

Milldale Fast-Track

29/07/2025 – Auckland Council Response

Annexure 8:

Surface Water

**Specialist Response Template – Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 –
Substantive Application**

Technical Specialist Memo – Surface Water Stream Diversion

To: Dylan Pope – Lead Planner & Carly Hinde - PPL

From: Charlotte Lockyer, SLR Consulting

Date: 17 July 2025

1.0 APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Application and property details

Fast-Track project name: Milldale

Fast-Track application number: BUN60446761 & FTAA-2503-1038

Site address: Wainui Road, Milldale, Upper Orewa

2.0 Executive Summary / Principal Issues

N/A

3.0 Documents Reviewed

- Vol 1: Evaluation & overview report
- Vol 2: Stages 10-13 Assessment of Environmental Effects
- App 2D: Milldale (P21) Stream Investigations
- App 2E: Hydric Soil & Hydrology Tool Assessments
- App 2F: Infrastructure Report
- App 2G
- Part 1 – Flood assessment
- Part 2 – Wainui East Stormwater Management Plan
- App 2K: Engineering Drawings (Part 2 and Part 5)
- App 2R: Groundwater Dewatering Assessment
- App 2S: Adaptive Monitoring Plan

- App 2W: AUP(OP) Activities and Standards Assessment
- Vol 6: Proposed Conditions of Consent

4.0 Additional Reasons for Consent Not included in AEE

N/A

5.0 Specialist Assessment

The application has not adequately addressed the potential effects from the permanent diversion of surface water (1,134m of intermittent stream length) and the associated discharge of water. The only aspect considered adequately addressed is the effects from flooding to properties. The application notes that the proposed development provides for flood free properties in a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event, including an allowance for the predicted impacts of climate change (2.1°C warming and culvert blockage scenarios).

As raised during the Milldale Fast Track Review meeting on 27 May 2025, the applicant agreed to consider the effects of the surface water stream diversion with respect to both E3.4.1 and E7.4.1 rules of the AUP. Of particular interest is peak velocities through the watercourses during flood conditions and whether adequate measures have been considered to ensure the diversion does not cause scour, erosion or other instability of any land or waterbody.

It is expected that the applicant will review the potential effects against both E3.4.1 and E7.4.1 noting whether the proposed works fall within the permitted activity standards, and identify any measures required to reduce adverse impacts.

As the applicant has not provided an assessment of effects from the surface water stream diversion, it is difficult to comment on whether the draft conditions are considered appropriate. It is noted that there are no proposed conditions specifically relating to the surface water diversion works (s13 and s14). Aspects of this work are covered by other conditions, for example, erosion and sediment control, and water quality monitoring. However, there are no specific conditions for the subsequent monitoring and remediation of any scour or erosion, or significant deposition of sediment, resulting from surface water diversion works of the diverted channel or downstream of the diverted channel within stream 21.

6.0 Section 67 Information Gap

I have identified the following Section 67 information gaps:

The application has not provided any assessment of effects of the surface water stream diversion. This was expected under AUP rules E3.4.1 and E7.4.1. The applicant's team noted this lack of assessment and stated a response will be provided.

7.0 Recommendation

From a surface water hydrology perspective, I support the application. I believe the effects associated with the surface water stream diversion can be mitigated through appropriate design, and consent conditions requiring mitigation of any adverse effects.

8.0 Proposed Conditions

I suggest the following condition:

The consent holder is required to monitor the stability of the diverted stream channels and stream 21, both vertical and horizontal, for the first five years and until the banks are fully vegetated.

a) Any scour or erosion should be remediated, and the risk of future scour and erosion should be mitigated by the consent holder.

b) Any sediment deposition that has the potential to reduce the channel conveyance in frequent to rare flood events should be remediated, and the risk of future deposition should be mitigated by the consent holder.

9.0 Supporting Documents

N/A