

Wednesday 18 August 2021

Re: open letter to the cleanfill community liaison group and the wider community

Kia ora koutou. Here are the minutes for the ~~August 2021~~ ^{16 August 2021} meeting of the Wainuiomata cleanfill community liaison group. Upon reflecting on that meeting I only have a few comments to make, which I will set out here.

Firstly, it appeared as though the draft environmental restoration plan (T+T, 2021) was well received. Gary gave some incredibly valuable feedback on the species list, and ongoing maintenance of weeds and plant health. Several people on the night raised the issue of ongoing monitoring and accountability of the closed cleanfill. Two responses were given to this concern. Firstly, that the land is owned by council (to be transferred to parks and reserves) and so long as it remains in council ownership, that council as the landowner is responsible for any necessary remediation. Secondly, that the activity is a cleanfill and the tabled draft plan relates to environmental restoration, which is distinct from a closed landfill which requires an ongoing post-closure management plan for leachate. I think that it would be prudent for the council as a local authority and a landowner to provide some form of aftercare for the site. This would be, above and beyond what is required by the resource consent, but would be sensible in any case considering public ownership. I encourage the consent holder to consider these matters, and present an updated draft at the next community group meeting.

I think that it is worth recording that cleanfill from the greater Hutt area will be placed on the earmarked development land to the south of Silverstream college i.e., the Mawaihakona Stream. This will reduce the reliance on the Coast Road cleanfill, notwithstanding any private cleanfills that may open at other sites. Members of the Community Board and Council recognised this as a political commitment made by Council to close the Coast Road cleanfill at or before mid-2022.

Consulting staff also commented that the consent holder is investigating dust monitoring once the winter weather clears. Staff also confirmed that a dust monitoring station has been erected on the site, but was not in use because of ongoing wet weather over winter, damping any dust on site. I encourage the consent holder or their agent to bring further details of this matter to the next community group meeting, or any data collected, and modelling completed; as this is clearly an important matter to the community and council.

Finally, with respect, please ensure that Dave Larsen (Dave_larsen@icloud.com) is removed from your email correspondence going forwards.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday 16 November 2021**. Therefore the 10-working day deadline for pre-circulation of material is Tuesday 2 November, and I will be sending a reminder 15 working days prior to the meeting, being Tuesday 26 October. At this early stage, the information I want to see before 2 November includes: an updated dashboard for the period August to October, an updated draft ERP reflecting on what was discussed at the August meeting (namely, post-closure monitoring), and comment on the dust monitoring equipment and protocols.

Please send me agenda items in time for me to include in a draft agenda on Tuesday 26 October.

Best,

Charlie Hopkins

Practice Leader – Planning

Appendix 1: list of action points from the August meeting

1. **Alastair** and **Jörn** to report back at next meeting regarding:
 - A. Whether any post-closure monitoring is being proposed
 - B. What dust monitoring infrastructure has been installed, and what any results from initial monitoring are indicating
2. **Council** to report back at the next meeting about the naming protocol of reserve land
3. **Alastair** to present updated draft environment restoration plan
4. **Charlie** to prepare cover letter to accompany the minutes identifying the community's request for post-closure monitoring
5. **Sally-ann** to provide **Parvati** and **Paul** with details of the June complaints relating to sediment on Coast Road, which were missed from the complaints log, and the audit
6. **Charlie** to ask auditor (Tess) to reconsider the truck numbers, and the outcome of item (5) above depending on the outcome of that investigation
7. **Parvati** to ensure that auditor is uploaded to the council webpage / portal
8. **Alastair** to contact **Gary** about the draft ERP including species list
9. **Council** to report back how the stormwater pipe will be managed post-closure
10. **Sally-ann**, **David (Smith)** and **Dawn** are to prepare terms-of-reference for the lessons learnt paper, and circulate these to the group.
11. **Consent holder** to book a venue for Tuesday 16 November (16/11/21)

Present (names):

John Gray	Gary James	Sally-ann Moffat (affected party)
Miria O'Regan	(Wainuiomata Natural Heritage Trust)	Barrie Green (resident, Westminster Grove)
Alastair Meehan	Debbie Feely (Coast Rd)	Christine Green (resident, Westminster Grove)
David L.F. Smith (resident)	Kim Nicholas (Coast Rd)	Parvati Rotherham (HCC)
Jason Tamasese (resident Coast Road)	Craig Innes (Sunny Grove)	Niamey Izzett (HCC)
Jodie Winterburn (Wainuiomata Community Board (WCB))	Scott McWhirter (Wainui cleanfill)	David Pannekoek (Coast Road, WOA)
Dawn Mckinley (WCB, resident)	Bob McWhirter (Wainui cleanfill)	Campbell Barry (HCC)
	Gabriel Tupou (WCB)	Charlie Hopkins (consultant)
	Gerald Rillstone (Wainuiomata News)	

Apologies (names): n/a

7:00 pm, at the Wainuiomata community centre Queens Street

1. Introductions, health and safety, fire, earthquake, evacuation, media and audio recording (5 minutes)

<p>1. Introductions, health and safety, fire, earthquake, evacuation, media and audio recording (5 minutes)</p>	<p>Welcome and paper passed around for everyone to record their presence at meeting.</p>	
<p>2. Discussion regarding clean fill closure and working together to produce a draft 'environmental restoration plan' – Discussion from 7.05pm – 8.10pm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion on the environmental restoration plan (ERP) was brought forward to the meeting to seek feedback on the restoration plan and allow for contribution on the plan from all members of the CLG. Further opportunity for community members and council to work and build on together. • The report was authored by Alastair Meehan (T+T) but notes the report presented is in draft form. The aim of this report is to formalise a number of conversations had through CLG meetings, hearings and comment from GWRC <p>Request for information regarding closure of the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who undertakes the final sign off to confirm there is no toxic waste or potential for human exposure? - Impacts of people in the wind shadow of the site and how will this be assessed – particularly regarding asbestos on property (drains and dwelling walls). - Concerns regarding asbestos as previous discussions with clean fill operator said asbestos was found on site but confirmed was transported and disposed properly in Silverstream landfill. - How will council ensure accuracy of ongoing monitoring and up keeping the environment restoration plan. Is any monitoring of air, soil, water proposed? How will these monitoring results be shared with community members - Question regarding who will 	<p>Alastair indicates that monitoring and aftercare of a site generally relates to the operation of the site when it was open i.e., in this case a cleanfill compared to a landfill. The guidance prepared for landfills is not wholly applicable to all sites such as cleanfills</p> <p>Alastair to run the monitoring request past Jörn (HCC). Report back at next meeting.</p> <p>Charlie has noted the communities desire for post-closure monitoring in the above cover letter.</p>

	<p>bear the cost of upkeep and ongoing monitoring at the site.</p> <p>Questions regarding what will be included in the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alastair explains that the draft places a focus on planting rather than on going monitoring particularly monitoring of toxins. - Alastair explains that the way in which the cleanfill has been operating (capping with topsoil soil) that there is no need for ongoing monitoring as contaminants will be captured and retained within the fill volume - Community request for a report and testing of on-site soil to ensure contaminants are not present in concentrations that affect human health <p>Gary gave advice regarding the species list, specifically to species that are not locally native (eco sourced) to the Wainuiomata/Wellington area. <i>Phormium tenax</i> was recommended as a ground cover due to its large radius. Charlie asked Alastair to contact Gary outside of the meeting to get further details and to update the draft ERP.</p>	<p>Charlie has encouraged the council to consider this request, and to report back at the next meeting.</p>
	<p>Concerns regarding product taken from the Wingate petrol station site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alastair confirms that the material was tested and not all material taken to the clean fill. From memory Alastair indicates that the top layer of soil from the site was scraped away and hydrocarbon was found but this did not enter clean fill. - The only material from this site that entered the clean fill was virgin undisturbed rock. <p>Bob indicates that when the digger is near river, this is required to maintain vegetation on access tracks; available for contractors to access groundwater quality/depth monitoring wells.</p>	

	<p>Water monitoring has occurred on a one-off occasion as the water quality is a matter for regional consents not Hutt city land use consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reasons for this is due to sufficient setbacks from waterways, no erosion, sediment control measures, free draining soils which allows for water to infiltrate easily and located in an alluvial fan which further promotes this. - Community still has concerns that contaminants are getting into the water ways and water tables - Request for ongoing water monitoring to continue after the closure and include in restoration plan <p>Charlie notes the limitations of relying on one single monitoring round i.e., one point in time cannot show long term trends and state.</p> <p>HCC indicated that dust testing will be undertaken but current weather conditions do not allow this. Alastair shares picture of a dust monitoring station on site. This station just captures the quantity of the dust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dust monitoring will be undertaken on-site (but not off site at this time) as this relates to attribution - If high levels of contaminant concentration on-site, then testing will be undertaken on private properties but concerns of consent holder remains low. <p>There was discussion of the use of the site post-closure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planted out in its entirety to reduce members of public being able to use for motorbikes. - Some areas near river will be unable to be planted as a track needs to be kept clear. <p>Alastair notes that it is unlikely there</p>	<p>HCC to contact Gary regarding feedback on species list that will be planted in the area. Alastair to check on further plants and report</p>
--	--	--

	<p>will be ongoing future monitoring of the site post closure. Any monitoring that could be done will be as a good will measure.</p> <p>AP: Alastair will check with Council as landowner and consent holder to confirm if any post-closure monitoring be undertaken. Notes that this is not required by consent but may be undertaken outside of consent. Report back at next meeting.</p> <p>Concerns regarding leaching from materials into the water table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing monitoring of landfills is normally undertaken due to leachate. Mitigation also undertaken through capping of the material on the site. - In this case, the cleanfill does not have leachate and therefore not managed in the same way as a landfill. - Storm water pipe continues to run through the site, Council to report back how this will be managed post-closure <p>Confirmation to be provided of who is responsible of the storm water pipe. HCC or WWL?</p> <p>Summary of feedback regarding restoration management plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is not a landfill closure management plan - Restoration plan of reserve area - Not an area for public to use for recreation (walks, or motor biking) - Changes to be reported back next time - Alastair to circulate changes when these are ready <p>Charlie confirms that the feedback (that is, the request for post-closure monitoring) on the plan will be communicated to council members who were not present. Charlie confirms this is done in the above</p>	<p>back.</p> <p>Council to report back how the stormwater pipe will be managed post-closure</p> <p>Council staff to confirm re: naming of the reserve and who will have this responsibility e.g., the community board or the council committee</p>
--	---	--

	<p>cover letter.</p> <p>Mayor reiterates that it is council's responsibility to look after the site post closure as it is council owned land.</p>	
<p>4. Discuss the findings of the compliance audit, including noise and dust monitoring results</p>	<p>Charlie presented the report on behalf of The Catalyst Group.</p> <p>There remains an outstanding disagreement re: compliance of noise monitoring compliance from March reporting. The audit concluded that noise was non-compliant in round 1 of monitoring, but later compliant in round 2. Non-compliance related to the use of the bulldozer in the corner of the site closest to dwellings.</p> <p>Community members express that they understand 1DB noncompliance is not significant on its own but stress that this must be considered in the context of cumulative effects "on top" or above and beyond the 50 dB, then there is a potential for effects.</p> <p>The auditor was given material showing trucks were present on site past 5 PM. This was discounted by the auditor because it was not formally logged with the compliance officers, or able to be verified.</p> <p>Charlie reiterated why it's important to confirm through official channels. Sally-ann referenced complaints that were not identified in the complaints log or in the audit. Charlie is happy to receive material in writing on this matter, and to ask the auditor to consider. Prior to 16/8/21, no further material of missed complaints have been supplied other than those quoted in the compliance audit.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding complains not being recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 4th Sediment on Road (ref 520864) • June 30th Clean fill material on road (ref 523428) 	<p>Charlie to ask Tess (auditor) to check truck numbers and update report to reflect this. Once complete the report will be put online. This may be delayed by one week because of COVID lockdown.</p> <p>Parvati to upload finalised report when ready.</p>

	<p>Council to follow up on these. Depending on the outcome of this, Charlie will ask the auditor to consider and if necessary, amend report. Charlie happy to receive further material on this matter.</p>	
<p>Mayors comment regarding new council cleanfill site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirmed that the new clean fill servicing Hutt Valley will be located in Silverstream near the 9-hole golf course and the boys college. - The officers report provided to Council indicates a number of pros and cons which lead to the decision of this being the new site. - Decision was made for fact that Silverstream will be able to service both Hutt Valley and Upper Hutt. - Council decided they would not use council land and instead work with private operator. - Mayor notes that the decision was made by council for political reasons not technical matters - Community Board acknowledge and pleased the site has not been chosen in Wainuiomata 	
<p>Presentation of the latest dashboard, and any feedback</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remaining air space indicates that it could be closed before June 2022 - Daily truck numbers show one day above 75-truck limit. - Batters near south end almost complete - Planting for season will be complete in approximately next month with approx. 2,000 plants to go. Plants continued to be sourced from local nurseries - Dust concerns have been passed to GWRC - Concerns on site visit regarding trucks were passed on to the contractors from the clean fill operator. 	

Lessons learned paper	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Draft, work in progress- Will communicate council, community and operators opinions- Will include issues, resolutions and recommendations- More to be discussed on this paper at the next meeting. <p>Meeting end 8.55pm</p>	Charlie has requested that the papers authors are identified to provide accountability.
------------------------------	---	---