

Report 2016.146
Date 8 April 2016
File CCAB-14-126

Committee Hutt Valley Flood Management Subcommittee
Author Cr Sandra Greig, Chair, Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan Hearing Panel

Report of the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan Hearing Panel

1. Purpose

This report outlines the deliberations and recommendations of the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan Hearing Panel (the Panel) on the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan, arising from the consideration of written and oral submissions and other feedback.

2. Background

At its meeting on 22 July 2015, the Hutt Valley Flood Management Subcommittee (HVFMS) resolved to release the Proposed Pinehaven Floodplain Management Plan (Proposed Plan) for a second round of public consultation, including the publication of maps amended to differentiate freeboard.

The Proposed Plan incorporated amendments recommended by the audit, which was completed after the 2014 consultation on the initial Proposed Pinehaven Floodplain Management Plan (Initial Proposed Plan).

On 26 November 2015, the HVFMS resolved to establish a hearing panel to consider written and oral feedback on both the Proposed Plan and Initial Proposed Plan. The Subcommittee also adopted terms of reference for the Panel.

Submissions were invited on both the Initial Proposed Plan and Proposed Plan. Submissions were received online (by online form), email and mail.

Submitters who made a submission on the Initial Proposed Plan were contacted in 2015 to advise them of the Proposed Plan and their opportunity to update or amend their submission on the Initial Proposed Plan.

In 2014, 32 submissions were received. A petition was received calling for an independent audit of the flood mapping and to save the Pinehaven Hills from development.

In 2015, seven submissions were received, including one from the ‘Save Our Hills’ group containing 364 pro-forma completed by members of the community.

The Panel received copies of all feedback responses and a summary of submissions received (Report 16.140). The summary report outlined the consultation process and oral feedback received by officers at public meetings.

The Panel met on 7 April 2016 to hear 13 oral presentations and consider all written feedback.

3. Feedback received – summary

Key issues raised are:

There is support across the community for structural works to continue as outlined in the Floodplain Management Plan. However, the community now wants design certainty around what the works will look like and how they will function, particularly for directly affected landowners. Overall, land owners want the design certainty so they can continue to plan their lives on their properties. It was requested that any structural works undertaken take into account the bird corridor and the impact that structural works may have on increasing pests along the stream. The Panel was also asked to consider the impacts of structural work on security for residents.

The community wanted clearer guidance on definitions in the Flood Management Plan and for all of the maps recommended through the Beca Carter Ferner Independent Audit to be included.

The stormwater runoff assumptions used for the hydraulic model were asked to be included in the Flood Management Plan.

Some submitters also found the formatting and quality of the maps used not good enough to provide clarity to the reader about what the flood hazard is and how it may affect their individual property.

The Pinehaven Progressive Association asked for a review of the approach to the district plan rules to be undertaken as they considered the approach to be inappropriate.

The Save our Hills submission asked for an additional Independent Audit to be undertaken in 2016.

4. Deliberations

The sections below outline the Panel’s deliberations on key issues raised by the feedback.

4.1 Structural impact

It was noted that the comments made in relation to the bird corridor and concern about an increase in pests will be considered at the design phase of the project. The Panel was assured that the potential impact on residents' security which may result from flood protection work in the area would also be considered at the design phase of the project (before work on the project commences).

4.2 Flood maps

The Panel was assured by officers that the flood model used in the Plan had been independently audited and had been determined to be fit for purpose. However, it was acknowledged that how the maps had been portrayed could, and should, be improved to enhance community understanding.

Officers advised that they would make the baseline information used to create the maps available to the Pinehaven community. Officers also advised that they were prepared to release additional new maps to the Pinehaven community covering a variety of scenarios.

4.3 Other matters

The Panel requested, and received, assurance from officers that the Plan recommends that UHCC's District Plan does not enable future residential developments to add to the flood risk that is already present for the Pinehaven community.

4.4 Recommendations

At the conclusion of its deliberations the Panel recommended the adoption of the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan, subject to officers reviewing the presentation of flood hazard maps for the purpose of enhancing community understanding of the Plan in consultation with the independent auditor and representatives of the Pinehaven community, and reporting the outcome of the review to this Subcommittee at the same time as the Subcommittee considers this report.

5. Communication

All submitters and key stakeholders will be advised by letter once the Plan has been approved by Council.

6. The decision-making process and significance

The subject matter of this report is part of a decision-making process that will lead to the Council making a decision of medium significance within the meaning of the Local Government Act 2002.

The process applied to date has involved the identification and detailed analysis of options, and identification of options for public consultation. This report outlines the process of consultation followed, the feedback received and the consideration of that feedback.

6.1 Engagement

In accordance with the significance and engagement policy, officers determined that the appropriate level of engagement is informing and consulting. The consultation and engagement activities undertaken were provided to the Panel in Report 16.140.

7. Recommendations

That the Subcommittee:

1. *Receives the report.*
2. *Notes the content of the report.*
3. *Endorses the recommendations of the Panel as set out in section 4.4 of this report.*

Report approved by:

Cr Sandra Greig
Chair, Pinehaven Floodplain
Management Plan Hearing
Panel