

File No: WGN130264 [32238]  
27 June 2013

Greater Wellington Regional Council Flood Protection Department  
Tonkin and Taylor Ltd  
P O Box 2083  
Wellington 6140

**For: Jenny Clafferty**

Dear Jenny

**Further information request under section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991**

---

<b><i>Applicant:</i></b>	<i>Greater Wellington Regional Council Flood Protection Department</i>
<b><i>Proposal:</i></b>	<i>Operations and maintenance activities for flood protection purposes in the Hutt River</i>
<b><i>Location:</i></b>	<i>Hutt River and specified tributaries</i>
<b><i>Resource consents required:</i></b>	<i>Water permits, land use consents and discharge permit.</i>

---

Thank you for your application, which we received on 5 April 2013.

I have reviewed your application the supporting information and information gained from a peer review. I need further information on your application so that I can better understand the effects of your proposal operations and maintenance activities for flood protection purposes its effects on the environment and how any adverse effects on the environment might be mitigated.

**Information requested<sup>1</sup>**

The outstanding information required is outlined below. It has been broken down into two broad areas that have been identified from the peer review undertaken by EOS Ecology and our “Questions and Answers” meeting on 11 June 2013:

---

<sup>1</sup> Any person who has been asked to provide further information under section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act), has the right to object to the consent authority in respect of that request for information under section 357A(1)(b) of the Act.  
HUTT RIVER S92 [1225665]

### **Proposed Environmental Code of Practice /Adaptive Management Regime:**

1. Please provide a draft Code of Practice for the proposed Flood Protection operations.

This document will allow an understanding of the proposed works methodology to date works and therefore the environmental effects.

2. Please provide a copy of the final report by Alton Perrie (referred to as “unfinished draft” in the application) yet to be submitted.

This is required to gain all information available at present regarding the effects of “wet extraction” and gravel extraction.

3. Please provide full details and description of options for the integration of native tree species with Willow for bank erosion protection purposes.

This is required to ascertain the potential for native species to be integrated as a means of bank erosion protection.

4. Please provide a detailed description of how rock rip rap will be managed in areas identified as being suitable Inanga habitat within the application area in the future.

This information is required to get an understanding of what engineering solutions are available or can be potentially developed to provide for improved Inanga habitat.

5. Please provide a description of the proposed frequency, timing and anticipated environmental effects anticipated from the dredging of the Lower Opahu Arm given the importance it has as fish habitat (in particular Inanga).

This information is necessary to understand the environmental effects of the proposed dredging.

6. Please provide an overview of proposed erosion and sediment control methodology for stream works, works on the banks of the river and tributaries that would lead to a discharge of sediment to the river. E.g. when diversions need to be undertake or works like River Rd/Royal Wellington Golf Club.

This is required to understand the methodology proposed to mitigate the effects of these works.

7. Please provide details of on-going mitigation proposals to improve the Stokes Valley Stream. This should include details on the ability to enhance the stream and ways of reducing the impact of mowing the berm.

This is required to gain an understanding as to how Flood Protection intends to mitigate the environmental effects of undertaking works in the stream and banks.

8. Please provide the proposed Draft Monitoring Plan that will form part of the Adaptive Management framework.

An understanding of the proposed monitoring is required at this stage of the consent process to gain an understanding of proposed monitoring criteria and methodology.

9. Please provide the details of the proposed “flood event” water quality monitoring that was discussed in the question and answer session on 11 June 2013.

This is required to get a full understanding of the proposed monitoring programme and links in with question eight above.

10. Please provide identification of areas where mitigation planting using native species has been undertaken in the application area and how this is seen to be suitable mitigation.

Further information as to how mitigation planting will be used in future is also required.

Reference is made in the application to mitigation planting using native species although no details of the location, type and function of this planting are provided.

11. Please provide a summary of the proposed exclusion periods for gravel extraction and bed re-contouring in relation to effects on aquatic ecology and recreational users.

12. Please confirm the proposed limits to the amount of bed re-contouring and gravel extraction proposed by Flood Protection per calendar year. This should detail both wet and dry extraction.

Information on proposed limits is required to gain an understanding of what scale of works is proposed and the resulting environmental effects. No limits are proposed in the application.

**Dave Cameron: Effects of Flood Protection Activities on Aquatic and Riparian Ecology in the Hutt, Waikanae, Otaki and Wainuiomata Rivers and the Application Report**

13. Please provide a set of plans with a key that clearly and accurately shows the total area affected by the application including all specified tributaries. If possible these maps should show the location of where data was gathered that was included in the report.

This is required to gain a clear understanding of where information was gathered in the application area and outside it.

14. Please provide full details and description of the composition of fish, periphyton, macrophyte, invertebrate communities and bird life in the application area compared to the unaffected area of the Hutt River.

This is required to gain a complete understanding of the existing environment and the differences between where flood protection works are taking place and the Hutt River where it is undisturbed by Flood Protection.

15. Please provide an analysis of water quality in the Hutt River during base flow conditions.

This is required to assess the effects or changes in water quality during works in the flowing channel. Works tend to occur during periods of lower flow as this is when machinery can safely operate. Therefore water quality data during base flows will provide a more relevant set of data for when machinery is creating disturbance.

16. Please provide an ecological description and details of the existing environment of the tributaries of the Te Mome Stream, Speedy's Stream, Stokes Valley Stream and Akatarawa River.

This is required to obtain a complete description of the existing environment in the application area.

17. Please provide a detailed assessment of environmental effects of channel and bank maintenance works on the tributary streams included in the application area.

The application does not include an assessment of environmental effects of Flood Protection works on this in these specified tributary streams. This information is required to allow a full understanding of the effects of the overall proposal for the Hutt River *including* tributaries.

### **Date information required**

Please provide the above information to me by 18 July 2013. If you are not able to supply the information requested<sup>2</sup> by this date, you must let us know in writing within this timeframe, either that you require additional time (at which time we will set a reasonable timeframe for you to provide the information) or that you refuse to provide the requested information. I appreciate it may take longer to address my requests depending on the complexity or amount of work required for each. It may be worth discussing timeframes or having a staged response to my request to ensure an understanding of how long it will take to respond.

We may decline your application if we consider we have insufficient information to enable us to determine your application, or if you do not respond to our request by 18 July 2013 or if you refuse to supply the information. If you consider you have a valid reason for refusing to provide the requested information, please contact me on the number below to discuss this further.

### **Processing of your application**

Your application has been placed on hold, and the statutory 'clock' stopped<sup>3</sup>, until such a time that either I receive the above information, receive written notice that you refuse to provide it, or the time period for providing the requested information has expired. As soon as one of these occurs, the statutory 'clock' will restart and I can continue processing your application.

---

<sup>2</sup> Under section 92A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

<sup>3</sup> Under section 88C of the Resource Management Act 1991

Please note that because additional information is required, your application may now take more time to process. If this is the case, you will be charged for the additional time. This will be recorded in our time breakdown.

Please feel free to contact me on 04 830 4139 if you have any questions or concerns.

Yours sincerely

**Andrew Dooney**  
Resource Advisor, Environmental Regulation

Cc: Tracy Berghan, Principal Planning Advisor, Greater Wellington Flood Protection Department.