



FILE NOTE

DATE 20 April 2020
AUTHOR Claire McKeivitt
SUBJECT Pinehaven pre-hearing notes
FILE NUMBER WGN200083

On 20 April 2020 at 7pm a virtual pre-hearing meeting for the Pinehaven Streamworks Improvement Resource consent and Notice of Requirement was held.

Attendees:

Lindsay Daysh – Facilitator

Kirsty Van Reenen – Team Leader, Greater Wellington Regional Council

Josie Burrows – Resource Advisor, Greater Wellington Regional Council

Claire McKeivitt – Senior Resource Advisor, Greater Wellington Regional Council

James Beban – Consultant Planner for Upper Hutt City Council

Tristan Reynard – Project Director, Wellington Water Ltd

Ben Fountain – Stormwater Advisor, Wellington Water Ltd

Nicky McIndoe – Counsel, Dentons for Wellington Water Ltd

Helen Anderson – Planner, GHD for Wellington Water Ltd

Submitters

Steven and Sue Pattinson

Peter and Rosalyn Ross

Alex Ross

Bob Hall

Robyn Hickson

Darryl Longstaffe

Key Issues discussed

- One submitter whose property is regularly affected by the flooding would like the project to proceed as quickly as possible. The existing flooding is causing undue stress, both due to financial and health implications. In their opinion, over engineering is not necessarily a concern as it is better than no stream works upgrades being undertaken.
- Save Our Hills (SOH) members are concerned that the changes to the hydraulic model that the applicant is about to undertake will not address their issues which are with the hydrological

model. The issue they have with the hydrological model is that the infiltration rate used assumes no infiltration, too much rain and an oversized catchment, resulting in over engineering of the stream upgrades.

- The concern SOH members have with over-engineering of the model is that if future development is to go ahead within the catchment (ie. the Guildford Development), the developers would not be required to undertake additional storm water mitigation as the stream upgrade would already provide enough flow for that development.
- This means by undertaking these works at this scale now the UHCC (funded by the ratepayers), is compensating future private development.
- Further, because no streamworks are proposed for the upper catchment, there is fear that should new development occur higher up in the catchment, this may exacerbate the existing flood issues in the upper catchment. Noting that these aren't currently as bad as the flooding issues in the lower catchment which this project is to target.
- SOH members would like expert conferencing to go ahead, but only if it's multi-disciplinary, including the flood modellers/hydrologists as well as urban design experts to account for infiltration from hypothetical development.

Specific Information requests

- SOH members would like to see modelled stream flows, not just designed AEP's. In particular for a 1 in 25 year flood event.
- Peter and Rosyln Ross would like clarity as to what works are being undertaken on their property, with updated drawings. They also questioned whether the proposed width of the stream through their property was necessary.
- SOH sent Kirsty an email with requests to be included in the scope of the re-run of the hydraulic model. This was provided to the applicant. The applicant will consider these requests and provide a response.
- WWL to provide a response (via GWRC/UHCC) to SOH in regard to their requests about the flood model comparison to the December 2019 flood event.
- Clarification is required from WWL as to what infiltration has been used in the hydrological model, why this is considered appropriate and realistic of the baseline (and not future development).

Recommended Next Steps

- The applicant undertakes the discussed hydraulic model updates
- The updated model results and related flood hazard assessment is shared.
- The pre-hearing meeting for SOH and the flood experts is arranged.
- Expert conferencing is undertaken to clarify matters of contention in the model if any.