

TKURFMP – Sub-Committee Option Development – August Workshop 25 August 2016

Overview Workshops / Preliminary Discussion

- Francie outlined tasks, future workshops and timeframes leading up to preparation of FMP
- Committee discussed whether FMP likely to be as contentious, noting the following:
 - o Seemed better organised than Waiohine with very good leadership
 - o Some concern about amalgamating river catchments – although generally considered to be support across scheme committees
 - o Need to ensure committee and councils endorse FMP at the time it is approved for consultation
 - o Engagement with community around implications of wider buffer is essential
 - o Committee generally considered to provide a good representation of the community - ‘A foot in every place’ – being careful not to do the splits!

Urban Waipoua

- Bob outlined that he felt MDC and GWRC close to agreeing hydrology
- Bob had meetings with Pim Borren and Lynn Patterson - each verbally committed to working with GWRC to resolve issues. This is yet to be formalised.
- Confirmation of 100 year standard of protection is critical and councils are aligned on this.
- Bob outlined his recommended process to move into resolving design options:
 - o Form ‘working group’ to undertake reach specific discussion / design input around concepts to be brought back to the sub-committee.
 - o David Hopman, Lyn Patterson and Pim Borren all need to be engaged supported by design input from Boffa Miskell and others as necessary.
 - o Sub-committee makes decisions and recommendations based on working group outputs.
- Bob to work with Barbara and Graham to come back to sub-committee with formal proposal on this basis.
- Sub-committee agreed that this approach is necessary to enable Councils to establish ‘buy-in’ at officer and councillor levels.

FMP Timing / Urban Waipoua Implications

- Urban Waipoua Reach (Masterton – Reach 13) to be developed separately from rural reaches. Could possibly drop numbers from reach names.
- FMP to be developed in 3 parts
 - Volume 1: Background
 - Volume 2: Rural Reaches
 - Volume 3: Urban Reaches
- Bob felt extended timing of urban reach may be too generous and could be brought forward - Ideally bring all reaches together in one FMP volume.
- Key to get hydrology report out to give people a chance to see where MDC and GWRC have progressed to.

Rathkeale Stopbank Options Update

- Workshop addressing major project response for Rathkeale College stopbanks previously held on the 17th June 2016. The responses structured in relation to FMP Aims are set out in the notes relating to this workshop.
- The sub-committee supported options which look to move the stopbank further away from the river and provide more room for buffer strips. This recognises that preferred option does not provide an improved level of protection for fields.
- In resolving the preferred option, the sub-committee was reminded to consider higher level outcomes rather than detailed design. Detailed decision making is not something the committee needs to dwell on in terms of choosing the alignment of the redesigned stopbank when developing a preferred option.
- Key outcomes reiterated by the sub-committee included the financial implications of maintaining an existing stopbank in its current location and the desire to provide more room for the river and its associated natural processes.
- Since the June Workshop, GWRC have spoken with Brian James the Property Manager at Rathkeale College in terms of considering option response \ Brian was keen to work with the sub-committee and was understanding of what GWRC are seeking in terms of retreat options – he was keen to understand and see more detail of what options were on the table.
- The presence of existing trees beyond the stopbank creates a sense of things seeming benign at the moment – though it was noted that trees on opposite bank were recently eroded.
- GWRC are looking at providing a potential alignment, footprint and height to assist further understanding.
- Consultation to date has included the following:
 - o Bob and Alistair met with Willy Kersten (Principal)
 - o Alistair met with Brian James (Property Manager)
 - o George and Francie met with Brian James (Property Manager)
- If long term option is retreat, there also needs to be guidance on long term operation. An outcome to go into an implementation programming part of the FMP may be to maintain existing stopbank where it is until a trigger option happens then invest in new asset elsewhere, e.g. as a result of erosion.
- Holding the line of the existing stopbank would cost the individual with retreat supported by the scheme and assistance with investment.
- There could be a question of what happens to existing with new alignment,
- There is a possibility of a two tiered standard. i.e. core asset protected back from the river. Existing stopbank provides protection to lower standard for protection of playing fields.

Waingawa Stopbank Update

- Workshop addressing major project response for Waingawa Stopbank previously held on the 26th July 2016.
- This identified that the integrity of the current stopbank is unknown, but not expected to be high. Work has commenced to confirm its quality.
- Additional erosion protection would also be required.
- During the July workshop, the sub-committee requested estimated costings to help inform their preferred option. These were summarised as follows:
 - o New rock line to achieve erosion protection = \$250 ~ \$300k
 - o Removing stop bank = ~\$50k + depending on material
 - o New stopbank = ~\$250k
 - o Repairing stop bank = ~\$10k + (depends on event size)
 - o Land purchase = ~\$450k (not including relocation).
- The land owner has not currently been included in the process.
- Members of the subcommittee questioned whether additional parks are necessary in Masterton and whether access to the river was required at this point (there is no formalised public river access in the vicinity of the southern entrance to Masterton).
- Acknowledged that the SH2 road-bridge was identified as an area recreation users including kayakers obtained access to the river.
- An option was identified by project officers which looked to swap the existing industrial area with the more elevated gravel yard to the north in order to avoid the need to construct a new stopbank in this location. The eventual purchase of the related gravel yard could occur in the event open space / river access was to be formalised.

South Masterton Gateway

- The area south of the SH2 bridge occupies the identified buffer strips along which access and planting can be established
- The design of this area needs to be carefully considered, given the difficulty establishing planting in this area.
- A good opportunity to get good community / corporate buy in giving the prominence of this site from SH2.
- This option was supported based on delivering community needs / amenity outcomes

Mauriceville Workshop

- Flood risk identified in relation to properties along margins of river at Mauriceville - however there is difficulty modelling issues in this area given channel blockages could potentially threaten more properties.
- The Kopuaranga scheme currently finishes down-stream from the community.
- The following structural options were not supported given conflicts with FMP Aims:
 - o Raise houses
 - o Provide barrier protection
 - o Buy houses
- Sub-committee agreed that Mauriceville should be brought into the river management scheme accommodating the following non-structural preferred options:
 - o Manage vegetation and blockage potential (and erosion measures)
 - o Provision of erosion and flood information
 - o Planning Controls
 - o Civil Defence and Emergency Management

Economic

- Scheme inclusion and planning controls best consider long term property protection
- Need to consider additional erosion protection funding

Resilient Community

- Given review of upstream extension also need to look at downstream service level

Cultural

- Nothing additional discussed

Natural Spaces / Processes

- Crack willow is essentially a pest plant which should be removed
- Clearing these out of the river provides more space for the river to function
- Side effect could be increased erosion of banks due to increased flow

Community Needs / Amenity

- Clearing river channel of willow can improve access / recreation associations along upper reaches of river
- School not in current flood hazard zone

Tools for Communication

- At the end of the workshop, GWRC shared experience consulting with communities developed through the Hutt River Project using UAV imagery and artist's impressions to show how preferred options could be developed.