

Transcript

March 28, 2025, 9:34PM

Paul Thomas

- Francis Holdings, as will be appreciated by the Council, has had the benefit of reasonably close liaison with the Council through the evolution and preparation of this plan change, which has been very helpful, I think in terms of the storm water matter the concerns we have is in relation to the imposition of permeability standards, when we think that a more flexible approach should be taken. We think that storm water should be sorted out at the subdivision stage.

We are obviously well aware of the very clear proposal for a much larger outfall through the river Stop Bank. We see that as absolutely crucial to enabling redevelopment of this area and are keen to understand Horizon's position on that outfall, because it's not entirely clear from their submission.

We think given there is a physical solution to the stormwater constraint with that outfall that permeability stuff is pretty uncertain given the nature of the land we're dealing with as it's totally impermeable at the moment. It's always likely to be positive in terms of conversion to residential, but should be driven at the subdivision stage, and we think if the outfall is consented and built, there isn't a need for that imposition of permeability standards.

If for any reason it's not built then all options should be on the table in terms of how a first stage or an early stage or a stage prior to construction of the outfall or whatever could be advanced and that should be around a stormwater management plan that achieves the required standards, not just relying on permeability.

For example, Francis Holdings are very conscious that they have a multi \$1,000,000 investment to make before they even start on redevelopment through demolition of buildings, clean-up of contaminated land etc. So, constraints on potential purchases of sections that aren't necessary or justified. I really do think of something to be avoided in terms of feasibility of this whole redevelopment.

In the work I've done, post the last pre-hearing I actually proposed that some of the provisions be changed and I don't know if that version of provisions have been amended available to Horizons.

I basically said delete a lot of the stormwater stuff out of the residential section in terms of policies and change the policies in the subdivision section to it is proposed to build an outfall that will meet the 200 year plus climate change standard and

should that not be possible, yes there is a need for a stormwater management plan that would address the storm water problem.

It's possible, for example, that once the site's cleared and a first stage of development is advanced you might stick a jolly great tank on the rest of the site or something as an interim measure or something like that.

Because you're dealing with a dominant landowner that's got, you know, 80% of the land asset for this redevelopment it does generate some options should that be necessary.

Francis Holding submission and further submission is that we think Horizons are very supportive of this plan change, but we just really want to be clear that the discharge outfall is a consentable proposition from Horizons point of view, otherwise, we're kind of wasting our time going down that track.

Jono

none of those provisions haven't been provided to the Council or Horizon support We're happy to provide them those professional settings that you gave us, you have probably just through that described pretty, pretty accurately sort of sort of what's in those provisions in terms of Francis Holdings position and changes to the plan change.

I'd be very happy if they are shared as absolutely.

Horizons. (Leanna)

From a Horizon's point of view. there's two parts to it: There is the planning element regarding the one plan and some objectives and policies that have come in recently around guiding Urban Development that were made operative at the end of last year, and so we have a view as to how storm water should be managed or considered and this plan change to give effect to that higher order RPS direction. That's sort of set out in our further submission.

So there's that which deals with, and it's in relation to Urban Development, climate change, it's around making sure there's water, sensitive design, etc. I appreciate there are other options for water sensitive design, our position is that we would like to ensure that any changes to the objectives or policies or rules within the proposed district plan give effect to that direction in the Regional Policy statement with regards to the stormwater outlet, I mean it's a consentable proposition. Can always

apply for a resource consent. In terms of giving any certainty at this stage, there's no way that I could do that.

There are rules in the One Plan, obviously around storm water discharges and they would have to go through the process, so that would be one part of the overall management of stormwater for that site, I don't see it being the whole part.

Also, my understanding was talking to our design engineer, was that the proposal for the stormwater outlet means that there is a flat gate which would shut off stormwater discharges when river flows are at a certain level. And so that from a point of view of managing stormwater on site or within the development would also become an important factor to consider.

That's a very brief summary of where the Horizons submissions.

Jono

Comment on what Paul's described in terms of the changes that Francis Holdings are requesting, sort of your initial professional view on that at the stage, noting that we continue to have an open mind.

Mary Wood

Fundamentally, in terms of the storm water, the approach has been to take the water sensitivity in the design approach and permeability limits remain one of the main ways to reduce the volume of runoff generated in the first place.

There's lots of other options for managing the flow and discharge and all the rest of it, but permeability is one of the mechanisms for managing that. We've worked through a process of identifying limits that would enable some initial development and then once we get some of that capacity through the outfall, then those permeability limits can be pulled back.

But it is part of a consistent framework, a precautionary approach, recognising that there's a lot of uncertainty in terms of climate change and future things.

So managing the generation of runoff for the first instance it's the tools that Council have available to them, given that you know Palmerston North is fairly flat, got some decent rivers around the edges of it and over time managing runoff and this piece is one of the tools that they have available to them.

And so that's sort of an underpinning premise and it aligns with the one plan in terms of that water sensitive design approach and when considered in the context of the outfall, then 30% for residential seemed appropriate and fairly consistent with

other councils in terms of a reasonable proportion of service for most residential development forms.

In terms of what people would tend to want to have as part of residential development

Kevin

We accept water sensitive design has to happen, but is it a matter of just saying that the subdivision must come up with a water sensitive design that meets Council's collective requirements and the engineering standards which is a document that both surveyors and certainly engineers refer to often.

Engineering standards also has guidance in there about water sensitive design and to change the engineering standards to modernize them towards is a very simple process or simpler process, rather than actually going through a plan change to change the words in a district plan.

I suspect everyone in this room, wants to have water sensitive design and we will want to have something that's workable, and from my perspective, I'd rather have that good water sensitive design required. That means risers contain emissions, government conditions, and the engineering standards, and something along those lines, will probably be quite simple to word and allow flexibility, because let's say today water sensitive design looks like this, in five years time it may look like something different, 10 years from now it may look like something else, you can implement those changes in the engineering standards quite simply and providing the engineering standards deal with all the lwi constraints, which are a standard discharge consents that we would expect Regional Council to impose on us anyway. There's this ability to not be constrained by what's in the district plan, and you can say that there's just an option we're putting forward to allow a start. But why do we need to have it in the district plan as that type of document? And I guess you're probably trying to provide it to us for our convenience, but it might not be for our convenience because it might end development if you follow what I'm saying.

Mary

I guess Council will need a degree of confidence in terms of how the land you know, can be progressed, there's some genuine constraints right off the bat with the current outfall and the ability to allow development on there.

What would you do differently on the site where you wouldn't be wanting to provide

that permeability?

Kevin

I don't know the answer to that, but I've never actually put my mind to answering that question either. Having the flexibility to come up with an idea. And look, your idea could probably be a very good idea. I'm not saying it's not, but flexibility not to be sort of constrained by that as an idea we might come up with, and we need to talk about putting structures in. I don't know if it's acceptable.

We talk about detention structures or something else, and again without any analysing of the situation was overall, we're just thinking that there is possibly other options that could be looked at, and you've just come up with an option, not the only option.

Mary

Correct, it is an option, but it is the main tool for council have to reduce the actual volume of runoff generated in the first instance, so soakage and all those other types of tools, somewhere around disposing of the volume or attenuating peaks to get it into the system or anything else.

Maintaining permeable surface reduces the generation of runoff on the 1st instance and that's quite a core part of that water sensitive design. I get your point there's lots of water sensitive urban design. It's a big umbrella, it's lots of ideas about what's involved in it, but maintenance of permeable surfaces is sort of that front piece.

Those other tools are used to manage what comes off your site.

Is your gut feel that, 30% is going to be too hard to achieve?

Kevin

I don't think there's any interest in developing at all site until that storage pipe is through. I can only speak for the landholder who owns 7% of the site so I don't think there's any interest in having any conditions that are required prior to the pipe going in. And I don't think any development probably should go back to basic industrial use until the pipe does go on. From a permeable perspective, are you talking grass, permeable pavers, etcetera.

Mary

I mean, permeable pavers are contentious, so in my technical opinion there's probably not a long enough record.

So you see lots of great video footage, but I think the longevity of permeable paving still has to be addressed and the maintenance requirements for it.

So my personal opinion is permeable paving may not, depends on the type of permeable paving. We're talking about grassed areas, landscaped areas, if there were going to be, so it's not in addition to other green things, it is this part of your how you might develop this.

Kevin

McIndoe and Local probably have done some work on this to save them. If you have a site. So essentially what you're saying, they've 70% hard stand area and the building, itself will probably take up 45% of that so that does lead 20 to 25% for another hardstand.

I don't think they're doing some specific site analysis so 30% is probably acceptable. And what you should in my opinion is that's something that can be put in the engineering standards becomes something that's actually citywide and can be implemented citywide, what possibly you're doing, you're going to pick up a hundred lots in a small corner of Palmerston North and impose condition on it. I think a better way to deal with engineering standards, which is citywide so everyone is subject to the same rules.

Jono

We have to go away and have a conversation around that and consider that heading into the hearing.

Kevin

The Iwi consents, all the requirements can, rather be stuck in the district plan, can then be also put in the engineering standards, along with anything that Horizons or government decides to implement and becomes the route for the engineering standards as much as you amend as should become online or Government policy changes. In the district plan it's rather difficult to do so.

Mary

Because the engineering standards are more around methods falls where it's a

district plan sort of sets out firmly the approach that's going to be taken to the meet objectives.

So I think I hear what you're saying I appreciate the difficulty in changing industry plans.

It's probably a level of certainty or confidence in the outcomes that would probably still be need to be maintained.

Jono

You look at the subdivision section in general that talks about engineering standards being compliance and I think what you're saying is that you would in this case you would like the subdivision standards to be a means of complying.

I think when we look at other plan changes that we currently be doing and stormwater is by far the single biggest issue we're dealing with, not just with this plan change but with the other density plan change, the Aokautere plan change. As you know Matangi has had its issues.

Our feeling is that because of such a significant issue in engineering standards continue to be a means of compliance. We've been moving towards more certainty, but again happy to have an open mind on that for the team to think about what the opportunities and the risks associated with it might be.

Neil

How do you tie in and link up lot sizes with what you're talking about, driving the water back into the into the sections?

The sections really need to be the driver, about whether the argument is put up, in regards to sections being 150 or 200 square metres.

I would have thought lot sizes need to be bigger

Mary

It becomes harder when you're getting to those smaller. The district plan's looking at it over the whole area so where there's an opportunity to create a bigger space for one in relation to some of the small areas. It might be something. From a stormwater perspective if we were looking at it overall.

It's about getting that balance of reducing the runoff, I think getting it through to a correctly sized system so we can have a bit more discussion around how it gets

assessed. It is harder to get those in permeability targets small lots

Jono

Maybe if we could just circle around just to an issue that I think Horizons raised Paul and I'll be interested in your opinion on this in terms of your proposed amendments and the extent to which they might give effect to the RPS.

And the manner that Leanna was talking about, have you given any thought as to whether those provisions were done, the assessment as to whether those changes provisions might give a feed to the RPS.

Paul Thomas

I agree with what Kevin said.

That with any stormwater management plan, water sensitive design needs to be considered and be a component to whatever extent is appropriate in the circumstances.

I would have no problem with amending my proposed policy 11.8 to be more clear in that regard. In other words, that any stormwater management plan should incorporate water sensitive design in a policy sense and bring it in line with the Regional Policy Statement in that regard. There's a lot of options toward a sensitive design. I'm not a stormwater engineer, but I'm a bit of a sceptic about what you achieve in terms of permeability, sure, permeable surfaces soak up water, but what we're talking about is managing extreme events.

We're talking about resilience, that whole policy is all about resilience with climate change, a more flexible approach is required.

Could I ask Mary?

Why a different approach has been taken in plan change I to this plan change when we're actually dealing with part of the catchment of the stormwater in plan change I?

Mary

I can't speak to the detail on plan change I.

Jono

My understanding Paul is that there is a permeability role in plan change I

Paul Thomas 26:48

But there's options. There's a requirement for a stormwater management plan that should consider permeability, should consider tanks, should consider whatever you can do in terms of redevelopment of what would be smaller land areas in general. But it provides that flexibility, and I find the two approaches rather interesting. And I'd be quite happy with the plan change I approach being applied to Roxburgh.

Jono

Noted

I think to a certain degree, we're probably apples with oranges, but the the PCI approach is, you know the permeability approach is a permanent activity standard to provide for up to, I think it's 3 medium density units as of right and then anything over and above that requires a consent, especially if you're in the stormwater overlay, which then obviously has another range of mechanisms, including a stormwater plan as you described, so we'll take that on board. Are there any elements of the PCI approach that we might be able to fold into this? Happy to give some thought to that.

Paul Thomas

I mean, if there's a given PCI stormwater overlay is being applied to very large parts of the city, there needs to be a jolly good reason why a different approach would be taken at Roxburgh. I feel like industrial to residential when for this particular catchment, a larger stormwater discharge can deal with that.

And is funded, is proposed, is proceeding, is subject to obviously successful consents. You know that's a major investment that'll probably be recovered from our client through development contributions. So they're in effect paying for that, at least in part. And I feel like if you then paying for that. You're then paying for treated, dealing with contaminated land, demolition of buildings. You need to give people who are buying sections as much flexibility as possible. They might well achieve their permeability standards, but it's about not putting additional hurdles in the way of actually getting a successful project off the ground.

Jono

Noted

I think we're happy to look at the PCI provisions.

I would note that you know this is a site specific plan change relating to a very specific piece of land in the location and PCI plan change a third of the whole residential zone.

Appreciate that there could be some learnings for us there and we're happy to have a look at that, but also noting that they are two quite different plan changes, but there's some benefits to some of the approaches that were taken to PCI that that we need to consider for this, that we're happy to do that, so, noted.

Leanna

Nothing of real value other than I think it's just with that Urban Development and climate change policy that's in the RPS, I think even relying on the stormwater discharge outlet, there will be a point at which there is no discharge to the river during certain design events and so it is about ensuring that as the land use change into that residential type, that the stormwater flooding hazard isn't significant. So that's what I think partly that policy is also trying to achieve is ensuring there's some resilience within the Urban Development and residential area around that.

Paul Thomas

Could I ask that Mary comment on that? Because I'm really interested in that. I haven't read the stormwater report for a while, but my recollection was that we didn't have a flood risk matter over and above managing stormwater and I accept that there could be event circumstances where the flap has to be closed because of floods going down the Manawatu River. Can you help us with that, Mary?

Mary

So my understanding is you're correct. There not a particular flooding issue associated with the site. There's no overland flow path. Noted from the local modelling. You've got your main channel flooding and I am personally not 100% sure on whether there's any residual risk around properties, but I don't believe there is. I'd have to go back and check the report.

Paul Thomas 32:14

We've got an outfall there now, it's just a small one.

So that situation has been faced for decades, probably ever since that outfall was constructed, whenever that was. So, I don't know what the history is of having to

close off that outfall has been in the past because obviously the consequences of that could be very serious.

Mary

I think from a resilience perspective, it's more around not generating more run off than you need to in the 1st place, and that's probably the main point.

Paul Thomas

But we've got we've got a plan change that is seeking higher densities. It is seeking, admittedly going from industrial, that's obviously pretty impervious to higher density residential than is average in Palmerston North. Francis Holding submission includes a tweak to the maximum lot size because Kevin's done some work on sort of schemes and whether you could actually do a scheme that ensured every lot was under 500 and found that because of some of the physical characteristics of some of the land, that's quite difficult. So our submission is the maximum be 600 not 500, which gives a little bit more flexibility about keeping a subdivision consent in the restricted discretionary class.

The whole density versus permeability thing, as Neil and Kevin said is a real tension between what the urban design objectives are and what the stormwater objectives are.

Jono

Yeah, Paul, I totally agree with.

But I mean, the reality is planning is all about trade-offs, isn't it? And when you're looking at those trade-offs and those tensions is that there is no perfect position or perfect setting of all these things that you have to look at the trade off and go on balance was an appropriate position in the planning.

I agree with you there teaching, but it's just the natural planning really. And you're saying that in terms of in terms of the way the plan and the different elements of the plan impact on development and yield, you're saying that some of those balances need to be a little bit different. At the moment, we've got a slightly different opinion on that.

Hopefully this conversation here enables everyone to go away and rethink that.

And then ultimately, you know, it'll be up to the panel members to decide where that balance should be in the planning instrument.

Kevin

From a stormwater perspective at the moment, if we had an event that closed off the gate. You would find it to be more water captured behind the stop bank, and because the industrial area is pretty much 100% of previous the discharge off the site would be considerably significant.

The water would go down probably end up in the golf course. By doing this development we are increasing the amount of permeable land on the site as of right. So therefore, there's going to be less discharge anyway by putting a bigger pipe in. You're also getting a lot more storm water out before it becomes an issue. I think the development is probably more positive than negative towards downstream flooding or any flooding.

Mary

We've done that assessment and teams that the flows and capacity now, I guess with redevelopment the new outfall that's the intention.

If you're increasing the permeability on your site and we're putting in a bigger pipe, then yes, it will be making sure it's just finding that balance, really, or an equally uncomfortable situation for everybody, perhaps.

Kevin

My understanding is of the bigger pipe. One of the drivers behind the bigger pipe is because of the improvements that are being done in that whole catchment area, Pahiatua Street, part of the school, all that area which Council has already started on, so the pipe's not being made, the outfall is not being made bigger because of the development work in Roxburgh Crescent itself.

Mary

It needs to be increased to reflect current climate change.

It's the analysis started off with what size pipe would we need to accommodate current design standards with climate change and then the discussion with Regional Council at the time was, if you're going to do an upgrade and work another pipe through the stop banks then you ideally it's an opportunity to provide wider benefit then there's additional capacity to allow for the other improvements.

So at the moment the outfall when you look at climate change and size of the

incoming catchment, it's not big enough and so improvements would be required as part of the redevelopment and then there's wider benefits to the wider catchment. And so then the pipe size was reviewed accordingly and upsized

Kevin

But what I'm saying is whether the driver behind bigger pipe is the wider catchment or whether because of the Roxburgh development or it's a bit of both.

Mary

A bit of both and climate change thrown

Well, I mean that applies everywhere.

Yes, it does, and that's part of the problem. Most councils in New Zealand, they've got old pipe networks of a size for one in five year calculation done for the seven years ago and now, it's a design standard, which is one in 10. Got climate change increased, so the pipe size that we have is no longer sufficient in the ground for what we anticipate we would need and so with larger redevelopments, that's the time we provide that capacity.

Kevin

In the Council's long term plan they have allocated \$293,000 this year, \$140,000 in next year, and allocated \$2.6 million and if you use time for construction component of it, I don't know whether that is. going to be At the moment, Council seeing that \$3,000,000 Site is all payable by infill growth, whether that's going to apply that over the whole catchment that comes out to you

Jono

So for stormwater What we'll look at doing is looking at.

Basically, the way growth programs works we go. Who benefits?

And in this case usually it's any property within the catchment.

you look at the catchment and then go over the next 20 years, How many additional lots can we expect, whether it be through Roxburgh Crescent or infill or some of its many density, and then divide that into the total? whoever develops pays their share.

Kevin

So you'll be paying a share of that 3 million. But that'll be based on size of catchment, so that might not be a significant amount, but I don't know that until that that's been assessed

Jono

All dependent on how many lots we expect in the catchment.

Kevin

So at some stage after the zone has gone through on the presumption it's approved. The Council will then decide that the development contributions per a lot will be 'x' amount,

Jono

just to give you a little bit of an idea. It does vary a lot across the city. Depending on the size of development so in the Whakarongo area, for example, we would just spend a lot of money. The stormwater DC just by itself was close to \$20,000.

And you know, that's if you look at, I don't see over in Feilding look on the charging for their storm water. Storm water is right across the country. Seems to be that, you know, it's not so much the war in the wastewater and the road, it's actually the storm water that's going up

Every time we do a plan change, it's the most complex area we're dealing with.

It's not just about conveying what's about water quality and about the NPS fresh water and the NPSUD

And it's requiring both councils the same without the Council as well. You know, we're having to a lot of our operational staff go oh Why do we have to provide these rain gardens? Because an from operational point of views a lot more expensive to maintain rain gardens and I think everyone's going to be facing the same issue.

Kevin

our directors going to want to know what that's going to be before they go too far down the track. Commercial reality point of view you're just going to kill it.

Paul Thomas

There's also, of course a benefit to all the existing residents in the catchment from that investment, not just new lots created, so that would obviously logically be taken

into account in terms of what's recovered from DC's versus what's recovered from rates, wouldn't it, Jono?

Jono

The way DC's work is, so you've got a capital program for something like this and you basically say, well, putting \$1,000,000, it's going to cost us \$1,000,000. How much has it been driven by maintaining or improving existing levels of service. How much of that cost has been driven because of growth and we might say. 50% the cost \$500,000 is related to maintain or improving levels of service for the broader catchment. 50% of that has been driven by growth and that's what we chose

Paul Thomas

The city is working on a sort of citywide stormwater strategy.

Would that include consideration of the scenario we're talking about here that didn't occur in 2004, whereby you do get as a result of climate change, a maximum flow down the river plus a heavy storm event in the local catchment.

Will that be looking at those sorts of scenarios?

Jono

It does in some ways in terms of looking at resilience and climate change, but that that policy that that strategy is really a high level strategy to say what are the main challenges facing the city. And what are some of the actions we need to take? And it's a very high level to inform LTP decision making. So I think we've identified 10 catchments and then we've said out of those 10 catchments what are the priority areas for investment in the next 20-30 years, and what and those priorities have been driven by, the challenges like resilience and climate change, affordability, all those sorts of things at the high level.

Councillors will then have to consider the stormwater strategy when they're looking at where they invest future capital and stormwater infrastructure over the next 20-30 years. It's not a detailed level. Very much about directing decision making at the elected member level. We're going to be quite clear there's a couple of catchments that the Kowarau, for example. Where we're saying actually, you know, there's some major issues there within the existing environment over the next 20 or 30 years. It'd probably be a good idea for councillors when they're decision making when

they're looking at decision making to prioritise, you know, one of those catchments. So it's not at that detailed level.

Paul Thomas

It's really about prioritizing catchments, really not going much beyond that, OK.

Kevin

Back to development contribution so one of the things I would find helpful would be and is an indication of what the development contributions would be, because I know you've got pool prices. It's got to go to the council, but if there was an indication of what would be the development contribution or what you think it would be, would be helpful. Even if it's just an indication.

I don't presume that there's the sewer and the water supply and the roading supply will be as per the present district plan

You're up looking upgrade Roxburgh Crescent, is there any sort of specific site costing that will be or that can be part of Council's overall just to give a bit of a feel for the where the DC's are going and the general contents would be up for?

Here is really no one on being asked to do by our directors.

Prepare project costs to develop the area. The more information I have, the more accurate the cost. Things can be the least I have. To all over the place. So yeah, it's really important to get that as soon as we can get. Well, as soon as it can come to us so that it can go out to our board.

Jono will have a look at it for you.

As you know the government's looking at transitioning to development levies. And also rates given what I've seen, I think the numbers are going to go up, not go down under the new legislation.

Because current government's quite clear around the principal of user pays. Quite clear with central government that while the development contributions policy over the last 20 years right across the country has been a useful mechanism in collecting cost of growth. The message that local government central government is that when you look at the numbers policies still aren't collecting full cost of growth.

There's going to be a lot of change in the space over the next 12 to 18 months.

We've still got time left, is there anything else that anyone would like to discuss.

Kevin

We're very keen to have just one outlet through the development, so the existing out let we would prefer to have closed and blocked off and put to bed.

One is the outputs been there for a while and probably at some stage we'll need some maintenance, but also in the proposed structure plan has a no build area about 10 metres wide.

We prefer that area was available for building, especially if there was a site that's right up against the stopbank, which is going to have views and favourable land that we won't have to develop because the old pipes are set.

And we've we had talks previously probably before you came on board Mary about upsizing the pipe from, Reiko had come up with, to take the 7:50 because I think she was kind of running the two pipes together. We were thinking we'd love one up the central boulevard - which would mean there would be 1 pipe in council ownership all these areas rather a 63 pipe, which is probably 50 years old now, if not older and will need attention in the future.

So we'd prefer if that was considered and we will be very keen on removing that no build area from the structure plan.

If you can do that would be would be a benefit to the development because it just provides more land for us to develop.

Mary

I can see what the current basis of design is sitting in terms of the other.

Kevin

So I think there's no physical impediment to having that happen. So we prefer we could and that the second thing is the filterra systems. I think there was some wording around. We must have to put one in for every 270 square metres of hardstand area or something to that effect

I heard a rumor that the Council like filterra systems and then they don't. They like them again and don't like them.

Does, Council actually have a position on the filterra systems, as we see here at the moment? If it's going to be enshrined in the district plan, then filterra systems and all similar.

Jonathan Wallace developmental, the Old Teachers college, I believe they're having trouble with them actually working and they've gone away from New Zealand

Harman

Think eventually it's when it will be the decision maker on, you know terms of or treatment. What would be supported by the Council?

Yeah, feedback that I've had from the teams is in terms of maintenance period maintenance is picked off the. That's not so much the operations as you said.

Sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't work.

In terms of maintenance, I haven't heard any issues that maintaining them is difficult compared to say for instance rain gardens

Kevin

I don't think the issue was maintenance.

It was more they don't function properly, but the trees keep dying on top of the filterra system, so if we know that the Council have some issues with them from time to time, Is it wise to have that sort of mechanism in the district plan as the means of compliance?

Mary

So I think there's proposed wording that takes out reference to Filterra, it still references a high rate Biofiltration system and that was, to my understanding of the intent behind that was to try and come up with a device that would be smaller, right? Be easier to accommodate within the development and future that was the intent behind it.

So from a technical perspective, the Filterra is not that different from a normal rain garden in that it's got a precast sort of system which is easier to, you know, just buy it off the shelf and size it up plans and then it's a particular mulch that's high rate through there. And you can get that mulch specification. There are landscape suppliers there that have the high rate of mulch arrangement that allows that higher and the ultimate.

Does the Terra Council use filter assistant?

Across the board. But they do use them.

The devil is in the detail.

You've got to get the unletting correct.

And you have to figure out whether you're doing an internal bypass or an external bypass. These configurations in terms of how it sits and you need to look at.

Not quite the plug and play that they sell it as you know, you need to work with the roading guys to get the drop right. But there has been working reasonably well as my understanding.

Kaevin

With their exception, are they all premium surfaces have to be maintained

Somebody's got to maintain it - who's going to maintain it?

Because if they're not maintained very quickly they become inefficient to the extent they don't work.

Mary

But I think that's something that just needs to be addressed going forward now because you know, rain gardens and the like, they provide multiple benefits and I've had many healthy discussions with operations teams around the maintenance requirements and effectively, if you're maintaining them and you have to clear out stuff, then it's actually a good thing because the intent of them is to protect the downstream environment while also allowing for that infiltration.

It's a cost that can be in theory, scoped, managed over time versus the cost of the environment, which you know is harder to remedy once it's out there and it is a shift right from the way we used to do things. But it's. This is the space we play in now

Kevin

So I guess my question still stands is you know what is Council's present view on those and if there is some there's some work that's not happening at some levels whether they're not functioning because of certain things that might solve the problem?

But if you hear rumours that the Council's not happy with them, and here we are trying to put it into the book of words that that type of system is what we want here. And it probably leads into a where if they're not functioning well enough, then we may want to look at making the roads wider, shall have another arrow on footing, so we can get rain gardens in the and I understand the difference. The rain gardens take a lot more land, but that's the bike system Council. We need to have a look at what

other options we could do there.

Jono

Look, I think maybe between Harmon, Mary and Veni - maybe just get back together and we can just consider that as we start as we start writing evidence.

Paul Thomas

This this was part of the subject of pumps and all City Council's own submission, which we commented on in our further submission so it's well and truly on the table.

What is Iwi's view

Leanna

Aligned with Horizons

Alongside the water quality elements associated with discharging to water, there was a strong desire for there to be storm water management on site, and that aligns a lot with some of the feedback that was given as part of the future development strategy. submission that they did, which was where the stormwater strategy came from. So I think there is a, and I can't speak for Rangitane, but from what I read here there was a strong desire for there to be on site management of stormwater as a preference to a discharge.

Jono

I honestly think that a lot of what we talked about tonight is very closely related. So I'm happy to have a chat to Rangitane and see whether you feel that there'd be some benefit meeting with them or whether maybe the issue that we've discussed today.

They will get a copy of the notes.

We can share that and maybe what might as leave us letting Rangitane and yourselves to discuss as to whether you'd like to have a pre hearing meeting and if you do then Council are happy to open and facilitate that.

I've been dealing with Siobhan for and she's pretty realistic. They raised issues with storm water through development strategy and that was picked up by Council and the current stormwater strategy came from their submission.

Jono

It's probably fair to say also now that the resource stuff that's submitting more on plan changes in terms of water, from their perspective water quality is really critical to them and you know a part of the appeal to PCG stormwater approach there in Environment court.

They submitted observer submission on plan change I and in this plan change. So I think that's sending a real message that they care about water and they're getting a lot more involved may be what they did in the previous 10 or 20 years.

Kevin

I don't think we're actually at loggerheads with any of what they're proposing anyway. I think my main concerns be capturing probably more citywide. It's becoming an engineering standards business, making 200 bots more.

While you were talking. I was just looking through Rangitane's submission, and there's quite a lot of alignment with some of the things we've been signaling in there. I think it would be well worth giving them even the recording if they wanted it. If not, the notes and having to listen to that and seeing where they want to go from there.

The hearing is scheduled for the 20 and 21st of May, Jono has a meeting with the Governance Team next week and advise if there is any change