

Christchurch City Council CRC190445 comprehensive resource consent

Right of reply by Kathryn Snook 22/2/19

I would like to thank the expert witnesses for their time and effort in the preparation of the joint statement. Due to time constraints I have focused my comments on this document

13 The areas of disagreement are as follows:

- (a) We have not sought agreement on acceptable water level increases in particular the 120mm increase in the Styx River.

Note: the CRC131249 consent hearing the level increase went from 50mm to 100mm throughout the hearing

I would question the interpretation of a 'Styx river level rise' as day by day and year by year the river levels change as seen in the graphs. What would be deemed existing water level in which to compare the level rise.

If all areas of surface water flowing into the river mitigate up to a 1 in 50 year event one would expect no acceptable level rise as a result of the consent.

Following on from the setting of arbitrary river levels **13** or volumes **14** from models and the promise of **Identification of key locations**. I suggest this

CRC190445 consent should have constraints with CCC responsibilities and consequences clearly identified to ensure the CCC maintains and mitigate the rivers/drains/waterways to ensure the rivers have the ongoing capacity to act as a stormwater drain/system in any 1 in 50 year event situation.

This would give Christchurch residents the confidence that the council will fulfil its consent obligations by mitigating areas where it fails in under a 1 in 50 year event.

23 The existing hydraulic model of the Pūharakekenui / Styx River is calibrated against the August 2008 storm event, considered at the time

The CCC has had sufficient time to calibrate the model against the highest river level at June 2013 storm event which would bring model in line with post earthquake effects.

To support this In **figure 5 Harbour Rd levels** shows the Jun 13 event highest level 10.35 when the Earlam area experienced significant flooding and the river water flowed over the river banks.

I question why the CCC continue to use weed growth as a reason for Styx water level rise? During the Styx Working Group there was a weed cut that made no difference to the river level. Mr G Harrington should be able to clarify this. There are obviously other factors for river levels not just weed growth.

Issue (e) – Effect of Filling near Earlham St

As a CCC resident who queried the land fill activity, due to my concern about the impact on drainage within the Brooklands area, I am shocked to find that my concern was justified yet not acted upon.

Consequential reinstatement the Barkers drain is not an acceptable fix when it is obvious that the whole Earlham street drainage system needs to be upgraded due to the new and existing developments in this area with its known flooding and drainage issues.

61 (d) Groundwater levels are closely related to Styx River levels in the Lower Styx area and at times of elevated river levels, groundwater could be above the ground surface in lower lying areas

I have experienced this effect with water ponding post flooding yet when discussing with CCC member they dismissed that the River was affecting the groundwater levels – thank you for clarification. As identified this is now an additional issue we need to cope with additional water flowing in the Styx River and I would deem this a hazard of this consent.