

# Minutes of Meeting No. 1

## 80 MCLARIN ROAD SMP

### Initial Comments from HW SMP to Support Plan Change

**PRESENT:** Jonathan Chambers, Ahlia Hicks, Danny Curtis (HW)      **HG PROJECT NO:** A2010091  
**ABSENT:** None.      **DATE:** 30/08/2022  
**START TIME:** 3:00 PM      **END TIME:** 4:00 PM  
**MINUTED BY:** Ahlia Hicks

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	
		INITIALS	DATE
<b>1.0</b>	<b>RUN-THROUGH THE SUBMITTED SMP</b>	JC	
	Have not received clear layout from client for the plan change. Therefore, a final stormwater management approach has not been identified or presented in the SMP at this stage.		
	Council floodplain model guidelines were followed. Current model scenarios run include no site development, existing with no SLR and MPD.		
	DC - Using a 2m SLR masks the development impacts. Should only use 1m SLR to ensure the impacts from the proposed development can be identified.		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>FEEDBACK ON SMP</b>	DC	
	Understands that no formal layout has been provided for the Plan Change at this stage. The amount of Greenspace proposed in the landuse may not be accepted by the client.  To allow for landuse changes the model should be simplified to 60% imperiousness over the whole development area and ignore roading and greenspace areas. This is a simpler and more flexible model.	JC	
	A 'No site development' model scenario is not relevant for this SMP from an RMA perspective as we 'ignored' our development.  Suggest we model 'existing development' and 'existing + MPD' scenarios.	JC	
	The SMP needs to provide a technical solution for the NDC requirements. These solutions should be based on the landuse with a justification as we don't have a detailed layout yet. The SMP doesn't need to go into as much detail into WSP ect.  Possible options can be discussed with anything questionable pushed through to the conclusions and recommendations e.g., Existing pipe network doesn't have sufficient capacity – need a clear solution for attenuation. Scaled drawings and layouts should be provided to show that the solutions are actually feasible for the site.	AH	
	Existing dry detention pond will remain. We need to clearly explain what it does and how it does it.	AH	
	SMAF Controls - We look at the sensitive streams that could be impacted which required hydrological mitigation and potentially extra wetlands. It is sufficient for the SMP to say we needs to apply minimum equivalent to SMAF 1.		

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	
		INITIALS	DATE
<b>3.0</b>	<b>RECAP</b>		
	Simplify model to take 60% across whole area and ignore roading and small greenspaces – Post development scenario.		
	Model 3 Scenarios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ED</li> <li>- ED+Dev</li> <li>- MDP (using flat 60% imperv so we don't lock client into urban layout).</li> </ul> Danny is looking for MPD vs existing development.		
	Only 1m Tide level in modelling		
	Look at reducing green space extent around wetlands and streams.		
	Fewer larger devices are generally better. Depends on the plan change whether the extent of greenspace remains. 1 x attenuation device and a couple of pre treatment devices at top of site could suffice. Base attenuation device on the difference between ED+Dev and MPD eg. 10000L of storage that could be located somewhere and can actually fit on site.		
	Ownership of this space needs to be defined.		
	SMP can be simplified to be based on landuse to avoid being too prohibitive for plan change. Keep higher level than road layouts.		
	Theory is that network will take 10% AEP but we know it won't. A rain on grid model is good for now. Add to conclusions that network will be added at a later stage. Can add a simple TP108 calc for the pre and post dev volumes. Don't need to model it necessarily.		
	There is a vision of connecting wetlands and streams with green space. Wetlands were dependant on surface flows. Include bio-retention or attenuation structure for first flush before discharge into northern wetlands.		
	Include discussion for future changes to NDC ect in conclusions.		
<b>4.0</b>	<b>&lt;ENTER HEADING HERE&gt;</b>		

Next Meeting – <enter text here>

**DISTRIBUTION:**

NAME	INITIALS	EMAIL
Jonathan Chambers	JC	j.chambers@harrisingrierson.com
Danny Curtis	DC	danny.curtis@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Ahlia Hicks	AH	a.hicks@harrisingrierson.com