

**BEFORE A HEARING PANEL
CONSTITUTED BY UPPER HUTT CITY
COUNCIL**

**PPC55
Gabites Block**

IN THE MATTER OF:

an application by **Maymorn Developments Ltd**
for a private change to the Upper Hutt District
Plan (Private Plan Change 55)

Summary Statement of: David Patrick Wilson

Acting on behalf of: Upper Hutt City Council

Summary Statement of David Patrick Wilson on behalf of Wellington City Council

1. My full name is David Patrick Wilson. My qualifications and experience are in my statement of evidence dated 22nd September 2022.
2. My summary statement is both a summary of the key points and an addendum to my statement of evidence.
3. I visited the Site on Friday 14th October.
4. I also attended a joint meeting on 29th September 2022 with the Applicant's expert witness, Mr Alan Blyde and his modeller Dr Steve Joynes to discuss the submitted Floodplain Assessment report.

Stormwater Flood Hazard

5. I have reviewed the Floodplain Assessment Report dated September 2022 by Dr Steven Joynes which is appended to Mr Blyde's evidence. I can confirm that Wellington Water's Senior Hydraulic Modeller has reviewed the model and that in principle and in terms of methodology the model meets Wellington Water's expectations. However, this assessment and report are only intended to *"determine the extent of flooding of the site and any channel upgrade requirements."*
6. The model does not assess the off-site impact on flood hazard of PPC55. The model assumes each Lot and the roads have on-site stormwater mitigation and does not assess the impact of increased impervious in terms of increased runoff volume. Nor does the model assess the possible impacts of changes in peak flow timing.
7. Therefore, I disagree with My Blyde's statement in paragraph 84 of his evidence that floodplain assessment *"proved that peak flow stormwater discharge from the Site could be controlled to ensure there is no increased downstream peak discharge, post development. "*
8. The floodplain assessment report does include a parallel modelling exercise to produce concept sizing of detention ponds to achieve hydraulic neutrality. However, these ponds are not integrated into the floodplain assessment model.
9. The possible downstream flood hazard impacts from the PPC55 resulting from increased imperviousness, earthworks within the existing floodplain and culvert upgrades are increased runoff flows and volumes and changes the timing of peak flows.

10. As stated in my evidence, it is my opinion that it is best practice that at Plan Change stage of a project, a flood hazard assessment would include an assessment of the off-site impact of the proposed plan change.
11. However, I agree with My Blyde that given the area of suitable land on the Site adjacent to the existing stream network, it is possible that any additional mitigation measures over and above those required for hydraulic neutrality could provide on the land available.
12. Therefore, given the Site's topography, I believe that for PPC55 the downstream flood hazard impact assessment can be provided at the subdivision stage.
13. The Floodplain Assessment Report shows that through earthworks and culvert upgrades, the extent of the existing floodplain can be greatly reduced and therefore, any flood hazard layers based on the existing flood extents would be made obsolete. Provision DEV3-NH-P2 requires appropriate overland flowpath protection and minimum habitable floor levels based on a post-development flood assessment at the subdivision stage. These controls are equivalent to those typically imposed on ponding and overland flow flood hazard areas.
14. Tthe model also demonstrates the importance of the stream corridors to achieve this flood plain reduction outcome. It also indicates that there is only a limited probability for the identified Stream Corridors to change as part of the envisaged subdivision and development of the Site.
15. Therefore, I consider that these stream corridors need to be protected from activities that may impact their hydraulic capacity. I consider that the stream corridor provisions proposed combined with a map showing stream corridors 5m on either side of stream centrelines. The 5m distance on either side of the centreline is the standard approach adopted by Wellington Water for these types of flood hazard areas. This approach has been used to develop the Flood Hazard - Stream Corridor overlays in the proposed Porirua and Wellington District Plans.
16. I consider a map based on the centrelines of the streams shown in Envelope Engineering drawing 1594-01 PC-94 Rev PC-2 dated 30th September 2022 would be appropriate.

Stormwater Management Plan

17. As stated in my evidence it is my opinion that best practice is for a site wide Stormwater Management Plan to be provided in support of a plan change request.
18. However, as per my evidence, I accepted that aside from the Flood

Hazard assessment which is discussed above, the stream health and water sensitive design aspects of stormwater management could be provided at the subdivision consent stage.

19. This opinion relies on provisions requiring Stormwater Management Plan for the entire Gabites Block Development Area with the first subdivision, along with supporting provisions that detail the outcomes Stormwater Management Plan must address. For example, identification and protection of overland flowpaths.
20. I consider that the current provisions achieve this outcome.

Servicing Wastewater

21. During discussions with the Applicant in July 2021 before the lodgement of PPC55, Wellington Water indicated that the existing downstream network does not have the capacity to manage the predicted development flows in wet weather conditions.
22. Storage with a smart control system linked to downstream constraints would be required, and the proposed provisions now require this outcome.

Servicing Water Supply

23. During discussions with the Applicant in July 2021 before the lodgement of PPC55, Wellington Water also indicated that the water supply network had no spare capacity (both in terms of pressure and storage) to service the proposed development.
24. Therefore, the only option for water supply for the Site is on lot water supply. Wellington Water's Wellington Water's Regional Standard for Water Services Version 3.0 December 2021 (RSWS) is silent regarding on site water supply requirements. Therefore, the on site water storage will need to meet the requirements of Upper Hutt City Council's Code of practice for Land Development 1998 (COP) and the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.
25. I am satisfied that a minimum volume of potable water supply storage of 37,800L which required by the current provisions.
26. The current provisions also require compliance with the water storage requirements of SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.
27. The provisions also allow connection to a reticulated water supply network, enabling connections to an upgraded water supply network when this work is completed.

Summary

28. Based on the current version of the provisions at this stage, it is my opinion that the plan change should be approved. This is because the matters raised in my evidence have been addressed through new and/or revised provisions.



David Patrick Wilson

18th October 2022