

IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission in respect
of the **PROPOSED
WAIKATO DISTRICT
PLAN** by **MOWBRAY
GROUP LIMITED** pursuant
to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of
the Act of Waikato District
Plan Review- Hearing 25
Zone Extents.

**STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF TRISHA SIMONSON FOR
MOWBRAY GROUP LIMITED AND ANDREW MOWBRAY**

[Submission 404 and 563]

[ON-SITE WASTEWATER]

1. Introduction.

1.1 My qualifications are as set out in my primary evidence for Hearing 25 Zone Extents. I support many of the recommendations in the s42A reports, relating to on-site wastewater treatment and disposal. This rebuttal evidence relates to a small number of recommendations to which I provide further comment. These are set out below.

2. S42A Report - Hearing 25: Zone Extents Mixed Use Zone - Matangi

2.1 The s42a report is generally supportive of my original evidence with respect to the management of existing and future on-site wastewater discharges on site, that large scale or wet industrial activities are not appropriate in this location and that subdivision should not be contemplated until such time as sewage reticulation is available.

2.2 The s42a report invites further comment regarding management of stormwater on site. I provide comment however state for the benefit of the panel that I am not an expert in stormwater matters.

2.3 As noted in point 90 of the s42a report, currently stormwater generated from impervious surfaces on site is managed through a private pipeline into the Matangi Drainage System. I understand that this is a legacy of the site's previous usage. I am unaware of any adverse effects from flooding or stormwater quality as a result of the existing discharge, however, to limit the future effects of further development, it is

proposed that stormwater generated from any new impervious surfaces is managed through on-site soakage.

- 2.4 The site investigation undertaken indicates the underlying site soils are classified as category 1 beyond 1m depth with respect to on-site wastewater disposal (AS/NZS 1547:2012 Table L1). These soils have excellent soakage abilities, with indicative permeabilities of up to 3 m/day and I consider they are suitable for on-site stormwater discharge. Stormwater contains a lower contaminant load than treated wastewater, and can hence be discharged at higher rates. I consider there will be adequate space on site for both on-site wastewater and stormwater discharges, to the extent of development described in my original evidence.

3. S42a Report – Appendix 6 – Beca Summary Reports.

- 3.1 This review raised issues regarding stormwater which I have addressed in part above, and notes that future development will be subject to future consents and that the details of the discharge (water and stormwater) should be worked through at the consenting stage. I concur with this recommendation and in my opinion there are no impediments to achieving the relevant authorisations for the discharge of up to 24,500 litres/day of wastewater on site.

4. Conclusion.

- 4.1 I support many of the recommendations made through the s42A reports prepared for Hearing 25: Zone extents. I have made additional comment with regards to a small number of the recommendations as outlined in this rebuttal evidence.



Trisha Simonson

30 April 2021