

Before the Selwyn District Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: Proposed Private Plan Changes 81 and 82 to the
Operative District Plan: Dunns Crossing Road, Rolleston

and: **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited** and
Brookside Road Residential Limited
Applicant

Summary of Evidence of Tim McLeod (Infrastructure)

Dated: 12 September 2022

Reference: JM Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)
LMN Forrester (lucy.forrester@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 4 499 5999
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 993
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF TIM MCLEOD

- 1 My full name is Timothy Douglas McLeod and I am a Senior Civil Engineer at Inovo Projects Limited.
- 2 Accounting for the infrastructure assessments provided for PC81 and PC82, my evidence on PC73, and the Council decisions on PC73 and PC69 (insofar as they concerned infrastructure requirements), I consider the infrastructure requirements of the Proposed Plan Changes can be accommodated and such matters should not present a barrier to the rezoning.
- 3 There are a number of feasible options for collection and conveyance of wastewater from the PC81/82 sites to the Pines Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). Capacity modelling has confirmed the existing rising main in Selwyn Road / Edwards Road to the Pines WWTP has capacity to service the plan change sites.
- 4 In his s.42A report **Mr England** states that the WWTP is currently at or near capacity, with upgrades already underway to increase the WWTP capacity to approximately 60,000 persons equivalent (PE). The current connected population (45,000 PE) plus already approved plan changes (15,000 PE) totals approximately 60,000 PE. **Mr England** also stated that extension of the WWTP to 120,000 PE capacity (known as Pines 120k) has been identified and budgeted for in the Council's long term plan. The additional load from the proposed plan changes are within the scope of projected growth of 120,000 PE for the WWTP.
- 5 The PC81 and PC82 areas are able to be supplied with sufficient water to meet the average annual demand volume using an existing water take consent associated with the PC82 site (CRC021647), meaning other water take consents associated with the site can be re-allocated for neighbouring plan change areas. Higher flow rates to meet peak demand can be achieved by utilising storage reservoirs or amending the consented flow rate for the new supply bores as outlined in **Mr Mthamo's** evidence.
- 6 Stormwater from the development will be discharged to ground via soakpits as is common practice in the Rolleston Area. Where required, runoff from roads would be pre-treated before discharging to ground. Flood risk can be mitigated by making use of new roads and streets created within the development to convey overland flow.
- 7 The Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) carried out by Fraser Thomas Ltd for the PC82 block found evidence of potential HAIL areas on parts of the site. The sources of contamination are typical of farming and poultry operations. Carrying out detailed investigation and remediation of contamination hotspots is a matter of course for most greenfield developments. I am satisfied that any

matters related to contaminated land can be addressed at the subdivision consent stage, should the plan changes be approved.

Response to Statement of Evidence of Mr Langman

- 8 I have read the evidence prepared by **Mr Langman**, in particular paragraphs 115-121 relating to infrastructure which is relevant to my evidence. Below I provide some commentary on the statements made by **Mr Langman**.
- 9 In paragraphs p.115 to 118 **Mr Langman** argues that development should not occur until appropriate infrastructure is in place, and *"considers it [appropriate infrastructure] should be identified and budgeted for in a timely manner in an Annual Plan or LTP of the relevant local authority (unless it can be evidenced as being provided through a developer agreement or similar third party arrangement)"*.
- 10 The only major infrastructure upgrades required that are external to the proposed plan change areas are upgrades to the Pines wastewater treatment plant and the electricity supply network. Both SDC and Orion have confirmed that these infrastructure upgrades have been planned and budgeted for, and can be completed within an appropriate timeframe should the plan change be approved.
- 11 I refer to Section 2.6.3 of the SDC Engineering Code of Practice (ECoP) which describes when cost share agreements may be required between Council and the Developer for works to be completed which are not required directly to service the proposed development. Developer agreements or other third party arrangements are typically formalised at the resource consent approval stage, not at the Private Plan Change stage to rezone the land.
- 12 Further, funding of significant infrastructure beyond the development boundary such as the Pines 120K upgrades will predominantly be provided by Developer Contributions paid by land developers to cover the costs borne by SDC in building, expanding or upgrading the facilities required to meet the associated growth.
- 13 In paragraph p.120 **Mr Langman** raised concerns regarding ground water quality in proximity to the Pines WWTP. Bores used for public water supply are sourced from deep secure ground water which are protected from the influence of near-surface water contamination and therefore deemed a better source of raw water supply. Bores used for potable water supply in Rolleston are typically deeper than 150m deep.
- 14 Overall, I do not agree with **Mr Langman's** view that approval of plan changes PC81 and PC82 could undermine the timely delivery of other land already identified for urban development in the Selwyn

district. Plans to progressively upgrade the Pines WWTP to meet the projected growth in the district are already planned for and being implemented, and in my view can be completed in time to meet the development programme for the Proposed Plan Changes.

Dated: 12 September 2022

Tim McLeod