



## PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Report PE06.663  
Date 12 November 2006  
File N/03/18/01

Committee Hutt River Advisory Committee  
Author Daya Atapattu, Project Engineer

### **Boulcott/Hutt stopbank feasibility study: Round 2 Consultation and the preliminary design**

#### **1. Purpose**

- To update the Advisory Committee on progress made with consultation on 'Option Evaluation' outcomes
- To obtain the Advisory Committee endorsement to proceed with entry and land purchase negotiations with the two golf clubs on the basis of the favoured alignment

#### **2. Significance of the decision**

The matters for decision in this report do not trigger the significance policy of the Council or otherwise trigger section 76(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002.

#### **3. Exclusion of the public**

Grounds for the exclusion of the public under section 48(1) of the local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 are:

*That the public conduct of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists (i.e. to enable the Council to carry on negotiations without prejudice or disadvantage).*

*Interests protected:  
Greater Wellington Regional Council  
Golf Clubs and Private landowners*

## 4. Background

In the 28 September 2006 special meeting, the Advisory Committee considered the stopbank alignment option evaluation outcomes and endorsed the process and programme for Round 2 consultation.

Three conceptual alignments were chosen and analysed by a Multi-criteria analysis (MCA) taking into consideration the various advantages and disadvantages of each option across a wide range of attributes. The three alignments selected for the feasibility study and the attributes selected for the evaluation were confirmed through the Round 1 consultation process.

The MCA process completed in September 2006, favoured a 'Hutt Blue', 'Boulcott Green' and a 'Safeway Green' alignment. **Attachment 1** shows the favoured alignment.

## 5. Round 2 consultation

The purpose of Round 2 consultation was to provide opportunities for the stakeholders and adjacent property owners to actively participate in the process of selecting an alignment by commenting on option evaluation outcomes. Round 2 consultations began on 18 October 2006 with the distribution of Newsletter #4. This newsletter provided a summary of option evaluation outcomes and included an invitation to a public meeting on 25 October 2006. **Attachment 2** provides a record of the consultation undertaken to date and the issues raised. The following provides a summary of consultation outcomes for each sub-section of the proposed alignment.

### **Boulcott sub-section**

Boulcott Golf Club prefers the Blue alignment in a form which is golf friendly and will allow the course to continue to operate. A golf friendly 'Blue' or a 'Green' stopbank for the Boulcott section would cost about \$8 million. The MCA analysis favours a golf friendly 'Green' or an engineering 'Red' alignment, because of the lesser impacts on the adjoining properties.

An 'Engineering' stopbank on the GWRC land connected to the Hutt section with a 'Golf Friendly' section on the Boulcott and Hutt boundary would cost about \$5.5 million without any land purchase costs. An 'Engineering' stopbank across the Boulcott golf course would cost about \$3.7 million not including land purchase costs. The golf course cannot continue to function with either of these 'Engineering' stopbanks.

The Boulcott golf course has a total area of 10.75 hectares. Out of this GWRC owns 2.4 hectares. The licence for the Golf Club to use GWRC land expires on 31 March 2007. The Boulcott golf course cannot function as a full '9 hole course' without the GWRC land.

The above analysis shows that the costs of retaining the Boulcott golf course are in the range of \$3 – 4 million. In addition to the extra costs, GWRC also has to commit to the long-term use of its land by the Boulcott Golf Club.

The project team believes that an ‘Engineering’ stopbank through the Boulcott golf course is the most economic option. This option will also have lesser impacts on the adjacent properties. With an engineering stopbank on Boulcott, there is the possibility of developing a superior ‘18 hole’ golf course by combining the two golf courses. An Engineering stopbank through Boulcott will also provide a high level of flood protection to a part of the Boulcott golf course which could remain in golf club ownership. However, the project team is not in a position to explore any engineering stopbank options while the Blue alignment remains open because the Boulcott membership prefers the Blue alignment. We would therefore seek the Advisory Committee’s endorsement to reject the Boulcott Blue alignment on the basis of economic feasibility and adverse impacts on the adjoining property owners. If this proposal is accepted the key issues for the discussions with the Boulcott golf club will include;

- GWRC to facilitate discussion on amalgamation of the Boulcott Golf Club with the Hutt Golf Club or Shandon Golf Club.
- GWRC to facilitate discussions between the two golf clubs to share course facilities during construction. A Boulcott representative has already indicated that this is possible.
- GWRC purchase of the land required to construct an Engineering stopbank across the golf course. The golf club land on the east of the stopbank will be protected by the new stopbank and could remain in golf club ownership.

We believe that the adjacent property owners generally support the ‘Boulcott Green’ alignment.

### **Hutt sub-section**

The Hutt Golf Club originally preferred the ‘Hutt Red’ alignment but is now inclined toward support for the ‘Hutt Blue’ alignment. The Hutt Golf Club decision on how to proceed is heavily influenced by the outcome on the Boulcott golf course. If Boulcott is a Blue alignment, Hutt would also likely to follow the Blue alignment. If the Boulcott course ceases to exist because of an Engineering stopbank, Hutt would explore amalgamation options with Boulcott on the basis of developing a superior 18 hole course.

The Multi Criteria analysis (MCA) favours the ‘Hutt Blue’ alignment because of its low costs, sustainability and lesser impacts on the river environment and the golf course. The ‘Hutt Blue’ alignment was discussed at the Annual General Meeting of the golf club held on 15 November 2006. To assist the golf club members in assessing effects of the ‘Red’ alignment we marked on the ground the foot print of the proposed ‘Hutt Red’ stopbank.

Other issues raised by the Hutt Golf Club include frequent flooding from the Hutt River, stormwater flooding from the Military Road drain and obstructions to views from the clubrooms.

As part of the Hutt Blue alignment, we will also investigate a low level stopbank on the golf course along Harcourt Werry Drive to prevent direct flooding from the Hutt River during minor flood events. We will also work with Hutt City Council (Capacity) to find solutions for the stormwater problems. The top of the proposed stopbank in front of the clubrooms will be at a level about 500 mm above the floor level and will not seriously block views to the course from the clubrooms

We believe that the proposed 600-800 mm high stopbank along the Stellin Street to Allen Street residential boundaries will not have significant impacts on residential properties. Residents prefer a grassed mound well integrated into the golf course to a flood wall. Issues raised by residents such as stormwater, construction access, ground vibrations and golf balls bouncing off the landward slope of the stopbank will be addressed through the next stage of the design.

The residents in the three Military Road properties, 32, 32A and 34A, now understand that the proposed stopbank will follow a route incorporating the 15 and 16 greens and not along their boundaries.

Through the preliminary design, we will also investigate an alternative to a part of the 'Hutt Blue' alignment. This alternative alignment will follow a route across the fairways 11, 15 and 16 to join the existing embankment near the pond. The feasibility of this alignment is dependant on fill requirements, play visibility from tees to greens and acceptance by the golf club.

### **Safeway sub-section**

In the Safeway reach, the favoured stopbank is on the existing alignment. Other options investigated for this reach include;

- A flood wall on Transpower land across the front of Safeway
- A stopbank which would pass through the Safeway site
- A stopbank which would pass on the riverside of the Transpower and Safeway sites

Safeway's preference is a stopbank protecting both Transpower and Safeway sites. Such a stopbank is too close to the river and is not viable.

This section of the stopbank has the potential to affect access to Safeway and Transpower sites and to a few residential properties on the south of the stopbank. We believe that we can find engineering solutions to minimise effects on access to these properties.

## **Other issues**

Other issues raised during Round 2 consultation included, attribute weightings, 440 year design standard, lack of consultation and the too tight time frame for making a decision.

A few residents questioned the attribute weightings assigned by the project team to represent the 'local' and 'Golf Club' views. The project team used these weightings to check the sensitivity of the 'Project Team's weightings on outcomes. The project team agrees that the weightings assigned as 'Local' may not represent the views of some of the local residents. At this stage, we do not expect to carry out any further evaluations.

The 440 year design standard was adopted through the Hutt River Floodplain Management Plan following an extensive consultation process. This standard is appropriate for this section of the stopbank designed to protect the Hutt City CBD from major floods in the Hutt River.

Round 1 and Round 2 public meetings were notified by a newsletter and public notices in the 'Hutt News'. Some residents in Stellan Street missed the first meeting because they were not in the distribution area of the newsletter. We have now included these properties in our distribution list for the future newsletters.

The project team agrees that more time is needed to resolve issues with the two golf clubs and other stakeholders before making a recommendation on a preferred alignment.

## **6. Project costs**

The rough order cost estimate of the favoured 'Hutt Blue', Boulcott Green' and 'Safeway Green' stopbank alignment is \$16.7 million. This is on the basis of an 'Engineering' stopbank on the GWRC owned land of the Boulcott golf course. The total budget available is \$6.3 million.

We propose to further refine the cost estimates through a preliminary design before the Advisory Committee makes a recommendation on the preferred alignment to the Landcare Committee. This process will commence once we have reached some certainty on the preferred alignment through the two courses.

The preliminary design will include;

- Ground survey and geo-technical investigations along the favoured alignment and its variations
- Preparing detailed plans for the alignment and its variations through the two golf courses in consultation with the two golf clubs and affected residential property owners

- Preparing detailed plans showing the stopbank profiles at the Connolly Street crossing and access to properties in consultation with the affected parties
- Identifying land purchase requirements
- Preparing detailed cost estimates

The preliminary design will provide more accurate cost information required by GWRC to make decisions on affordability and implementing time frames.

## **7. Comment**

Most of the land on which the proposed new stopbank is to be built is owned by the Hutt and Boulcott golf clubs. Our aim from the beginning of this project is to obtain entry agreements and purchase any required land on a 'willing seller – willing buyer' basis and so avoid the formal 'designation' process.

The two golf clubs have now accepted that the stopbank has to be constructed on their golf courses and are also willing to discuss options for amalgamation in case Boulcott ceases to exist. However, the project team cannot progress discussions with the Boulcott golf club while keeping the Boulcott-Blue option open. The Boulcott Blue option is not economically feasible and causes adverse impacts on the adjoining property owners.

The two golf clubs and the project team need more time to discuss various issues, consider options and reach conclusions.

## **8. Communication**

We will distribute a newsletter in December 2006 updating the stakeholders and the community on progress made with the feasibility study. This newsletter will also provide information on the issues raised during Round 2 consultation that we propose to address.

Following this, another newsletter will be distributed before commencing the preliminary design outlining how the stakeholders and the community can continue to participate in the Boulcott / Hutt stopbank preliminary design. As the design progresses, we will have meetings with groups of affected residents and stakeholders to provide them opportunities to comment on the design. A public meeting will be held towards the end of the preliminary design phase to present the design to the wider community. Discussions with the two golf clubs will continue throughout the preliminary design phase.

## 9. Recommendations

*That the Committee:*

1. **Receives** the report.
2. **Notes** the content of the report in particular the progress made with Round 2 consultation
3. **Notes** that the two golf clubs and the project team need more time to discuss issues, consider options and conclude negotiations
4. **Agrees** that the costs of the Boulcott Blue alignment are such that the project team should proceed on the basis of the Multi Criteria Analysis favoured Boulcott Green option.
5. **Endorses** the project team proceeding with land entry and purchase negotiations with the Hutt Golf Club and the Boulcott Golf Club on the basis of the favoured Hutt Blue and Boulcott Green alignment

Report prepared by:

**Daya Atapattu**  
Project Engineer

Report approved by:

**Graeme Campbell**  
Manager, Flood protection

Report approved by:

**Geoff Dick**  
Divisional Manager,  
Catchment Management

**Attachment 1: Favoured alignment**

**Attachment 2: Round 2 consultation record**