


80 MCLARIN ROAD, Stormwater Management Plan
GLENBROOK -
REZONING

HD Project 2 Ltd







DOCUMENT CONTROL RECORD

CLIENT HD Project 2 Ltd
PROJECT 80 McLarin Road, Glenbrook - Rezoning
HG PROJECT NO. A2010091.01
HG DOCUMENT NO. R001-A2010091-SMP-ALH-JMSC
DOCUMENT Stormwater Management Plan

ISSUE AND REVISION RECORD

DATE OF ISSUE September 2022
STATUS Final


ORIGINATOR Ahlia Hicks - Graduate Engineer
Fatemeh Mohammadi - Graduate Engineer


REVIEWED Jonathan Chambers – Team Leader Water Resources
Saeed Ghavidelfar – Senior Water Resources Engineer


APPROVED FOR ISSUE Bryce Powell - Senior Planner

OFFICE OF ORIGIN Parnell
TELEPHONE +64 9 212 6553
EMAIL a.hicks@harrisingrierson.com



CONTENTS

1.0	EXISTING SITE APPRAISAL	1
1.1	Summary of Data Sources and Dates	1
1.2	Location and General Information.....	1
1.3	Topography.....	3
1.4	Ecological	4
1.5	Existing Drainage Features and Stormwater Infrastructure	6
1.6	Receiving Environment.....	8
1.7	Stormwater discharge and pipe capacity	9
1.8	Existing Hydrological Features.....	10
1.9	Flooding and Overland Flow paths.....	10
1.10	Coastal Inundation.....	11
1.11	Biodiversity	12
1.12	Cultural and Heritage Sites.....	13
1.13	Contaminated Land	13
2.0	DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY AND PLANNING CONTEXT	14
2.1	Regulatory and Design Requirements.....	14
3.0	MANA WHENUA: TE AO MĀORI AND MĀTAURANGA	14
3.1	Identification and Incorporation of Mana Whenua Values.....	14
4.0	STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION	16
5.0	PROPOSED REZONING APPROACH	16
6.0	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT.....	16
6.1	Principles of Stormwater Management	16
6.2	Proposed Stormwater Management.....	19
6.3	Hydraulic Modelling.....	22
7.0	DEPARTURES FROM REGULATORY OR DESIGN CODES.....	34
8.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	34
9.0	LIMITATIONS	35
9.1	General	35

APPENDICES

No table of contents entries found.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Harrison Grierson (HG) has been engaged to advance a private plan change to rezone 80 McLarin Road from 'Future Urban' to an urban residential land use zoning under the Auckland Unitary Plan 2016 – Operative in Part (AUP(OP)).

80 McLarin Road is one of three properties within the coastal Waitangi Stream catchment, on the Manukau Harbour, identified as 'Glenbrook Beach 2' in the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy 2017 (FULSS) and is earmarked as being 'Development Ready' from 2023.

High-level feasibility investigations undertaken by HG indicate that once urbanised and developed, 80 McLarin Road could yield around 100 household units. Final yield numbers will depend largely on housing typologies and the effective integration of stormwater management, ecology, civil engineering, and urban design.

This Stormwater Management Plan assesses existing information about the subject site including ecological, cultural, and natural hazards data. It presents the results of a detailed rain-on-grid hydraulic modelling exercise which identifies adverse flood impacts associated with a potential future development of the subject site. It proposes a stormwater management approach that is consistent with the aspirations of the Cultural Impact Assessment, complies with the requirements of the Auckland Council Regionwide Network Discharge Consent, and addresses the adverse effects identified in the flooding assessment.

1.0 EXISTING SITE APPRAISAL

1.1 SUMMARY OF DATA SOURCES AND DATES

TABLE 1: DATA SUMMARY	
EXISTING SITE APPRAISAL ITEM	SOURCE AND DATE OF DATA USED
Topography	GeoMaps, Auckland Council (2021)
Geotechnical / soil conditions	Detailed Ecological Assessments, Pattle Delamore Partners (December 2021) Additional Wetland Investigations, Pattle Delamore Partners (April 2022) Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Report, Lander Geotechnical (September 2021)
Existing stormwater network	GeoMaps, Auckland Council (2021)
Existing hydrological features	Concept Master Plan, Harrison Grierson (2020)
Stream, river, coastal erosion	Detailed Ecological Assessments, PDP (December 2021)
Flooding and flow paths	Detailed Ecological Assessment, PDP (December 2021)
Coastal Inundation	GeoMaps, Auckland Council (2021)
Ecological / environmental areas	Detailed Ecological Assessments, PDP (2021)
Cultural and heritage sites	Cultural Impacts Assessment, Ngati Te Ata Waiohua (November 2021) Archaeological Assessment, CFG Heritage (August 2021)
Contaminated land	Preliminary Environmental Site Investigation, ENGEO (November 2021)

1.2 LOCATION AND GENERAL INFORMATION

The proposed Private Plan Change consists of approximately 8.0 ha of land at 80 McLarin Road, Glenbrook. The site is shown in Figure 1 below with respect to the wider Auckland Region.




FIGURE 1: Regional site context (Auckland Council, 2022).



FIGURE 2: Local site context (Auckland Council, 2022).

The property information is outlined in the following table.

TABLE 2: PROPERTY INFORMATION	
FEATURE	ATTRIBUTE
Site address	80 McLarin Road, Glenbrook, Auckland
Legal description	Lot 2 DP 204733
Current Land Use	Rural - Pastoral
Current building coverage	None
Historical Land Use	Rural - Pastoral

1.3 TOPOGRAPHY

The site is characterised by rolling topography, shelter belt vegetation, three small natural wetlands, and a network of modified watercourses. It has a 19-metre change in elevation from the northeast (approx. 22.5 m RL) to the southwest (approx. 3.5 m RL). A ridgeline runs from west to east across the centre of the site, separating the elevated plateau in the northern portion of the site from the sloping land to the south (HG, 2020). The southwestern corner is low-lying (3.5 m RL) and located around 150 m from the coast.



FIGURE 3: Existing site topography (Auckland Council, 2022).

1.4 ECOLOGICAL

1.4.1 WETLAND ECOLOGY

PDP (2021) undertook a Detailed Ecological Assessment of the site to assess the ecological values of the watercourses and the condition of wetlands on the site. This assessment relies on field investigations undertaken in October 2021. Three small natural inland marsh wetlands were identified, with areas of 0.025 ha (W1), 0.02 ha (W2) and 0.1 ha (W3). All three wetlands are in a moderate condition and have some natural vegetation remaining after moderate changes in ecosystem processes and growth of exotic vegetation. These wetlands are shown on Figure 4.

Further investigations and assessments were then undertaken in 2022 using the Wetland Delineation Hydrology Tool for Aotearoa New Zealand (MFE, 2021) after additional hydrophytic vegetation was identified within the site.

Seven 2 x 2 m vegetation plots were investigated across the site for wetland delineation. Of these, plots 1-3 meet the definition of natural inland wetlands, however, they are considered to be induced wetlands created through unintentional human disturbance (PDP Ltd., 2021). Plots 4-7 do not meet the definition of natural inland wetlands. These plots are also shown on Figure 4.




FIGURE 4: Wetland extents, setbacks, and plot locations.

1.4.2 STREAM ECOLOGY

The drainage pattern across the site generally flows northeast to southwest. The two major overland flow path (OLFP) catchments are shown in Table 3 and Figure 5.

CATCHMENT	AREA
Western	3.65 ha
Eastern	5.02 ha
Southern	1.32 ha
Combined	9.98 ha




FIGURE 5: Sub-catchments within the subject site (Auckland Council, 2022).

PDP assessed these stream reaches using the Auckland Council River/Stream Classification Guidance Note method (Auckland Council, 2021). The on-site stream reaches were identified as ephemeral and intermittent streams, as shown on Table 4 and Figure 6. These watercourses have been heavily modified through historical farming activities and are degraded by a lack of riparian cover and stock access. All streams have no riparian cover and have very low ecological value.

STREAM NAME	APPROXIMATE LENGTH	CLASSIFICATION	OVERALL ECOLOGICAL VALUE
A1	65 m	Ephemeral	Very low

STREAM NAME	APPROXIMATE LENGTH	CLASSIFICATION	OVERALL ECOLOGICAL VALUE
A2	69 m	Ephemeral	Very low
A3	100 m	Intermittent	Very low
A4	401 m	Intermittent	Very low




FIGURE 6: Classification of streams within the subject site.

undertook a semi-quantitative and qualitative stream habitat assessment of stream A3. The assessment covered an approximately 50 m reach of the intermittent watercourse and found it to have low ecological value. The stream bed was found to be entirely soft sediment with limited organic material and woody debris. A lack of riparian vegetation has resulted in limited habitat for aquatic and terrestrial organisms. The banks were generally stable; however, some evidence of erosion was found (PDP Ltd., 2021).

1.5 EXISTING DRAINAGE FEATURES AND STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE

A dry detention pond is located at the southwestern corner of the site, spanning the boundary with the neighbouring site (Lot 3 DP 160963). GeoMaps indicates the dry detention pond is 144 m², installed in 2003 and is privately owned and maintained by Auckland Council. The northern boundary of the pond is aligned with the southern boundary of W3 (Figure 4). The purpose of this pond is likely to collect OLFPs and sheet flows running off the subject site and neighbouring property

and discharge them into the pipe network before spilling into neighbouring residential sites. The dry detention pond is shown in Figure 7 and FIGURE 8.

The dry detention pond will be left in place and continue to provide water quantity control for the proposed development. The pond aims to provide peak flow control and stream channel protection. However, dry detention ponds are generally not designed to provide water quality treatment or reduce runoff volumes through infiltration.



FIGURE 7: Dry detention pond outlet.




FIGURE 8: Dry detention pond and outlet into the network (Auckland Council, 2022).

1.6 RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT

The watercourses that converge in the southwestern corner of the site are piped through the Glenbrook township and drain into the Waiuku River inlet of the Manukau Harbour a short distance downstream (to the west) of the site. The dual DN450 line draining the pond runs for around 75 m length, then runs into a single DN450 line for around 78 m along Fleet Street, which discharges to the coast via a 6 m length of DN600 line.

The network and outlet are shown on Figure 9 and Figure 10 below.



FIGURE 9: Underground discharge pipe network to the beach outlet (Auckland Council, 2022).



FIGURE 10: Stormwater outfall at Glenbrook beach.

1.7 STORMWATER DISCHARGE AND PIPE CAPACITY

By inferring pipe grades from GeoMaps the dual DN450 line likely does not have capacity greater than 800 L/s. This capacity will likely be further restricted to around 400 L/s where the network flows into a single DN450 line. For comparison, the un-attenuated peak flow discharged from the site in the 10% AEP event is likely around 1500 L/s based on a possible future development scenario characterised by medium density housing. The existing network is likely at or near capacity servicing the existing township. The capacity of the network may be reduced further in future sea-level rise and storm surge events given its low elevation and proximity to the harbour. It is unlikely that the existing network capacity will be sufficient to service the subject site and attenuation of the 10% AEP site runoff may be required to address this.

Figure 11 and Figure 12 show the hydraulic model result for the existing scenario and no sea-level rise with 1% and 10% AEP events, respectively.




FIGURE 11: Fleet Street Existing Scenario, 1% AEP hydraulic model results for 0 m SLR model results.




FIGURE 12: Fleet Street Existing Scenario, 10% AEP hydraulic model results for 0 m SLR model results.

1.8 EXISTING HYDROLOGICAL FEATURES

Sections 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 discuss the existing natural wetland and stream network on site.

In accordance with the NES-F (2020) and NPS-FM (2020) policies to protect natural wetlands, the proposed Plan Change should acknowledge the existing natural wetlands (W1, W2, W3) on the site as illustrated in Figure 4 and support their protection and enhancement.

1.9 FLOODING AND OVERLAND FLOW PATHS

Several isolated and confined floodplain areas are identified within the subject site. These floodplains are associated with flat land in the northern portion of the site and associated with the ephemeral and intermittent watercourse in the western site catchment. Another floodplain area in the southwestern catchment is connected to a significant floodplain system in the Glenbrook Beach township, associated with the low-lying, flat land fronting the beach. These floodplains were produced by a Rapid Flood Hazard Assessment in 2009 and do not include climate change factors nor probable future levels of development permitted by planning rules.

The extents of on-site overland flow paths (OLFPs) and floodplains are shown in Figure 13 below.



FIGURE 13: Floodplains and OLFPs within the subject site.

1.10 COASTAL INUNDATION

Coastal boundaries and inundation hazards are identified on GeoMaps in terms of the 1% AEP storm surge event as set out in the policy framework of Part E36, Natural Hazards and Flooding, of the AUP(OP).

Storm surge is the rise in sea-level due to meteorological effects. The 1% AEP coastal-storm inundation is at a level that has a 1% chance of being equalled or exceeded per year.

Sea-level rise (SLR) values are based on the projections by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change fifth assessment report (2015). A one metre SLR is representative of the upper-bound climate change scenario to 2115. A two metre SLR is representative of potential, longer term SLR conditions (2120 to approximately 2200).

Figure 14 shows the indicative coastline and extent of coastal inundation anticipated in a 1% AEP event (Auckland Council, 2022). The following datasets are presented:

- 1% AEP (to demonstrate present day risk in alignment with the Auckland Unitary Plan activity controls), correlating to around 3.1 m RL in Glenbrook.
- 1% AEP + 1 m SLR (in alignment with Auckland Unitary Plan activity controls), correlating to around 4.1 m RL in Glenbrook.

- 1% AEP + 2 m SLR (to demonstrate longer term risk with ongoing sea-level rise), correlating to around 5.1 m RL in Glenbrook.

Figure 14 shows that around 930 m² of the site may be inundated by a 1% AEP storm surge event in a future +1 m SLR scenario, and a further approx. 670 m² may be inundated by the same event with +2 m SLR. The main risks to the site posed by coastal inundation are likely reduced performance of the stormwater collection and drainage network in the future.




FIGURE 14: Coastal inundation extents (Auckland Council, 2022).

1.11 BIODIVERSITY

PDP (2021) have undertaken a Detailed Ecological Assessment of the site in support of the proposed Plan Change. Key findings of this assessment, relevant to stormwater management, are summarised below.

The lack of riparian vegetation has resulted in limited habitat available for both aquatic and terrestrial organisms. PDP (2021) have provided some detail on the semi-quantitative and qualitative stream habitat assessment that covered an approximately 50 m reach of the intermittent watercourse located in the south-western corner of the site.

Biotic indices were indicative of poor water quality at the site, thus only pollution tolerant taxa were identified. The dominant taxa comprised of midges, seed shrimp, and ribbon worms. The ecological value of this site was assessed as very low.

1.12 CULTURAL AND HERITAGE SITES

CFG Heritage undertook an Archaeological Assessment on the site. The following summarises the key findings of this assessment.

A small section of remaining forest to the west of the site has been identified as pōhutukawa, pūriri, broadleaved forest with an IUCN threat status of Endangered. The potential or historical extent of indigenous vegetation for this area has been identified as pūriri forest with a treat status of critically endangered.

CFG Heritage (2021) concluded that no archaeological and heritage constraints on the proposed Plan Change have been identified. It is recommended as a precautionary measure that any earthworks and ground disturbance undertaken should be under a HNZPT archaeological authority, and further research into the locations of John Kent and Te Wherewhereo's children's graves should be taken. Archaeological survey cannot always detect sites of traditional significance by Māori, or wahi tapu, so the appropriate tangata whenua authorities should be consulted regarding the possible existence of such sites, and the recommendations in this report.

Ngati te Ata supports the recommendations made in the CFG Heritage Archaeological Assessment (Ngati te Ata Waiohua, 2021).

1.13 CONTAMINATED LAND

ENGEO Ltd undertook a PSI of the subject site to support the plan change process. The report found the site may have been impacted by two activities listed on the HAIL (ENGEO, 2021).

1. HAIL ID H: Any land that has been subject to the migration of hazardous substances from adjacent land in sufficient quantity that it could be a risk to human health or the environment.
 - The sites adjacent to the northern end of the property were historically used for horticultural purposes, therefore the site may have been subject to spray drift during pesticide application on this neighbouring property.
2. HAIL ID I: Any other land that has been subject to the intentional or accidental release of a hazardous substance in sufficient quantity that it could be a risk to human health or the environment.
 - Agrichemicals, in particular superphosphate fertiliser, are likely to have been applied to the site to support use as grazing land. Cadmium is often co-located with the source of superphosphate fertiliser, resulting in a build-up of cadmium in soils where superphosphate fertiliser is regularly applied.

The report does not make any recommendations specifically relating to stormwater management. The author notes that it is unlikely for either or both of the above HAIL activities to apply to the site however recommends topsoil contamination testing should be undertaken.

2.0 DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY AND PLANNING CONTEXT

2.1 REGULATORY AND DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

Table 5 summarises the relevant regulatory and design requirements for the proposed stormwater management.

TABLE 5: RELEVANT REGULATORY AND DESIGN REQUIREMENTS	
FEATURE	ATTRIBUTE
Auckland Council Regionwide Network Discharge Consent	Greenfield Development under Schedule 4 of the Auckland Council Network Discharge Consent
Auckland Unitary Plan Precinct	N/A
Existing Catchment Management Plan	No
Natural Hazards	Coastal inundation 1% AEP + 1 m SLR Flood plains
High Contaminant Generating Areas	No
Unitary Plan – SMAF hydrology mitigation	No

3.0 MANA WHENUA: TE AO MĀORI AND MĀTAURANGA

Incorporating te ao Māori and mātauranga Māori to our work encourages meaningful community engagement and builds the relationship between people and the environment.

A Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) (2021) has been prepared by Ngati Te Ata Waiohū in respect to the proposed Plan Change. The CIA identifies the cultural considerations and aspirations of the site at 80 McLaren Road, Glenbrook. The cultural and historical associations of Ngati Te Ata Waiohū with Glenbrook have been researched and the conclusions from the CIA (2021) are summarised below.

The CIA notes that the proposed Plan change could provide significant economic development opportunities for Ngati Te Ata Waiohū including housing, employment, social enterprise, skills development and driving a development framed around the Te Aranga principles. It also acknowledges the cultural dimension of the plan change and the importance to Ngati Te Ata Waiohū of having a say in how ancestral land is used and developed.

3.1 IDENTIFICATION AND INCORPORATION OF MANA WHENUA VALUES

The main goals of Ngati Te Ata Waiohū include the protection, preservation, and appropriate management of natural and cultural resources in a manner that recognises and provides for their interests and values, and enables positive environmental, social, and economic outcomes.

Ngati Te Ata Waiohū supports engagement that respects and provides for their cultural and traditional relationships with Glenbrook, its unique cultural identity, and have input into shaping the physical, cultural, social and economic regeneration of these areas.

Ngati Te Ata Waiohū is committed to protecting the mauri of natural waterways and advocates for the highest level of treatment of stormwater before being discharged into waterways. It is important that 'clean' and 'contaminated' waters are not mixed, i.e., no direct disposal of waste into

waterways, including wetlands. Natural wetlands should only be used to filter stormwater after passing through at least two forms of treatment to promote the regeneration of any wetland.

The CIA (2021) identifies that the improvement of stormwater quality is an essential element towards protecting aquatic receiving environments. Ngati Te Ata Waiohua notes that the proposed development activity has the potential to adversely impact cultural values, including:

- i) The relationship of Ngati Te Ata Waiohua to wai (water) and thus the mauri (lifeforce) and orange (livelihood) of wetlands, streams, the Taihiki Awa and Manukau Harbour.
- ii) The harm to fish particularly Kahawai to which the area is traditionally renowned for, and the young kanae (mullet) and patiki (flounder) to which the Taihiki Awa is considered a nursery for.
- iii) The harm to shell fish and thus the adverse impact upon kutai (mussel) and tio (oyster), and subsequently the adverse impact upon mahinga mataitai, (customary shellfish gathering sites) in the Taihiki Awa and Manukau Harbour.
- iv) The harm to wildlife populations, killing native vegetation, fouling drinking water supplies, eroding and destabilising mana whenua sites of significance and the Taihiki Riverbank and make traditional recreational areas (e.g., waka ama) unsafe and unpleasant.

To minimise the contaminants in stormwater runoff from streets, car parks, access-ways, roofing, spouting, external wall cladding and architectural features adversely affecting cultural values, a water sensitive design approach is requested by Ngati Te Ata Waiohua. The CIA seeks a treatment train approach for future urban development of the site, e.g. with roof tanks for reuse and groundwater recharge discharging to swales and dry basins/wetlands prior to discharge to the receiving environment. Specific outcomes sought by Ngati Te Ata Waiohua include the following.

- **Rain barrels and cisterns** for harvesting rainwater for reuse, which can be implemented without the use of pumping devices, are recommended for every home building covenant or public building.
- **Permeable pavements** as an alternative to asphalt or concrete surfaces are recommended for every home driveway, footpath, public pathway and carpark.
- **Tree pits** coupled with permeable pavements are recommended along streets to filter runoff from small carpark areas and roads.
- **Planted vegetated swales** are culturally pleasing and supported for the retention and treatment they provide as well as mitigating the harsh urban appearance of developments. At least one swale should feature in the proposed development of the site.
- **Rain gardens** are recognised as best practice along with swales contributing options for contaminated road runoff and reducing pressure on detention basins. The use of native plants for these devices as well as tree pits adds to best practice stormwater management.
- **Wetlands** are recognised as being among the most effective stormwater practices for pollutant removal and aesthetic and habitat value for their filtration of contaminants and dissolved particulates, incorporation of contaminants in soils, adsorption, plant uptake, and biological microbial decomposition. They offer safety benefits to alternatives like wet ponds and are important cultural features to Ngati Te Ata Waiohua. The potential adverse impacts on natural wetland features should also be managed through the development process to avoid cumulative effects and maintain and stabilise the water levels and ecological condition of significant wetlands.

4.0 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

Informal meetings have been held with Auckland Council Healthy Waters specialists leading towards the preparation of this Stormwater Management Plan.

Feedback from Mark Iszard of Auckland Council indicated the management of natural wetlands within the subject site being a key matter for the Council. Additional feedback provided indicated the potential adverse effects of development on flooding of neighbouring sites. A flood modelling exercise was undertaken to support the plan change application as a result of this feedback.

5.0 PROPOSED REZONING APPROACH

This Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) has been prepared to anticipate future urban residential development of the subject site.

This SMP anticipates that rezoning of the land will facilitate a range of residential dwelling typologies to establish on the land, including high intensity typologies in appropriate locations. This SMP also anticipates that future site development will incorporate a stormwater management design and approach that works with the natural stormwater characteristics of the land and that achieves integration of best-practice stormwater, roading and urban design principles and outcomes.

6.0 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

6.1 PRINCIPLES OF STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

The proposed stormwater management is intended to comply with the requirements of Auckland's regionwide stormwater network discharge consent. The strategy has been developed to demonstrate the overarching principles of how stormwater will be managed for the site proposed to be live zoned, as required by the regional NDC, AUP, and Auckland Council Stormwater Code of Practice version 3 (SW CoP).

6.1.1 NETWORK DISCHARGE CONSENT

The regionwide stormwater Network Discharge Consent (NDC) is a tool for managing and integrating land use, stormwater discharge and the region's natural water assets to mitigate the impacts of climate change and flooding (Auckland Council, 2021). It allows multiple community and environmental outcomes to be realised. Schedule 4 of the regionwide NDC outlines development requirements for Greenfields developments within Auckland.

Below summarises how the future development of the site will meet the requirements of the Greenfields section of the regionwide NDC.

TABLE 6: NDC REQUIREMENTS FOR GREENFIELDS DEVELOPMENT	
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS	DESIGN APPROACH
Water Quality Treatment	Water Quality Treatment to GD01 standard or equivalent for all new impervious areas, and areas with High Contaminant Generating Activities.

TABLE 6: NDC REQUIREMENTS FOR GREENFIELDS DEVELOPMENT	
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS	DESIGN APPROACH
	Gross Pollutant Traps for waste storage areas.
Stream Hydrology (discharge to streams via the public stormwater network outside of AUP SMAF 1)	Hydrological mitigation to SMAF 1 standard for all new impervious areas to GD01 standard or equivalent. This will be managed using a SMAF 1 overlay applying to the total extent of the Plan Change area.
Flooding 50% AEP – Coastal Catchments	Attenuate stormwater runoff generated within coastal catchments 3, 4, and 5 to 100% of the peak flow rate generated in the existing scenario, 50% AEP rainfall event.
Flooding 10% AEP - Pipe Network Capacity	Attenuate stormwater runoff generated within northern stream catchments 1 & 2 in the 10% AEP rainfall event as required to avoid adverse effects and comply with AC SW CoP requirements and AT SW CoP requirements for all existing public stormwater infrastructure draining runoff from the site. Alternatively, upgrade the existing public stormwater infrastructure draining runoff generated within the site to achieve the same level of performance.
Flooding 1% AEP – Buildings	Attenuate stormwater runoff generated within northern stream catchments 1 & 2 in the 1% AEP rainfall event as required to avoid adverse effects and comply with AC SW CoP requirements and AT SW CoP requirements for all existing public stormwater infrastructure draining runoff from the site. Manage OLFPs safely within engineered OLFP channels and drainage reserves and establish minimum finished floor levels for new buildings as per AC SWCoP and NZBC.
Assets	All new public stormwater infrastructure will be designed and constructed in accordance with AC SW CoP and AT SW CoP requirements.

6.12 GD04 PRINCIPLES

GD04 outlines a Water Sensitive Design (WSD) approach for stormwater management to provide guidance for land use planning and development (Lewis, et al., 2015). It provides an innovative and resilient three waters strategy to ensure long-term benefit to the development, the wider community and surrounding natural environment. The approach aims to reduce, mitigate, or eliminate environmental degradation, maintain and enhance the quality of the existing stream network, and contribute to healthy soils and enhance the quality of the receiving environment by reducing the amount of nitrogen and contaminants flowing into the sea.

WSD principles from GD04 are provided below with an explanation of how these can be applied to the subject site.

TABLE 7: WSD PRINCIPLES AND THE APPLICATION TO THE SUBJECT SITE	
WSP PRINCIPLE	POTENTIAL APPLICATION OPTIONS TO THE SUBJECT SITE
Promote inter-disciplinary planning and design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing a robust options assessment of stormwater management devices that includes all devices supported by Ngati Te Ata Waiohua and Healthy Waters.

TABLE 7: WSD PRINCIPLES AND THE APPLICATION TO THE SUBJECT SITE	
WSP PRINCIPLE	POTENTIAL APPLICATION OPTIONS TO THE SUBJECT SITE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting early with Auckland Council Healthy Waters specialists to discuss the site, its constraints, and an early draft concept. • Collaborating with urban designers, ecologists, and planners to develop a stormwater management concept that is integrated with natural site features and existing infrastructure.
Protect and enhance the values and functions of natural ecosystems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying at an early stage the sensitive nature of the existing wetlands. • Delineating the contributing catchments of existing wetland features to understand their surface hydrology in the undeveloped site. • Designing the developed site contours and stormwater networks to achieve primary and secondary catchment extents that preserve the surface hydrology of existing headwater wetlands within a small error margin, relative to their current function. • Protecting and enhancing the tributary streams within the site, including new riparian planting and in-stream features. • Prioritising bioretention stormwater devices over non-bioretention devices to improve treatment and greening outcomes.
Address stormwater effects as close to the source as possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopting at-source management of stormwater runoff across the whole site. • Mitigating frequent storm runoff prior to discharging into the on-site tributary stream reaches and headwater wetlands. • Providing erosion protection for discharges to the headwater wetlands by way of diffuse surface spills from stormwater devices.
Mimic natural systems and processes for stormwater management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopting bioretention swales, raingardens and wetlands as the Best Practicable Option (BPO) for most of the site, reflecting the drainage of the site in its present form. • Preserving baseflows by discharging runoff to ground via infiltration wherever possible; however, recognising the limited soakage capacity across much of the site referenced in the geotechnical investigation report prepared for the site.

TABLE 7: WSD PRINCIPLES AND THE APPLICATION TO THE SUBJECT SITE	
WSP PRINCIPLE	POTENTIAL APPLICATION OPTIONS TO THE SUBJECT SITE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing physical treatment pathways for particulate contaminants within stormwater runoff via sediment forebays, check-dams, and live ponding areas. • Providing biological treatment pathways for soluble contaminants within stormwater runoff via filtration through soil media, nutrient uptake in the rhizosphere, and adsorption to particulate matter settling out of the flow.

6.1.3 PLAN CHANGE PRINCIPLES

The GD04 principles for stormwater management are sound and should be adopted for the purposes of this plan change.

6.2 PROPOSED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

6.2.1 SUMMARY

The proposed stormwater management complies with the requirements for Greenfields development under Schedule 4 of the Auckland Council Regionwide stormwater network discharge consent.

- Water quality treatment will be provided for all new impervious areas within the site to GD01 standard.
- Gross Pollutant traps will be provided for all waste storage areas.
- SMAF requirements (5 mm retention and 95th percentile detention) will apply for runoff generated on new impervious areas within the site as per AUP E10.
- 10% AEP flood hazards will be addressed by attenuating runoff on site or upgrading the receiving network capacity.
- 1% AEP flood hazards will be managed in accordance with the SW CoP.
- Assets will be established and vested to Council or held in private ownership in accordance with the SW CoP.
- Auckland Transport will be consulted with for stormwater assets within public roads.

Natural streams and wetlands will be managed in a way that reflects the expectations of the Ngati te Ata Waiohua Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA), aspirations of the NPS:FM 2020 and NES-FW 2020.

A range of stormwater management devices are supported for mitigating runoff and providing treatment from the subject site. These devices should be used in a treatment train to create a resilient stormwater system with a pre-treatment stage. These devices are as follows:

1. **Bioretention swales, rain gardens and tree pits** in the public roads, reserves, and accessways providing treatment, retention, and detention of runoff.
2. **Rainwater tanks** in private lots and accessways providing runoff retention and detention.

3. **Treatment swales, filter strips and rain gardens** in public roads, reserves and accessways providing runoff treatment.
4. **Treatment wetlands and peak flow attenuation devices** in reserves providing treatment, retention, detention, and/or peak flow attenuation.

Preliminary layouts of these proposed attenuation required can be found in Appendix 1. It should be noted that this is a preliminary layout based on the hydraulic modelling results and the indicative plans provided from the client. This layout and the attenuation volumes are subject to change as the masterplan is finalised.

6.2.2 ASSET OWNERSHIP & MAINTENANCE

Devices located on private lots including rainwater tanks will be owned and maintained by the future owners of those lots.

Devices located in road reserves and public reserves will become vested in the Auckland Council's ownership in accordance with the SW COP criteria in section 4.3.6.2.

6.2.3 MANAGING RUNOFF FROM PRIVATE LOTS

Rainwater tanks are proposed to provide SMAF1 retention and detention of runoff generated by private lots within the site. These devices will be connected to the private drainage within the site.

6.2.4 MANAGING RUNOFF FROM ROADS AND PUBLIC SPACES

Bioretention swales, rain gardens, and natural wetlands are proposed to provide pre-treatment and hydrological mitigation for runoff generated by roads and public spaces within the site. This will ensure the protection of the natural wetlands from contaminants in the runoff from developed areas in accordance with the expectations set by Ngati Te Ata Waiohua. It will also prioritise surface spills from bioretention features into the wetlands (rather than piped stormwater discharge) to avoid scouring of the natural wetlands.

Vegetated bioretention swales are the preferred stormwater management devices for road runoff, with good performance in removing total suspended solids, oils, and heavy metals as well as preserving stream baseflows by infiltrating runoff into the ground. These versatile devices can reduce the extents of stormwater networks required to service a site, and form part of the overland flow path management system.

6.2.5 WETLAND MANAGEMENT

There are three existing wetlands within the proposed development site. The locations of the wetlands (W1, W2 and W3) are shown in Appendix 1.

PDP Ltd. (2021) found that wetlands W1 and W2 are primarily sustained by surface water inflows such as overland flow and stream flow. W3 may be primarily fed by groundwater, and it is also likely that there is some subsurface flow/groundwater component feeding the northern portion of W2.

To protect and enhance the natural wetlands overland flows should be directed and retained into the stream network for longevity, through the consideration of best practice Low Impact Design principles (PDP Ltd., 2021). It is envisioned that the wetlands and streams will be connected with the greenspace of the development. Bio-retention or attenuation devices should be placed suitably to capture the 'first flush' of surface runoff before discharging to the northern wetlands.

PDP Ltd. (2021) have outlined the relevant freshwater NES and NPS implications. The NPS-FM (2020) includes policies to avoid the loss and extent of natural inland wetlands and rivers, and to protect their values and promote their restoration.

Important considerations in terms of the NPS-FM (2020) for future site development include:

- The 'hierarchy of obligations' to prioritise the health and wellbeing of waterbodies, the essential needs of people, and any other uses.
- National bottom lines defined with all water bodies to be at least maintained, and degraded water bodies required to be improved.
- Adverse effects on wetland or river extent or values to be managed by the effects management hierarchy.
- The NPS-FM (2020) does not support any loss in potential ecosystem values (e.g., loss of streams through reclamation or piping).

The NES-F (2020) regulations require strict measures, including resource consents, for activities that can result in the loss of extent and value of natural inland wetlands. Table 8 outlines the relevant activities.

TABLE 8: REGULATORY AND DESIGN REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE NES-F 2020 (PDP LTD., 2021).		
ACTIVITY	NON-COMPLYING	PROHIBITED
Vegetation clearance	Vegetation clearance within 10 m setback from a natural wetland if they do not have another status (for example restoration, scientific research, maintenance, natural hazards).	N/A
Earthworks or land disturbance	Earthworks within, or within a 10 m setback from, a natural wetland. Earthworks outside, but within a 100 m setback from a natural wetland if it results, or is likely to result, in the complete or partial drainage of all or part of a natural wetland; and does not have another status under any regulations 38 to 51. Earthworks within, or within a 10 m setback from, a natural wetland if they do not have another status.	Earthworks within a natural wetland if it results, or is likely to result, in the complete or partial drainage of all or part of a natural wetland; and does not have another status under any regulations 38 to 51.
The taking, use, damming, diversion, or discharge or water.	The taking, use, damming, diversion, or discharge or water within, or within a 100 m setback from, a natural wetland if it results or is likely to result, in the complete or partial drainage of all or part of a natural wetland; and does not have another status under any regulations 38 to 51. The taking, use, damming, diversion, or discharge or water within, or within a 100 m setback from, a natural wetland if they do not have another status.	The taking, use, damming, diversion, or discharge or water within a natural wetland if it results or is likely to result, in the complete or partial drainage of all or part of a natural wetland; and does not have another status under any regulations 38 to 51.

6.2.6 ATTENUATION DEVICE SIZING

Attenuation of extreme event runoff from the site will be required to avoid exceeding the capacity of the receiving stormwater networks and the increase of surface flooding to property.

The flood model results presented in Section 6.3 of this report indicate the potential future development of the site will increase the peak flow rates and volumes of runoff discharged from the site in a range of storm events.

The results shown on Table 10 indicate that if peak flow attenuation will be required to attenuate 10% AEP runoff to the peak rate in the pre-development scenario. The required live volume to provide on-site is 3,600 m³ (as the difference between the ED and MPD scenario events).

Peak flow attenuation is required to attenuate 1% AEP runoff to the same standard, the required volume is 4,800 m³.

We have considered the option of upgrading the existing network on site, however providing attenuation on site is more feasible.

There are many suitable locations within the site where these volumes could be provided in conjunction with treatment and detention functions, e.g., immediately upstream of wetlands W1 and W2. Preliminary locations of these devices are shown in Appendix 1. The footprints of the basins/ponds are based on the 1% AEP volume requirements at 1 m depth.

6.2.1 WATER QUALITY DEVICE SIZING

Water quality treatment will be provided for runoff from all new impervious areas throughout the subject site in accordance with SMAF retention and detention requirements. Hydrological mitigation will be provided through bioretention swales, rain gardens, and communal wetlands. Where HCGAs or HURs are identified, water quality treatment will be provided in accordance with Chapter E9 of the Auckland Unitary Plan and the proposed development precinct conditions.

6.2.2 STREAM HYDROLOGY

PDP's assessment found that modifications in the catchment have altered the surface hydrology (PDP Ltd., 2021). To mitigate adverse effects on the wetlands, overland flow paths should be retained and not diverted, and directed into the streams without scouring the wetland features. Monitoring of groundwater levels at W3, and of the surface flows at W1 and W2, is also recommended by PDP.

6.3 HYDRAULIC MODELLING

Hydraulic models were developed using InfoWorks ICM v11 software to support Plan Change application. These models are primarily 2D models using topographical survey data presented in this report to identify flood hazards within the existing site and downstream of the site through the future development process.

A total of twelve hydraulic model simulations were completed for three land-use scenarios with 1% and 10% AEP rainfall and 0- and 1-metres sea level rise, (SLR) correlating to tidal boundary levels of 2 m and 3 m respectively. The completed model simulations are shown on Table 9

Three scenarios are based on the following assumptions:

- An 'Existing Scenario' (ED) model representing the present land-use throughout the subject site.
- A 'Maximum Probable Development' (MPD) model representing a possible future development of the subject site and catchment based on AUP OP zoning. Impervious coverage on 60% was used across the entire the subject site based on a conceptual future development scenario to ignore roading and greenspace layouts. This will enable future changes to the proposed layout to be made without causing significant changes to hydraulic modelling results.
- An 'Existing Development + Maximum Probable Development on site (ED + MPD) model representing the existing scenario throughout the catchment, but with the subject site modelled using its MPD coverage. This scenario enables us to quantify the downstream impacts of the proposed development on the downstream network.

TABLE 9: HYDRAULIC MODEL SIMULATIONS					
MODEL SCENARIO	TIDAL LEVEL	RAINFALL EVENT	DESIGN RAINFALL DEPTH	CLIMATE CHANGE FACTORS?	STORM PROFILE
ED	2 m	1% AEP	178	Yes – per AC SW CoP	TP108 SCS
		10% AEP	118		
	3 m	1% AEP	178		
		10% AEP	118		
MPD	2 m	1% AEP	178		
		10% AEP	118		
	3 m	1% AEP	178		
		10% AEP	118		
ED + MPD on site	2 m	1% AEP	178		
		10% AEP	118		
	3 m	1% AEP	178		
		10% AEP	118		

6.3.2 MODEL ASSUMPTIONS & EXCLUSIONS

- New pipe networks associated with potential future development were not included in the model. This exclusion caused ponding in several wetland areas within the site.
- Primary network and secondary network sub-catchments are assumed to have equal extents. This is a typical assumption for rain-on-grid modelling.
- A weighted curve number is calculated for each land-use area.
- The coastal boundary is a static water level set at 2 m and 4 m RL for the 0 m and 2 m SLR scenarios respectively. This corresponds with the indicative coastline extent indicated on Auckland Council GeoMaps.
- A 60% Impervious coverage was used over the entire development site for the post development (MPD) scenario. This allows for more flexibility in the proposed roading and greenspace layout.

6.3.3 DESIGN RAINFALL

All hydraulic model simulations use TP108 SCS method rainfall with climate change factors applied in accordance with the Auckland Council Stormwater Code of Practice v2.

Runoff zones were delineated across the site based on soil types and proposed density. Runoff hydrographs were applied directly to rainfall zones within the model using the 'net rainfall' approach, whereby initial & constant losses are subtracted from the rainfall hyetograph prior to modelling. Design rainfall depths are shown on Table 7.

6.3.4 CATCHMENT IMPERVIOUSNESS

The ED scenario was modelled using weighted curve numbers derived from different land use zones based on percentage impervious coverage as shown on Figure 15.

The MPD post-development scenario was modelled using weighted curve numbers derived from a potential future development layout. The impervious coverage zones anticipated in the modelling are shown on Figure 16. The MPD+ED scenario was modelled using the MPD scenario imperviousness values within the proposed development site extent and the ED imperviousness coverage values within the rest of the catchment as shown on Figure 17.

A constant impervious coverage was used over the development site for the post-development scenarios to provide flexibility in the layout of the masterplan as it has not been finalised. This means further modelling will not be necessary if changes to the road and green space layouts are made.

Weighted curve numbers of CN = 65, 83, 87, and 94 were used to represent reserves, residential areas, laneways, and commercial/road areas respectively.




FIGURE 15: ED scenario model extent and imperviousness.



FIGURE 16: MPD scenario model extent and imperviousness.




FIGURE 17: ED+MPD site scenario model extent and imperviousness.

6.3.5 SURFACE ROUGHNESS

Surface roughness values for the existing scenario were derived by validating observations from successive site visits against Manning's roughness values put forward in Chow (1959). This is also a valid general assumption for the MPD and ED+MPD site scenarios due to the level of intensity anticipated under a future development concept for the site. The surface roughness used in the hydraulic models are shown on Figure 18 and Figure 19.




FIGURE 18: Hydraulic model ED scenario surface roughness values (Manning's n values).




FIGURE 19: Hydraulic model MPD and MPD+ED scenario surface roughness values (Manning's n values).

6.3.6 DOWNSTREAM IMPACTS

The results of the 1% AEP ED scenario flood model simulations are presented below. These results indicate the significant hazard posed to the Glenbrook township and the southern corner of the subject site by local sea-level rise.




FIGURE 20: Existing Development scenario, 1% AEP hydraulic model results (no SLR).




FIGURE 21: Existing Development scenario, 1% AEP hydraulic model results (1 m SLR).

Table 10 shows peak flow rates and volumes discharged from the subject site for the 1% and 10% AEP rainfall event with 1 m SLR (3m tide level). Flood maps indicating changes in the extents and severity of flooding experienced across the site and downstream receiving environment in the 1% and 10% AEP with 1 m sea level rise scenario are provided in Figure 22 to Figure 25.

TABLE 10: MODEL SCENARIO RESULTS (1 M SLR)			
MODEL SCENARIO	RAINFALL EVENT	PEAK FLOW RATE (M3/S)	24HR FLOW VOLUME (M3)
ED	1% AEP	1.9	10,500
	10% AEP	0.8	5,200
MPD	1% AEP	2.6	15,300
	10% AEP	1.4	8,800
ED+MPD	1% AEP	2.4	14,200
	10% AEP	1.3	7,950




FIGURE 22: 1% AEP depth difference, ED + MPD minus ED flood model scenarios (1 m SLR).




FIGURE 23: 10% AEP depth difference, ED + MPD minus ED flood model scenarios (1 m SLR).



FIGURE 24: 1% AEP ED and MPD scenario flood extents (1 m SLR).



FIGURE 25: 10% AEP ED and MPD scenario flood extents (1 m SLR).

The flood-prone and low-lying nature of the receiving environment to the west of the site does not allow for an objective assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on downstream flood hazards. Therefore, a further round of model simulations was undertaken to isolate the effects associated with sea-level rise and development of adjacent properties.

Table 11 shows peak flow rates and volumes discharged from the subject site for the 1% and 10% AEP rainfall event with no SLR (2m tide level). Flood maps indicating changes in the extents and severity of flooding experienced across the site and downstream receiving environment in the 1% and 10% AEP with no sea level rise scenario are provided in Figure 26 to Figure 29.

TABLE 11: MODEL SCENARIOS RESULTS (NO SLR)			
MODEL SCENARIO	RAINFALL EVENT	PEAK FLOW RATE (M3/S)	24HR FLOW VOLUME (M3)
ED	1% AEP	1.9	10,500
	10% AEP	0.8	5,200
MPD	1% AEP	2.64	15,300
	10% AEP	1.4	8,800
ED+MPD	1% AEP	2.5	14,200
	10% AEP	1.3	7,950



FIGURE 26: 1% AEP depth difference, ED + MPD minus ED flood model scenarios (no SLR).



FIGURE 27: 10% AEP depth difference, ED + MPD minus ED flood model scenarios (no SLR).



FIGURE 28: 1% AEP ED and MPD scenario flood extents (no SLR).



FIGURE 29: 10% AEP ED and MPD scenario flood extents (no SLR).

6.3.7 FLOOD MODELLING SUMMARY

The influence of SLR partially obscures the impacts of the potential future development of the site on flood hazards in the receiving environment. Despite the additional 0.7 m³/s peak flow and 4,800 m³ total runoff from the subject site from the 1% AEP (1 m SLR) MPD scenario compared to the ED scenario, there is no noticeable increase in flood hazards to downstream properties. This result is replicated in the 10% AEP (1 m SLR) event.

The results are similar once SLR is removed from the equation. The results in Figure 26 and Figure 27 indicate a small number of properties neighbouring the subject site experience an increased flood depth of between 2 and 10 mm resulting from the development of the subject site.

It should be noted that the model likely over-estimates flood hazards in the 'no SLR' simulations since the stormwater pipe network is not included in the model. It may be possible to mitigate this increased flood hazard using peak flow attenuation devices within the subject site. The current model has also assumed the entire developable site to have an imperviousness coverage of 60% to produce a conservative estimate of the flooding impacts. This allows for flexibility in the final masterplan layout.

Further refinements to the flood models could be made throughout future plan change, consenting, and development processes to progressively confirm that the adverse effects of development on flood hazards can be adequately mitigated. These model refinements could include adding topographical survey data, design earthworks surfaces, existing and proposed stormwater pipe networks, building footprints, and any attenuation devices proposed under future applications.

7.0 DEPARTURES FROM REGULATORY OR DESIGN CODES

No significant departures from regulatory or design codes are proposed.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 CONCLUSIONS

This SMP demonstrates that stormwater within the subject site area will be managed in accordance with the relevant standards and requirements. No major concerns are anticipated relating to stormwater management across the site. Based on the investigations that have been completed, it is expected that stormwater effects from the subject site can be appropriately and adequately managed in accordance with the requirements of the AUP and NDC. This SMP will continue to be updated as the project progresses, and as further investigations are carried out.

The 80 McLarin Road Plan Change proposes to significantly expand the Glenbrook Beach area. This report provides insights into the existing site features and the interventions that may be required to mitigate the potential adverse effects of future urban intensification of the subject site on the receiving environment. These interventions include stormwater management controls of water quality treatment, SMAF 1 retention & detention, and peak flow attenuation of the 10% and 1% AEP rainfall events.

The current AUP provisions are sufficient for stormwater management of the site relating to SMAF 1, water quality treatment, and peak flow attenuation.

This proposal seeks to preserve the ecological value of existing natural features within the site, including wetlands and stream reaches, and will create new valuable areas by creating treatment and bioretention assets within the site. This proposal provides a range of stormwater management controls that could be used to provide several stormwater quality and quantity management outcomes, which are proposed to mitigate impacts on existing watercourses within the site, existing flood-prone properties downstream of the site, and the sensitive estuarine environment of the Waikopua Creek.

Ngati Te Ata Waiohūa provided a detailed Cultural Impact Assessment report to support the Plan Change application. This assessment identified iwi values in the subject site and proposed stormwater management concepts and devices that have been adopted under this SMP.

Hydraulic modelling was used to understand existing floodplain extents, infrastructure constraints, and downstream hazards, and how these might change as a result of the future development of the subject site. Increases in downstream flood hazards and capacity restrictions in the receiving pipe network identified through the hydraulic modelling can be mitigated using suitable peak flow attenuation devices discussed in this report. The hydraulic modelling completed so far is a 'rain on grid' model, not including any piped network. The piped network can be added to the model at a later date when the masterplan is at detailed design phase if necessary.

Stormwater management devices proposed in the SMP have been chosen to align with the mana whenua values of this project and the principles of Water Sensitive Design. They are in accordance with WSD guidelines for the Auckland Region and Schedule 4 of the Regionwide NDC. These devices include rain water tanks, wetlands, bioretention swales, rain gardens, and tree pits, and other attenuation devices to achieve the retention, detention, water quality, and peak flow attenuation requirements set out in this report.

The recommendations outlined in this SMP were based on the present NDC and AUP conditions. The recommendations will be re-assessed and the SMP updated accordingly with any future changes to the NDC or AUD conditions.

The findings of this report support that the implementation of these devices will help protect the area from stormwater quality and quantity risks and enhance the cultural and ecological value of the area.

8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Ongoing consultation with mana whenua and the local community is necessary for successful project implementation. The findings of this assessment should be validated against the observations and expectations of iwi/hapū groups and local community members.

Much of the assessment in this report is based on 'rain on grid' hydraulic modelling undertaken using a concept design surface of a potential future development within the subject site. There is significant scope for change within the layout. The stormwater modelling and design tasks presented in this report should be progressively refined in line with specific future development proposals and as any future changes to engineering codes, particularly and changes to climate change impacts on rainfall or stormwater device design requirements.

9.0 LIMITATIONS

9.1 GENERAL

This report is for the use by HD Project 2 Ltd only, and should not be used or relied upon by any other person or entity or for any other project.

This report has been prepared for the particular project described to us and its extent is limited to the scope of work agreed between the client and Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited. No responsibility is accepted by Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited or its directors, servants, agents, staff or employees for the accuracy of information provided by third parties and/or the use of any part of this report in any other context or for any other purposes.

9.2 ESTIMATES

Should this report contain estimates for future works or services, physical or consulting, those estimates can only be considered current and will only reflect the extent to which the detail of the project is known to the consultant (feasibility, concept, preliminary, detailed, tender etc) at the time given.

The client is solely responsible for obtaining updated estimates from the consultant as the detail of the project evolves and/or as time elapses.

9.3 PEER REVIEW

Should this report be a peer review of the work of another consultant (“the designer”), the following limitations apply:

- The review is limited to only those aspects of the designer’s work specified in the peer reviewer’s scope of engagement.
- The liability for the reviewed work remains at all times solely with the designer.
- If any comments or recommendations by the peer reviewer are adopted by the designer, the responsibility for their adoption is assumed totally by the designer.

APPENDIX 1 PRELIMINARY STORMWATER MANAGEMENT DEVICE LAYOUT

