

**BEFORE THE UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL
AND
GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER OF

and a related

Resource Consent application for Pinehaven Stream
Flood Protection Works (GWRC),
Notice of Requirement (UHCC)

CONSENT APPLICANT

REQUIRING AUTHORITY

Upper Hutt City Council

Upper Hutt City Council

4th MINUTE OF INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL:

Required Information

DATED 31 July 2020

**Minute #3 of Independent Hearing Panel
Pinehaven Stream Flood Protection Works
[WGN200083 and 351/10/006]**

Information Requested by Minute # 2

1. In our Minute #2 (dated 10 July), we requested the following information from the Applicant which has not yet been provided:

a) Paragraph 20 - Hydrological model calibration

“We require information from WWL in relation to the hydrological model and its calibration. Our following request relates to Appendix A, Table 1, Item 3 of the Jacobs letter dated 26 February 2020, which was provided as a section 92 response. With regard to the 2008 model using HYDSTRA software – please advise who prepared this model and carried out the calibrations. Please also advise whether this model and the calibrations against the 31 July 2008 storm event and independent flow estimation have been peer reviewed either internally or externally. If there has been a peer review, please provide relevant details.”

b) Paragraph 21 – Beca Technical Review

“We also require information from WWL which relates to the Beca technical review of flooding dated 2 December 2019. In that review, section 4.2 states that the hydrological model “... *does not differ substantially from the 2015 model and mapping review*”. Please describe the nature of the Beca review and its outcome, and also provide a copy of the review report to the panel. A copy of the review will also need to be provided to the hearing administrators so that it can be circulated to all parties.”

2. Some aspects of these matters may have been addressed in the Applicant’s evidence. However, please note that we will expect these matters to be fully and clearly addressed by the Applicant at the hearing and, where they are additional to written evidence already provided, circulated in writing to the Commissioners and all other parties.

Responses to SOH Evidence

3. Save Our Hills (SOH) has provided detailed technical evidence prepared by Mr Hall. We require Mr Kinley and Mr Law to review that evidence and provide written responses for the benefit of the Commissioners and all parties. At a minimum, the responses should cover:

a) RJ Hall report of 27 July.

b) Alasdair Keene memo regarding Pinehaven rainfall assessment.

c) G. Horrell review of RJ Hall 27 July report.

4. We also request that Mr Kinley and Mr Law each provide comment at the hearing on:
 - a) The flood frequency curves prepared by Mr Hall and their views on the relevance and usefulness of Mr Hall's curves with respect to the methods used, as compared with the Applicant's methods of assessment of flood flows at various frequencies.
 - b) Mr Keane's assessment of the 2 hour rain of 8 December 2019 of 52mm, being an ARI of approximately 28 years. We note that this appears at odds with the rainfall discussed in 2.1 (b) of the joint witness statement on Hydrology and Flood Modelling.
 - c) Any other aspects of the SOH evidence that they consider useful to the panel.

Correspondence

5. As per our previous Minutes, any correspondence with the independent hearing panel should be directed through Ainslee Brown (Ainslee.Brown@gw.govt.nz).



Mark Ashby
Chair of Hearing

For and on behalf of:
Commissioner Nigel Mark-Brown
Commissioner Rawiri Faulkner
Commissioner Mark Ashby