

<b>UNDER THE</b>	Resource Management Act 1991
<b>IN THE MATTER OF</b>	the submissions of B & A Stokes on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan (#214) and Variation 1 (#29)
<b>AND</b>	Hearing Stream 12E: Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend; Variation 1

---

## **SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ANDREW HALL**

---

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My full name is Andrew James Emil Hall. I hold the position of Engineering Director at Davie Lovell-Smith Limited (**DLS**).
- 1.2 I have prepared two statements of evidence on behalf of B & A Stokes in relation to their submissions on the Waimakariri Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) and Variation 1 to the PDP. The first was a primary statement of evidence addressing the infrastructure and civil aspects of the Stokes' proposal to rezone their land to the north of Ravenswood (**Site**) to General Residential / Medium Density Residential zone (**Proposal**), subject to an Outline Development Plan (**ODP**). I then prepared supplementary evidence that responded to infrastructure and civil matters raised in the Section 42A report with respect to the Proposal.
- 1.3 The author of the Section 42A Report (**Council Officer**) has recommended rejecting the Proposal, in part, because of a perceived lack of evidence regarding:
- (a) downstream capacity for stormwater resulting from the Proposal; and
  - (b) the rule framework and/or other mechanisms that will ensure that necessary upgrades occur prior to beginning development and/or staged throughout the development.

### **2 MY EVIDENCE**

- 2.1 The Proposal includes substantial stormwater facilities along the eastern extent of the Site (described as the **Eastern SMA / Open Space**) (refer **Tab 9** of the Graphic Set). These facilities will be sized and designed to attenuate stormwater from the Proposal to a 2% (or 1:50) Annual Exceedance Probability (**AEP**) event to achieve hydraulic neutrality (i.e. post-development flows are approximately the same level

- as pre-development flows) (described in the ODP narrative at **Tab 11** of the Graphic Set).
- 2.2 Provision of these facilities (and the ability to achieve those outcomes) will be assessed as part of the subdivision resource consent (which requires alignment with the ODP) and as part of the regional consents to authorise that discharge. The specific triggers for this in the PDP are addressed in the evidence of Mr Clease.<sup>1</sup>
- 2.3 With those features provided for, I do not consider that the Proposal will result in any additional adverse effects on downstream stormwater capacity. For his part, Mr Aramowicz appears to agree, noting that “the effect of any additional stormwater runoff from a future subdivision can be largely mitigated using onsite attenuation”.<sup>2</sup>
- 2.4 I am aware that existing flood flows from the Site have previously contributed to downstream flooding. This is attributed to an undersized culvert under State Highway 1 (**SH1**), unmaintained drainage channels and a blocked flap valve in the Ashley River Stopbank. As stormwater will be attenuated on the Site through the Proposal, the Proposal will not exacerbate these effects. There are number of initiatives available to the Council to address those external constraints, and to the extent relevant to the Proposal, those initiatives can be addressed at the time of subdivision.
- 2.5 My primary evidence identifies a range of options for servicing the Proposal. I have consulted with the Council’s engineers on those options, and we agree that there are no significant constraints on servicing the Proposal that would prevent the rezoning. I have reviewed that assessment again in light of the proposed increase in yield from the Site to 15 households per hectare (**hh/ha**). I remain of the opinion that the options identified in my primary evidence would be suitable for accommodating that additional yield.
- 2.6 The specific PDP rules relating to infrastructure assessments for subdivision consents are identified in Mr Clease’ evidence.<sup>3</sup> Those provisions enable the imposition of conditions which would require the completion of any necessary upgrades or connections at the appropriate time, which is standard practice.

---

<sup>1</sup> Supplementary evidence of Jonathan Clease on behalf of B & A Stokes, 2 August 2024 (**Cleasant Supplementary**) at [5.25].

<sup>2</sup> Memorandum to Peter Wilson (Council Officer) from John Aramowicz, *Proposed District Plan Rezoning Requests Stream 12E – Servicing, Natural Hazards, Geotechnical Matters*, at [160].

<sup>3</sup> Cleasant Supplementary at [5.25].

- 2.7 In terms of funding and/or the allocation of responsibility for those upgrades/connections, again, that will be a matter for determination at the subdivision stage. In general, connections to existing services will be funded by the developer. Where a development triggers that requirement for unplanned upgrades, the cost of that will usually be borne (at least in part) by the developer. Those arrangements can be secured through development agreements, or costs can be recovered through development or financial contributions.
- 2.8 As identified in my primary evidence, planned upgrades to Council's existing wastewater and water supply network will ensure there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the Proposal.
- 2.9 In that context, I remain of the opinion that there are no infrastructure or flooding hazard constraints which should preclude the Proposal.

**Andrew Hall**

21 August 2024