

Auckland Council / Healthy Waters and Beachlands South Workshop

Minutes

Date: 07 September 2026

Time: 12:30 – 1:30pm

Purpose: Technical review of stormwater, flooding, hydrology, asset vesting, network discharge consent, and dam assessment matters associated with the Beachlands South Fast Track Application.

1. Attendees

Auckland Council / Healthy Waters	Beachlands South / Consultant Team
Brooke Dales Mark Iszard Martin Meyer Dali Suljic Zheng Qian	Rob Bassett Khai Azizi Nick Roberts Vijay Lala Pamela Santos Campbell McGregor Tom Gilbert

2. Summary

This workshop was convened to work through Auckland Council Healthy Waters' technical review comments on the Beachlands South Fast Track consent application and identify a clear pathway toward supportable outcomes for the Fast Track Panel.

The primary focus areas were:

1. Suitability of the Regional Network Discharge Consent pathway.
2. Flood modelling results and downstream flooding impacts.
3. Existing flood risks affecting properties near Jack Lachlan Drive.
4. Potential dam classification and ponding volume implications.
5. Overland flow path hazard classifications.
6. Stormwater asset design, maintenance access and vesting requirements.
7. Hydrology and water quality compliance documentation.

Healthy Waters did not indicate any fundamental objection to the proposed overall stormwater management strategy. However, requested additional technical evidence and justification in several areas to ensure the proposal can be confidently supported before proceeding to the Fast Track Panel.

Healthy Waters has also appreciated the open and collaborative discussions that have been facilitated between the applicant team and Healthy Waters.

3. Discussions

3.1. Stormwater Consent Pathway

A discussion was had regarding discharge consent pathways and Vijay Lala sought clarification regarding whether the proposed development could operate under Auckland Council's Regional Network Discharge Consent (NDC) framework or whether separate stormwater discharge consents would still be required.

Mark Iszard confirmed that because the current application relates to live zoned land, the proposal could generally proceed under the Regional Network Discharge Consent framework. However, discharges from future urban zone land would not fall within that pathway and would require a separate approach. The applicant has also indicated that they are exploring both private and public ownership paths for stormwater assets and the pro/cons of each option.

The applicant team emphasised that its preferred strategy is to design and construct infrastructure that ultimately meets Council standards and can be vested to Council rather than remaining under long-term private ownership. This was considered preferable from both operational and maintenance perspectives.

Brooke Dales highlighted the need to consider the stormwater runoff off from the road within 712 Whitford Maraetai Road, which is a future urban zoned land. The applicant team noted the impervious area from this road could be 3,000 to 4,000m². Healthy Waters noted a separate discharge consent could be applied for this and that it may be a permitted activity.

3.2. Flood Modelling and Downstream Effects

Campbell McGregor provided the responses to the Healthy Waters comments regarding downstream flooding effects.

Campbell advised that:

1. The assessment focused on pre-development versus post-development effects, which considers the latest climate change factor increase of 3.8°.
2. The 100-year event showed approximately 20 to 30 mm difference between pre and post-development scenarios.
3. The increase was considered to be within modelling tolerance and effectively neutral.
4. The current strategy intentionally avoids placing additional flow control structures upstream in order to minimise future Council maintenance obligations and operational risks.
5. Existing culverts controlling site outflow without requiring additional attenuation measures.

Mark Iszard acknowledged that 20-30mm may be considered a small increase but expressed concern regarding how the Fast Track Panel may interpret the reported modelled increase.

Whilst technical specialists may regard a 20–30 mm difference as modelling noise, the Panel must be satisfied that there is no meaningful increase in flood risk to existing properties.

Dali Suljic emphasised that if modelling tolerance is being relied upon as justification, then that tolerance should be demonstrated through further testing.

Suggested additional work included:

- Hydrograph comparisons.
- Peak flow assessments.
- Sensitivity testing.
- Review of velocity changes.
- Analysis of flow pathways.

The applicant team agreed that additional modelling justification and supporting sensitivity analysis could be completed.

3.3. Existing Flood Risk to Downstream Properties

Campbell McGregor presented additional analysis of downstream residential properties based on approved resource consent floor level information obtained from the original builder.

The analysis showed that:

- Multiple properties were already marginal under existing conditions.
- Several dwellings have less than the preferred freeboard.
- At least one property appears vulnerable under existing climate change scenarios.
- Existing flood issues are present regardless of the proposed development.
- The flood wall was not protecting against flood risks as intended.

Zheng Qian recalled previous work associated with the nearby apartment development and questioned whether all levels had been correctly interpreted and whether the latest levels had been utilised in the model. The applicant team presented the latest aerial taken in 2025, which shows that the pond Council thought had been filled in is actually not a pond but a low point near a retaining wall/batter by Ninth Avenue.

The applicant advised that the model used the latest levels. The levels for the boathouses had been sourced directly from approved consent documentation. It was agreed that as the levels had been sourced from approved consent documentation, the levels could be adopted.

Healthy Waters Post Meeting Note (PMN): Dali Suljic raised a question at the meeting with regards to whether the proposed flood management outcomes are consistent with the Beachlands South Precinct (I458) policies, as already outlined in HWFR s67 memo (dated 18 August 2026). The Applicant has not yet provided a response, however HWFR notes that it maintains their position that the direction of the restricted discretionary assessment criteria I458.8.2.(9) is that the proposed flood management devices need to be designed to ensure existing flood risk downstream of the site, assuming existing land use and no climate change, is not increased as a result of the proposed development, assuming maximum probable development and 3.8-degree climate change.

3.4. Ponding Volumes and Dam Classification

The meeting also focused on potential dam classification implications associated with ponding behind existing road embankments and culverts.

Campbell McGregor advised that the flooding assessment undertaken shows that:

- Under the pre-development conditions ponding already occurs within the EPAN areas.
- The development does increase volume in some locations where ponding is occurring but this is a marginal addition, compared to the existing ponding already occurring.
- Existing upstream and downstream risk classifications remain largely unchanged.

Campbell also requested the risk analysis from Council on the existing ponding/damming occurring, so that it could be updated but noted that if Council has not undertaken a risk assessment on the existing condition, the applicant team can undertake this assessment, which will consider the existing condition and the post-development condition as a result of the development.

From Council, Dali Suljic explained that assessment needs to consider both:

- Embankment height.
- Stored volume.

The increase in detention volume may alter how the infrastructure is assessed from a dam safety perspective.

Zheng Qian also raised concerns regarding future liability implications if increased storage volumes trigger dam classification thresholds.

Mark Iszard noted that similar questions are currently arising throughout Auckland and that regulatory pathways are still being worked through, across multiple developments.

It was agreed that further technical work is required to determine:

- Existing storage volume.
- Proposed storage volume.
- Dam classification thresholds.
- Whether a Potential Impact Classification (PIC) assessment is required.
- Whether additional consents may become necessary.

Post Meeting Note (PMN): Based on the definition of a dam under the Building Act, the road embankment does not constitute a dam and on this basis can't be classified as a dam or be subject to a PIC. Council to confirm what risk assessment (if any) it would require noting this PMN note? Any risk assessment required by Council could be undertaken during the detailed design stage.

Healthy Waters Post Meeting Note (PMN): Based on the available information, the existing road embankment (and culvert) was not constructed to provide flood attenuation and therefore would not be considered to meet

Section 7 definition of a dam under the Building Act¹. However, as part of this Application, it is now proposed that the existing road embankment (and culvert) will be used to control stormwater runoff from the proposed development for the purpose of providing flood attenuation. Therefore, HWFR considers that as a result, the existing road embankment (and culvert) will now meet the definition of a dam under Section 7 of the Building Act and will not qualify as an exclusion under the Section 7(c) definition. On this basis, HWFR requires the Applicant to carry out a dam classification and PIC assessment as part of resource consent because:

1. Classifiable dams will incur ongoing financial obligations from the Council to ensure that the structure is operated and maintained in a way that meets the necessary legal and regulatory requirements.
2. The increase in volume of stormwater runoff from the proposed development being temporarily stored behind the existing embankment would increase the risk to life to people and risk of damage to property and infrastructure downstream in case of structure failure.

3.5. Overland Flow Path Hazards

Campbell McGregor discussed approximately eight locations where elevated hazard classifications remain within road corridors, based on the recent hazard classification assessment.

Campbell noted that:

- Some hazard classifications arise due to road 3D design not being complete, which will be completed during detailed design.
- The modelling assumes a conservative approach where all the pipe networks are blocked. whereas this will not be the case in reality.
- An effort will be made to design out hazards where possible but not all hazards can reasonably be designed out, especially around low points or on roads where the grade is slightly steeper.

A discussion was had about hazard areas which couldn't be designed out and what be done about them. Council noted that they would need to understand how people moved through these areas, the road classification (e.g. High Use Roads or Low Use Roads).

Further hazard analysis will be required during detailed design, to confirm overland flow path hazards that may remain and how these could be managed.

3.6. Stormwater Assets, Vesting and Maintenance Access

Healthy Waters requested whether the stormwater communal devices had been assessed to ensure a complying design could be achieved within the allocated land parcels, considering factors such as surrounding levels, maintenance tracks, and turnaround areas.

Campbell McGregor advised that access requirements had previously been considered but agreed that further information could be supplied to demonstrate:

- Turning movements.

¹ MBIE, Guide to complying with the Dam Safety Regulations, Section 11.1, Inadvertent dams, July 2025

- Maintenance operations.
- Long-term functionality.
- Adequate land allocation

3.7. Hydrology and Water Quality Mitigation

Healthy Waters requested a more transparent presentation of how hydrology and water quality requirements are achieved across each catchment area.

Campbell McGregor agreed that the information already exists within the technical documentation but could be presented more clearly through a consolidated summary table. Auckland Council agreed that a consolidated summary table was what they were seeking.

The Stormwater Management Plan will be updated with a catchment by catchment summary showing:

- Hydrology requirements.
- Water quality requirements.
- Public asset responsibilities.
- Private asset responsibilities.

4. Action Register

No.	Action	Owner	Due Date	Status
1.	Assess variance between pre and post-development flooding to demonstrate that 20-30mm increase is the model's computational error/tolerance and not an effect from proposed development.	Harrison Grierson	Not stated	Open
2.	Provide additional flood assessment outputs including flow rate, volume, and velocity.	Harrison Grierson	Not stated	Open
3.	Assess existing and post-development ponding volumes and determine whether a Potential Impact Classification (PIC) assessment is required.	Harrison Grierson	Not stated	Open
4.	Undertake further overland flow hazard assessment during detailed design and identify management responses for any residual H3/H5 hazard areas.	Harrison Grierson	Not stated	Open
5.	Assess stormwater management device footprints against surrounding levels, maintenance access requirements and turnaround areas to confirm a compliant design can be achieved within allocated parcels.	Harrison Grierson	Not stated	Open
6.	Update SMP with hydrology and water quality matrix	Harrison Grierson	Not stated	Open

7.	Healthy Waters to confirm if any risk assessment is required, noting Post Meeting Note (PMN). Any assessment required could be conducted during detailed design stage.	Healthy Waters	Not stated	Open
----	--	----------------	------------	------