**Before an Independent Hearings Panel** 

The Proposed Waikato District Plan (Stage 1)

**IN THE MATTER OF** the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

IN THE MATTER OF hearing submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (Stage 1): <u>Topic 25 – Zone Extents</u>

# HIGHLIGHTS PACKAGE RYAN JAMES PITKETHLEY ON BEHALF OF HAVELOCK VILLAGE LIMITED (ENGINEERING)

12 May 2021

**BUDDLE** FINDLAY

Barristers and Solicitors Auckland Solicitor Acting: Vanessa Evitt / Mathew Gribben Email: vanessa.evitt@buddlefindlay.com / mathew.gribben@buddlefindlay.com Tel 64-9-358 2555 PO Box 1433 DX CP24024 Auckland 1140

# 1. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 1.1 My full name is Ryan James Pitkethley. I am a Civil Engineer and Engineering Manager at CivilPlan Consultants Limited.
- 1.2 I have provided both statements of primary (EIC) and rebuttal (Rebuttal) evidence in relation to land development/infrastructure engineering matters for the proposed rezoning sought by Havelock Village Ltd ("HVL")<sup>1</sup> of land at 5 Yashili Road, 88 Bluff Road, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road, Pokeno ("Site" or "Havelock").

## Servicing and transport infrastructure to support the rezoning

- 1.3 My EIC confirmed that all servicing required for the Site, including in relation to the three waters and access to the Site, can be delivered. This will be provided at HVL's cost. In particular I noted that:
  - (a) Several options for roading connections were tested during the conceptual design phase in conjunction with other experts such as Mr Leo Hills. We identified that the Site can be serviced with a suitable roading network including key connections and a suitable internal road layout, both to be funded by the developer.
  - (b) Stormwater management to address both quality and quantity would be required at the time of subdivision and development, and would be based on low impact design as required by the Waikato Stormwater Management Guidelines, Waikato Regional Plan and Waikato District Council requirements. Based on current information I saw no reason why those guidelines and requirements cannot be met.
  - (c) Overland flow will be captured on site via roads and overland flow paths discharging into public communal and/or private attenuation devices before discharging into the stream / gully network at pre development flow rates. No offsite treatment or attenuation will be required.
  - (d) Appendix 5 to the Section 42A Report Hearing 25 Zone Extents prepared by Dr Mark Davey confirms that Watercare have provided for the main infrastructure for wastewater and water supply (including for future capacity to accommodate Havelock), and that developers are to undertake extensions of this infrastructure to their site. In my experience this is typical practice for standard land

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Submitter 862 and further submitter 1291.

development projects. This is consistent with my consultation with Watercare. Figures 1 and 2 show the wastewater and water supply catchments used to plan for infrastructure upgrades in Pokeno. The catchments include Havelock.



Sourse Litz Rands, Projenties Bounderies -2010, Antoin -2010, Grid Fishure Antopeand Nodes, Distring Nationaler Mindower Pump Dations, Discharge Indiostry, Poleno, Davadoji, Pupoaed Datod Pan Zinee - OZ 2010.

Figure 1 – Wastewater catchments considered in WDC's upgrade requirements.



Figure 2 – Water supply catchments considered in WDC's upgrade requirements.

1.4 In my EIC, I concluded that there is no infrastructure engineering reason to not rezone the Site as part of the Proposed Waikato District Plan for residential development.

#### **Response to submitter issues**

1.5 In my Rebuttal, I responded to the evidence of Mr Campbell McGregor filed on behalf of Hynds Pipe Systems Ltd and the Hynds Foundation and Ms Dale Paice for Pokeno Village Holdings Limited.

### Uncompleted downstream works

- 1.6 Mr McGregor has identified some uncompleted works recommended in the 2008 Stormwater Catchment Management Plan ("SCMP") and the uncompleted work associated with the Pipeline A and the Hynds and Synlait overland flow path channels both on site and upstream. In my opinion the completion of these works is not necessary to manage stormwater from the HVL land and so these are unrelated to whether the HVL land should be rezoned. They are issues needing resolution separate to and regardless of the rezoning outcome.
- 1.7 Yashili, Hynds and Synlait and Waikato District Council ("**WDC**") are required to manage as a minimum the upstream predevelopment flows entering their site (or public road in the case of WDC), pass it through their site and discharge it downstream. This is currently being achieved in the temporary situation with private accessways, channels, pipes and publicly vested road overland flow without Pipeline A being completed.
- 1.8 The proposed stormwater strategy for Havelock is to reduce flow rates from the HVL site to 80% of predevelopment flow rates, which would reduce flooding in the downstream land and be accommodated by the existing downstream piped and overland flow network. This means that the current temporary situation as between WDC, Yashili, Hynds and Synlait can accommodate HVL now and until Pipeline A is completed. As explained above, those four parties are required to ensure that the situation is maintained.
- 1.9 Figures 3 and 4 show the proposed stormwater management for Havelock and downstream overland flow networks in more detail.



Figure 3 – Proposed stormwater management on site.



Figure 4 – Downstream existing overland flowpaths.

#### Need for a further catchment wide analysis

- 1.10 In my response to Mr McGregor and Ms Paice regarding the application of a further catchment wide analysis, I agree with the suggestion that for appropriate stormwater management, controls should be considered on a catchment wide basis. This will be useful to understand whether the timing and volume of stormwater discharges is managed appropriately, and to confirm that the HVL strategy of over attenuation is benefitting the catchment as intended.
- 1.11 However, the timing of when a catchment wide analysis is completed is in my opinion not related to whether the land should be rezoned and developed. I consider that a catchment wide analysis would not alter the proposed stormwater strategy for Havelock and there is no need to wait for this analysis to rezone the Site. I disagree with Mr McGregor and Mrs Paice on this point and consider that these matters can be addressed at the subdivision stage (during the resource consent process) as is usual for this type of development.
- 1.12 For similar reasons I also disagree with Mr McGregor and Ms Paice that the existing SCMP needs to be updated before Havelock can be rezoned. A catchment wide hydrological model is not required to support the rezoning but can be provided as part of the resource consenting process. If development occurring on the upstream land identified in the SCMP as 'rural' manages stormwater so as to replicate predevelopment peak flow rates and to control increased runoff volumes (as intended in the HVL strategy), then flooding is not likely to be exacerbated downstream.
- 1.13 Therefore, any further catchment modelling or update to the current SCMP is not required prior to rezoning because the upstream development will still be in line with the SCMP assumptions.
- 1.14 Mr McGregor agrees with me that there is a technically feasible design to manage stormwater from the HVL land. The only real area of dispute is whether the detail needs to be provided prior to rezoning or at resource consent stage. In my view the relevant information can be provided at that later stage. That is consistent with the view of Mr Mead the section 42A report writer.
- 1.15 The issues raised by Mr McGregor and Mrs Paice are in my opinion about how the HVL land should be developed for housing, rather than if the land should be developed. Therefore, I see no reason not to rezone the land as previously submitted.

### Summary

1.16 In summary, I remain of the view that the full extent of development enabled by the proposed rezoning can be appropriately supported by the existing and upgraded infrastructure, to maintain appropriate levels of serviceability to the proposed development through utilities provision, three waters, roading alignments and grades, and the earthworks required to facilitate these.

**Ryan Pitkethley** 12 May 2021