

Taramakau Rating District

Minutes of the Special Meeting held at S. Langridge's Residence on Tuesday 27 November 2012

Present

S. Langridge, J. Stewart, P. Stevenson, M. Dyke, D. Groot

In Attendance

W. Moen (WCRC)

The meeting commenced at 10.00pm

W. Moen welcomed those present and explained the issues, namely:

- a) M. Stewart and J. Pugh's resource consent application
- b) Stopbank vegetation control
- c) Rock availability

A) Resource Consent Issues.

W. Moen outlined the situation to date explaining that Council Consent staff had commissioned Tonkin &

Taylor Consultants to undertake a peer review of the applicants' Good Earth Matters supporting report.

Those present, indicated that Murray had supplied a copy of this report to all ratepayers for their information.

Discussion took place.

Some of the issues that the ratepayers had were:

1. The long term unknown effects of increased velocities (up to 50% increase) on existing right bank structures
2. The lack of detail and location of the "spillway" structure
It was noted that the T&T review stated "*that further work for any detailed design will be needed to confirm actual freeboard once the configuration of the true left stopbank and spillway has been determined.*"
3. The narrowing effect at the "Hook" area and the potential upstream impact
4. The potential transport of sediment through the proposed channel and the lack of effects on downstream right bank properties
5. The lack of detail on the overall final proposal

W. Moen explained that as the Tonkin & Taylor peer review had not carried out a detailed check on the modelling results and that the only way to settle any difference of opinion in river behaviour would be for the Council to arrange for a check modelling exercise to be undertaken.

It was indicated that this could cost in the vicinity of \$5,000 (G.S.T. Exclusive)

Such an exercise would need to be funded out of the rating account.

When put to the meeting, the majority felt that this modelling check needed to be done in order to substantiate, or otherwise, the Good Earth Matters findings on the theoretical flood levels.

John Stewart voted against the proposed exercise, on the basis that it could hold up the proposed construction on the left bank.

W. Moen explained that he was conscious of the apparent delays from Murray's point of view, however felt it was felt necessary in order to satisfy everyone of the potential effects, if any.

He also advised that the modelling would be carried out as soon as possible.

W. Moen was asked to report back once this exercise was carried out.

B) Vegetation Control

W. Moen explained that at the October 2012 Annual Meeting, individual ratepayers had asked that they be allowed

to carry out the necessary vegetation control along the individual frontages.

He explained that Council had decided to allow this to be trialled this summer and outlined Council's requirements, namely that:

- a) The floodwall top and full batter slopes be sprayed with appropriate herbicide to
- b) remove all vegetation other than grass.
- b) Any bare soil must be re - sown to achieve maximum grass cover.

Covering letters showing the individual areas and extent of coverage were handed out to individual ratepayers.

It was pointed out that the work had to be completed by 31 January 2013 and if the work has not been completed within the timeframe allowed, the Council would initiate the work and invoice the individual landowner for the costs involved.

J. Stewart agreed to give Murray his copy in his absence.

C) Rock Availability

W. Moen advised ratepayers that he was concerned at the long-term availability of good quality rock.

He explained that the rating district has been fortunate in recent times to have access to quality rock from Ian Whyte's gold claim at Greenstone, however it was his responsibility to remind ratepayers of a potential rock shortage in a major flood event.

He asked ratepayers to consider long-term options to assist in achieving a reliable ongoing rock supply.

The meeting closed at 11.30am