File No: 60 53 58A
Document No: 28742982
Enquiries to: Brian Richmond

15 March 2024

Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240, NZ

waikatoregion.govt.nz
0800 800 401

Thames Coromandel District Council
Attention: S7(2)(a) LGOIMA 1987
By Email: S7(2)(a) LGOIMA 1987

S7(2)(a) LGOIMA 1...

Thames Coromandel District Council – Williamson SW Pond

Thanks for your email dated March 7, 2024 and for providing the information relating to TCDC's proposed upgrade of the existing soakage pond at Williamson Park in Whangamata. As discussed, we have reviewed the proposal and have the following comments:

1. The existing pond was originally designed to be a soakage basin, with a spillway outlet. As discussed in the Metis memo, the existing pond provides a long residence time, hence achieves associated settlement of sediments. Also, when not clogged there would be soakage out the base of the pond, achieving additional filtering before release to groundwater/the beach. TCDC advises that the pond has been cleared out from time to time, indicating that it is functioning as a settling device. Treatment in the proposed solution includes provision of a GPT in the outlet pipe, which would target removal of litter and sediments larger than 5mm dia. A GPT is not considered to provide equivalent treatment to what is currently provided by the existing soakage pond. It is expected that if an upgrade is being undertaken that at least the same, but ideally better treatment would be achieved by the proposal. It is understood that the Residents Society has provided some feedback on what was suitable from their perspective, i.e., no planting and no standing water, accommodating their requests cannot come at the cost of providing an effective solution. Compliance and consistency with the TCDC Whangamata Comprehensive SW Discharge Consent needs to be ensured.

2. Typical contaminants of concern in stormwater runoff include PAHs, heavy metals, and nutrients, in addition to the litter and sediments that are listed in the Metis memo. The memo notes that algal blooms observed in the pond in spring and early summer indicate high nutrient loading in the pond influent. The proposed pond upgrade will need to address these water quality issues. As noted in comment 1 above, the currently proposed use of a GPT only to provide water quality treatment is not considered adequate.

3. The proposal will result in more frequent discharge to the beach, at higher peak flow and velocity than what is currently experienced, particularly for the smaller channel forming events. Careful design is required to ensure erosion and scour effects are adequately mitigated so as not to cause erosion issues at the point of discharge on the beach. More information is

required to demonstrate adequate consideration of potential erosion and scour effects at the beach and how the design addresses these concerns. Maintaining soakage functionality in the base of the pond is recommended. Note that providing treatment before the pond will help to maintain soakage capabilities in the pond as it will reduce the potential for clogging to occur.

4. It is understood that in an earlier design iteration, a wetland was proposed for the proposed pond upgrade. Council supports the wetland proposal, subject to adequate design to ensure that wetland vegetation would survive the dry summer conditions.

Yours faithfully

S7(2)(a) LGOIMA 1987

Brian Richmond
Project Manager, Resource Consents
Resource Use Directorate