

APPENDIX 5

Addendum to Technical Specialist Report – Stormwater – Section 42A Reporting

PLAN CHANGE 13 – TE RAPA RACECOURSE PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE

to

HAMILTON CITY DISTRICT PLAN

Hamilton City Council

1 Introduction

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This addendum provides further assessment and comment on Plan Change 13 following review of the applicant and submitter evidence. It updates the Technical Specialist Report – Te Rapa Racecourse Private Change Stormwater and Wastewater (Beca, July 2023) – Section 42A Reporting, prepared by Greg Cumming and Iain Smith of Beca for Hamilton City Council (HCC).
- 1.2 This is a statement of evidence from Iain Smith and addresses stormwater aspects only.

Information Considered

- 1.3 In preparing this addendum the following documents have been reviewed:

- Evidence of Hayden John Vink
- Submitter Evidence from Michael Robert Campbell on behalf of Kainga Ora
- Submitter Evidence from Brendan Scott Liggett on behalf of Kainga Ora
- Submitter statement at the hearing from Jade McNally

Code of Conduct

- 1.4 While I understand that the present hearing is not a matter to which the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note (2023) applies, I confirm that I have approached the preparation of this evidence in the same manner as I would for Environment Court proceedings and have complied with the requirements of the Code. I confirm that the issues addressed in this evidence are within my area of expertise and the opinions I have expressed are my own except where I have stated that I have relied on the evidence of other people. I have not omitted material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my evidence.

2 Review of Evidence

- 2.1 I have been involved in reviewing the stormwater design elements of the proposed plan change from the beginning of the application process. I also prepared the stormwater parts of the Section 42A report issued by Greg Cumming.
- 2.2 I consider there are no outstanding technical stormwater issues that the subcatchment ICMP needs to address.
- 2.3 I note there remains a planning issue with respect to flooding and hazard mapping rules raised by Mr Campbell and Mr Liggett. Provided that flooding and freeboard is applied to any future design in accordance with the requirements of the District Plan, then I have no additional comment to make on the structure of the rules relating to this and so defer to HCC's planning advice on this matter.
- 2.4 I can clarify the representations made by Jade McNally at the hearing refuting part of the subcatchment ICMP in that she maintains that the racecourse land actually drains onto 89 Garnett Ave (and the adjacent property 6b Ken Browne Drive) and not the other way around as noted by Mr Vink in his evidence. I consider that both are correct for these reasons:
 - i. Part of the racecourse land does fall gently from the racecourse onto 89 Garnet Avenue and 6b Ken Browne Drive and stormwater would run off as Jade McNally states. It is not just racecourse land that drains in this fashion onto these properties.
 - ii. However, the topography these properties forms a basin such that in extreme flood events ponding inundates these properties and is contained by surrounding more elevated land (as can be seen by the shape of the flooding shown on the drawings in the subcatchment ICMP – drawing WE1733-03-03.2 in Appendix C of the Subcatchment ICMP).
 - iii. In these extreme storms, such as a 100 year return period storm as mapped by HCC, then inundation would spread out and over the northern boundary from 89 Garnet/6b Ken Browne onto the racecourse. From there the overflow would be routed northwards over the racecourse land.

- iv. Therefore, both representations are correct to a point, it just depends on the severity of the storm considered.
- 2.5 Further to item 2.4, it is acknowledged that by developing the racecourse as proposed it will necessitate regrading the land and providing a new piped drainage network to route runoff to the proposed wetland. This will mean that racecourse land will no longer drain over the boundary of 89 Garnet Avenue and 6b Ken Browne Drive and so provide an improvement over the existing situation.
- 2.6 I note that various representations have been made during the hearing by several appellants that an acoustic wall could be provided along the boundary of the development. This arrangement, depending on its configuration, could block the overland flow path during severe flood events with the risk of increasing or diverting flooding upstream of the wall. This is an unresolved matter but one that could be addressed during the resource consent stage.

3 Conclusion and Recommendation

- 3.1 There are currently no technical stormwater issues raised by submitters that remain unaddressed by the applicant.
- 3.2 However, should an acoustic wall be required as an outcome of the Plan Change, then the applicant will need to demonstrate this does not cause adverse flood effects. This matter may be deferred until more detailed modelling is carried out to evidence effects as part of a resource consent application.
- 3.3 Therefore, I reconfirm the statements in the S42A report that the applicant has appropriately addressed stormwater issues.

