

Meeting: Omanawa Falls

Date: 19 May 2021

Time: 2.00pm

Attendees:

Chris Watt, Peter Watson, Stuart Harvey, Bevan Hudson,
Lucy Holden (BOPRC Planner), Marlene Bosch (BOPRC)
Paula Golsby,
Julie Price (Veros on behalf of TCC)

Paula

- Currently developing the resource consent application now
- I will run through the technical inputs to date
- Introduce consent status/ inputs/ discussion around process/ notification outcomes/ way forward – look to efficiency of processing by both Councils.

Julie

- Project has three work-streams
 - Ownership
 - Access (current)
 - Experience
- Access:
 - Carpark – structured. Aim to get people off the side of the road
 - Prioritise a safe track to the bottom of falls
 - Make use of the existing 4WD track
 - New decks / steps / ladders / tramping feel.
 - An element of fitness would still be required
 - Gets you down next to the pool = onto a 'lower landing'
- Engineers developed technical assessment
 - cliff stabilisation
- Landscape Visual Assessment (LVA) – Isthmus Group / full landscape analysis
- Ecology – Tonkin & Taylor/ Full ecology review and plan
- Key driver:
 - Physical safety
 - Cultural safety
 - Spiritual safety
 - Ngatai Hangarau in partnership with emergency services (access)
- Built heritage – operative power station and tunnel (but unsafe)
- Proposition is not encouraging people into the water, cultural issues over that (although people likely to use/ enter/...)
- Water is seen as culturally important for cleansing and not swimming/... in
 - Difficult to stop (like closing the beach!)

- Access is better than no access as we have seen unfortunately with the resulting injuries and deaths. Human nature is that people going there to swim anyway; so make as safe as possible
- Get information message across to the public also.
- There are, and will be no ablutions at bottom; toilets will be up the top (toilets tank – pumped) no discharge.
- Formal carpark – cars off the road.
- Ngati Hangarau = Cultural experience and full 'Place of Assembly' attraction carving / storytelling/ ...
- The site is not a reserve subject to Reserves Act 1977. In TCC Reserve Management Plan (?) – not a "reserve". The intention for land to be transferred from TCC to Ngati Hangarau. Could include small-scale shops / food truck / events – educational for Hapu – might have up to 200 people there for an event (potential for clash with parking for other uses?) – timing critical. Number of persons in a structure for fire-occupancy limit to be considered. Need to understand the building use and intensity.
- Existing shed could be repurposed or rebuilt. Yet to be determined.
- Alternatives can be discussed within the RC application?
 - Education on-site
 - Place of assembly/ ...
 - Funding currently unsecured for new building
 - Could consent a building envelope
 - Consider shared activities on the site
 - Café might be a separate activity
 - Colours and materials to be defined under LVA

RC Required For

- **BOPRC**
 - Earthworks stabilisation and forming of the track (in part)
 - Earthworks – Riparian Management zone (Discretionary Activity)
 - Slope of the land (Discretionary Activity)
 - Vegetation clearance (Discretionary Activity)
 - **Marlene** - SW discharge considered hand-in-hand with earthworks
- **WBOPDC**
 - Rural zone
 - Significant Ecological area (2 x areas)
 - Built heritage feature (pump-station)
 - Public trails - Significant Ecological Area - (track within 30m of property boundary)
 - Place of assembly (toilets and main centre building)
 - Overall Discretionary Activity
 - Car-parking should "comply"
 - Proposal exceeds the plan requirement
 - 77 spaces to be provided

- If managed (booked) slots for visiting then 44 spaces required (we note a peak in 2019 (Waitangi Day) was about 200 people (90+ spaces!). 77 spaces considered in the middle of 44 and 90 (!)
- Bus parks – limited to 19 x seater bus size due to Omanawa Road widths in addition to 77 x spaces (i.e. schools / future cruise passengers/....)
- Area 05 – on the presented plans = close the informal carpark and revegetate, bollard the road and restrict the on-street parking.
- Full traffic management to be provided when open as arrivals will be high initially (or subject to booking system).
- **Peter** highlighted there are other riparian esplanade / paper road route(s) to the site.

Technical Reports

- Archaeological report – Heritage NZ – support in principle and will obtain the necessary authority(ies).
 - Peter – suggested that the applicants best to engage Iwi/ Hapu to apply for authority (don't need to be landowner). Not then likely to receive a condition on cultural monitoring as Iwi/ Hapu are the applicant
- Built heritage – should be oaky as there is no effects/ no change to structure
- Construction methodology = to be of a high level in accordance with Council guidelines (BOPRC). Draft erosion/ sediment control plan required with application

Bevan

- Limitation on numbers of persons on the track, ladder, swing bridges? Loading limits?
- 3 lookouts proposed; could look to stop at a safe point and not progress onto next lookout/ ladders/...

Traffic

- TIA – BECA (updated to cover 2 x scenarios)
- Slip lane to go in
- Brown tourist signs to be set up
- Omanawa Road is an 80km/h speed environment
- Signage/ supply parking sufficient
- Traffic generation – peak 85 vmph
- Volume - detailed analysis required
- Happy to provide **Stuart** a draft in advance (done)
- Estimate an increase of 2-4% at state highway intersection (especially under the managed scenario)
 - **Stuart** OK with that to read first (discuss Westlink and identify any issues/ clarification)

Stuart left the meeting

- Cultural (for BOPRC/WBOPDC)
 - Ngati Hangarau = Cultural impact assessment
 - And others on Tangata Whenua Directory(ies)
- Ecological Assessment (BOPRC/ WBOPDC)

- BOPRC staff to review for WBOPDC too as we have no experience in that field
- Tonkin & Taylor report (written under EIANZ guidelines)
- Bats are an issue. Considered to be a 'moderate' adverse effect – "more than minor" = notification (under RMA1991)
- What is the mitigation??
- Adapt the route according to location of bats (trees etc)
- High level opposition from immediate neighbours to the proposal.
- Miriam Taris (CEO), Gary Allis (Deputy CEO/ GM) and Rachael Davie (GM) are aware of this (email come in?).
- May request application be publicly notified
- Met neighbours – taking on feedback and may address some things – other issues appear to be non-RMA effects/ issues
- Intentions to lodge with support
 - If all on board – non not? (bats aside) or;
 - limited notified? or;
 - public notified?
- Other effect – rural character /amenity effect

Joint BOPRC/WBOPDC

- If publicly notified = 130 working days
- BOPRC take lead in joint protocol
 - Notification and Hearing/ Appointment of Commissioners
- Once received could be notified in 1 x week
- Submissions = 20 working days
- Tech reviews (up to 4 weeks) can occur during submission phase
- Submissions close
- Schedule hearing
 - Submissions could raise unknown issues
 - Commissioner availability
 - Date / venue to be arranged
- Assumes no s92 issues
- Need enough time to write up report / reconciliations
- Applicant could assist by proposing consent conditions?
- **Peter** provide Omanawa/ Kaimai ratepayer contact – Peter Lawrie?
- **Peter** – Forest and Bird (Kate Graham?) / DOC?
 - **TCC** – Get Warren to talk to them?

3.35pm: Peter left the meeting

- Landscape Visual Assessment – anticipate effects low/ not adverse
- Acoustics – not done yet
 - Traffic effects
 - Cultural facility events?
 - Dependent on the number of events per year (ie Matariki)

Meeting closed at 3.47pm