

PC19 SUMMARISING NOTES ON BEHALF OF SUBMITTER #146 (PVD LTD & PMV LTD)
(CAMPBELL HILLS HEARING STATEMENT ON SUBDIVISION AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

- 1.1 With reference to the rationale provided in my submitted evidence, it is my opinion that the proposed re-zoning of the orchard and vineyard site immediately to the west of the established Pisa Moorings residential area is appropriate from a subdivision and infrastructure perspective.
- 1.2 The proposed re-zoning is expected to facilitate in the vicinity of 292 residential allotments and approximately 1.2 hectares¹ of local convenience commercial activity, and it is considered extremely unlikely that even half of the potential allotments on the site could be titled and require servicing before 2030.
- 1.3 Titles for any first stage of development would not be expected until at least early 2026, with subsequent stages expected to take two to four years each, subject to market demand. On the basis of the existing zoning, additional development is not expected to require servicing until at least 2028; that being development which is over and above what Council should have already made some allowance for through existing areas of residential zoning over the site. Any demand triggered by the proposed re-zoning is therefore very closely aligned with Council's indicated timeframe for full serviceability.
- 1.4 The water and wastewater capacity summary statement that Ms Julie Muir presented to the Hearings Panel at the commencement of these Stage 2 hearings did provide some further clarification on expected timeframes for upgrades necessary to service growth in the Pisa area.
- 1.5 In particular, Ms Muir noted that upgrades required to address the main wastewater capacity constraint (at the treatment plant) are needing to be brought forward, with expected delivery now around 2025.
- 1.6 Similarly, with respect to water supply, Ms Muir noted that upgrades required to address the main water capacity constraint (particularly for the Pisa area) are expected between 2025 and 2028.
- 1.7 These clarified timeframes provided by Ms Muir are slightly at odds with those understood on the basis of Ms Muir's Section 42A report, which generally indicated

¹ 1.2ha is the likely developable yield excluding road area

that the submitter's site (and various other sites at the extents of Council's existing networks) could be serviced for both water and wastewater "after 2029". On this basis, the appropriateness of a Future Growth Overlay (FGO) is questioned on the basis that Ms White, at paragraph #245 of her Section 42A report, has relied on the dates for serviceability of the site being "after 2029".

- 1.8 Whilst I consider that the timeframe for infrastructure demand associated with the proposed re-zoning is very closely aligned with the Council upgrade schedule as previously understood (i.e. "after 2029"), and this brings into question the appropriateness of the proposed FGO, the clarified Council upgrade timeframes certainly indicate that the proposed re-zoning through this Plan Change 19 process is completely appropriate from an infrastructure capacity perspective.
- 1.9 To provide some context, the site is situated in a unique infrastructure environment and, as a result, there is considered to be scope for various suitable water and wastewater solutions to be considered in consultation with Council at resource consent stage, and this is a typical part of any subdivision process.
- 1.10 There are currently three established domestic water networks immediately on (or directly adjoining) the site, along with additional established private bore water options on the site that could be utilised, even in a temporary manner and in a way that facilitates simple switchover to Council's ultimate consolidated network. As such, I do consider the site to be well positioned for connectivity to, and extension of, existing water supplies.
- 1.11 Whilst the existing wastewater network is consolidated with a single treatment plant for the Cromwell Basin, there are methods available for mitigating the impacts associated with additional development. These include variable control of start and stop levels at pump stations between Pisa and Cromwell, and on-site retention and attenuation at peak flow times, which is particularly applicable in this situation given the ample site area available for these options.
- 1.12 Furthermore, I have recently commenced preliminary discussions with Ecoflow (who are pressure sewer specialists) and they intend to engage with Council shortly in an attempt to assist with balancing growth demand against existing wastewater treatment plant constraints. This is something that they have been actively and extensively assisting Queenstown Lakes District Council with in recent years due

to very similar constraints with the Queenstown Wastewater Treatment Plant, and particularly to enable growth in the Southern Corridor.²

- 1.13 Subject to detailed consideration at resource consent stage, I consider that the site has very few constraints from a wastewater servicing perspective for the following reasons:
- (a) The site is elevated above the existing wastewater network
 - (b) There are multiple adjacent gravity connection options
 - (c) The site area is large enough that there is scope for significant retention and potentially even on-site discharge to be considered at resource consent stage (even if the measures are only temporary) to mitigate downstream impacts
 - (d) Pressure sewer systems are also a possibility as a means of providing attenuation, customised and uniform control of flows, and ultimate mitigation of downstream impacts
- 1.14 I consider that it is important to recognise that the water and wastewater servicing constraints identified in the Section 42A reports are derived from existing (and generally wider) network issues, particularly as PC19 as notified does not consider any infill development for Pisa Moorings.
- 1.15 **On the basis of my previously submitted evidence, and the further considerations I have just presented, I do not consider that a lack of complete water and wastewater serviceability for the fully developed site precludes the site from being re-zoned at the present time, due to:**
- (a) **the scale of subdivision that is actually considered achievable within the timeframes that Ms Muir has noted for upgrades which would service the full development (being approximately 2025 for wastewater, and by the end of 2028 for wastewater);**
 - (b) **the relatively minor increase in demand/flow (prior to the site being considered fully serviceable) which may be able to be absorbed within the existing infrastructure, subject to modelling confirmation and any necessary site controls to reduce impacts at peak times;**
 - (c) **previous discussions with the Council Environmental Engineering department, which identified some remaining capacity in the water and wastewater networks at Pisa Moorings, subject to confirmation through modelling that is currently underway;**

² Southern Corridor comprises Jack's Point, Hanley's Farm, Coneburn and Homestead Bay Marina development areas)

- (d) Plan Change 19, as notified, not identifying any increase in demand through infill development at Pisa Moorings;
- (e) re-zoning providing a level of certainty for Council in terms of infrastructure planning and funding;
- (f) Council having ability to control the nature and scale of subdivision, and associated servicing requirements, at resource consent stage, including the opportunity to establish developer agreements to assist with provision of infrastructure and development contribution credits, and to levy development contributions generally.

1.16 Finally, from an infrastructure perspective, I consider the proposed FGO is an ineffective method for controlling development as it provides no certainty for the landowners with respect to their ability to develop the property; particularly in terms of timeframes or suitable level of investment in either horticulture/viticulture, subdivision, or other development.