

**BEFORE THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL HEARINGS
COMMISSIONER**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Plan Change 69

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF IVAN THOMSON ON BEHALF OF
MANMEET SINGH**

25 November 2021

INRODUCTION

1. New information has come to the submitter's attention during the course of the Hearings for which a written rather than verbal response may assist the Commissioner and save time.
2. The new information relates to two matters raised in the submission of Mr Singh and covered in my evidence - in- chief: access and transport integration; and set back from the Lincoln Sewage Treatment Plant (LSTP).

ACCESS AND TRANSPORT INTEGRATION

3. As stated in my evidence, the amended ODP no longer shows a road connection linking the PC 69 site and Allendale Lane. This reduces the statutory effect of the amendment sought to the ODP Narrative in Mr Singh's submission.
4. The amendment refers to a connection through to Liffey Springs Drive and this is no longer being sought. However, what is still being sought is recognition of the need for a local road connection between the PC 69 site and Allendale Lane. The Allendale Lane site is identified in the Proposed Selwyn District Plan as an Urban Growth Overlay (Rural Residential) and submissions have been made on the PSDP to rezone the area for urban residential purposes.
5. If a connection to Allendale Lane is not provided for on the ODP then I strongly consider that it needs to be made clear in the Narrative that such a link is expected to be provided for at the subdivision stage of the PC 69 land.
6. In commenting on my evidence, Mr Philips states in his Summary Evidence that the Narrative already provides adequate comment on this matter. He states at paragraph 18:

‘the realignment of the road on the ODP adjacent and closer to this boundary also provides an opportunity for future connectivity. I also note that the ODP text requires that ‘The transport network for the area shall integrate into the pedestrian and cycle network established in adjoining neighbourhoods and the wider township’.

7. With respect I do not consider this to be sufficient. I consider a more appropriate amendment would be to the second paragraph of the Access and Transport section as follows:

An integrated network of roads will facilitate the safe and efficient distribution of internal traffic, provide access to properties, assist in connecting the open space

reserves network both within and beyond the site and provide an opportunity for road links to adjoining neighbourhoods. **This includes provision for a future road link that will enable a connection with the Allendale Lane Urban Growth Overlay area.**

REVERSE SENSITIVITY

8. Mr Singh supports the removal of the 150 metre set back from the LSTP for the reasons similar to those set out in the Application, expert evidence and the Applicant's legal submissions.
9. At the Hearing, the Council produced new data suggesting that the assumed use of the LSTP site (and therefore its potential odour effects) may have been underestimated.
10. I note that, in his Summary Evidence Mr Philips states that 'In the event that doubt remains (on the future use and upgrades of the LSTP, and in light of the applicable CRPS and OSDP provisions concerning infrastructure ', ... 'a precautionary approach would warrant retention of the 150m setback'.
11. Ms Nieuwenhuijsen's evidence is that, even with the new assumed uses, a set back is still not needed, or alternatively a 50m set back could be considered. I also note that the Applicant's legal submissions raised questions over whether the LSTP is a legally established use. The expert odour advice is that a precautionary 150m setback is not necessary or appropriate. It will impose significant costs for other parties so should be imposed unless the expert evidence confirms that it is essential.
12. I accept of course that if the Applicant no longer wishes to pursue the removal of this rule that is the end of the matter. It will be pursued by Mr Singh as part of his rezoning submission. However, if the Commissioner recommends the 100 metre set back as apparently agreed between the Parties, I consider it important that the Recommendation that the set back as arrived at through a commercial based agreement, not based on expert odour evidence presented at the Hearing.
13. I also consider that it is important to record that the operation of the LSTP will be subject to being granted resource consent and the conditions of that consent (including any that are directed towards mitigating odour effects, are not yet known. Nor has there been a Section 32 Evaluation undertaken to justify the 150 meter set back since the commissioning of the Rolleston Treatment Plant i.e. the function of the LSTW within Selwyn's wastewater system and the rationale for the set back may well have changed.

14. The PC 69 Decision on the set back is likely to be raised in evidence at the hearings on the PSDP and it is important that , whatever the conclusions on PC 69, in my view it needs to be acknowledged that the final outcome on the odour set back at this Hearing was not based on expert evidence.