

HUTT CITY COUNCIL

WAIWHETU STREAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report of a meeting held in the Council Chambers, Administration Building, Hutt City Council, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on
Thursday 15 June 2006 commencing at 3.30pm

PRESENT: Mr L Roberts (Waiwhetu Stream Working Group) (until 5.35pm)

Greater Wellington Cr P Glensor (Chair from 4.12pm)
Cr S Greig
Cr G Evans (Alternate)

Hutt City Council Mayor DK Ogden (Chair until 4.12pm)
Cr VR Jamieson
Cr RW Styles (from 3.40pm)
Cr JMK Baird (Alternate) (from 4.12pm)
Cr G Barratt (Alternate) (until 5.11pm)

APOLOGIES: Apologies were received from Mr S MacCaskill, Mr T Puketapu and Cr C Laidlaw, and apologies for lateness from Cr RW Styles and Cr JMK Baird, and for early departure from Mayor D Ogden, Cr G Barratt and Mr L Roberts.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr R Hart, Chief Executive, HCC (part meeting)
Mr B Sherlock, Divisional Manager Utility Services, HCC
Mr G Dick, Divisional Manager Catchment Management, GWRC
Mr J Eyles, Project Manager, GWRC
Mr T Porteous, Biodiversity Co-ordinator, GWRC
Mr J Easter, URS New Zealand Ltd
Mr M Fischer, URS New Zealand Ltd
Ms J Lindesay, URS New Zealand Ltd
Mr B Fountain, SKM New Zealand Ltd
Mr C Martell, SKM New Zealand Ltd
Mr BS Collinge, Committee Advisor, HCC

PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. **APOLOGIES**

RESOLVED:

Minute No. WSAC 060301

“That the apologies from Cr C Laidlaw, Mr T Puketapu and Mr S Macaskill and the apologies for lateness from Cr JMK Baird and for early departure from Mayor D Ogden, Cr G Barratt and Mr L Roberts be accepted and leave of absence be granted.”

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no speakers under public comment.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

Minute No. WSAC 060302

“That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 April 2006, circulated pages WSAC 1- 6, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.”

4. **WAIWHETU STREAM FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT STUDY LOWER WAIWHETU OPTIONS REPORT** (N/03/21/01/RM50-15-11)

Report No. WSAC2006/3/1 by the Project Manager – circulated pages 1 – 16.

Mr J Easter of URS Ltd spoke to this report on the Waiwhetu Stream explaining the 3 Options put forward and recommended that Option 3 be investigated further, as this did not preclude the Committee from recommending Options 1 or 2 if that is what the Committee decided in future.

Responding to questions from members, Mr Easter explained the differences between stopbanks and floodwalls and said that some areas of the stream were more suited to the building of stopbanks, and others for the building of concrete flood walls depending on the area of land available. He went on to say that stopbanks and floodwalls block natural flowpaths of rainwater to the stream and so pump stations would be needed to drains areas behind them. Mr Easter commented that Option 3 has the least environmental and long term effects for the area but is also the most expensive.

Responding to questions about the cost of removing the contaminated sediments, Mr Easter said that the cost of clearing the sediments is estimated at \$6.5 M, but there are still some unknowns. He went on to say that Hutt City needs to address the issue of ongoing contaminated stormwater discharges in the Seaview–Gracefield industrial area.

Mr Roberts said that the issue of contamination is important and there needs to be a balance between the flooding issues and contamination removal.

Cr Styles noted that Hutt City had allocated funds to address the stormwater capacity problems in the Seaview-Gracefield area.

Responding to a question about affected householders, Mr Easter said about \$2M had been included in the estimates as compensation for the five residential property owners directly affected in the area.

Discussion took place on the need to provide a case to central government, when that should take place and the need to resolve the stormwater contamination issue at this stage before the flooding issue.

Responding to questions from members, Mr Easter said that the Waiwhetu and Awamutu Streams can be treated separately from an engineering perspective.

Responding to questions from members, Ms J Lindesay from URS Ltd outlined the consultation process that had taken place with both residents and the industrial users and stated that those consulted had indicated that the priority was to halt the flooding. Mr Easter clarified that there would be a formal consultation process at the planning stage in 12-18 months and that "resource groups" were being used to assist at this initial stage.

Regarding central government funding, Mr Easter said that the timing of any approach to the Ministry for the Environment was dependent on further refinement of the likely timing of works to address the contamination. This would be determined as part of further investigations into Option 3.

RESOLVED:

Minute No. WSAC 060303

"That the Committee:

- (i) receives the report and notes its contents;*
- (ii) notes that officers propose to proceed with further investigation of Option 3 (to preliminary design stage) as this work will provide the information to undertake further assessment of Options 1 and 2, if required;*
- (iii) notes that the preliminary design of Option 3 does not preclude the Committee from recommending either Options 1 or 2 as the preferred option for the Waiwhetu Stream Floodplain Management Strategy at the completion of the preliminary design stage (August 2006) and;*
- (iv) notes that all options provide the same opportunities to stage improvement works as required to address priorities and funding constraints."*

4.

5. WAIWHETU STREAM FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT STUDY AWAMUTU OPTIONS REPORT (N/03/21/01/RM50-15-11)

Report No WSAC2006/3/2 by the Project Manager – circulated pages 17 – 30.

Mr B Fountain of SKM Ltd spoke to this report. He said that Hutt Park was a major flood storage area for the Awamutu and a decision had to be made on what is an acceptable frequency for flooding Hutt Park.

RESOLVED:

Minute No. WSAC 060304

“That the Committee:

- (i) receives the report and notes its contents;*
- (ii) notes that Options 3 and 4 have the highest benefit cost ratios and lowest construction costs of the options considered;*
- (iii) notes that officers propose to proceed with further investigation of Option 3 (to preliminary design stage) as this work will provide the information to undertake further assessment of Option 4, if required; and*
- (iv) notes that the preliminary design of Option 3 does not preclude the Committee from recommending Option 4 as the preferred option for the Waiwhetu Stream Floodplain Management Strategy at the completion of the preliminary design stage (August 2006).”*

6. WAIWHETU STREAM FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT STUDY PROJECT MANAGER’S REPORT (N/03/21/01/RM50-15-11)

Report No. WSAC20063/3 by the Project Manager – circulated pages 31 – 41.

The Project Manager suggested that a workshop be held for the benefit of the Committee as there is so much information being generated in a very short space of time. He went on to say that phase two of the project starts next month. He agreed to pre-circulate copies of the presentation material to assist the Committee in understanding the issues.

RESOLVED:

Minute No. WSAC 060305

“That the Committee receives the report and notes its contents.”

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 5.46pm.

PG Glensor
CHAIR