



## PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Report PE 06.530  
Date 19 September 2006  
File N/03/18/01

Committee Hutt River Advisory Committee  
Authors Daya Atapattu, Project Engineer  
Peter O'Brien, Property Consultant

### **Boulcott/Hutt stopbank feasibility study: Land purchase and compensation**

#### **1. Purpose**

- To advise the Advisory Committee on land and compensation issues arising from the Boulcott/Hutt stopbank feasibility study.
- To seek the Advisory Committee endorsement to commence land purchase and compensation discussions with the Hutt and Boulcott golf clubs and Connolly Street land owners.

#### **2. Significance of the decision**

The matters for decision in this report do not trigger the significance policy of the Council or otherwise trigger section 76(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002.

#### **3. Exclusion of the public**

Grounds for the exclusion of the public under section 48(1) of the local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 are:

*That the public conduct of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists (i.e. to enable the Council to carry on negotiations without prejudice or disadvantage).*

*Interests protected:  
Greater Wellington Regional Council  
Golf Clubs and Private landowners*

#### **4. Background**

Most of the land on which a new Boulcott/Hutt stopbank is to be built is currently owned by the Hutt and Boulcott Golf Clubs. During Round 1

consultation, we had a number of meetings with representatives of both golf clubs to discuss issues associated with a new stopbank. We now believe that the golf clubs would accept a new stopbank through the golf courses provided that it is well integrated into the golf course design and that the clubs are adequately compensated for the disruption. The clubs prefer to retain land ownership with easements granted to GWRC.

In the Safeway section, modifications required at Connolly Street will affect access to a number of private properties south of the existing stopbank. We are yet to consult these property owners on this specific issue.

## 5. Hutt Golf Club section

The Hutt Golf course is generally laid out in a north/south direction, being the same direction the stopbank must run. This is beneficial to the project as golf can be played from high ground to low ground and from low ground to high ground, but for safety reasons is not able to be played over high ground. The Hutt golf course is therefore set out ideally for a stopbank to be designed which will not require golf to be played over the stopbank.

The Hutt golf course has been flooded several times recently from the Hutt River causing flood damage and disruption to golfing activities. The club expects the proposed new stopbank to provide protection to parts of the golf course.

Prior to the consultation process, the Hutt Golf Club's preference was to have the stopbank constructed beneath Harcourt Werry Drive which would achieve optimum flood protection for the Club and minimise disruption to golfing activities. That stance has since been modified and we now believe that the Club would consider a stopbank well integrated into the golf course with the club adequately compensated for disruption.

In this section, the proposed 'Blue' stopbank provides a sustainable low cost solution. This will be a low stopbank/floodwall option with minimal disruption to the golf course. However, this option will not provide any flood protection to the Hutt golf course. Construction of a low level stopbank on the western boundary of the golf course, in addition to the 'Blue' stopbank will provide protection to the golf course from frequent flooding while providing 440 year standard protection to the residential areas. The table below gives a breakdown of the estimated compensation and mitigation costs for each option in the Hutt golf course section.

Description	Red \$'000s	Green \$'000s	Blue \$'000s
Engineering costs	7,115	6,010	4,155
Golf course surfacing (Greens, Tees etc)	510	865	420
Disruption costs	675	1,125	225
Low stopbank			1,300
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,300</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>6,100</b>

## 6. Boulcott Golf Club

The Boulcott Golf course layout is generally at right angles to the direction in which a new stopbank must run. The Boulcott golf course therefore causes a fundamental problem in establishing a new stopbank through the golf course that will enable the golf course to continue and remain viable.

The Boulcott Golf course has a total area of 10.75 hectares. Out of this, the Boulcott Golf Club owns 8.35 hectares and GWRC owns the balance 2.4 hectares.

The Boulcott Golf Club occupies the Council land under a licence which runs for a term of 9 years from 01 April 1989 and possessed one right of renewal of nine years with final expiry 31 March 2007. The licence specifically excludes the Golf Club from all rights to compensation.

For the golf course to remain viable, GWRC would need to commit to make its land available to the Club for the long term and a 'golf friendly', 'Blue' or 'Red' option will need to be adopted. A 'Blue' option, which will be a 3 to 4 metre high stopbank, will be expensive and will have major impacts on the adjacent residential properties from Hathaway Avenue to Connolly Street. A 'golf friendly' Red option will encroach into the primary river corridor and is not favoured.

In the option evaluation the 'Engineering' options, 'Red' and 'Green' score high for this section of the stopbank. These two options follow a route on the common boundary of the two golf courses and then on the GWRC land of the Boulcott golf course. If the land is available, a better option is to construct a gently curving stopbank following a route diagonally across the golf course. This option would cost \$5.0 million including an amount of \$2 million for purchasing the golf course.

The table below gives a breakdown of costs.

Description	Red \$'000s	Green \$'000s	Blue \$'000s	Golf course purchase \$'000s
Engineering costs	7,200	7,400	7,110	3,000
Golf course surfacing (Greens, Tees etc)	340	480	770	
Disruption costs	60	120	120	
Golf course purchase				2,000
Total	7,600	8,000	8,000	5,000

A decision has to be made between a 'golf friendly' \$8 million option, which in essence commits GWRC land to Golf Club use and an 'engineering' \$5 million option. We believe preference should be given to the golf course purchase option.

## 7. Safeway Section

In the Safeway section, the 'Green' option scores highest in the option evaluation. This option will affect the access to a number of private properties as Connolly Street needs to be raised to pass over the new stopbank.

An alternative route does exist through the south rear of the TransPower substation site with the construction of a 3.5 metre high concrete flood wall. This is not favoured because of the height of the wall, the questionable foundation and the generally unknown robustness of the flood wall system in the New Zealand context. Inspection of the Hutt District Plan also revealed the TransPower site is a noted Pa site possessing significant cultural and archaeological resources. The costs for this option are likely to increase when the foundation costs are known.

The table below gives a breakdown of costs.

Description	Red (flood wall) \$'000s	Green \$'000s	Blue \$'000s
Engineering costs	4,550	3,695	3,830
Property purchase	50	1,605	2,270
Total	4,600	5,300	6,100

The cost estimates for the favoured "Green" option include a budget \$1.6 million for some property acquisition if owners are able to demonstrate a measurable loss in value. It is recommended that owners be offered council purchase rather than compensation. Council will be free to resell the properties on work completion. Most or all of the purchase cost should be able to be recovered.

## 8. Communication

Direct communications with the community on this report are not appropriate at this stage.

## 9. Recommendations

*That the Committee:*

1. **Receives** the report.
2. **Notes** the content of the report.
3. **Endorses** the project team consulting with Connolly Street land owners potentially affected by road raising
4. **Endorses** the project team proceeding to enter detailed, but without prejudice, discussions with the Hutt Golf Club to obtain their approval for the 'Blue' option

5. *Notes that discussion with the Hutt Golf Club would include the offer of a low stopbank for protecting the golf course from minor floods*
6. *Endorses the project team proceeding to enter detailed, but without prejudice, discussions with the Boulcott Golf Club to assist in refining the stopbank alignment through the Boulcott golf course*

Report prepared by:

**Daya Atapattu**  
Project Engineer

Report prepared by:



**Peter O'Brien**  
Property Consultant

Report approved by:

**Geoff Dick**  
Divisional Manager,  
Catchment Management

Public excluded