

Report 15.642

Date 31 March 2016 File CCAB-14-49

Committee Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan

Hearing Panel

Author Margaret Meek, Senior Democratic Services Advisor

Process for considering submissions on the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan

1. Purpose

To brief the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan Hearing Panel on the process for considering submissions on the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan.

2. Background

At its meeting on 26 November 2015 the Hutt Valley Flood Management Subcommittee (HVFMS) established the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan Hearing Panel to consider and hear submissions, seek clarification from officers on technical matters and to provide recommendations to the Subcommittee on the plan.

2.1 Public Consultation

The establishment of this Panel follows two rounds of community consultation with the Pinehaven and Silverstream communities, undertaken by Greater Wellington Regional Council in 2014 and 2015 respectively. The Hearing completes the public consultation phase on the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan.

2.2 Principles of consultation

Six principles of consultation are set out in section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002. One of these principles is that views presented to a local authority should be accepted with an open mind, and should be given due consideration by the local authority, in making a decision.

It is consistent with best practice that members should be present for the substantial part of the hearing and deliberations in order to participate in the decision-making of the Panel.

If it is necessary that a member is absent for part of the hearing, it is also consistent with best practice that the member acquaint themselves with the matters raised by persons who presented in their absence.

3. Submissions received

Submissions were received from individual submitters and groups representing parts of the community. A copy of all submissions is provided separately.

3.1 Submissions received in 2014

Thirty-two submissions were received. A petition was received calling for an independent audit of the flood mapping and to save the Pinehaven Hills from development.

3.2 Submissions received in 2015

Six independent submissions were received. A submission was received from the 'Save Our Hills' group containing 364 pro-forma completed by members of the community.

4. Submissions process

4.1 Oral submissions

The purpose of this hearing is to hear oral submissions in support of written submissions made to GWRC. At the time of writing this paper 10 persons and three groups have requested that they be heard.

Ten minutes have been allocated to individual submitters appearing before the Panel. Thirty minutes have been allocated to persons speaking on behalf of a submission made by a community group.

If the individual or group does not use the full amount of time allocated to them, members may use the remainder of the time to ask the submitter questions.

A hearing schedule is currently being developed; it will be circulated to members, with a final copy available at the hearing. **Attachment 2** to this report contains the hearing schedule as at 31 March 2016.

4.2 Consideration of issues raised in submissions

The Panel must consider all written and oral submissions. There will be an opportunity to discuss the issues raised in both written and oral submissions once all persons have been heard.

4.3 Deliberations

The Panel must consider all the written and oral submissions it receives at this meeting and must decide its recommendations to the HVFMS on the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan. Deliberations will take place during the course of the panel hearing.

4.4 Process after consideration of feedback

The Panel Chair will prepare a report to the HVFMS setting out the panel's recommendations on the Pinehaven Stream Floodplain Management Plan.

5. Communication

The recommendations from the Panel will be reported to the HVFMS for its consideration.

6. The decision-making process and significance

The matter requiring decision in this report has been considered by officers against the requirements of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002.

6.1 Significance of the decision

Officers have considered the significance of the matter, taking into account the Council's significance policy and decision-making guidelines. Due to the procedural nature of this decision officers recommend that the matter be considered to have low significance.

Officers do not consider that a formal record outlining consideration of the decision-making process is required in this instance.

6.2 Engagement

Due to its procedural nature and low significance, no engagement on this matter has been undertaken.

7. Recommendations

That the Panel:

- 1. **Receives** the report.
- 2. *Notes* the content of the report.

Report prepared by: Report approved by:

Margaret MeekFrancis RyanSenior Advisor DemocraticManager

Services Democratic Services

Attachment 1: Terms of Reference

Attachment 2: Draft Hearing Schedule (as at 31 March 2016)