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THAMES FORESHORE RECLAMATION : S G HARRIS

Thank you for the set of background papers which presumably have led to the final approval being granted to the reclamation by your office and for the land to be vested.

It is noted that the consultants report whilst making favourable overall recommendations mentions:

i the need for provisions to be made for maintenance of the rock rip rap wall

ii that settlement rates of up to 9 mm per annum were still occurring in 1984 without any superimposed loading

iii that the consultant does not guarantee the adequacy of the reclamation.

These were the issues of concern to this Ministry and our reluctance to support the final vesting of the reclamation. It would seem that the local authority is willing to accept the risks and be responsible for any costs involved in its endeavours to encourage development of the town centre. I hope they will not be disappointed.

The District Council is currently advertising its draft District Planning Scheme and objections close at the end of July. It is noted that provision does not exist for a reserve on the reclamation as recommended by the consultant nor do the ordinances note any restriction on the loading limit of buildings on the reclamation. I therefore consider that Council is not making plain the known limitations of the site.

A K Attwood

for District Commissioner of Works
Your reference 13/108/1 5 June 1986

The District Commissioner of Works
Ministry of Works & Development
Private Bag
HAMILTON

Attention: A K Attwood

THAMES FORESHORE RECLAMATION & S G HARRIS

I refer to your memorandum of 23 May 1986, which has been referred to this office for comment.

In February 1986 this office received a Bruce Wallace Partners Limited report from the Thames-Coromandel District Council which confirmed the reclamation had been constructed in accordance with the approved plan MD14484. A copy of that report is attached.

F D Ryan
for Secretary for Transport

Encl
4 February 1986

Secretary of Transport,
Ministry of Transport,
Private Bag,
WELLINGTON

Dear Sir,

S.G. HARRIS RECLAMATION - THAMES

Your 43/64/6/2 dated 24 January 1986 refers.

Enclosed is a copy of the certificate received from Bruce Wallace Partners dated 28 June 1985.

A copy of this certificate was forwarded to Mr M. Dunwoodie, Consulting Surveyor on 16 July 1985, so that the deposit of the land plan could be facilitated. No doubt the deposit of the plan is currently in process.

The certifying engineer did not request any improvements.

Yours faithfully,

K.C. Fenton
Chief Engineer
for General Manager

ENCL.
Dear Sir

Mr K. Fenton
Chief Engineer
Thames Coromandel District Council
THAMFS

I refer to the letter from the Ministry of Transport to the Thames Coromandel District Council, dated 6 May 1985.

I, Philip Scott Hutchinson, Registered Engineer hereby certify that I have inspected the above reclamation and state as follows:

1. **Dimensional Consistency with Approved Plan MD 14484**

The as-built reclamation has been surveyed by Dunwoodie & Henderson, Registered Surveyors and a signed copy of their drawing 0187/1 is attached. It can be seen from the drawing that the reclamation has been constructed generally in accordance with the dimensions and levels shown on MP 14484 except that the area of reclamation has been extended north of Mary Street extension. We understand that the question of approval of this area has been resolved by the Thames Coromandel District Council.

2. **Sea Wall**

The sea wall was inspected by the writer on the 31 May 1985. Mr Harris informs me that the stone facing has been in place for some twelve years and that no maintenance other than raising the land behind the wall has been required in that time. The wall is standing at a slope of about 1.5 to 1 with a depth of water outside the wall of about 800mm at mean high water as shown on the Dunwoodie & Henderson Report Drawing No. 0187.
Taking into account the wave climate, the depth of water, and the protection offered by the mud flat in front of the wall it would not be possible for waves higher than about one metre to attack the wall, and such conditions could only occur at high tide. The stone of which the wall is made is of sufficient size to withstand waves of that height but some erosion of the clay filling could occur behind the wall.

For this reason allowance should be made to maintain the wall and this could be achieved by placing a building line reticulation 20 metres back from the wall so access could always be gained for maintenance.

3. Settlement

The question of settlement of the reclamation has been investigated by Murray North Partners Ltd, Consulting Engineers, in their report dated November 1981 and signed by G.O. Woodward. This is held by the Council. Since this report levels have been taken periodically at five points on the reclamation, this record shows that the maximum settlement measured between 14-6-84 and 27-11-84 was 4mm which would amount to 9mm per annum. Provided that any buildings proposed for the reclamation are specifically designed by a Registered Engineer to accommodate any settlements which may occur as outlined in the Murray North report I consider that the magnitude of settlement does not preclude the use of the reclamation for the purposes associated with the Council's Town Centre zoning.

4. Conclusion

On the basis of the Dunwoodie & Henderson survey and the Murray North Settlement report both as described above and my observations of the seawall I confirm that the reclamation has been constructed generally in accordance with MD 14484. It is my professional opinion, not to be construed as a guarantee, that the reclamation construction is of an acceptable standard.

Yours faithfully
BRUCE WALLACE PARTNERS LTD

P.S. Hutchinson
Our Ref: 43/64/6/2
Your Ref: V4/2/11

6 September 1984

General Manager
Thames-Coromandel District Council
Private Bag
THAMES

Dear Sir

S.G. HARRIS: RECLAMATION

Thank you for your letter of 21 August 1984 in which you forwarded a plan showing amended details for the level of stopbank and adjacent land.

This Ministry is obtaining technical reports on the proposal and when these have been received I will write to you again.

Yours faithfully

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport

Dist. Commissioner of Works
Ministry of Works and Development
Private Bag
HAMILTON

Your 1981 reference was 13/108/1.

Could I please have your report on the attached proposal in terms of the Harbours Act 1950. Please direct your report through the office of the Commissioner of Works, Wellington.

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
HARBOURS AND FORESHORES

29 May 1986

The District Commissioner of Works
Ministry of Works and Development
Private Bag
HAMILTON

Attention: A. K. Attwood

THAMES FORESHORE RECLAMATION : S. G. HARRIS

Further to your memorandum of 23 May 1986.

This Office is unaware of any approvals being given for the above reclamation. We have therefore referred your request to the Office of the Secretary for Transport, Wellington, for action.

M. R. Biddle
for Regional Secretary for Transport

CC S.E.O (Harbours)
HEAD OFFICE

Attention: T. Law

Copy for your information and action. Your reference 43/64/6/2 refers. This Office does not appear to have a copy of your memorandum dated 6 September 1984 to M.W.D.

M. R. Biddle
for Regional Secretary for Transport
ATTENTION : Mr M R Biddle

THAMES FORESHORE RECLAMATION : S G HARRIS

This reclamation has been ongoing for many years and has always been considered not satisfactory by this office for development other than for restricted uses. Our last set of correspondence was generated by your head office memo 43/64/6/2 of 6 September 1984. This office reported adversely on the reclamation to our head office on 8 October 1984. Concurrently we advised the Thames Coromandel District Council Chief Engineer that he must make his own evaluation of a consultants report that he had supplied to us but did hint that the report may not have covered the critical areas of the reclamation.

Since then we have had no response from any party nor any information as to whether the reclamation has been approved or otherwise by your department.

I now note that application is being made by Mr Harris for a water right to discharge stormwater from the reclamation.

Could you please verify what approvals have been given as I am concerned that development may be proceeding without a satisfactory reclamation having been achieved.

A K Attwood
for District Commissioner of Works
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the following water right application/s may be inspected at the Board's office, 59 Whitaker Street, Te Aroha, or at the offices listed, during normal working hours.

Any body or person objecting to any such application on the grounds that the grant thereof would prejudice its or his/her interest or the interest of the public generally may do so by notice in writing, supported by a Statutory Declaration, stating the grounds of the objection and whether the objector wishes to be heard by the Board in support of the objection at the hearing of the application. Any objection is to be received by the Secretary of the Board, 59 Whitaker Street, Te Aroha (P.O. Box 246, Te Aroha) not later than 2.00 p.m. on 19 June 1986.

W1824: an application from

S.G. Harris,
c/- Curtin, Gallagher & Co.,
P.O. Box 9360,
HAMILTON NORTH,

for a right to discharge up to 4.03 megalitres per day of stormwater from a new reclamation into the sea from two points, at up to 324 litres per second and 405 litres per second respectively, in the vicinity of map references NZMS260-T12-359483 and 359481, adjacent to the Thames Branch Railway, Thames. The land involved is described as Lots 1 and 2 being part Pt B Karaka Block, Pt B Te Tapuae Block, Pt B Whakaupapa Block, Pt B Te Tapue Onenuku Block, Pt B Hangaruru Block; Block IV, Thames Survey District.

W1824 may also be inspected at the offices of the Thames-Coromandel District Council, Thames.

Dated at Te Aroha this 13th day of May 1986.

G.J. Bailey
SECRETARY

To be advertised in the Thames Star on 22 May 1986.

District Commissioner of Works,
Min. of Works & Development,
Private Bag,
HAMILTON.
ATTENTION : Mr P D Spackman

THAMES FORESHORE RECLAMATION : S G HARRIS

Further to my enquiry of 31 January 1984 I now advise that the District Council is awaiting submission of data, certificates and assurances from Mr Harris before giving further consideration to any subdivision proposals on this reclamation.

Accordingly no action is required of your department at this stage.

A K Attwood
for District Commissioner of Works
RECORD OF INTERVIEW/TELEPHONE CALL

With A Attwood.

Date: 15/5/84

Subject: SC Harris Reclamation

Persons present: 

Summary of discussion and conclusions reached:

SITE HAS NOT BEEN SEEN LATELY

A Attwood advise someone will be looking at the reclamation and will be getting back to us.

Action required:

BRING-UP

15/6/84

Initials: WHS

Date: 15/5/84
Mr A K Attwood  
31 January 1984  
13/108/1

The Regional Secretary  
Marine Division  
Ministry of Transport  
Private Bag  
AUCKLAND

THAMES FORESHORE RECLAMATION : S G HARRIS

Your head office wrote to the Thames Coromandel District Council on 3 August 1981 (43/64/6/2) setting out the remedial works that needed to be done. It is now noted that the District Council is subdividing the reclamation. The Hauraki Catchment Board has written to the Council pointing out the need for a reserve to include all of the stopbank, the need for a seaward pad and provision of internal drainage.

Could you please advise if the Division is now satisfied with the reclamation.

A K Attwood  
for District Commissioner of Works

A reply would be appreciated

A K Attwood  
9.5.84
The Regional Secretary
Marine Division
Ministry of Transport
Private Bag
AUCKLAND

THAMES FORESHORE RECLAMATION : S G HARRIS

Your head office wrote to the Thames Coromandel District Council on 3 August 1981 (43/64/6/2) setting out the remedial works that needed to be done. It is now noted that the District Council is subdividing the reclamation. The Hauraki Catchment Board has written to the Council pointing out the need for a reserve to include all of the stopbank, the need for a seaward pad and provision of internal drainage.

Could you please advise if the Division is now satisfied with the reclamation.

A K Attwood
for District Commissioner of Works
Dear Sir

S.G. HARRIS : RECLAMATION : THAMES

I refer to your letter of 29 July 1980 in which you advised that the above reclamation physically complete.

The Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967 authorised your council to reclaim from the bed of Thames Harbours areas as described in the schedule to that Act. This authorisation was given subject to the provisions of sections 176 to 1C2 of the Harbours Act 1950. Plan MD 14484 showing the reclamation proposed by your council was approved pursuant to section 178 of the Harbours Act on 7 March 1972.

In your letter you ask that if the Ministry has any powers to require the seawall to be brought to satisfactory standard your council would appreciate these being exercised. As stated above your council was authorised to carry out the work and the approvals were for your council to carry out that work. Therefore your council is responsible for ensuring that the works are completed to a satisfactory standard. Any arrangement that you have had with the developer is a matter between the council and the developer and not between the ministry and the developer.

Upon receiving your letter of 29 July 1980, the ministry sought a report on the reclamation works from our technical advisers. This ministry is concerned at the matters raised in the report as it would appear that your council has not supervised the construction of the work when council is responsible in terms of the approvals to ensure that satisfactory standard of work is achieved.

The following are matters which are of concern to this ministry and action must be taken to rectify the situations.

1. Plan MD 14484 was approved pursuant to section 178(b) of the Harbours and this approved the reclaiming of an area of 5 acres. This is the area between Danby Field
and the proposed Mary Street extension. The actual area reclaimed includes an area north of the proposed Mary Street extension. It appears that this area has been reclaimed without obtaining the necessary approvals under sections 176 to 182 of the Harbours Act as specifically required by the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act. The area in question includes Lot 1 being 4770 square metres plus the surrounding stop bank to the west and north. If approval has been given by this ministry in terms of section 178 of the Harbours Act for this area would you please supply a reference (MD plan number) otherwise submit a full explanation as to why the work was carried out without first obtaining the necessary approvals. It appears that the total area involved in some 0.81 hectares larger than that defined on plan MD 14484.

2. Stopbank/Sea Retaining wall height - Plan MD 14484 shows that the top of the stopbank is to be at RL 11.60. This is a height of 3.51 metres. Our technical advisers advise that based on levels taken over the whole length of the as is wall, the wall is on an average of 0.70 metres too low and in some places 0.9 metres too low.

To comply with the approved plan your council is required to raise the level of the stopbank to the height as shown on plan MD 14484 and to maintain the stopbank at that height (refer to later comment concerning settlement).

3. Our technical advisers have commented on the protection of the stopbank. We consider that the protection rip rap is not to an adequate standard for the following reasons.

(a) A uniform size of material appears to have been used instead of a suitably graded one.

(b) The rock rip rap has been used in conjunction with large concrete slabs, and this mixture is not likely to be compatible for stability and flexibility reasons under wave attack. This also results in an unsatisfactory visual impact of the rip rap material.

(c) The size of the rip rap used, and thickness used, appear to be inadequate for the degree of exposure to wave action expected as this site.

(d) There appears to be no evidence of a filter layer (be it fabric or aggregate having been used to prevent beaching of the reclamation filling into the tidal zone.

These above matters will need to be attended to by your council to ensure that sufficient protection is given to the reclamation.
4. It has been noted that between Danby Field and the reclaimed area in question, an open drain exists with the potential for waves to run up same causing erosion of the reclaimed area. The southwest corner of the reclamation is not protected from this wave action. It will be necessary for your council to remove the material from the northern side of the drain and replace it with suitable filter and rip rap.

5. Our technical advisers are concerned about the settlement properties of the reclamation. The reclamation and associated stopbank are built on unconsolidated estuarine clays and silts of a depth exceeding 20 metres. Ministry of Works and Development experience at the adjacent Danby Field reclamation, together with penetrometer sounding and consolidation testing carried out at sites south of the reclamation in question in similar materials, leads to the reasonable prediction that a total settlement of between 2/3rd and 1 times the height of the filling placed will occur over a period of approximately 20 to 40 years. Further, analysis and experience at Danby field show that for a 3 metre high filling, 1-1½ metres of settlement will occur in 5-10 years.

It is thus evident that the security and viability of a reclamation in this area is very dependent on the ability to keep regularly topping up or otherwise adjusting the height of the seawall. This can be done in one of two ways. Either by placing material outside the present batter on the seaward side, or by placing material on top of but inside the existing batter line. The former uses considerably more material and therefore costs increase. Also more weight is added to the seawall causing greater settlement and therefore reducing the time before further lifting is necessary. The latter method uses less material, but reduces the effective area reclaimed.

Just as the seawall has, and will continue to settle, so has and will the remainder of the reclamation, but to a lesser extent. This could cause problems in the laying of service pipes add drainage.

6. To satisfy the minimum requirements of security and viability of the reclamation, it is considered that the following matters will need to be attended to.

(a) The stopbank/seawall will have to be brought up to height and adequate provision for, and thought given to, the regular and perpetual topping up of the stopbank in order to maintain a level of 3.51 metres.

(b) A properly designed and constructed rip rap protection system will need to be provided to protect the reclamation from wave action.

(c) Adequate provision will need to be made for the filling of the reclaimed area as settlement occurs.
Ministry of Works and Development advise that the land would for a large number of years be only suitable for those types of development principally concerned with storage, or the like, with any associated buildings being of a light timber frame type capable of being relevelled at regular intervals. It is considered this approach is essential if potentially large claims against your council as reclaiming authority are to be avoided. Our advisers further state that the apparent onus for ensuring adequate foundation conditions exist for any particular type of development remains with the developments designers, and the controlling authority who permit the development, but great care should be exercised in this case when council considers a subdivision approval of the reclaimed land, not to claim or imply suitability of the area for other than the type of uses mentioned above. The type of use of that this reclaimed land is put must be limited. Adequate provision to adjust the stopbank level must be made in any subdivisional approval given by your council.

I must stress once again that the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967 authorises your council to reclaim the land and the application for 178(b) approval was made in the same of the council and therefore the responsibility to ensure that the work is completed satisfactorily lies with the council. As to who pays for the work as described above is a legal matter between your council and the developer.

It will be necessary for you to seek approval for any works which are carried out outside that area as shown on the approved plan MD 14484. These plans should show in detail, the dimensions, materials used and such other information that you may be able to supply.

We look forward to receiving from you in due course your council intentions in respect of the remedial work that is necessary.

Yours faithfully

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
Attention: Mr R.A. Burnett

Copy for your information. Your reference 13/108/1. Thank you for your comprehensive report of 20 July 1981 on the reclamation by the Thames Coromandel District Council contracted out to Mr S.G. Harris. I have quoted your report fully in the hope that by giving the council as much information as possible the problems of this reclamation may be overcome.

You will note that I have stated that the responsibility for the reclamation work lies with the Thames Coromandel District Council and I agree with your comment that additional works and who is responsible is a matter to be decided between the Council and Mr Harris.

In section F of your report you express concern that the public involvement in any future areas of reclamation is not available as the Thames Coromandel District Council has authority to reclaim in terms of the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967. The authority to reclaim land is given by this Act but it is subject to the compliance of the council with the provisions of sections 176 to 182 of the Harbours Act. Should an application be received for approval in terms of section 178 of the Harbours Act, this Ministry will require that the council prepare some form of environmental assessment documentation and that this document be made available for public comment. This procedure can be required of the council under section 178A of the Harbours Act.

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
The Secretary for Transport, Head Office, Attention: S.E.O. (Harbours) Regional Office, AUCKLAND

RECLAMATION: THAMES: S.G. HARRIS

28 October 1983

Enclosed for your information are various papers forwarded from Mr Attwood of the Ministry of Works and Development, Hamilton. These papers all relate to the incomplete reclamation by S.G. Harris at Thames.

A full set of papers is forwarded to you as there are some that you possibly could not have seen. Also enclosed is a copy of the advice from the Ministry of Works and Development to the Thames/Coromandel District Council regarding the scheme plan for subdivision.

J. N. Dean (Miss)
for Regional Secretary

Encl.
Dear Sir

SCHEME PLAN OF SUBDIVISION NO. K 03/51/276B : S G HARRIS

The abovementioned scheme plan has been examined and the following comment is provided.

The subdivision as shown on the plan has no legal access. According to the New Zealand Railways Corporation, no application for a public level crossing over the adjacent railway line has been made to provide such access. The level crossing must be applied for as established in terms of the New Zealand Railways Corporation Act 1981. The Resident Engineer, NZ Railways, Hamilton, should be consulted by the subdivider.

The Ministry of Transport, Marine Division may also wish to comment on the subdivision as the stopbank does not appear to have been built and maintained to the required standard. However, Marine Division will comment under the Harbours Act 1950.

Yours faithfully

Marion Whibley
for District Commissioner of Works

ATTENTION Mr P D Spackman
2 February 1983

General Manager
Thames Coromandel District Council
Private Bag
THAMES

Dear Sir

S.G. HARRIS : RECLAMATION

Further to your letter of 5 August 1982, I would be grateful if you would advise this office of the current position in respect of the above reclamation.

We note that your council was evaluating the report of Mr Harris' consultants and that a copy of the report and council's comments would be forwarded to this Ministry in due course.

Yours faithfully

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport

Regional Secretary
AUCKLAND

Attention: J.M. Dean


T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
Secretary for Transport  
Attention: T. Law  
S.G. HARRIS : RECLAMATION  

Regional Office AUCKLAND  
21 January 1983  

Your memorandum of 8 September 1982 refers.  

Have you heard any more from Thames Coromandel District Council about the above reclamation.  

If you have not, do you want us to contact the Council on your behalf.

J.M. Dean  
for Regional Secretary
Your minute of 2 September 1982 refers.

The Thames Coromandel District Council responded to my letters of 22 July on 5 August advising that the consultant report for Mr Harris was being evaluated by Council staff.

To date, I have received no further advise.

T E Law
for Secretary for Transport
Subject: S G. Harris - Reclamation

To: Head Office

5 E.O. (Hrs)

Attention: T. Law.

File No. 22/4/25-2

Date: 2-9-82

Department: ........................................

Section: ........................................

MINUTE SHEET

Your Ref: 43/64/6/2

Further to your minute of the 22-7-82, T.CDC replied to the letter of 22-7-82 as yet.

J. M. Bean

For Regional Secretary.

BRING-UP

20-9-82

Initials: JMD
43/64/6/2
V4/1
22 July 1982

General Manager
Thames-Coromandel District
Council
Private Bag
THAMES

Attention: Mr Parquhar

Dear Sir

S.G. HARRIS : RECLAMATION

I refer to your letter of 6 November 1981 in which you
advised that Mr Harris had engaged Murray North & Partners
to carry out an investigation and report on the above
reclamation. You stated that when this report had been
received, affected parties would be meeting to discuss the
position.

I would be pleased if you would advise this office of the
current position in respect of the above reclamation.

Referring to the other matters raised in your letter of
6 November, our records confirm your statement concerning
the other area of reclamation.

I look forward to receiving your reply in due course.

Yours faithfully

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport

Regional Secretary
AUCKLAND

Attention: P.D. Spackman

Copy for your information. Your reference 54/4/252

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
43/64/6/2

2 November 1981

General Manager
Thames Coromandel District Council
Private Bag
THAMES

Dear Sir

S.G. HARRIS : RECLAMATION : THAMES

I refer to my letter of 3 August 1981 in which I gave the comments that our technical advisers had made on the above reclamation.

In the last paragraph of that letter, I requested that you advise this office of your Council's intentions in respect of the remeatal work that is necessary to the reclamation. Would you also advise what steps Council intends to take regarding the legalising of the area reclaimed which was outside that area authorised.

I look forward to receiving your reply in at your earliest convenience.

Yours faithfully

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport

Regional Secretary
Private Bag
AUCKLAND

Attention: P.D. Spackman


T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
To--
Mr. P.D Spackman
Marine Div
Min of Transport
Private Bag
Auckland

Dear Peter,

In nothing copies I see not all
The correspondence has
been between your
Head Office & yourself
so hence I cannot
quote your file.

Until we receive the
assurances mentioned in
your HQ. letter 13.5.81
we would have to recommend
vetoing any submission in
terms of Howells Act.
Item 504

Unfortunately we have very limited powers under any other act we administer.

[Signature]

7/10/83
New Zealand Railways
Land Division

NEW ZEALAND RAILWAYS,
PRIVATE BAG, HAMILTON.
TELEPHONE 81-979.

109/59/143

IF CALLING PLEASE ASK FOR Mr. I. Brown
EXT. 8465

Your Ref: 40/11 of 16.9.83

20 September 1983

The District Commissioner of Works
Ministry of Works & Development
Private Bag
HAMILTON

SCHEME PLAN NO. 276B : S.G. HARRIS : THAMES URBAN

Railways wishes to object to the proposed subdivision on the grounds that the land has no legal access, and no access rights have been granted over Railway land to give access.

The provision of a public level crossing would be subject to Railway criteria, which the proposed subdivision does not meet.

Railways objection would be withdrawn if an application for a public level crossing is made to Railways Resident Engineer, Hamilton, and subsequently given approval by Railways Chief Civil Engineer.

LOCATION: 2ND FLOOR (RAILWAYS TRAVEL CENTRE) CORNER OF BRYCE & ANGLESEA STREETS, HAMILTON
T&CP : THAMES URBAN DIVISION : S G HARRIS
SP K3/51/276B

Your 40/11/1 of 7 September 1983 refers

1 This site has been the topic of significant correspondence and discussion, mainly in relation to the technical advice given to the Marine Division MOT in relation to the reclamation in terms of the Harbours Act.

Please refer to correspondence leading up to the MOT letter of 3 August 1981. Your file of 13/108/1 (or 96/093000) This letter is the last record we have on this topic since this latest SP Application.

2 From the tone of the correspondence outlined above it is obvious that the TCDC is seen as being held responsible for the developer's standard of work. However there are some issues which are not so clear cut and which I have no record of, of a satisfactory conclusion being met. While they may not strictly have much relationship to the current SP application, the issue is so diverse that it is best that you have all the background to it.

2.1 The area of the reclamation as approved as per Plan MD 14484 was 5 acres (2.024Ha). The current SP shows an area of approximately 2.7Ha. If approval has been given to reclaim this additional area then we have no record of it.

2.2 The stopbank has not been built and maintained to the required standard. In fact it appears to be much the same as outlined in the report to the MOT dated 20 July 1981. The cross section which accompany the SP appear to support this view.
2.3 Settlement is, and will continue to be a problem, both for the seawall and for any structures that may be built in the reclamation. I have obtained a copy of the Soil Report prepared by Murray North Partners in 1981. The conclusions largely follow those of this department in its knowledge of problems experienced on the adjacent Danby field play field reclamation.

1e That some settlement will follow development, that most of the settlement will take place within the first two years.

- that most of the settlement will be in the natural strata below the filling.
- that settlement can be minimised by keeping building pressures as low as possible.
- that preconsolidation by surcharging the building site for several years will accelerate settlement.

3 The Scheme Plan and the surveyors report are at variance in that lots 3 and 4 have been shown as 20m wide strips, and yet the report seeks sanction for a 3m wide strip 'as shown'.

4 In conclusion it is apparent that the developer has not carried out the works as required to MOT standard, as far as the sea wall is concerned. The question of site utilisation is for the TCDC to decide bearing in mind its limitations.

R J Nicholls
for Resident Engineer
5 September 1983

Ministry of Works & Development
Private Bag
HAMILTON

Attention: Commissioner of Works

Dear Sir,

RE: SCHEME PLAN NO. K03/51/276B
OWNER S G HARRIS

A copy of the above mentioned plan and surveyor's report are submitted for your comments on the proposed subdivision.

Please forward your comments as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully,

K.C. FENTON
CHIEF ENGINEER
THAMES-COROMANDEL DISTRICT

Per: E Jones
Techn. Planning Asst.

Encl: Plan Report

M. W. leg.

DW & SO - Any concerns here?

Acknowledged and sent to R.E.
23rd August 1983

The General Manager,
Thames Coromandel District Council,
Private Bag,
THAMES.

ATTENTION: MR A.C. JEFFERY

Dear Sir,

RE: PROPOSED SUBDIVISION - S.G. HARRIS RECLAMATION

Herewith six copies of the scheme plan and three copies of a plan of cross-sections.

We submit the scheme plan on behalf of Mr S.G. Harris who has reclaimed the land which is contained in C.T. 2020/144 which is owned by your Council. The purpose of this scheme plan is to allow the land to be subdivided so that the title can be transferred to Mr S.G. Harris.

The cross-sections show how the present filling relates to the levels set out in the original agreement between Mr S.G. Harris and Thames Borough Council. We understand Mr Harris has forwarded a copy of a stability report completed by Murray - North Partners Limited for your reference.

Lots 3 and 4 have been shown as a three metre wide strip of land to vest as esplanade reserve. We are aware of the provisions of Sec 289 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Mr S.G. Harris requests that Council consider supporting an application to the Minister to reduce the esplanade to 3 metres wide. Mr Harris's main concern is that if Council carry out further reclamation to the west, they could recover the rock rip-rap and utilise it to construct another sea wall further out. The construction of this sea wall was a very expensive part of the reclamation and Mr Harris does not consider that Council or some other developer should benefit at his cost. He is also very aware that when he entered into the agreement for the reclamation in 1970 no esplanade reserves were required under the Municipal Corporations Act. If a full 20 metre esplanade reserve was required it would take 26% of the area which Mr Harris has reclaimed.

cont...
Lot 5 has been shown to vest as road. This appears necessary at this stage to create a legal public crossing over the Thames Branch Railway.

Councils favourable consideration of this scheme plan would be appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

M.J. DUNWOODIE
M.N.Z.I.S.
Wide format was located here in this file

To view the wide format image(s) please go to the end of this document

The numbers listed below are also on the wide format image(s) that belong here

5964

5965
Enclosed for your information is a copy of the report from the Ministry of Works & Development, Hamilton together with the comments of Mr A. Smith for the Marine Works Engineer.

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
General Manager
Thames-Coromandel District Council
Private Bag
THAMES

Dear Sir

S.G. HARRIS : RECLAMATION : THAMES

I refer to your letter of 29 July 1980 in which you advised that
the above reclamation physically complete.

The Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967 authorised your
council to reclaim from the bed of Thames Harbours areas as
described in the schedule to that Act. This authorisation was
given subject to the provisions of sections 176 to 182 of the
Harbours Act 1950. Plan MD 14484 showing the reclamation proposed
by your council was approved pursuant to section 178 of the
Harbours Act on 7 March 1972.

In your letter you ask that if the Ministry has any powers to
require the seawall to be brought to satisfactory standard your
council would appreciate those being exercised. As stated above
your council was authorised to carry out the work and the approvals
were for your council to carry out that work. Therefore your
council is responsible for ensuring that the works are completed
to a satisfactory standard. Any arrangement that you have had
with the developer is a matter between the council and the developer
and not between the ministry and the developer.

Upon receiving your letter of 29 July 1980, the ministry sought
a report on the reclamation works from our technical advisors.
This ministry is concerned at the matters raised in the report as
it would appear that your council has not supervised the
construction of the work when council is responsible in terms of
the approvals to ensure that satisfactory standard of work is
achieved.

The following are matters which are of concern to this ministry
and action must be taken to rectify the situations.

1. Plan MD 14484 was approved pursuant to section 178(b)
of the Harbours and this approved the reclaiming of an
area of 5 acres. This is the area between Danby Field
and the proposed Mary Street extension. The actual area reclaimed includes an area north of the proposed Mary Street extension. It appears that this area has been reclaimed without obtaining the necessary approvals under sections 176 to 182 of the Harbours Act as specifically required by the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act. The area in question includes Lot 1 being 4770 square metres plus the surrounding stop bank to the west and north. If approval has been given by this ministry in terms of section 178 of the Harbours Act for this area would you please supply a reference (MD plan number) otherwise submit a full explanation as to why the work was carried out without first obtaining the necessary approvals. It appears that the total area involved in some 0.81 hectares larger than that defined on plan MD 14484.

2. Stopbank/Sea Retaining wall height - Plan MD 14484 shows that the top of the stopbank is to be at RL 11.60. This is a height of 3.51 metres. Our technical advisers advise that based on levels taken over the whole length of the as is wall, the wall is on an average of 0.70 metres too low and in some places 0.9 metres too low.

To comply with the approved plan your council is required to raise the level of the stopbank to the height as shown on plan MD 14484 and to maintain the stopbank at that height (refer to later comment concerning settlement).

3. Our technical advisers have commented on the protection of the stopbank. We consider that the protection rip rap is not to an adequate standard for the following reasons.

(a) A uniform size of material appears to have been used instead of a suitably graded one.

(b) The rock rip rap has been used in conjunction with large concrete slabs, and this mixture is not likely to be compatible for stability and flexibility reasons under wave attack. This also results in an unsatisfactory visual impact of the rip rap material.

(c) The size of the rip rap used, and thickness used, appear to be inadequate for the degree of exposure to wave action expected as this site.

(d) There appears to be no evidence of a filter layer (be it fabric or aggregate having been used to prevent beaching of the reclamation filling into the tidal zone.

These above matters will need to be attended to by your council to ensure that sufficient protection is given to the reclamation.
4. It has been noted that between Danby Field and the reclaimed area in question, an open drain exists with the potential for waves to run up same causing erosion of the reclaimed area. The southwest corner of the reclamation is not protected from this wave action. It will be necessary for your council to remove the material from the northern side of the drain and replace it with suitable filter and rip rap.

5. Our technical advisers are concerned about the settlement properties of the reclamation. The reclamation and associated stopbank are built on an unconsolidated estuarine clays and silts of a depth exceeding 20 metres. Ministry of Works and Development experience at the adjacent Danby Field reclamation, together with penetrometer sounding and consolidation testing carried out at sites south of the reclamation in question in similar materials, leads to the reasonable prediction that a total settlement of between 2/3rd and 1/3rd the height of the filling placed will occur over a period of approximately 20 to 40 years. Further, analysis and experience at Danby field show that for a 3 metre high filling, 1-1½ metres of settlement will occur in 5-10 years.

It is thus evident that the security and viability of a reclamation in this area is very dependent on the ability to keep regularly topping up or otherwise adjusting the height of the seawall. This can be done in one of two ways. Either by placing material outside the present batter on the seaward side, or by placing material on top of but inside the existing batter line. The former uses considerably more material and therefore costs increase. Also more weight is added to the seawall causing greater settlement and therefore reducing the time before further lifting is necessary. The latter method uses less material, but reduces the effective area reclaimed.

Just as the seawall has, and will continue to settle, so has and will the remainder of the reclamation, but to a lesser extent. This could cause problems in the laying of service pipes and drainage.

6. To satisfy the minimum requirements of security and viability of the reclamation, it is considered that the following matters will need to be attended to.

(a) The stopbank/seawall will have to be brought up to height and adequate provision for, and thought given to, the regular and perpetual topping up of the stopbank in order to maintain a level of 3.51 metres.

(b) A properly designed and constructed rip rap protection system will need to be provided to protect the reclamation from wave action.

(c) Adequate provision will need to be made for the filling of the reclaimed area as settlement occurs.
7. Ministry of Works and Development advise that the land would for a large number of years be only suitable for those types of development principally concerned with storage, or the like, with any associated buildings being of a light timber frame type capable of being relevelled at regular intervals. It is considered this approach is essential if potentially large claims against your council as reclaiming authority are to be avoided. Our advisers further state that the apparent onus for ensuring adequate foundation conditions exist for any particular type of development remains with the developments designers, and the controlling authority who permit the development; but great care should be exercised in this case when council considers a subdivision approval of the reclaimed land, not to claim or imply suitability of the area for other than the type of uses mentioned above. The type of use of that this reclaimed land is put must be limited. Adequate provision to adjust the stopbank level must be made in any subdivisional approval given by your council.

I must stress once again that the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967 authorises your council to reclaim the land and the application for 178(b) approval was made in the same of the council and therefore the responsibility to ensure that the work is completed satisfactorily lies with the council. As to who pays for the work as described above is a legal matter between your council and the developer.

It will be necessary for you to seek approval for any works which are carried out outside that area as shown on the approved plan HD 14484. These plans should show in detail, the dimensions, materials used and such other information that you may be able to supply.

We look forward to receiving from you in due course your councils intentions in respect of the remedial work that is necessary.

Yours faithfully

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
District Commissioner of Works
Ministry of Works and Development
Private Bag
HAMILTON

Attention: Mr R.A. Burnett

Copy for your information, Your reference 13/108/1. Thank
you for your comprehensive report of 20 July 1981 on the
reclamation by the Thames Coromandel District Council contracted
out to Mr S.G. Harris. I have quoted your report fully in the
hope that by giving the council as much information as possible
the problems of this reclamation may be overcome.

You will note that I have stated that the responsibility for
the reclamation work lies with the Thames Coromandel District
Council and I agree with your comment that additional works
and who is responsible is a matter to be decided between the
Council and Mr Harris.

In section P of your report you express concern that the public
involvement in any future areas of reclamation is not available
as the Thames Coromandel District Council has authority to
reclaim in terms of the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act
1967. The authority to reclaim land is given by this Act but
it is subject to the compliance of the council with the provisions
of sections 176 to 182 of the Harbours Act. Should an
application be received for approval in terms of section 178 of
the Harbours Act, this Ministry will require that the council
prepare some form of environmental assessment documentation
and that this document be made available for public comment.
This procedure can be required of the council under section 178A
of the Harbours Act.

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport

Commissioner of Works
Ministry of Works & Development
P.O. Box 12041
WELLINGTON NORTH

Attention: Mr A. Smith

Copy for your information as discussed 28 July.

T.E. Law
for Secretary for Transport
ATTENTION Miss D Galliers

MR S G HARRIS RECLAMATION : THAMES HARBOUR
REPORT ON COMPLETED WORKS

A Reclamation Area

Authorisation to reclaim up to 2.02 ha (five acres) from the firth of Thames in accordance with plan MD 14484 was given by MOT 7/3/72. It should be noted that the area proposed to be subdivided by Mr S G Harris, and referred to by the TCDC in their letter of 29 July 1980 that accompanied your 43/64/6/2 of 7 August 1980, is some 0.81 ha larger than that defined on plan MD 14484. This additional area of reclamation is sited immediately northwest of the reclamation defined on MD 14484, and if, or by whom, this additional reclamation was authorised is unknown. The attached scheme plan K3/2/276 illustrates the area reclaimed and the proposed subdivision.

The total reclamation was built by Mr S G Harris, a Contractor, under agreement entered into with the Thames Borough Council whereby Mr Harris obtained rights to reclaim 2.83 ha (seven acres) of land.

B Engineering Matters

i Background

In reporting on the application to reclaim in 1970, this office commented to the effect that based on the experience gained from the foreshore stopbanks across the Firth of Thames, that severe and very prolonged settlement with repeated restorations could be required.

The following comments relate to the total reclamation now alleged by the contractor to be physically complete.
The license issued by the Thames Borough Council to Mr Harris stipulated that plans and specifications were to be provided by Mr Harris, and these, together with the work itself, were required to be to the satisfaction of the Borough Council. It would appear that through an oversight the documents were not submitted, and no supervision appears to have been provided.

Attempts by the now District Council to secure such documentation have been to no avail.

The MWD did not see itself as being involved in any way in the works. No observations were made or supervisory role exercised whatever.

It must therefore be appreciated that limited definitive statements relating to the works in question can now be made, unless expensive exploratory drilling and soil tests are done.

Existing Stopbank/Sea Retaining Wall

a Height

Plan MD 14484 shows the height of the stopbank required as being 3.51 m. Based on levels taken over the whole length of the as is wall, the wall is on an average 0.7 m too low and in some places 0.9 m too low.

A wall height of 3.51 m has proved adequate to date on the adjacent Danby field reclamation for the type of use made of this area.

b Construction and Protection

It would appear from a superficial inspection of the works that the stopbank has been built of quarry strippings, and that consolidation has been achieved using the compactive effort of the cartage and spreading machinery used in its formation. Such an operation has probably achieved an adequate degree of compaction for a stopbank holding out low heads.

What type of filling was used in the reclamation is unknown.

The stopbank is protected with rock rip rap, but this is not constructed to an adequate standard for the following reasons.
A uniform size of material appears to have been used instead of a suitably graded one.

The rock rip rap has been used in conjunction with large concrete slabs, and this mixture is not likely to be compatible for stability and flexibility reasons under wave attack.

The size of rip rap used, and thickness used, appear to be inadequate for the degree of exposure to wave action expected at this site.

There appears to be no evidence of a filter layer (be it fabric or aggregate) having been used to prevent leaching of the reclamation filling.

c **Extent of Rip rap**

Between Danby field and the reclaimed area in question an open drain exists with the potential for waves to run up same causing erosion of the reclaimed area. The southwest corner of the reclamation is not protected from this wave action.

d **Settlement**

Based on experience with the adjacent Danby field reclamation, settlement at this reclamation is likely to be a major problem and the significance of same should be clearly understood and the potential consequences fully appreciated. The security and viability of the reclamation is dependent upon the settlement of the stopbank retaining wall being to an unacceptable rate, and/or adequate measures being adopted to offset such effects.

The reclamation and associated stopbank are built on unconsolidated estuarine clays and silts of a depth exceeding 20 m.

MWD experience at the adjacent Danby field reclamation, together with penetrometer soundings and consolidation testing carried out at sites south of the reclamation in question, in similar materials, leads to the reasonable prediction that a total settlement of between \( \frac{2}{3} \) and one times the height of filling placed will occur over
a period of approximately 20-40 years. Further, analysis and experience at Danby field show that for a 3 m high filling, 1-1½ m of settlement will occur in 5-10 years.

It is thus evident that the security and viability of a reclamation in this area is very dependent on the ability to keep regularly topping up, or otherwise adjusting the height of the sea wall. This can be done in one of two ways. Either by placing material outside the present batter on the seaward side, or by placing material on top of, but inside the existing batter line.

The former uses considerably more material and therefore costs much more. It also adds more weight to the sea wall causing greater settlement and therefore reducing the time before further lifting is necessary.

The latter method, which the MWD used at Danby field, uses less material, but reduces the effective area reclaimed. If this latter method is to be adopted then provision should be made for this when it is decided just how much of the reclamation can be subdivided.

Just as the sea wall has, and will continue to settle, so has and will the remainder of the reclamation, but to a lesser extent. This could cause problems with stormwater drainage on the service road and also stormwater and sewage service pipes.

**Necessary Additional Works**

In order to satisfy the minimum requirements of security and viability of the reclamation, it is considered the following matters will need to be attended to.

The stopbank/sea wall will have to be brought up to height and adequate provision for, and thought given to, the regular and perpetual topping up of the stopbank in order to maintain a level of 3.51 m.

A properly designed and constructed rip rap protection system will need to be provided to protect the reclamation from wave action.
C Land Use

Based on MWD experience with reclaimed land in this area, it is this department's considered opinion that such land is only suitable for those types of developments principally concerned with storage (vehicles, materials etc), or the like, with any associated buildings being of a light timber frame type capable of being relevelled at regular intervals.

It is considered this approach to land use is most necessary if potentially large claims against the Crown or District Council are to be avoided.

The apparent onus for ensuring adequate foundation conditions exist for any particular type of development remains with the developments designers, and the controlling authority who permit the development, but great care should be exercised in this case when considering a subdivision approval of the reclaimed land, not to claim or imply suitability of the area for other than the type of uses mentioned above.

D Conclusions

i Part of the reclamation in question appears to be unauthorised.

ii MD 14484 gives authority to reclaim only, and structural approval of the proposal is a matter between the TCDC and Mr Harris, with the MWD not being involved.

iii To satisfy minimum acceptable requirements of protection and viability, properly designed and constructed works are necessary.

iv The sea wall/stopbank has, and always will, settle and will perpetually require regular topping up. Adequate provision for topping up must be made.

v The reclaimed area will continue to settle and the type of use made of the land must be restricted.

E Recommendations

It is recommended that:

i It would be unwise for the TCDC to accept responsibility for the reclamation in its present condition.

ii Additional property designed and constructed works will need to be carried out to render the reclamation viable and give it adequate protection. Such additional works are a legal matter between the TCDC and Mr Harris.
iii Adequate provision to adjust the stopbank level must be made in any subdivisional approval given.

iv Once the reclamation is accepted by TCDC adequate provision of resources must be made to ensure the wall is regularly topped up.

v Any subdivisional approval by the TCDC should take account of the perpetual settlement problem and appropriate controls exercised over the type of use made of the land.

F Reclamations at Thames General

In light of the problems with reclamations at Thames on marine muds, and current public thinking on the rights of the public to be involved in a decision to reclaim or not to reclaim; there is some merit in the suggestion that the 1967 Thames Empowering Act should be repealed, or at least those aspects of the Act that restrict the rights of public involvement should be repealed.

Such a move would probably be opposed by the TCDC, but the best interests of the public in terms of end use and environmental aspects cannot be ascertained under the Empowering Act.

R A Burnett
for District Commissioner of Works

Encl
MWD Head Office
Civil Division
MOT
att Mr T Law
63/324
27/7/81

Reclamation (S G Harris) - Thames Harbour

Under Reference - now same 43/64/6/2 23/7/81 referring to
DCW Hamilton report 13/10/81 20/7/81
with background of your file 43/64/6/2 Vol

MWD reclamation recommendation was made on 26/1/72 on terms
of plan MD 14484 (Sept ’70) prepared by M J
Dunmoore, Land & Engineering Surveyor. This plan is not
an engineering plan, it includes in a site sketch a
typical cross-section only showing levels / reclamation &
protective steps / etc. All that have formal MWD
satisfaction was in relation to ‘injury of navigation’ MWD
report by DCW Hamilton 2/13/81 12/12/71
show attention to Town & Country Planning matters for MD
The council in relation to reclamation approved

The applicant for the reclamation approval was the Thames Borough
Council, & M D granted approval in terms of section
178(b) Harbours Act 1959 to the Borough Engineer
Thames Borough Council by letter 9/3/72

The Thames RC application was by letter 6/10/71, and
stated that the reclamation was to be completed within
the area caused by the Thames RC Engineering Act
1967. In support of plan MD 14484 the RC feared
intention to protect the seaward face of the reclamation
(being the step bank) by heavy stone spalls, to height of
11.5 ft above MSL (so that this was "to protect the reclamations from wave action until such time as further extension is carried out within the authorized area").

MD approved the BC to notify MD when the reclamation works become completed; the BC acknowledged that request by letter 29/3/72.

By letter 30/5/75 Borough of Thames advised that reclamations was being affected by the builder using horse-excavation, not suitable for filling, & that an additional period of two years would be needed to complete the reclamation.

By letter 24/12/76 Thames-Coromandel District Council advised that the Council had granted Harris time extension to 31/5/78 to complete "the reclamination of the foreshore area granted to him"

By letter 10/11/77 Thames-Coromandel District Council advised a further extension of time for completion to 31/5/79. This letter implies that Sale & Purchase Agreements between Harris & the DC are conditional on the satisfactory completion of reclamination & that for responsibility for the reclamination remained with the DC at that time.

By letter 4/7/79 the Thames-Coromandel DC stated it was negotiating a revised agreement & extended term with Harris & that the DC would advise MOT the details in due course. I have not sighted these details on file 43/44/6/2.

Thames-Coromandel DC letter V4/1/1 29/7/80 raised doubts as to responsibility for standard of the seawall.

_________________________________________
3. With the above as background I agree with the DCW Hamilton's report & recommendations.

   Please let me know if you wish to discuss DCW's report further.

3.1.

   Attached for information is a press clipping from the Thomas Valley Gazette 23/9/80 which indicates that the District Council might favour solutions which are unlikely to be satisfactory in the long term.

3.2. Please note that the Hawkesbury Catchment Board was approached by the District Council by letter V4/2/81 14/6/80 — copy attached for your careful reading. The Hawkesbury Catchment Board's reply was to effect:

   (a) The second rip rap protection is of poor standard.

   (b) The setting of the stepbanks with its seaward face as an extension of the riprap protection is not observable.

   The stepbanks should be set back sufficiently so that wave break does not carry onto stepbanks.

4. Please see also my memo 63/324 23/7/87 which forward DCW Hamilton's 13/108 26/7/81.

   [Signature]

   (For Marine Works Engineer)
General News

Interim Solution To Seawall

We are now ready on the interim solution to the problem of flooding and storm damage in the Moonah area of Thames.

Strong concern has been expressed in the past over the effectiveness of the Moonahali seawall and subsequently a report was made by the engineering department of the Thames-Combanieal District Council examining the solutions to the problem.

During north-westerly weather conditions, the seawall at Moonahali is over-topped by wave action and scouring of the soil behind the wall occurs. Debris is cast onto roads and properties opposite the seawall.

"The immediate problem", the report stated, "is the seawall is being eroded by the action of the water."

The report offered five different solutions to resolve the problem Council has opted for the cheapest solution.

An expenditure of $9,000 will enable the council to upgrade the existing wall and establish vegetation nearby. The 1930-31 estimates show around $1,200 of this to be spent this year.

Other options available to the council ranged from $30,000 to $90,000.

Discussing this report at the recent meeting of council's works and treasury committee, Cr C. Bevernshair said it seemed to be a very cheap solution at $9,000, but doubted it would be as simple as that.

Cr J. Eastwood suggested that if, in the long term, council was to consider more expensive options, which involved the dumping of about 450 million cubic metres of fill, perhaps council should consider reclaiming the land instead. This would provide more land and place residents further away from the sea.

"Of course this is in the long term, 50 or 100 years, but it is something to think about", he said.
The Chief Executive Engineer,
John Houston
P.O. Box 7,
IC AREA

Dear Sir,

S.S. HARRIS RECLAMATION THAMES HAVEN


Prior to amalgamation of the Thames Borough with the two Counties, the Borough entered into a sale and purchase agreement whereby Mr. S.S. Harris obtained rights to reclaiming 7 acres land at the western end of Parry Street Island. Although the Marine Division of the Ministry of Transport approved the plan of reclamation in 1961, it did not direct the attention to the method of protecting the stepped end land against marine erosion.

It is understood that the plan approved in 1961 did not illustrate the type of protection contemplated.

Mr. Harris has now provided Council with a sketch plan (attached) showing the rock wall to be placed along the stepped part, but Council is concerned that the wall may be inadequate to withstand the effects of the sea. Further there is the possibility that the proposal may subside to a level below that of 3.4m (11.2ft) the level considered by you to be a reasonable elevation for protection of the reclamation of 93,200m² (0.0111). In this regard, your report of marine and engineering report that the nearby Greenwich Field reclamation suffered serious settlement of the reclamation floor and its structures, primarily resulting from the weight of filling acting on very soft marine mud. As a result, the old banks were being overtaken by waves during periods of extreme high tide and strong westerly winds.

The Marine Division of the Ministry of Transport have advised that the question of the adequacy of the proposed rock wall should be referred to marine engineers for evaluation.

Accordingly, your views are requested.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

R.C. FORD
CHIEF ENGINEER
Dear Peter,

The enclosure with the copy of the memo is your ref. one for you only and this stage so that you can appreciate what is behind it all.

The House, ground floor, D.C. engineer are very concerned at the standard of construction and are having difficulty in getting a response from Homic. Don know how he built the wall.

All the best for yours.

Best wishes,

[Signature]
would you be willing to join the site inspection scheduled for 15 January?

Yours faithfully,

8 J Butcher
District Commissioner of Works
Per

(A K Attwood)

Regional Secretary
Marine Division
Ministry of Transport
Private Bag
AUCKLAND

ATTENTION Mr P W Spackman
ATTENTION Miss D Galliers

S G HARRIS THAMES
HARBOUR RECLAMATION

Your reference 43/64/6/2 of 15 October 1980.

Two reports have been received from my resident engineer at Paeroa and brief discussions held with engineering staff of the Thames-Coromandel District Council and with whom further discussions are to be held on 15 January 1981.

It is obvious that an unsatisfactory state of affairs exists and remedial works may be required. I trust I can submit a final report by the end of January.

B J Butcher
District Commissioner of Works
Par

(A K Attwood)

The Engineer
Haparua Catchment Board
P O Box 7
TE AROHA

Dear Sir

Copy for your information.

I consider the Board should be conversant with this issue as in the long term it could be involved. If you agree
Ministry of Works and Development

Inquiries to A W Stewart Date 1 October 1980

Ref 7/16

District Commissioner of Works
HAMILTON

ATTENTION: Mr Attwood
Mr Butson
Mr Coleman

Your ref: 13/108/1 of 19 August

TCDC: THAMES HARBOUR: PROBLEMS WITH SEAWALLS ON RECLAMATIONS

1) Enclosed is a cutting from the Thames Valley Gazette of 23 September. This is of interest for three reasons:

i) It has some relevance to the question of the sea wall on the Harris reclamation; on which the Marine Division of MOT has asked us to report - see your reference quoted above and our reply of 24 September.

ii) In view of the TCDC opting for a very low cost "solution" to the Moanataiari problem, I doubt whether it will be successful. Alternatively, if it is successful initially it will probably turn out to be only a short term solution. It is probable therefore that we will hear more of this matter, and that sooner or later there will be some form of request for financial assistance, either from the HCB, or the MOT?

iii) This matter has relevance to Mr Coleman's recent inspection of various reclamations in Thames (including the Moanataiari) with me, in relation to the proposed siting of our Thames Depot on a reclamation.

2) It is very evident that there are some serious problems involved with reclamations on seabed which is subject to severe settlement, as compared to reclamations on stable land. Sooner or later such reclamations are going to involve someone in very large costs to counter problems arising out of settlements - costs which would run into hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions.

This is the root of the problem which has currently arisen in regard to the Harris reclamation, although there the standard of the sea wall is also an issue.

It is very important that MOT realise the full significance of this. If our report of 24 September (and any covering memo which you have sent to MOT) does not spell this out clearly enough, then perhaps you should write to them again stressing the point. The problem is complicated by the fact that settlement is such a long term thing.
Work will begin shortly on an interim solution to the problem of flooding and storm damage in the Moana­
taari area of Thames.

Strong concern has been expressed in the past over the effec­
tiveness of the Moanataari seawall and subsequently a report was made by the engineer­
ing department of the Thames­
Coromandel District Council ex­
amining the solutions to the pro­лем.

During north-westerly weather conditions, the seawall at Moanataari is over-topped by wave action and scouring of the soil behind the wall occurs. Debris is cast onto roads and properties opposite the seawall.

"The immediate problem", the report stated, "is the seawall is being threatened by the action of the water".

The report offered five different solutions to resolve the problem. Council has opted for the cheapest solution.

An expenditure of $9000 will enable the council to upgrade the existing wall and establish vegetation nearby. The 1980-81 estimates allow around $5000 of this to be spent this year.

Other options available to the council varied from $30,000 to $307,000.

Discussing this report at the recent meeting of council's works and treasury committee, Cr C. Brokenshire said it seemed to be a very cheap solution at $9000, but doubted it would be as simple as that.

Cr L. J. Braddock suggested that if, in the long term, council was to consider the more expen­
sive solutions, which involved the dumping of about 4½ million cubic metres of fill, perhaps council should consider

reclaiming the land instead. This would provide more land and place residents further away from the sea.

"Of course this is in the long term, 50 or 100 years, but it is something to think about", he said.
Ministry of Works and Development

Inquiries to P N Sutton  Date 24 September 1980  Ref 7/16

District Commissioner of Works
HAMILTON

ATTENTION: Mr Attwood

Your ref: 13/108/1 of 19 August 1980

S.G. HARRIS RECLAMATION — THAMES HARBOUR

The sea wall fronting the Firth of Thames as shown on the Ministry of Transport plan M.D. 14484, has been inspected. However this would appear to differ in some respects to the subdivision that the Thames Coromandel District Council refer to in their letter of 29 July 1980 to the Ministry of Transport. The subdivision plan which I believe they are considering includes a further 4770m² of reclaimed land for subdivision. This extends north westwards, on the other side of the proposed extension of Mary Street. This is shown as Lot 1 on the subdivision plan K 3/2/276, copy enclosed, which was submitted by the Council in their memo of 4 July 1980, refer your file 40/11. Lot 2 on this plan is that covered by Ministry of Transport 14484. The sea wall along Lot 1 has also been inspected and would appear to be of a similar standard to that along Lot 2. The comments made below concerning the sea wall apply equally as well to that along Lot 1.

The reclamation covered by MD 14484 was referred to us in 1971 and was subsequently approved by the Ministry of Transport in March 1972, refer signature on plan. However I can find no record to suggest that the reclamation required for Lot 1 has ever been referred to us for our comment. Has this in fact been approved by the Ministry of Transport?

When we were asked for our comments, in 1971, on the reclamation covered by MD 14484 we had not had the experience with reclamations that we have now had. We are therefore now in a much better position to indicate the likely problems that may occur.

From our inspection of the wall it would appear as though it may not have been constructed so as to prevent fines leaching out from the fill material placed behind the wall. However as we did not see the wall being built it is not possible for us to be completely sure about this.

Ministry of Transport plan MD 14484 shows that the height of the sea wall is to be 11.5 (3.51m) above mean sea level. From the levels that we have recently taken the wall is only up to that height in one place.

Based on levels taken over the whole length, the wall is at present on an average 0.70m too low, and in some places as much as 0.90m too low.
From our experience with the adjacent Danby field reclamation, a sea wall height of 3.51m is sufficient. However since the Danby field sea wall has been built, in excess of 1.5m of settlement of the sea wall has occurred. This necessitated extensive lifting of the sea wall in 1977, up to an R.L. of 3.51m. Continuing settlement of this sea wall and playing field is expected well into the future.

It is anticipated that settlement of a similar, sort of magnitude will occur with Harris's reclamation. Similarly settlement can probably be expected to continue well into the future. There is therefore going to be a continuing problem in having to repeatedly lift the sea wall. This can be done in one of two ways. Either by placing material outside the present batter line the seaward side, or by placing material on top of, but inside the existing batter line.

The former uses considerably more material and therefore costs much more. It also adds more weight to the sea wall causing greater settlement and therefore reducing the time before further lifting is necessary.

The latter method, which we used at Danby field, uses less material, but reduces the effective area reclaimed. If this latter method is going to be adopted then provision should be made for this when it is decided just how much of the reclamation can be subdivided.

Just as the sea wall has, and will continue to settle, so has and will the remainder of the reclamation, but to a lesser extent. This could cause problems with stormwater drainage on the service road and also stormwater and sewage service pipes.

I return the plan as requested.

A W Stewart
Resident Engineer
per:

(P N Sutton)
29 July 1980

The Secretary for Transport,
Private Bag,
WELLINGTON I.

Dear Sir,

Your ref 43/64/6/2 S.G. Harris - Reclamation - Thames Harbour

The work of creating this reclamation physically is complete, except that the Council is concerned that the sea retaining wall on the seaward sides of the reclamation may not be sufficiently well designed to ensure the protection of the land created in the reclamation from marine erosion.

The Council is considering a plan of subdivision of the land created from S. G. Harris. Among the conditions of subdivision of the land I would expect would be a requirement relating to the standard of the sea wall.

If the Ministry has any powers to require the sea wall to be brought to standard the Council would appreciate these being exercised and the Ministry putting suitable pressure on the developer to have the wall rebuilt or properly certified.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
for B. H. de Boer,
GENERAL MANAGER.
The Auckland office of the Marine Department has submitted under their letter 55/4/252 of 4 December the attached plan for the reclamation of 158 acres on the Thames foreshore.

The reclamation will not hinder navigation and the stream reserves are adequate and the stopbank at the edge of the reclamation is sufficiently high.

The red line on the plan would suggest that the full area is being reclaimed but the Thames Borough letter 460/3 of 13 November to the Secretary for Marine indicates that a 15 acre marina is to be made at the north west corner of the reclamation. This ambiguity should be cleared as if the full reclamation should occur there is no provision for the Waiotahi Stream reserve.

Whilst it is not our concern in examining the plan for Marine Department permits I would comment that in the soft marine muds existing here severe settlement will almost certainly occur during reclamation and the possibility of the Borough's main sewer outfall line being fractured or collapsing should be investigated. If a collapse is deemed to be likely the Borough could either strengthen the line and its foundations or re-locate it. In the latter event a Marine permit will no doubt be required for the new location and the Borough should apply for this as soon as a decision on re-location is made.

R.E. Hermans
Dist Comr of Works
Per: [Signature]

(A.K. Attwood)
14 July 1972

The Town Clerk,
Thames Borough Council,
P.O. Box 400
THAMES.

Attention: Borough Engineer.

Dear Sir,

RECLAMATION: THAMES HARBOUR

In respect of the above, I am pleased to advise that pursuant to section 176 (b) of the Harbours Act 1950, approval has been given and endorsed on plan M.D. 14683, a copy of which is attached. Please notify this office when the work is completed.

Yours faithfully,

R. N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

Copy for your information. Your reference 7/16.

R. N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:

(B. A. Ranger – Miss)

The District Commissioner of Works,
Ministry of Works,
Private Bag,
HAMILTON.

Copy for your information. Your reference 13/108/1.

R. N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:

(B. A. Ranger – Miss)
The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254
AUCKLAND.


R. N. KERR
Secretary for Marine
per: [Signature]

(B.A. Ranger - Miss)
30 June 1972

The District Officer, Marine Department, Box 1254, AUCKLAND.

Dear Sir,

Refer: Foreshores Officer

Reclamation, Richmond Street - Shortland Wharf, Thames, 43/64/6/3

Further to my 460/6 of 21 April 1972, could you please advise progress in investigations for the proposed reclamation of 9 acres of foreshore, and when approval may be expected.

If it is possible, would you please expedite the matter.

Yours faithfully,

B.J. Poff
BOROUGH ENGINEER
Marine Reclamation : Thames Borough

Your 13/108/1 of 8 May refers.

1. The proposed reclamation will not be or tend to the injury of navigation, the southern limits being well clear of the navigation channel and on tidal mudflats.

2. The Borough's stormwater drainage system should be improved, by the proposed extension. There is adequate fall for the proposed pipe along Queen Street, and the existing outfall under the railway yards is evidently in a very poor condition and operating very inefficiently.

3. The Hauraki Catchment Board has been consulted by the Borough Council and its requirements complied with. The height of the stopbank is as recommended by the Catchment Board.

4. Rock protection will be provided to prevent erosion by wave action.

5. Levels are in terms of Lands and Survey Geodetic datum.

A. W. Stewart,
Resident Engineer

per [Signature]

Dist. Officer

25 May 1972

Telephone: 87257

P.O. BOX 123,
PAEOA
P.O. Box 1254,  
AUCKLAND.  

2nd May, 1972.  

District Commissioner of Works,  
Ministry of Works,  
Private Bag,  
HAMILTON.  

BOROUGH OF THAMES  
RECLAMATION  
THAMES HARBOUR  

Copy for your information and action.  

Would you please make a report in terms of the  
Harbours Act 1950 on the proposed reclamation to the Commissioner  
of Works, Wellington. Copies of plan 188 Sheets 1, 2 are  
enclosed.  

The land to be reclaimed is within the area approved for reclamation pursuant to the Thames Borough Empowering Act  
1967.  

B.E. TURNER  
District Officer.  

Per : D. Greig.  

Encls.  

Secretary for Marine,  
WELLINGTON.  

Your minuted 43/64/6/3 of 13/4/72 to the Town Clerk, Borough  
of Thames, refers.  
Copy for your information. As the land in question is subject  
to an Empowering Act, no comment from the Commissioner of  
Crown Lands is required.  

B.E. TURNER  
District Officer.  

Per : D. Greig.  

\(54/4/252\)
The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND

Dear Sir,

As requested by your H.O., I forward a further copy of plan 188, on 43/64/6/3 of 13 April, sheets 1 and 2 for your investigation of the proposed reclamation of 9 acres of foreshore at Thames between Richmond Street and the Shortland Wharf. All the area is within the authorised boundary for reclamation under the Thames Borough Empowering Act.

Yours faithfully,

B.J. Poff
BOROUGH ENGINEER

Enc. (2 sheets)
19 April 1972

The Town Clerk,
Thames Borough Council,
P.O. Box 400,
THAMES.

Dear Sir,

RECLAMATION 1. THAMES HARBOUR : STAGE 2

In respect of the above, I am pleased to advise that, pursuant to section 178(b) of the Harbours Act 1950, approval has been given and endorsed for stage 2 of the reclamation, as shown on plan H.D. 14284 edged in red, a copy of which is attached.

Please notify this office when the work is completed.

Yours faithfully,

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:

Encs:

The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

Copy for your information. Your Ref: 54/4/252.

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per: B.A. Ranger

(B.A. Ranger, Miss)
13 April 1972

The Town Clerk,
Thames Borough Council,
P.O. Box 400,
THAMES.

Attention: Borough Engineer

Dear Sir,

RECLAMATION - THAMES HARBOUR

I acknowledge your application for approval of plans for the reclamation of a further 9 acres of foreshore at Thames Harbour.

To enable the necessary technical reports to be obtained, would you please forward a further copy of plan 188, sheets 1 and 2, to the District Officer, Marine Department, P.O. Box 1254, Auckland.

Yours faithfully,

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:
(B.A. Ranger, Miss)

Copy for your information. Attached is a copy of the letter from the Borough. Please obtain the necessary technical reports when plans are received.

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per: B.A. Ranger

(B.A. Ranger, Miss)
Dear Sir,

Re: Reclamation - Thames Harbour

It is desired to reclaim an area of nine acres on the foreshore west of the Thames Railway Station and lying between Richmond Street Extension and the Shortland Wharf.

The boundaries will be as defined in Plan No. 188 (2 sheets) drawn by Mr. M. Dunwoodie M.N.Z.I. a copy of which is enclosed. A set of the plans are at present with the Hauraki Catchment Board for final approval.

Would you please examine the plans and grant your approval to reclaim.

The area to be reclaimed will be completely within the boundaries authorised for reclamation by the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

B.J. Poff
BOROUGH ENGINEER

Encl.
9 March 1972

The Borough Engineer,
Thames Borough Council,
P.O. Box 400,
THAMES.

Dear Sir,

RECLAMATION : S. G. HARRIS

In respect of the above, I am pleased to advise that pursuant to section 178(b) of the Harbours Act 1950 approval has been given and endorsed on plan M.D.14484, a copy of which is attached.

Please notify this office when the work is completed.

Yours faithfully,

R. N. KERR
Secretary for Marine
per:

(B. A. Ranger, Miss)

Encl.

The Resident Engineer,
Ministry of Works,
P.O. Box 123,
PAERORA.

Copy for your information. Please refer to your 7/1 of 29 November 1971.

R. N. KERR
Secretary for Marine
per:

(B. A. Ranger, Miss)

The District Commissioner of Works,
Ministry of Works,
Private Bag,
HAMILTON.

Copy for your information. Please refer to your 13/108/1 of 20 December 1971.

R. N. KERR
Secretary for Marine
per:

(B. A. Ranger, Miss)
Copy for your information. Please refer to your minuted memorandum 54/4/252 of 19 October 1971.

R. N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per: B. A. Ranger
(B. A. Ranger, Miss)
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.


Secretary for Marine,
WELLINGTON.

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL
RECLAMATION
FIRTH OF THAMES

A letter from the Borough Engineer, Borough of Thames, enquires regarding the progress made in giving consideration to the above reclamation. A copy of the enquiry is enclosed. A copy of the Commissioner of Works report was sent to your office on 10/2/72.

B.E. TURNER
District Officer.

Encl.

Per : D. Greig.
The District Officer,
Marine Department,
Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

Refer: Foreshore Officer

Dear Sir,

Foreshore Reclamation : Thames Harbour

I refer to your 43/64/9/3, the Town Clerk's 460/4 of 7 May 1971 to the Secretary of Marine, my 460/4 of 14 April 1971 also to the Secretary of Marine, and my 460/4 of 6 October 1971 concerning the proposed reclamation of five acres of foreshore adjacent to Mary Street Thames.

Would you please advise of the progress made in this matter as it is now some time since the Ministry of Works were making the necessary examination of the project.

Yours faithfully,

B.J. Poff
BOROUGH ENGINEER
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

10th February, 1972.

Secretary for Marine,
WELLINGTON.

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL
RECLAMATION (THAMES BOROUGH EMPOWERING
ACT 1967)
FIRTH OF THAMES

Your 54/4/252 of 4/2/72 refers.

Enclosed for your information and action
minuted copies of the Ministry of Works reports
dated 29/11/71 and 30/12/71.

B.E. TURNER
District Officer.

By memorandum 54/4/25 the Auckland office of Marine Department has forwarded the attached plan. A copy of the resident engineer, Paeroa, memorandum 7/1 of 29 November 1971 is also attached.

Whilst approval of the reclamation in terms of Marine interests can be recommended, some aspects of the town and country planning require consideration. It is believed undesirable for commercial or industrial zoning to exist along the foreshore and to lie between the sea and the residential area of the town. Although the resident engineer's report indicates commercial zoning it is understood that the Thames Borough are proposing industrial use. Public access and recreational areas along the Thames Coast are very limited in the vicinity of Thames. Whilst the area immediately adjacent to the proposed reclamation is mudflats I do not believe the public should be excluded from the area as it can be quite attractive at higher stages of the tide.

The reclamation could proceed provided there is a reserve along the foreshore and I would recommend that this proposal be investigated.

These town and country planning aspects have been discussed with the district planning officer and you may care to bring this reclamation proposal to the attention of the Town and Country Planning Division in your office.

R.E. Hermans
Dist Comr of Works

Per: (A.K. Attwood)

Enc.
MINISTRY OF WORKS

Telephone: 8725

P.O. BOX 123,
PAEROA

29 November 1971

Dist. Commr. of Works,
M.O.W., HAMILTON.

Thames Borough Foreshore Reclamation

Your 13/108/1 of 28 October refers.

The area of the proposed reclamation is at present tidal, partly mangrove-covered mudflats, and the work proposed will not be on tend to the injury of navigation.

The Borough Engineer has advised that the proposed usage of the land is commercial. This would fit in with the usage of all the land fronting onto the immediately adjacent section of Mary Street which is zoned either Commercial B or Community Uses. The present zoning in the District Scheme is Rural but Clause 3.4.2 of the Scheme Statement says that this area is scheduled for special treatment under the Thames Borough Empowering Act 1967.

The plan is returned herewith.

A.W. Stewart,
Resident Engineer

per [Signature]

J.A. Foster

Encl.
The District Officer,  
Marine Department,  
P.O. Box 1254,  
AUCKLAND.

RECLAMATION : THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL

I refer to your minute of 9 December 1971 to the District Commissioner of Works, Hamilton, in which you asked for action to expedite the reclamation proposal as above.

Could you please advise if you have been given any indication as to when their report is to be expected.

R.N. KERR  
Secretary for Marine

per:  
(G. McKissock)
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND,

9 December 1971

The District Commissioner of Works,
Ministry of Works,
Private Bag,
HAMILTON.

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL RECLAMATION PURSUANT TO 1967 EMPOWERING ACT PIRTH OF THAMES

My minute copy requesting a report in terms of the Harbours Act 1950, dated 19.10.71 refers.

Could you please take action to expedite the report requested, to allow the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give consideration to the proposal.

B.E. TURNER,
District Officer.

Per : D. Greig.

Secretary for Marine,
Marine Department,
WELLINGTON.

Your 43/64/8/3 of 3 December 1971 refers
Copy for your information.

B.E. TURNER,
District Officer.

Per : D. Greig.
The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

RECLAMATION - THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL

I refer to your minuted memorandum of 19 October. As the Thames Borough Council has requested urgency, please ask the DCW to expedite his report.

Commissioner of Crown lands not affected.

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine
per: [Signature]
(G. McKissock)
Dear Sir,

Receipt of your proposal for your proposed is acknowledged.

Technical reports are now being obtained on the proposal, these may take some little time to prepare, but as soon as a decision has been reached, you will be advised by my Head Office, Wellington.

Yours faithfully,

B.E. TURNER,
District Officer.

Copy for your information and action.
Would you please make a report on the proposed in terms of the Harbours Act, 1950, to the Commissioner of Works, Wellington.

The following papers are enclosed:

(1)
(2)
(3)
(4)

B.E. TURNER,
District Officer.

Secretary for Marine,
WELLINGTON.

Copy for your information and action.
The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND,

Dear Sir,

Approval to Reclaim Portion of Thames Foreshore

My Council wishes to obtain permission to proceed with the reclamation of 5.4 acres of foreshore mudflats adjacent to the intersection of Mary Street and State Highway 25 viz. Queen Street, Thames. This reclamation will be completely within the area covered by the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967 and it is intended to reclaim this area to a maximum height of 8.00 feet above M.S.L. as recommended by the Hauraki Catchment Board.

A portion of this reclaimed land will be dedicated as an extension of Mary Street to the west and suitable stormwater drainage will be provided to cater for the existing S.W. outfalls at Mary Street and immediately to the south.

I forward two copies of plan no. 187 herewith, showing the area as defined in red and a typical cross-section. The seaward faces of the reclamation will be protected by heavy stone spalls to a height of 11.5 feet above M.S.L. This will protect the reclamation from wave action until such time as further extension is carried out within the authorised area.

With the advent of the new construction season approaching it would be appreciated if approval could be granted as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully,

B.J. Poff
BOROUGH ENGINEER
5 August 1971

The Town Clerk,
Thames Borough Council,
Box 400,
THAMES,

Dear Sir,

RECLAMATION - THAMES HARBOUR

Further to my telegram of Tuesday, 3 August, I now enclose a copy of your plan No. 182 which has been endorsed M.D. 14284.

The authority contained in this approval is to reclaim that area shaded green on the plan and marked stage 1.

I assume that when your council has settled the question of reclamation over the existing sewer line that you will submit further proposals to cover stages 2 and 3.

I am sorry that there was some delay in this matter, but it was out of this department's control in the matter of obtaining technical reports.

Encl:

The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.


Yours faithfully,

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:

(O.J. Conway)

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:

(O.J. Conway)
11 May 1971

The Town Clerk,
Thames Borough Council,
P.O. Box 409,
THAMES.

Dear Sir,

HARBOUR RECLAMATION
(Your ref: 460/3)

Please refer to your letter of 3 May and that of your Borough Engineer of 5 April. Reference is made first to a number of points raised in your Engineer's letter:

(a) The area to be reclaimed is stated to be 158 acres plus 11 acres for a marina. It is assumed that the marina is still within the boundaries of the bed of the harbour as defined in the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967. Please confirm.

It will be necessary to supply plans of the marina complex within this reclamation and also in respect of the new sea wall. At the moment all we have, by way of detail, is a cross-section of reclamation on plan reference 182 already supplied. If the marina is not to be constructed at this time it could be regarded as a separate proposal to allow work to commence but plan 182 does show the marina as a "reclamation" and therefore it is assumed that it and the sea wall are to be constructed at the same time as the main reclamation. Please advise.

(b) Regarding the sewer outfall, I regret that we cannot offer any technical advice as this is the responsibility of the reclaiming authority. If, for example, a replacement sewer line is to be built, then further plans will be necessary. Again, please let me know what is to be done.

(c) It was asked if the approval of the Catchment Board was required. Our view is that the question should be put to the Catchment Board and that copies of the relative correspondence be forwarded here.
It was noted that "the developers, Messrs Hall & Andersen, are expressing readiness to proceed........" It is assumed that the developers are under contract to the Council and that it is the Council which is reclaiming the land. If not, it would seem that section 9 of the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967 will have a bearing on this matter in regard to any authority to dispose of the said land.

I would be grateful if you would clarify the points raised but at the same time, subject to prior approval, I cannot see any reason why it should not be possible for the reclamation to proceed, but that the approved plans be endorsed with a condition that such shall not proceed beyond the sewer line until the question of its suitability has been completed.

Yours faithfully,

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine
per:

(O.J. Conway)

The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

Copy for your information; your ref. 54/4/252.

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

(O.J. Conway)
Dear Sir,

FLORESHORE RECLAMATION: S.C. HARRIS

Your letter of 14 April advising that an agreement for sale and purchase of an area of 5 acres of the foreshore for reclamation had been executed between your Council and Mr Harris has been noted.

You did not indicate if the area to be reclaimed was within that granted to the Thames Harbour Board under the Thames Harbour Board Act 1878. If so then an additional plan identifying the proposed reclamation to that area would be necessary.

A further point is that land owned by a Harbour Board cannot be sold unless it is for the rectification of boundary lines or street or road levels on, or of providing access to any reclaimed or other land vested in or held by the Board or any land adjacent thereof. The full conditions are set out in section 143 of the Harbours Act.

If my assumption is correct then unless your legal officers are able to advise me to the contrary your Board does not appear to be able to sell the land which has been granted to it under the Act of 1878. It does not matter that the land involved is the sea bed as any reclamation thereon is still land owned by the Board and therefore cannot be disposed of unless it can be considered under section 143 of the Harbours Act.

In the circumstances it appears that the matter requires further investigation and clarification. I would be grateful if in the first instance you communicate with our District Officer, Marine Department, P.O. Box 4254, Auckland enclosing the plans which are now returned together with a locality map of the inch to the mile Lands and Survey series together with any other explanatory information connected with this proposal.

28 April 1971

[Return Address and Marine Department Stamp]
It is also suggested that it be known that any communications are by the Borough Council acting in its capacity as a Harbour Board.

Yours faithfully,

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:

(O.J. Conway)

The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

Copy for your information. No previous reference. The proposal was for a 5 acre reclamation to be sold to Mr Harris.

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:

(O.J. Conway)
THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL RECLAMATION
THAMES HARBOUR

Your 43/64/9/3 of 25 March 1971 refers.

Enclosed is a copy of the M.O.W. report requested by my 4 December 1970 in response to your minuted copy of 30 November 1970 to the Thames Borough Council.


On 25 March 1971 you again requested the M.O.W. report and by minute you were advised of its being sent previously.

It would appear that some confusion has occurred in this matter.

B.E. TURNER,
District Officer.

Per: D. Greig.
13 April 1971

The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

Attention Mr D. Greig

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL RECLAMATION

Your 54/4/252 of the 5 April 1971 refers.

I enclose for your information a copy of the relevant report.

R.E. Hermans
District Commissioner of Works

Per: [Signature: J. Westwood]

Encl.
The Auckland office of the Marine Department has submitted under their letter 54/4/252 of 4 December the attached plan for the reclamation of 150 acres on the Thames foreshore.

The reclamation will not hinder navigation and the stream reserves are adequate and the stopbank at the edge of the reclamation is sufficiently high.

The red line on the plan would suggest that the full area is being reclaimed but the Thames Borough letter 460/3 of 13 November to the Secretary for Marine indicates that a 15 acre marina is to be made at the north west corner of the reclamation. This ambiguity should be cleared as if the full reclamation should occur there is no provision in the Waitemata Stream reserve.

Whilst it is not our concern in examining the plan for Marine Department permits I would comment that in the soft marine muds existing here severe settlement will almost certainly occur during reclamation and the possibility of the Borough's main sewer outfall line being fractured or collapsing should be investigated. If a collapse is deemed to be likely the Borough could either strengthen the line and its foundations or re-locate it. In the latter event a Marine permit will no doubt be required for the new location and the Borough should apply for this as soon as a decision in re-location is made.

R.E. Hermans
Deputy Commissioner of Works

Per: A.K. Attwood
5 April 1971

The District Commissioner of Works,
Ministry of Works,
Private Bag,
HAMILTON.

(Attention Mr Westwood)

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL - RECLAMATION
THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL EMPOWERING ACT 1967
FIRTH OF THAMES

Your 13/108/1 of 10 February 1971 refers.

Advice from my Head Office, Wellington dated 25 March 1971 would indicate that the report requested from your office has gone astray. I would therefore be obliged if you would forward a copy of your report which was sent to your Head Office on 24/12/70, to this office.

B. E. TURNER
District Officer.

Secretary for Marine,
Marine Department,
WELLINGTON.

(Attention Mr Conway)

Your 43/64/9/3 of 25 March 1971.

Copy for your information.

As advised by my 12/2/71 the D.C.W. with his 13/108/1 of 10/2/71 reported that his report was sent to his Head Office on 24/12/70.

B. E. TURNER
District Officer.

Per: D. Greig.
THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL RECLAMATION
(Your Ref: 54/4/252)

Please refer to your memorandum of 12 February in which you advised that you were seeking reports from Ministry of Works.

It would be appreciated if you could let me know when these might be expected.

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

[Signature]
9 February 1971

The Town Clerk,
Thames Borough Council,
P.O. Box 400,
THAMES.

Dear Sir,

RECLAMATION: THAMES HARBOUR

(Your ref. 460/3)

The proposal by your Borough to reclaim 15½ acres of the Thames foreshore which you referred initially through our Auckland office has been examined and reported on by the Ministry of Works and the marine works engineer.

While your Council has the necessary authority to reclaim the 15½ acres it is necessary to ensure that the plans of the reclamation are sufficient. In this respect I wish to raise two matters the first being the question as to whether the proposed marina is included in the actual physical reclamation amounting to 15½ acres and secondly the sufficiency of strength for the extension of the main borough sewer system.

Information is sought as to whether a full investigation has been made as to the stability of the sewer extension within the reclamation as I am advised that the foundations of the area are relatively soft and with the settling of the earth fill there could be a danger that the pipeline could become distorted or fractured. I would be grateful to have any information you have on this point and if the matter has been already investigated to forward any engineering details which cover the points generally raised above.

There is also the question as to whether, in locating the sewer outfall, you have cleared this matter with the Nauraki Catchment Board particularly as the new outlet will be approximately 40 chains further out to sea.

Could you confirm that approval has been given by that Board to the sewer extension.

Yours faithfully,

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

per:
(C. J. Currow)
The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

Copy for your information. Your file 54/4/252.

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

(Handwritten name)

Secretary for Marine,
WELLINGTON.

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL
RECLAMATION - THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL
EMPOWERING ACT 1967
FIRTH OF THAMES

Your 43/64/9/3 of 29/1/71 refers.

The D.C.W. Hamilton advises their report was sent to their Head Office on 24/12/70.

I have written to Hamilton and requested minuted copies as received from other residencies.

B.E. TURNER
District Officer.

Per : D. Greig.
The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL RECLAMATION

Your 54/4/252 of the 5 February 1971 refers.

Our report was forwarded to our head office on the 24 December 1970.

R.E. Hermans
District Commissioner of Works

Per: (J. Westwood)
F.O. Box 1254,  
AUCKLAND.  

5th February, 1971.

The District Commissioner of Works,  
Ministry of Works,  
Private Bag,  
HALIFTON.

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL  
RECLAMATION - THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL EMPOWERING ACT 1967  
FIRTH OF THAMES  

Further to my request of 4/12/70 for a report in terms of  
the Harbours Act 1950, urgency is requested as my Head Office,  
Wellington, wishes to give this proposal early consideration.

B.E. TURNER  
District Officer.

Per : D. Greig.

Secretary for Marine,  
WELLINGTON.

Copy for your information. Your 43/64/9/3 of 29/1/71 refers.

B.E. TURNER  
District Officer.

Per : D. Greig.
29 January 1971

The District Officer,
Marine Department,
P.O. Box 1254,
AUCKLAND.

RECLAMATION: THAMES HARBOUR

(Your ref. 54/4/252)

I would be grateful if you could see if the Ministry of Works' report on the proposed reclamation could be expedited as in their letter of application the Thames Borough Council sought early approval.

R.N. KERR
Secretary for Marine

(Ch. Conway)
P.O. Box 1254,  
AUCKLAND.  

4th December, 1970. 

The District Commissioner of Works,  
Ministry of Works,  
Private Bag,  
HAMILTON.  

THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL  
RECLAMATION - THAMES BOROUGH COUNCIL  
EMPOWERING ACT 1967  
PIRTH OF THAMES  

Copy for your information and action.  

Would you please make a report on the proposed reclamation  
in terms of the Harbours Act 1950 to the Commissioner of Works,  
Wellington.  

Enclosed are:  (1) Plan of reclamation  
(2) Correspondence (1).  

B.E. TURNER  
District Officer.  

Encls.  

Secretary for Marine,  
WELLINGTON.  

Your 43/64/9/3 of 30/11/70 refers. Copy for your information.  

B.E. TURNER  
District Officer.  

Per : D. Greig.
The Secretary for Marine,
Box 10-142,
WELLINGTON.

Dear Sir,

Harbour Foreshore Reclamation

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3 of the Thames Borough Council Empowering Act 1967, and to Section 178 of the Harbours Act 1950, I forward herewith two copies of a plan for the reclamation of approximately 158 acres of the Thames foreshore, and the development as a Marina of an adjoining area of approximately 15 acres inside the stone wall which formed the basin adjoining the southern side of the former Burke Street wharf.

It would be appreciated if early consideration and approval could be given to the carrying out of this work. Please advise if any further information is required.

Yours faithfully,

TOWN CLERK
Dear Sir,

RECLAMATION : THAMES HARBOUR

Your letter 460/3 of 13 November 1970 refers.

I have forwarded the plans for the reclamation to my Auckland Office who will obtain the necessary technical reports. These will take several weeks to complete and you will be advised of the results in due course.

Yours faithfully,

C.W. FRANKS  
Acting Secretary for Marine

District Officer,  
Marine Department,  
P.O. Box 1254,  
AUCKLAND.

Copy for your information, together with the plans and a copy of the letter from the Town Clerk. Would you please arrange for the necessary works report to be submitted.

C.W. FRANKS  
Acting Secretary for Marine

per:  

(B.H. Noell)
PLAN OF LOTS 1 - 5 BEING PROPOSED SUBDIVISION OF PT TE TAPUA, WHAKAUPAPA PT B, TE TAPUA OVENUKU PT B, HANGARU PT B CT 220/144 THAMES, COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL • OWNER

PLAN OF RECLAMATION OF PART THAMES HARBOUR BLK IV THAMES SD.

N. G. HARRIS ESO,

DUNODIE & HENDERSON SURVEYORS CIVIL & STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS WAY STREET \ PHONE 813273

APPROVED BY THE THAMES COROMANDEL DISTRICT COUNCIL UNDER THE 27TH OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1974, AT A MEETING HELD ON THE DAY OF 1974. SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN RESOLUTION NO.

DRAWN: SCALE 1:750. DUNODIE & HENDERSON 0187. SUMMER. WIEHATT.