

**BEFORE THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**UNDER**

the Resource Management Act 1991

**IN THE MATTER**

of Proposed Plan Change 68: West Prebbleton

**REQUESTOR**

Urban Holdings Ltd, Suburban Estates Ltd and  
Cairnbrae Developments Ltd

---

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF ANDREW JAMES EMIL HALL**

---

---

**Christchurch**

Solicitor acting: G Cleary  
Level 9, Anthony Harper Tower  
PO Box 2646, Christchurch 8140  
Tel +64 3 379 0920 | Fax +64 3 366 9277

A handwritten signature in dark green ink that reads "Anthony Harper". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of "Anthony" and "Harper" being capitalized and prominent.

## Introduction

- 1 My full name is Andrew James Emil Hall. I am a Chartered Professional Engineer and a director of Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd, an engineering firm based in Christchurch. I am a Chartered Engineer.
- 2 My area of expertise is consulting in civil engineering related to the development of land. I have 30 years' experience in this field including 20 years' experience in the greater Christchurch area.
- 3 In preparing my evidence, I have consulted with Mr Murray England, representing the Selwyn District Council.

## Scope of Evidence

- 4 The purpose of this evidence is to provide an outline of how water supply, stormwater, and wastewater will be managed as part of the applicants land becoming a residential zone.

## Summary

- 5 Consultation has been carried out with Council Officer Mr Murray England, and this evidence is in compliance with his advice. Mr England and myself are in agreement as to how the proposal can be successfully serviced.
- 6 The PC68 site is directly adjacent to the urban edge of Prebbleton.
- 7 **Stormwater.** The site is underlain with deep gravels suitable for direct soakage of stormwater to ground. Groundwater levels on this site fluctuate and are approximately 5-10m below ground level. This site is able to meet Regional Council discharge standards. This type of disposal is not always available in Prebbleton as the depth to groundwater reduces on land closer to the Halswell River. There will therefore be no need to construct Stormwater Basins within the PC68 area. Stormwater will not inhibit the potential for this land to be developed.
- 8 **Wastewater.** A new pump station is to be constructed at the lower eastern end of the Plan Change area. This pump station will receive wastewater from a catchment that includes the PC68 area. The wastewater will be pumped to the Prebbleton Wastewater Pumping Station and then on to the Pines Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Prebbleton Pump Station has a limited capacity that can be improved with some minor upgrades and changes to the existing rising sewer. The proposed pump station can be provided with additional emergency storage to buffer peak flows or add additional catchment areas adjacent to the Plan Change Area. The Plan Change site does not have a high groundwater level and as such, there will be minimal ingress of water into the system. Following implementation of some changes to the existing system, wastewater capacity should not inhibit the potential for this land to be developed.
- 9 **Water Supply.** The Selwyn District Council has a strategy for the supply of potable water to the area of this Plan Change Proposal. Should Selwyn District Council require a new well within the PC68 area, then that can be accommodated. Any well within the Plan Change area can be transferred to Council upon development. Water Supply will not inhibit the potential for this land to be developed.

## **Submissions**

### **Submitter - Xiaojiang Chen**

- 10 Mr Chen is eager to be included inside the Plan Change 68 area if it is accepted but has the following concerns in regards to infrastructure:
- (a) If Mr Chens land is not included in PC68, then the integrated planning of infrastructure becomes difficult.
  - (b) Secondary stormwater flows off Mr Chens land will need to be accommodated.
  - (c) Mr Chen is concerned about drinking water quality as a result of the discharge of stormwater to ground.
- 11 In the case of Mr Chens land, the only reason that it may not be included, would be wastewater capacity. This capacity is the limiting factor to the expansion of Prebbleton. If that capacity is available then I see no reason why Mr Chens Land cannot be included.
- 12 All secondary flows off Mr Chens land will be accommodated as part of the subdivision process. This is usually addressed at the time of subdivision consent with conditions such as the following:
- (a) *The proposed development shall not discharge run off onto adjacent properties unless via a controlled outlet approved as part of the Engineering Design Approval.*
  - (b) *In the event that an adjacent neighbour's historical stormwater drainage was onto the site, the proposed development must maintain or mitigate the historical discharge.*
- 13 The quality of stormwater being discharged to ground is controlled by the Regional Council stormwater discharge consent process. If required, the stormwater will be treated to ensure that there are no inappropriate effects on downgradient water users.

### **Submitters - Sommerfield, Tod, Pollard et al represented by Mr N Williamson**

- 14 In regard to infrastructure, the submitter's have concerns as to how the infrastructure for the proposed PC68 area will be funded. The submitters are represented by Mr Williams who, while having very limited experience in Selwyn District council or Prebbleton, raises an interesting point.
- 15 The roll out of integrated infrastructure in the Selwyn District is one of the most successful in the country. The methods used have been a key reason for Selwyn being one of the fastest growing and progressive Councils in New Zealand. The basis for most situations, such as the proposed PC68, is a collaboration between developers and Council by way of Development Contributions or a Private Developer Agreement. These are of course mechanisms available to the Council under the Local Government Act 2002.
- 16 In some instances the Council will pay for infrastructure projects by including them as capital expenditure in their Long Term Plans and then recovering the costs by way of Development Contributions paid by developers – this is the case for a raft of growth related expenditure included in the Council's current LTP including, upgrading of roading infrastructure required as a consequence of the establishment of the Christchurch Southern Motorway, and also upgrading of its wastewater treatment plant to double its capacity. On other occasions the Council

and developers collaborate in a Private Developer Agreement where the Developer constructs the infrastructure and Council reimburses the developer for any upsizing i.e the provision of additional capacity beyond that required for an individual development. The reimbursement payment is made by Council at the time of s.224c certification. Those Council costs are recovered at the time of future development. Whilst the developer is temporarily absorbing the cost of the infrastructure upgrades, he is happy to do so as it allows work to progress at the development rate rather than at a rate dictated by Council funds. Ultimately, the developer pays for the infrastructure.

- 17 These agreements are created at the time of subdivision when the extent and cost of the infrastructure is known, as opposed to at the time of zoning. This is entirely appropriate, as there is often a lag between zoning and the approval of subdivision, during which time the cost of infrastructure may increase and developers' plans may evolve. In all cases where I have been involved, the detailed engineering designs are completed and tendered prices obtained before the agreement is signed. By doing this the Council is guaranteed as to the actual costs. This work can only occur post Subdivision Consent.
- 18 These methods have been used successfully for many years in the Selwyn District and I don't see any reason why that can't continue. I personally have been involved in multiple developments within the Selwyn District where infrastructure has been funded by either of the mechanisms discussed above. I am not aware of any situations where these mechanisms have failed. Recent examples involving large development include, to name but a few:
- (a) Faringdon, Rolleston
  - (b) Barton Fields, Lincoln
  - (c) Wilfield, West Melton
  - (d) Rosemerryn, Lincoln
- 19 The three applicants in PC68 are all highly experienced developers in Selwyn District. They will continue to work together with the Council to ensure that the proposed infrastructure is efficient, integrated and robust.
- 20 Added to this, the Selwyn District Council is well funded and progressive by nature. They do not suffer the financial burdens of other councils and this allows some freedom for a better strategic roll out of services.
- 21 I have no concerns as to the installation of infrastructure in PC68 and believe that is easily achievable using methods that are well practiced and successful in the Selwyn District. Mr Williams concerns are, in a practical sense, unfounded.

**Submitters – Canterbury Regional Council and Christchurch City Council represented by Mr M Langman**

- 22 A key point raised by Mr Langman, in terms of infrastructure, is his query into how the proposal may address the proposed Medium Density Residential Standards. This is a very relevant issue for all urban land. New development is perhaps better suited to deal with this, but the real issues will become more impactful for existing infrastructure. The concept of placing enormously greater demands on existing infrastructure does not appear to be well conceived and it is my opinion that the effects of this potential legislation will need to be addressed in a forum far greater than this.
- 23 For the purposes of this application, the infrastructure capacity will be dictated by Council and development will be formulated to suit this. Simply asserting that all

land can become Medium Density does not factor in the practical matters of servicing such as the size of the pipes to be used to connect into public infrastructure.

**Andrew J E Hall**

**18 March 2022**