

Report 2015.547  
Date 28 October 2015  
File N/03/18/21

Committee Hutt Valley Flood Management Subcommittee  
Author Cr Sandra Greig, Chair, Hutt River City Centre Upgrade Project Hearing Panel

## Report of the Hutt River City Centre Upgrade Project Hearing Panel

### 1. Purpose

This report outlines the deliberations and recommendations of the Hutt River City Centre Upgrade Project Hearing Panel (the Panel) on the Hutt River City Centre Project, arising from the consideration of written and oral submissions and other feedback.

### 2. Background

In June 2015, following a recommendation from the Hutt Valley Flood Management Subcommittee (the Subcommittee), Greater Wellington Regional Council approved two selected options for the City Centre Project to proceed to community consultation.

The options were released for public consultation on 30 July 2015 with feedback sought from the community by 14 September 2015.

On 24 September 2015, the Subcommittee resolved to establish a hearing panel to consider written and oral feedback from the land owners and other interested and affected parties.

In total 279 written responses were received. The Hearing Panel received copies of all 279 feedback responses and the summary report 'Community feedback on Integrated Concept Design options' (Report 2015.506). The summary report outlined the consultation process and oral feedback received by officers at various meetings and public displays, along with comments from officers on the outcomes.

The Hearing Panel met on 15 October 2015 to hear 28 oral presentations and consider all written feedback. Of the 28 presenters, 26 provided written feedback through the consultation process. Two landowners who had not

provided written feedback spoke at the hearing. Of the 79 landowners whose properties maybe required for the project 43 provided written responses.

### 3. Options A and B

The two options for community consultation were selected following the evaluation of ten Integrated Concept Design Options investigated by the project Working Group.

Both Options A and B include building the flood defences on a widened river corridor between Ewen and Melling Bridges and at Mills Street to provide and maintain the Hutt River Floodplain Management Plan (HRFMP) recommended 440 year flood standard over a long period of time with allowances for the predicted climate change impacts on the flood frequencies.

Option A is a one step process where the flood defences on the wider corridor will be completed in one step.

Option B is a staged approach, where the flood defences on the City Centre side will be constructed to the final standard but the stopbanks and channel widening on the Marsden Street side will be initially constructed within the existing corridor and widened at a later date. The works from Melling to Kennedy Good Bridge are the same for either option. The newly constructed flood defences from Ewen to Melling on the Marsden Street side will have to be moved to the wider corridor in around 20 years' time to maintain the recommended flood standard. This staged approach will involve transfer costs because of the necessity to demolish some of the initial works, including channel edge protections and the stopbanks but will reduce the initial expenditure requirements.

### 4. Feedback received – summary

Of the 279 total respondents, 89% provided a preference for Option A or B, with 11% respondents not indicating a preference for either of these options or not providing a specific preference.

The preferred option of the 279 respondents was Option A (one step) with 74% identifying this as their preferred option. Officers have also reported that oral feedback received at various meetings, displays and open days had a strong preference for Option A.

Other key feedback questions relate to the Making Places components, linkages and Melling Bridge replacement. These components are common to both options A and B.

The table below provides a summary of feedback received on the key questions. A detailed analysis of the feedback received was provided to the Panel in Report 2015.506.

Question		Support %
Option Preference	Option A (one step)	74%
	Option B (two steps)	15%
Parking areas within the corridor		59%

Daily Street Promenade	59%
Replacing Melling Bridge with a Gateway Bridge	43%
Pedestrian/Cycleway Bridge	64%

## 5. Deliberations

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

### 5.1 Design Standard and Climate Change

The design standard for the proposed City Centre flood protection works was set in 2001 through the Hutt River Floodplain Management Plan (HRFMP) following an extensive community consultation process. The 440 year design standard set for the urban areas includes an allowance for the predicted climate change.

Other options, including dams in the upper catchment and diversions, have been investigated during the development of the HRFMP and found not feasible for the Hutt catchment. The gravel extraction is used to manage flood events usually contained within the river channel, but major floods cannot be managed by gravel extraction alone.

Information from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) fourth (2008) report confirms that climate change is causing increased rainfall intensities impacting on flood frequencies. The Ministry for Environment (MfE) guidelines, based on IPCC 4, for the Local Government on ‘Preparing for Climate Change (2008)’, direct councils to make allowances for an increase in rainfall intensity due to climate change impacts. The proposed work makes allowance for the climate change recommended by MfE. The IPCC 5 report is now available, though MfE has not yet updated their guides to allow for this. The IPCC 5 report primarily indicates that climate change is more certain, will occur more quickly and possibly to a greater level.

## 6. Project Costs and Rating Impacts

The total estimated costs of the two options in current dollars, excluding GST, are:

Option A one step process	\$143 m
Option B Step One	\$114 m
Step Two	\$68 m

Officers have estimated discounted costs on the basis of possible timelines for each option and in most cases the total discounted costs of Option B are higher than those of Option A. A detailed breakdown was provided to the Panel in Report 2015.506. The rating impacts on Lower Hutt City and the regional properties are dependent on the project costs, implementation timelines and the

cost share between the three agencies and other parties. The rating impacts will be estimated during the next stage when more accurate information will be available for the various project components.

### **6.1 Land potentially required for improvements**

It has been identified that a part or the full extent of 118 properties (79 land owners) are potentially required for the proposed works. Where a part of a property is required the exact extent will be known only on completion of design in 2016. During consultation, the affected land owners have been advised that Council, once an option is selected, will consider any offers to sell from the affected landowners. Of the 43 affected property owners who responded, 28 preferred Option A and 13 preferred Option B.

### **6.2 Matters to be considered during the planning and design stage**

The matters to be addressed during the next stage of the design include:

- Land purchase and impacts on the remaining businesses on the western bank and options for the surplus land on the eastern side of Pharazyn Street
- Preparing plans showing the accurate extent of land required for the flood protection works and other project components
- Loss of recreational areas between KGB and Melling and mitigation options
- Completing the Melling Intersection Business case process, including the impacts on the Melling Rail link
- Careful consideration given in the design to reduce the impacts on public and private parking areas affected by the design
- Developing design and planning provisions for incorporating new Daly Street development with the stopbank and promenade. Consider access linkages for a range of users.

## **7. Communication**

The project received wide publicity through the local and national newspapers. The community feedback process involved an extensive communication and consultation process. All land owners whose land is potentially required for the project and key stakeholders will be advised by letter once the Council approves an option. The wider community will be informed through media releases.

## **8. 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.

### **8.1 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 2015.506.

## **9. Recommendations**

*That the Subcommittee:*

- 1. **Receives** the report.*
- 2. **Notes** the content of the report.*
- 3. **Recommends** that Council proceeds with the preliminary design, costing and implementation timelines to be prepared for Option A.*
- 4. **Asks** officers to consider issues raised by feedback providers on all project components when refining the integrated design for the project.*

Report approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ :

**Cr Sandra Greig**  
Chair, Hutt River City Centre  
Upgrade Project Hearing  
Panel