From: [redacted]
Subject: Re: PRR00043684 100 Halsey Street, Auckland Central
Date: Thursday, 20 August 2026 4:39:59 pm
Attachments: [redacted]

You don't often get email from [redacted]. Learn why this is important

Kia ora Caitlin,

Thanks also, some notes in blue as follows:

- The Growth and Development Team will be our Healthy Waters point of contact for this application (including the SMP), and will bring in the Catchment Manager as required.

  Correct. We are still waiting on confirmation on the SMP template, but are fairly confident that the Version 1.1 online is the most up to date one.

- This site is governed by rainfall flooding in the short term and coastal inundation in the long term (the combined rainfall and coastal inundation event level does not approach the standalone coastal inundation design level). We are not intending to undertake a joint probability assessment, and if our client chooses an adaptation pathway, we will propose conditions similar to those applied at 188 Beaumont Street.

  Accepted in principle, however this approach will need to be supported with an assessment of the different rainfall flooding and coastal inundation scenarios to support that the coastal inundation itself is ultimately the governing natural hazard in terms of risk from inundation in this area. It is expected that the risk assessment will then be carried out relative to the worst-case scenario as demonstrated by this assessment.

- We intend to address the minor filling of the floodplain with a qualitative assessment, without additional flood modelling, which you agreed with in principle. As noted by Dali, this is governed by the mechanism causing flooding, and if it can be demonstrated that there is no material impact, this approach is acceptable.

  Confirming this is acceptable provided that the assessment demonstrates that displacement and/or narrowing of the overland flow path or floodplain will have a negligible impact on the existing flooding within the public road corridor or the neighbouring properties (potential concerns are but not limited to whether the displacement will result in an increased frequency of flooding to the existing buildings, whether the displacement will increase existing flooding or create new flooding of buildings, whether the displacement will increase existing flood hazards in the road corridor).

- We consider that detailed flood modelling is not required for this application, which you agreed with in principle.

  Subject to the assessment as noted above.

- We will send a request for flood model information through you.

  Noted.

- The Growth and Development Team will take the lead on SMP adoption, in coordination with the Catchment Planning Team.

  Correct, as above.

- We need to demonstrate that stormwater runoff does not result in worsened water quality compared to the current situation. For roofs, you will send us information on low contaminant-generating materials from the Water Quality Team. The SMP needs to demonstrate no worsening from existing conditions, noting that there is an existing discharge consent for the site.

We are not able to share the practice note yet as it is still in development. However, we can share the below advice:

Schedule 4 of the NDC requires that Brownfields Large sites treat all impervious areas by a water quality device designed in accordance with GD01/TP10 for the relevant contaminants, or to provide an alternative level of mitigation determined through a SMP that demonstrates the proposed solution is a BPO and is achieving Schedule 2 compliance – i.e. the quality of existing stormwater discharges from the site are maintained or enhanced.

In terms of roof area, roofing materials commonly referred to as 'inert' can generate contaminants. Roofing material that is commonly proposed (Pre-painted steel roofing, Painted Galvanised Steel, Asphalt Shingles, Bitumen, Aluminium-zinc coated steel roofing) is considered by HWFR to not be low contaminant generating, as such water quality treatment is required. Roof runoff should be managed by a catchment scale device designed in accordance with GD01 to target the relevant contaminants of concern. If a catchment scale device is not feasible (explanation as to why to be provided and agreed by HWFR) then roof runoff should be treated by an at source treatment device designed in accordance with GD01 to target the relevant contaminants of concern, preferably a bioretention device. If an at source treatment device is not feasible (explanation as to why to be provided and agreed by HWFR) then roof runoff should be managed by rainwater tanks with non-potable internal re-use functionality for a minimum of 5mm runoff depth.

- An updated TP108 was released for feedback on 7 August. We need to consider this in our application but are not required to demonstrate full compliance with it. We will assess impacts qualitatively based on topography and discuss whether there is any additional flooding risk.

  Correct.

- For the 10% AEP scenario, in terms of network capacity, you are comfortable with the site continuing to discharge to the existing network provided the existing catchment arrangement is maintained (i.e. no catchment is materially diverted to a different network). Given the site is 100% impervious going to 100% impervious, attenuation is unlikely to be required.

  Correct. The key here will be to establish where the site is currently discharging to and maintain this arrangement post-development.

Happy to further discuss any of the above if needed!

Hillary Johnston
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Date: Wednesday, 19 August 2026 at 4:27 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: PRR00043684 100 Halsey Street, Auckland Central

Hi Hillary and Dali,

Thank you for meeting with us on Monday, and for sending through the referral comments.

I have summarised the key discussion points from our meeting below — please let me know if anything has been missed or if you'd like to add anything!

- The Growth and Development Team will be our Healthy Waters point of contact for this application (including the SMP), and will bring in the Catchment Manager as required.
- This site is governed by rainfall flooding in the short term and coastal inundation in the long term (the combined rainfall and coastal inundation event level does not approach the standalone coastal inundation design level). We are not intending to undertake a joint probability assessment, and if our client chooses an adaptation pathway, we will propose conditions similar to those applied at 188 Beaumont Street.
- We intend to address the minor filling of the floodplain with a qualitative assessment, without additional flood modelling, which you agreed with in principle. As noted by Dali, this is governed by the mechanism causing flooding, and if it can be demonstrated that there is no material impact, this approach is acceptable.
- We consider that detailed flood modelling is not required for this application, which you agreed with in principle.
- We will send a request for flood model information through you.
- The Growth and Development Team will take the lead on SMP adoption, in coordination with the Catchment Planning Team.
- We need to demonstrate that stormwater runoff does not result in worsened water quality compared to the current situation. For roofs, you will send us information on low contaminant-generating materials from the Water Quality Team. The SMP needs to demonstrate no worsening from existing conditions, noting that there is an existing discharge consent for the site.
- An updated TP108 was released for feedback on 7 August. We need to consider this in our application but are not required to demonstrate full compliance with it. We will assess impacts qualitatively based on topography and discuss whether there is any additional flooding risk.
- For the 10% AEP scenario, in terms of network capacity, you are comfortable with the site continuing to discharge to the existing network provided the existing catchment arrangement is maintained (i.e. no catchment is materially diverted to a different network). Given the site is 100% impervious going to 100% impervious, attenuation is unlikely to be required.

Thanks,
Caitlin
Ngā mihi | Kind regards,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 17 August 2026 4:55 pm
[redacted]
Subject: Re: PRR00043684 100 Halsey Street, Auckland Central

Kia ora Caitlin,

Thanks again for arranging the meeting this afternoon,

I have attached our referral comments on this application in full, hopefully they are helpful. The other couple of

actions on us I have include:

- Confirm latest SMP template
- Investigate if we are able to share the latest guidance on water quality management

I understand that Jon will send a formal request through to HW to pull information that you need from the RW model, we will keep an eye out for that.

Please let me know if I have missed anything!

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
When: 1:00 PM - 1:25 PM 17 August 2026
Subject: PRR00043684 100 Halsey Street, Auckland Central
Location: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Hi Hillary,

We are working on the substantive application for the redevelopment of 100 Halsey Street, which I understand you have provided comments on for the referral stage.

We would like to meet with you to discuss the stormwater management plan requirements and flood risk assessment. Would 10am on Friday work for you?

Thanks,
Caitlin

[redacted]

[redacted]

NOTICE: This email together with any attachments is confidential, may be subject to legal privilege and may contain proprietary information, including information protected by copyright. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not copy, use or disclose the information in it, and confidentiality and privilege are not waived. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return email and delete this email.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.