

20230430 Emails regarding stakeholders meeting

From: Brett Houston <Brett.Houston@tcdc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2023 1:51 PM
To: ian@moisturedetection.co.nz
Cc: Bruce Hinson <bruce.hinson@tcdc.govt.nz>; Jagdeep Singh <Jagdeep.Singh@tcdc.govt.nz>; Mohamed Imtiaz <mohamed.imtiaz@tcdc.govt.nz>; Ed Varley <Ed.Varley@tcdc.govt.nz>; Anouska Greene <anouska.greene@tcdc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: (DWS Doc No 9150222) RE: Follow up from stormwater meeting #1

Ian

Currently we, as a Whangamata Stormwater Group, agreed to work on the attached Whangamata SW Action Plan with short-term, medium-term, technical investigation and long-term actions. In your email below you appear to be going straight to long-term actions with your proposals/solutions rather than ensuring we have completed the medium-term and technical investigations.

I commend you on your efforts to produce these proposals/solutions but we need to ensure we have all of the medium-term and technical investigations completed, reviewed and agreed by the Group before we start developing the final solutions. I suggest you raise this at the next meeting that you have been developing some proposals and we are able to review and potentially incorporate into our final solutions when we reach that stage.

Re the regulatory and compliance matters I am unable to comment as they are not part of the Whangamata Stormwater Group's focus.

Regards

Brett Houston
Water Services Manager

Thames-Coromandel District Council
Private Bag, 515 Mackay Street, Thames
e: brett.houston@tcdc.govt.nz
w: www.tcdc.govt.nz



The contents of this e-mail may be CONFIDENTIAL OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED and is intended only for the persons named above. If this e-mail is not addressed to you, you must not use, read, distribute, or copy this document. If you have received this document by mistake, please call us and destroy the original.

Please consider the planet before printing out this email.

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>
Date: Thursday, 11 May 2023 at 10:35 AM
To: Bruce Hinson <bruce.hinson@tcdc.govt.nz>
Cc: rob.boston50@gmail.com <rob.boston50@gmail.com>
Subject: (DWS Doc No 9150222) RE: Follow up from stormwater meeting #1

Hi Bruce

Thanks for the meeting minutes.

To keep this email short – I have developed what I would call a 50 year plan – to be implemented within say 5-10 years that I think would be a good thing for Tim to model against.

What I have done is divide the sand flats (not Moana or surrounding areas) into zones. The purpose is to create the boundaries for gravity pipe collections (Zone A) and separated these from zones where we will expect programmed loss of fall to sea level which get divided into economic zone for pumping before retreat (zone B) and a zone for retreat (Zone C). In the middle somewhere is the zone D for hard wall.

Currently I count 30 discharge pipes around Moanaanuanu, Harbour, the Coast and Otahu. Zones B and C would retain these but in very reduced volumes.

Due to many of the road to floor line negatives within zones A and B we create a new type of cesspit. The road cesspits that are piped will have soak pits installed next to them with a difference that the road piped systems will get feed by the overflow of the soak pits – not the road. That way in lighter rainfall events all rainwater will be dropped into the water table until either the percolation rate is overwhelmed or the water table is full. That way we protect against the danger of over drainage with removing too much rainwater that is needed in the water table health.

Zone E is the golf course. It has been designated as a flood plain but that is incorrect. The golf course topography has a swale right around except at the Williamson Road walkway preventing overland flow onto it. It gets flooded from the rain itself but behaves differently to the roading and housing around its edges because it has depression where the water table springs up. The financial issue we are facing is why spend any money on the old swamp when very few people play golf in winter and none play in the rain. We will never justify any spend on it – unless it becomes central to the long term plan. I have created a management plan for the water table – prior to the need to well point and pump. That may come but I believe I can deliver a ‘proof of concept’ by surface means first. As the sea level rises or in extreme extended flooding pumps may well be needed. The theory I have worked on is to breach the swales around the edges and create – or rather – recreate the old natural overland flow paths into the golf course. My plan deals with this.

I have also developed a model for the pond. I would like your permission to present that prior to our next meeting.

Regarding the regulatory and compliance matters I still want to go ahead with that – in the first instance I would like to use the attached document – MBIE Technical review section 4 pages 15 and 16 and see if we can re-visit this and see where the resource and compliance team got to. I see s73 and s71 need some work. Seems contradictory to me but I think I can understand it. I am firmly of the opinion to get positive buy in for a storm water LTP we need to be able to explain tags.

I have not attached my proposals in this email – what I would like from you is if I send them and you are okay on a ‘more than one idea is good to consider’ approach then I’ll tart it up and send it to you. I would really hope you’ll be okay for me to then send it to Tim to then have a pock at it. With your blessing.

Regards Ian

From: Ian Holyoake <ian@moisturedetection.co.nz>

Sent: Sunday, April 30, 2023 9:20 PM

To: 'bruce.hinson@tcdc.govt.nz' <bruce.hinson@tcdc.govt.nz>

Cc: 'rob.boston50@gmail.com' <rob.boston50@gmail.com>

Subject: Follow up from stormwater meeting #1

Hi Bruce and Brett.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on Thursday.

What I see in summary is:

1. Urgent responses required to homeowners with flooded floors. This response should initially be to assess the causation of the flooding (objectively) and to see if a solution is possible to minimise the likely re-occurrence. Where this involves storm water assets the moneys could come from the current budget. If the solution is longer term, then it goes to planning and into the next phase of projects – remembering the likelihood of another such event like Hale and Gabrielle may not occur for say 4-5 years eg 2003, 2017 and now 2023. I don't believe we need an Opus report to do this. We already have the 2005 and 2018 ones to work off if we need their direction.
2. Major flooding – we'll call it water finding its own overland flow path – sometimes on roads, sometimes over private properties – let's get these all logged and assessed for planning if it fits within the LTP. Sometimes this could fit into the annual plan?? Then owners would see a plan.
3. Minor surface ponding – nuisance flooding – this does not seem to fit into the planning of the Annual Plan or LTP. Maybe these homeowners can be logged and explained that this is minor and goes away after a few days – and is intended to fit into the longer-term plan after the urgent flood victims are resolved.
4. Maintenance of soak and cesspits. I think we agreed on these being programmed.
5. I have created a 'complaint form' as I would with other inspections I conduct in my business. I attach a word version for you to look at and see if you can add anything – or make it simpler. I am not asking TCDC to do these – just if I prepare them on behalf of owners would they be sufficient so your team will get a grasp of the problem and possible solution. I have already sent about 30 forms to owners so far and slowly getting responses. I have analysed just a couple so far. It may be that Bruce from EPL is the best person to take some off me and review them and come back to you with simple solutions. I see almost everyone so far is **'house below the road and no overland flow path backup'**.
6. I would like to progress the Regulatory and Compliance part of storm water. I have completed 2 houses that could be good case studies for this discussion. If this group had time, I would like to include discussion on Tags. The properties I have analysed have up to 14 possible solutions so far. The goal of solutions is **'would the proposed solution provide council with suitable confidence that 'on reasonable grounds' would s71 be satisfied to the word 'likely'**'. If we can come up with a 'toolbox of solutions' that can be fitted into the LTP and can be drilled down into upcoming Annual Plans then the 'loss' cannot be suffered – just deferred. This would change the landscape for claims, or threats of claims.
7. I would like to progress a **'special workshop' on draining the weir**. Reason is simple. On Thursday afternoon the weir level dropped down about 200mm below the top of the pipes. It may be coincidence but overnight on Thursday the Golf Course drain into the 4th dried up and the lake in the left of the first fairway almost dried up. The lake on the right of the first dried up totally. Personally, I have difficulty accepting these are that closely linked time wise but what if it was? It could be all we need to do in the interim to 'proof of concept' is remove 75% of the sand behind the current weir and allow more infiltration through the weir so the water level drops down by seepage. If this worked, then the importance or urgency of bypass may be averted – if the water table suddenly dropped and allowed the

Golf Course land to be worked on they can restart the mowers and get playing started. Soak pits would have a better chance of working and reduce surface ponding from bubble up.

8. Robert Fletcher and I had a discussion about the losses. He is going to arrange a meeting so the board can appoint someone to take over his role and meet with Terry and Dave to come forward with some plan – outside the storm water group. That way we can move forward on storm water without worrying about legacy matters with the club.
9. **I would like to work with you to prepare the LTP that Mo picked up on.** It seems to me the logistics is we need to work through what we want 30 years out and break that back into 10 year chunks. To me the main objectives would be to get 105667 signed off BUT more importantly we want resilience and money well spent rather than band aiding what hasn't got a chance of meeting WRC's last request (2021). I just don't see the point in trying to keep the 2001 SWMP as it is when we're just not aligned to it (that is WRA).

So, in summary I would like to pressure you into getting the above highlighted sections above into meetings to get these projects underway so that for the upcoming 6 week meeting we will have some good proposals that can be hammered out. I can pop over Thursday say 2pm if that works – if not then next week.

Regards Ian 021607611