

HRFMP Consultation Database: Design Standard Phase

HRFMAC Version

Note: Key is located at the base of this schedule

Subs Code	Incoming Date	Submitter or Respondent	Topic	Submission Summary & Relief Sought	HRFMAC Report Coding
1	25/03/99	I Birdling 47 Aniseed Grove Upper Hutt	GR	Concern over gravel levels in the Hutt River. Suggests flooding problems are compounded by this.	1000
2	27/03/99 *20/07/99	M Kirby-Barr P O Box 48 006 Silverstream	O-P	Priority listing downgrades important objectives dealing with the protection of the environment. * Major responses to questions in newsletter 3: 2800 standard preferred since marginal costs are small. Implementation in 20 years preferred and residual risk and rates implications were accepted. Additionally, the Hutt River environment should also be maintained to a high standard.	1000
3	29/03/99	M Aitken 4 Godley Street Lower Hutt	M / OT	Wishes to receive schedule of HRFMAC meetings and associated agendas.	1000
4	30/03/99	D Lee 4 Pharazyn Street Lower Hutt	SW / GR / S	The submission addressed the following matters: - Surface water at Block Road and Pharazyn Street. - Back-up of flood water into the SW network. - Pumping suggested at William & Marden Street. - Selective gravel extraction requested. - Flood defence at Block Road suggested.	1000
9	6/04/99	C & M Essery 6 Willoughby Street Lower Hutt	SST	Concerned expressed about flooding in the Opahu Stream (Black Creek).	1000

Subs Code	Incoming Date	Submitter or Respondent	Topic	Submission Summary & Relief Sought	HRFMAC Report Coding
10	6/04/99	D Waechter Hutt Valley Angling Club	E	Supports the objective regarding enhancement of the river corridor. Concerned about riparian plantings in especially in the Upper Hutt reaches of the river.	1000
13	8/04/99	L C Little 73 Hyde Street Wainuiomata	S / O	Concern that WRC is focussing on 'small areas' in terms of flood protection, while other areas receive little attention. Value for money could be in question. 'More emphasis needs to be placed on flood prevention/ protection' rather than environmental enhancement. The submitter also suggests that protection may be 'undersized' in view of 'increasing rainfalls'.	1000
14	9/04/99 *20/08/99	E M Parnham Parnham and Associates 337A Waterloo Road Lower Hutt	DS / S / NS / RP	Submitter questioned whether data used by WRC sufficiently accounted for changing weather patterns, and the quality of stopbanks and their stability. Road upgrades act to prevent the drainage of flood waters. The gravel build-up issue was also commented on. * Requested the following: 1. 2300 standard preferred as is the use of a priority list to determine works. 2. Completing the work in 5 - 10 years, and then paying it off over 40 years. Submitter appears to also support raising of Ava rail bridge, and presents an alternative approach to calculating the NPV of saved damages.	1000
28	2/07/99	S Cotsilinis 91A Hamilton Road Wellington Wellington Fly Fishers Assoc.	O /EF	Commended WRC for ensuring that 'all aspects of the Hutt River Floodplain Management Plan are clearly understood' in Newsletter 2. The Plan (Objectives) do not appear to contain a commitment towards recreational use. Submitter also suggests that flooding and flood protection measures have in recent years reduced the quality of the sports fish fishery.	1000

Subs Code	Incoming Date	Submitter or Respondent	Topic	Submission Summary & Relief Sought	HRFMAC Report Coding
29	14/07/99	S J Constable 93 Lord Street Lower Hutt	M	Satisfied with the information presented in Newsletter 2.	1000
31	16/07/99	H Green Milcourt Flats 3-39 Mills Street Lower Hutt	P	Concerned with the frequency of flood events in recent times, as the submitter lives close to the river near Melling. Commends the Regional Council for addressing the flood issue.	1000
33	23/07/99	M Hanley 28 Buckley Street Alicetown	DS / EF / E / NS	The submitter preferred a 2800 cumec standard, given available resources and future increased risk in response to climate change. Additionally, works should be completed in the 'shortest practicable' time frame, because expediency should be prioritised once a decision on the standard is made, and early completion of works will maximise time that the higher standard is 'operative against the flood risk'. A concern was expressed that environmental considerations can sometimes be 'given an undue emphasis over the need for flood protection'. The submitter also supports the increased emphasis on managing the residual risk, stating that residents must 'maintain a realistic appreciation of flood risks'.	1000
37	30/07/99	H Cook P O Box 31 306 Lower Hutt	DS / C	Prefers a 2800 cumec standard. The cost to rate payers is outweighed by the costs of not having protection. Passed on thanks for receiving newsletters.	1000

Subs Code	Incoming Date	Submitter or Respondent	Topic	Submission Summary & Relief Sought	HRFMAC Report Coding
38	5/08/99	J Berridge Western Ward Committee Lower Hutt City Council PO Box 31 912 Lower Hutt	DS / S / NS / SW	<p>Preference is for a 2800 cumec standard.</p> <p>Manor Park: Floor levels of houses most at risk need to be surveyed in relation to flood levels; adequate emergency management planning for those properties is required; and all buildings are checked in relation to flood hazard vulnerability.</p> <p>Lower Belmont: Landowners will 'need to determine their own solutions' , and houses may need to make way for potential stopbanking; and urgent river edge protection is required at Owen and Carter Streets.</p> <p>Firth Park: Pleased to see removal of Firth Park.</p> <p>Stormwater Flooding: Additional pumping and a higher level of emergency management may be required. Congratulated the Regional Council for their approach to consultation and ongoing commitment to flood protection.</p>	1000
39	5/08/99	B Reile 59 Conolly Street Boulcott Lower Hutt	DS / S	<p>The submitter preferred a 2300 cumec standard, to be implemented over a 20 year period.</p> <p>Wished to have input to future plans regarding stopbank upgrading adjacent to the submitter's property, which may include a focus on aesthetic concerns.</p>	1000

Subs Code	Incoming Date	Submitter or Respondent	Topic	Submission Summary & Relief Sought	HRFMAC Report Coding
40	6/08/99 *23/08/99	A Fricker 30 Aketea Road Petone Lower Hutt	DS / SO / NS / RP/ C	Submitter stated that the status quo option would be unacceptable, with a preference for the 2300 cumec standard conducted over a short time period. However, there should be a focus on options which minimise the risk at the each location, as is proposed for Belmont. Additionally, only a 'small proportion of properties in Hutt City would be affected by flooding'. Alternative options including a floodway linking the Taita reach to the Waiwhetu Stream was suggested, which would affect properties in that area but could also result in a lower total damages for the floodplain. Criticism was directed towards present development which occurs 'in full knowledge of the risks' and the costs of risk prevention may be carried by people largely unaffected by the flooding risk. Scenarios relating to a catastrophic scenario for each option were not presented at the Belmont public meeting. These are necessary in order to help form perceptions of risk. Potential scenarios are presented by the submitter. General satisfaction with the consultation process was expressed.	1000
41	6/08/99	J S Reid <i>no address provided</i>	DS / NS	Preference is for a 2800 cumec standard, being implemented within 20 years. The potential rate increase is acceptable as are the risks linked to the design standard preference. However, residual risk should be minimised where possible. A balance between protection and environmental considerations should be sought.	1000

Subs Code	Incoming Date	Submitter or Respondent	Topic	Submission Summary & Relief Sought	HRFMAC Report Coding
42	18/08/99	G Evans 14B Bloomfield Tce Lower Hutt	DS/ S / C / EO	A preference was expressed for the 2800 cumec standard, to be implemented within 20 years. Flood protection works 'need upgrading with some urgency', and a programme of works should be finalised before 30 June 2000 with the highest priority works to be completed within 5 years. That will help to ensure community acceptance of the impact on rates. Climate change issues should be ignored in consideration of the options. Improvement of access to the river environment also needs to be prioritised. The submitter commended WRC for consultation undertaken, and good communication will need to continue.	1000
43	18/08/99	Upper Hutt City Council	DS / SO	Recommendations from Council are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upgrade all bridges to meet the 2800 cumec standard. - A 2800 level of protection should be maintained where it presently exists. - Stopbanks at Totara Park and Whirinaki Cres be upgraded to the 2300 and 2800 standards, respectively. - Flood protection works in the Gemstone Drive area to be upgraded to the 2300 standard. - Programme should be implemented within 25 years. - Council will support WRC in advocating to Transit NZ an upgrading of the Moonshine Bridge to 2300. 	1000
44	19/08/99	G & M Reid 50 Mills Street Lower Hutt	DS	Submitter seeks a 2300 cumec standard, to be implemented within 20 years.	1000
46	23/08/99	J Hudson <i>for</i> McDonald's System of New Zealand c/- 14 Advance Way Albany Auckland	DS	A 2300 cumec standard would be preferred. A small additional cost to ratepayers compared to the 1900 option indicates a favourable Benefit/Cost ratio.	1000

Subs Code	Incoming Date	Submitter or Respondent	Topic	Submission Summary & Relief Sought	HRFMAC Report Coding
47	23/08/99	J Coote 22 Mahoe Street Lower Hutt	DS	Submitter expressed a preference for the 2300 cumec standard, to be implemented within 20 years. Rating implications are acceptable as are risk implications.	1000
48	23/08/99	J Begg IGNS P O Box 30 368 Lower Hutt	DS / RCH	A considerable number of points were raised by the submitter. The key issues are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A balance needs to be established against the risks posed by all hazards. - The value of large expenditure on structural works without first assessing survivability in earthquakes and post quake effectiveness is questionable. - Suggested balance would involve implementing the 2300 cumec standard with additional expenditure on the slope and seismic hazard. - Risk exposure for the Wellington urban area to a major earthquake is more significant than for large flooding events. - The effect of subsidence and slope changes on drainage could be evaluated. 	1000
50	29/08/99	B E Thomas	DS	The 2300 cumec standard is preferred. Associated structural measures should be carried out in a manner to allow for a potential upgrade to a 2800 standard. In addition, bridges should be upgraded on replacement to the 2800 standard. Climate change is viewed 'too nebulous to be considered a significant factor'.	1000
51	30/08/99	B & B Yeoman 53 Bridge Road Akatarawa Upper Hutt	DS / SO	Structural options including stopbanks and river realignment, need to be considered for the Bridge Rd area. A rise in rates is supported provided Bridge Road residents are afforded 'some protection'. All works under the Plan should be spread over a 50 year period. The submitter prioritises river management over environmental enhancement.	1000

Subs Code	Incoming Date	Submitter or Respondent	Topic	Submission Summary & Relief Sought	HRFMAC Report Coding
53	2/09/99	N & P Dewhurst 42 Mabey Road Lower Hutt	DS	A 2800 standard is preferred, implemented in the shortest possible time. The submitter expresses no difficulty with rating implications.	1000
58	7/09/99	N & A Clarke 5 Agate Grove Birchville Upper Hutt	DS / S / EF / NS	Preferred a structural option as opposed to a non-structural option to minimise risk to the submitter's property. The option of raising the Akatarawa Road 'significantly to prevent breaching the channel in the Twin Bridges reach of the river was favoured. Positive comments regarding the consultation process were passed on.	1000

Key : Design Standard Phase

Form of Submission/Response	Topic	Acknowledged How/When
P = by phone E = e-mail L = letter F = fax	P = plan general C = consultation DS = design standard S/O = structural OR options EF = environmental effects CM/O = catchment management OR options O = proj. objectives O-P = obj. - priority list NS/O = non-structural OR options E/O = environmental opportunity OR options SW = stormwater GR = gravel and river management B = bridges RCH = river corridor hazards RP = risk perception M = mail list SST = small streams OT = Other	How = E, L, F When = date

