

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management
Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of the Proposed District Plan
for Waimakariri District

**HEARING STREAM 12C: REZONING REQUESTS (LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL
ZONE)**

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ANDREW JAMES SMITH
(GEOTECHNICAL)**

ON BEHALF OF

ANDREW CARR (SUBMITTER #158) 308 CONES ROAD

5 JULY 2024

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Andrew James Smith.
- 1.2 I have previously provided a Statement of Evidence (dated 28 February 2024) regarding geotechnical matters in respect of the Submitter's request for the rezoning of 308 Cones Road and 90 Dixons Road (**the site**). My qualifications and experience remain as set out in my Evidence in Chief.
- 1.3 I have been asked to review and provide comment on the s 42A report of Mr Buckley. I have also reviewed the answers of Mr Buckley to the Hearing Panel's questions.
- 1.4 I confirm I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

2. RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICERS

- 2.1 Mr Buckley's assessment of the site is set out in Section 5.4 of the s 42A report. In respect of geotechnical matters, he includes a very brief summary of my technical report included as Annexure A to my Evidence in Chief.
- 2.2 I have also reviewed the Engineering Assessment (Appendix D to the s 42A report) produced by Council's Senior Civil & Geotechnical Engineer, Mr John Aramowicz. However this includes only a brief comment in paragraph 72, where Mr Aramowicz states "*there are no significant geotechnical ... hazards that would prevent the proposed LLRZ land use*".
- 2.3 For completeness, I confirm that I have reviewed the responses of Mr Buckley to the Hearing Panel's questions. However none relate to geotechnical matters at the site.

2.4 Consequently, after reading the reports I have been unable to find any differences in opinion between myself and the Council relating to geotechnical matters at the site.

3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Having reviewed the Officers' Reports, I remain able to support the submission for the site to be rezoned as LLRZ.

ANDREW SMITH

5 JULY 2024