

Appendix K: Evan Harrison expert review comments



MEMO

TO Shannon Watson
COPIED TO Megan Oliver, Roger Uys, Iain Dawe, Sharyn Westlake
FROM Evan Harrison
DATE 9 May 2019
FILE NUMBER

Eastern Bays Shared Path notified consent – Review of Appendix B, Freshwater Fish Passage Requirements

I have reviewed the following report to assessing the impacts of the proposed construction works on the freshwater fish passage requirements:

- Appendix B - Eastern Bays Shared Path: Freshwater Fish Passage Requirements

Below I have split my review into general and specific comments.

General comments

I find the assessment of fish species present and analysis of fish passage barriers appropriate for the purpose of the survey. I agree with the authors' conclusion regarding requirements for pipe extensions and I also agree with the conclusions referring to the potential for the seawall design and outlet level relative to the existing beach level to have potential adverse effects on fish passage if they become perched. The avoidance and mitigation measures proposed are appropriate and I strongly support the need for a freshwater ecologist with fish passage experience to be involved in the design of the outlets.

Specific comments

- The outlet specific assessment approach used by the author is appropriate given the variability between locations. I strongly support the recommendations for modifying the seawall at some locations to allow for fish passage and the need to avoid blockage of outlets by beach nourishment during peak migrations of banded kokopu (locations listed in Table 6 of the report which will require monitoring of outlets during and after construction, and where necessary clearance of gravels and sand to maintain opening especially during migration periods).

- For the 30 Cheviot Road and Lowry Bay South streams I agree that the duckbill valve outlets which have been consented will impede fish passage for habitats present upstream. If possible this structure needs to be reviewed, but I note it may be outside the scope of this project.
- I agree with the proposal that where pipe outlets have both fish and penguin values there is the potential to create a solution that provides for both fish and penguin passage.
- Ongoing monitoring to assess the effectiveness of any fish passage mitigations put in place will be essential for ongoing freshwater fish passage within the area subject to seawall construction.
- The other recommendations noted in the report in relation to ground truthing of GIS layers for waterways and fish surveys in Eastern Bay streams are worthwhile for noting for future work, but do not impede the assessment of potential effects undertaken in this report.

Ainslee Brown

From: Ainslee Brown
Sent: Thursday, 24 October 2019 6:09 PM
To: Ainslee Brown
Subject: FW: Eastern Bays Shared Path project: Further Information Request (s92) and s95E RMA - WGN190301 & RM190124

From: Evan Harrison <Evan.Harrison@gw.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 23 July 2019 9:06 AM
To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@gw.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Eastern Bays Shared Path project: Further Information Request (s92) and s95E RMA - WGN190301 & RM190124

Thanks Shannon I'm ok with the response given and their conservative approach for allowing fish passage on all outlets given the lack of a detailed assessment of fish communities.

From: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@gw.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 22 July 2019 5:09 PM
To: Roger Uys <Roger.Uys@gw.govt.nz>; Hamilton, Catherine <catherine.hamilton@wsp-opus.co.nz>; Head, Jeremy <jeremy.head@wsp-opus.co.nz>; Iain Dawe <Iain.Dawe@gw.govt.nz>; Evan Harrison <Evan.Harrison@gw.govt.nz>
Cc: Megan Oliver <Megan.Oliver@gw.govt.nz>; Jo Frances <Jo.Frances@gw.govt.nz>; Parvati Rotherham <Parvati.Rotherham@huttcity.govt.nz>; Sharyn Westlake <Sharyn.Westlake@gw.govt.nz>; Angus Gray <agray@doc.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Eastern Bays Shared Path project: Further Information Request (s92) and s95E RMA - WGN190301 & RM190124

Hi all

The first part of the Eastern Bays Shared Path request for further information has come in for consideration while the more complicated matters (seagrass and effects on penguins) are being worked through. The consent will remain on hold under s92 of the Resource Management Act until ALL of the information has been provided and confirmed as appropriately addressing the information requested.

Megan – your concerns will be addressed in the second part of the further information response expected early August.

Everyone else - Can you please review the attached response and confirm whether or not the concerns you identified in your original assessments have been addressed by the applicant (I have attached the s92 request for ease of reference). If they have not been addressed can you please advise:

- Any areas of concern that have been addressed by the response
- Any areas of concern not appropriately addressed by the response
- what further information you require for remaining concerns to be 'closed out' and the format in which you would like this information to be provided

It would be appreciated if you could review the final response and provide any comments back to me within **5 working days (30 July 2019)**. Please let me know ASAP if you are not able to meet this timeframe.

Please give me a call if you have any questions.

Shannon Watson | Kaitohutohu / Resource Advisor, Environmental Regulation

GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

Te Pane Matua Taiao

Shed 39, 2 Fryatt Quay, Pipitea, Wellington 6011 | PO Box 11646, Manners St, Wellington 6142

From: Van Halderen, Caroline <Caroline.VanHalderen@stantec.com>

Sent: Monday, 22 July 2019 11:45 AM

To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@gw.govt.nz>; Dan Kellow <Dan.Kellow@huttcity.govt.nz>

Cc: Povall, Jamie <Jamie.Povall@stantec.com>; Simon Cager <Simon.Cager@huttcity.govt.nz>

Subject: Eastern Bays Shared Path project: Further Information Request (s92) and s95E RMA - WGN190301 & RM190124

Hi Shannon and Dan

I refer to your letter dated 29 May 2019 requesting further information under section 92(1) from both Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) and Hutt City Council (HCC) and for an additional request for affected party approval under s95E from GWRC.

Please find the attached memorandum outlining our responses to the requested information under the headings that are set out in your letter. Where necessary we have added more detail under a series of annexures attached to the memorandum.

Please note that further investigations are currently being undertaken on shoreline foragers, penguins and seagrass. We are planning to get a response to you early in August.

I have also attached a written approval form from CentrePort as requested. HCC Parks will provide comments during the internal feedback process. We have yet to receive written approval from Mr and Mrs Thomas and will follow up with them again.

Ngā Mihi | Kind regards,

Caroline van Halderen

B Town and Regional Planning, MNZPI
Senior Planner

Direct: +64 4 381 5716

Mobile: +64 277742409

Stantec New Zealand
Level 13, 80 The Terrace
Wellington, 6011 New Zealand



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.