRC and UHCC), by Mike Law, Senior Associate – Water Resources, Beca Limited (scope and time estimate provided in Attachment 1).
- Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (for GWRC), by Gregor McLean, Director/Environmental Consultant, Southern Skies Environmental (scope provided in Attachment 2)
- Terrestrial and riparian ecology (for UHCC and GWRC), by Frances Forsyth, Senior Ecologist, Wildlands (scope and cost estimate TBC)
- Traffic (for UHCC), by Harriet Fraser, Traffic Engineer, Harriet Fraser Traffic Engineer and Transportation Planning (scope and cost estimate TBC)

Date to respond to this notification

Under section 92B(1) you must give GWRC written notice of whether you agree to the commissioning of the peer review reports by 16 October 2019. An email response will be sufficient.

Processing of your application

Your application has been placed on hold and the statutory ‘clock’¹ stopped until one of the below situations occur:

- If you agree in written notice to the commissioning of the peer reviews, your application will remain ‘on hold’ from the date of this notification until we receive the final peer review reports.

¹ Under section 88C of the Resource Management Act 1991
SECTION 92_2 LETTER

- If you refuse to agree to the commissioning of the reports, your application will remain on hold until we receive written notice that you refuse.

Other reviews

For your information, I have also requested the following reviews from internal GWRC staff, which do not fall within the scope of the section 92(2) reports:

- Aquatic ecology – Dr Evan Harrison, Senior Environmental Scientist, GWRC Environmental Science
- Erosion, scour and structure sensibility check – Sharyn Westlake, Senior Engineer, GWRC Flood Protection Department

We will send you a copy of the final peer review memos when we receive them. Please feel free to contact me on 04 830 4435 if you have any questions or concerns.

Yours sincerely

J Burrows

Josie Burrows
Resource Advisor
Environmental Regulation
Greater Wellington Regional Council

pp. *J Burrows*

James Beban
Senior Planner
Urban Edge Planning
On behalf of Upper Hutt City Council

Attachment 1: Beca Limited - Scope of review and cost estimate

Attachment 2: Southern Skies Environmental - Scope of review

Attachment 1: Beca Limited - Scope of review and cost estimate

Part 1: Review of documents and preparation of a memo

	Deliverables	Milestone Date	Performance Standard
1.1	Review of the Pinehaven Stream Improvements model and modelling report		
(a)	Review the Pinehaven Stream Improvements model and modelling report with respect to changes made to the existing base model for the proposed works.	Four weeks from lodgement of consent	All Services to be provided to the Buyer in accordance with Good Industry Practice and to the reasonable satisfaction of the Buyer.
(b)	If required, attend a meeting/with Jacobs to discuss any questions raised during the review.	On request from the Buyer	
1.2	Review the Flood Hazard Assessment		
(a)	Review the Flood Hazard Assessment report produced by Jacobs, especially with respect to effects of the proposed works for consent.	Four weeks from lodgement of consent	All Services to be provided to the Buyer in accordance with Good Industry Practice and to the reasonable satisfaction of the Buyer.
(b)	If required, attend a meeting with the Buyer's other consultants to discuss any questions raised during the review.	On request from the Buyer	
1.3	Memorandum		
(b)	Prepare a memorandum for the Buyer addressing the following:	Four weeks from lodgement of consent	Good Industry Practice with a memorandum to a high, in the Buyer's opinion, standard that easily enables the Buyer to determine whether the model and assessment of effects of the proposal on flooding are acceptable and appropriate, and any further information that is required from the applicant in order to make that assessment.
(i)	Is the model suitable for providing flood predictions to help inform the design of the proposed flood improvement works?		
(ii)	Is the model suitable for use in undertaking an assessment of effects of the proposed flood improvement works on flooding?		
(iii)	Is the Flood Hazard Assessment adequate and correct in regards to assessing the effects of the proposed flood improvement works on flooding?		
(iv)	Is there any further information required from the applicant in order to complete this assessment? If so, please provide a list of further information requirements that can be included in a request for further information.		

Part 2: Review of further information provided (if required) and update to the memo

	Deliverables	Milestone Date	Performance Standard
2.1	Following the receipt of any further information as a result of questions from Part 1, review the further information provided and provide a final memo addressing the following:	On request from the Buyer	Good Industry Practice with a memorandum to a high, in the Buyer's opinion, standard that easily enables the Buyer to determine whether the model and assessment of effects of the proposal on flooding are acceptable and appropriate.
(a)	Is the model suitable for providing flood predictions to help inform the design of the proposed flood improvement works?		
(b)	Is the model suitable for use in undertaking an assessment of effects of the proposed flood improvement works on flooding?		
(c)	Is the Flood Hazard Assessment adequate and correct in regards to assessing the effects of the proposed flood improvement works on flooding?		
(d)	Does the further information address all the questions raised and is the response adequate? If not, what further information is still required?		
(e)	Provide comments on the applicants assessment outlined in the further information		

Cost estimate:

Task		Mike Law	Elliot Tuck	Katie Chalk	Cost (rounded to nearest \$100)	
		<i>\$248/h</i>	<i>\$248/h</i>	<i>\$164/h</i>		
Part 1 - Post-lodgement review	Review of the Pinehaven Stream Improvements model and modelling report	12 h	20 h	16 h	\$10,500	\$18,500
	Review the Flood Hazard Assessment	16 h	-	-	\$4,000	
	Memorandum	12 h	4 h	-	\$4,000	
Part 2 - Review of further information provided (if required) and update to the memo		8 h	8 h	-	\$4,000	
Disbursements – Travel/accommodation for meetings in WLG					\$2,000	
Total		48 h	32 h	16 h	\$24,500	

Attachment 2: Southern Skies Environmental - Scope of review and cost estimate

INFORMATION SOUGHT:

1. Has the applicant provided sufficient detail to understand the proposed construction, erosion and sediment control methodology and effects on water quality? If not, what further information and/or assessment is required?
2. Is the proposed construction, erosion and sediment control methodology appropriate and the best practicable option for the proposed works at this location?
3. Does the application provide sufficient detail on the monitoring and maintenance of erosion and sediment control devices that will be undertaken, how it will be undertaken and how effects on water quality will be managed?
4. Has the applicant proposed an appropriate monitoring plan, trigger and cease work triggers in relation to sedimentation of the stream?
5. Do you have any comments on the proposed consent conditions relating to erosion and sediment controls? What amendments or additions are required?
6. Any other comments?

Cost estimate: TBC by Monday 30 September