

Before the Hearing Panel
Appointed by the Central Otago District Council

Under The Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of Private Plan Change 14 to the Central Otago District Plan

Evidence of Peter Langdon Dymock

13 May 2020

Applicant's solicitors:

Sarah Eveleigh
Anderson Lloyd
Level 3, 70 Gloucester Street, Christchurch 8013
PO Box 13831, Armagh, Christchurch 8141
DX Box WX10009
p + 64 3 379 0037 | f + 64 3 379 0039
sarah.eveleigh@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Introduction

- 1 My name is Peter Langdon Dymock.
- 2 My qualifications are a B.Sc , Dip Mgt , RPSurv . MNZIS, and CSNZ.
- 3 At the time of preparation of Plan Change 14 (**PC14**, the **Request**) I was the managing partner of the Cromwell and Alexandra offices of Paterson Pitts Limited Partnership (**Paterson Pitts**), a multi-disciplinary firm practicing in the fields of surveying, resource management and land development engineering and associated project management. I subsequently resigned my partnership and I am currently employed by the Partnership as a senior consultant.
- 4 I have some 30 years' experience in land development throughout Central Otago and in particular the Cromwell district where Paterson Pitts has been responsible for many of the larger land development projects since the completion of the Clyde Power Project. This has included many rural and rural-residential subdivisions in the wider district. I have been involved in the design and construction supervision of many kilometres of urban and rural roads and associated reticulated water, wastewater, power and telecommunications. Over the years I have made countless resource consent applications and submissions on proposed plans to local territorial authorities and regional councils. I have prepared four successful private plan change requests to the Central Otago District Council (the **Council**). I have also been involved in providing infrastructure and land development engineering input into several other private plan change requests, including this one.
- 5 Paterson Pitts was been engaged by NZ Cherry Corp (Leyser) LP Limited (**NZ Cherry Corp**) to prepare the infrastructure report attached as Appendix F to the Request (**Infrastructure Report**). My involvement with PC14 began at the very earliest stages in the development of the project several years ago and has included boundary definition surveys, providing advice on the local planning environment, stormwater, access and roading alignment feasibility studies, some preliminary conceptual lot layout designs to inform the zoning provisions requested, preliminary designs of feature water retaining dams and engaging and liaising with some of the other consultants involved, in particular Geosolve, the geotechnical and hydrological consultants.
- 6 In doing so, I have personally walked and driven all over the entire PC14 site (**the Site**) many times and I am therefore very familiar with it.
- 7 In preparing this statement of evidence I have considered the following documents:

- (a) The Request and section 32 assessment, including the geotechnical and hydrological (flood hazard) technical reports, which need to be read in conjunction with my Infrastructure Report;
- (b) The section 42A report; and
- (c) Relevant submissions.

Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses

8 While this is not a hearing before the Environment Court, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2014 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

Scope of evidence

- 9 I have prepared evidence in relation to:
- (a) Stormwater, power & telecommunications, wastewater and water infrastructure;
 - (b) The submissions which raise issues related to these matters; and
 - (c) Items in the section 42A report of relevance to these matters.

Stormwater, power and telecom, wastewater and water infrastructure

10 The Infrastructure Report contains a detailed assessment of infrastructure requirements and availability. There is nothing in either the submissions, or the section 42A report which would cause me to revise the detail or conclusions set out in the report. The following evidence is a brief summary of the methodology used and conclusions reached.

Stormwater

- 11 The Infrastructure Report needs to be read in conjunction with Geosolve's flood hazard report which addresses the overall discharge of stormwater through and off the site. The Infrastructure Report only deals with the management of stormwater from road carriageways and within allotments from roof and hardstand runoff.
- 12 A series of test pits and rainfall intensity / permeability (soakage) tests have shown that the size of the proposed allotments is such that stormwater run-off

from roading and hardstand can be managed in the normal matter for rural residential subdivision. That is road water tables (side drains) discharging into the many natural drainage paths within the site, direct disposal to ground by way of soak pits, attenuation using storage tanks with irrigation discharge, and direct discharge to ground using dripper and soakage lines over the wider property.

- 13 The additional hardstand and roading is only a very small proportion of the total area of the site and will only have a marginal effect on overall peak flood flows off the site, which is further addressed in Geosolve's report.

Power and telecommunications

- 14 Chorus New Zealand Ltd and Aurora Energy Ltd have both confirmed that they can reticulate the development from their existing networks.
- 15 Alternative options for a power supply are an "embedded" network constructed and owned by an alternative supplier from a dedicated offtake from Aurora's network and, less likely, a direct grid exit point from Transpower's Cromwell substation.
- 16 Individual lot owners also have the option of the cellular network, long distance wi-fi (of which there are several local suppliers) and satellite services for their telecommunications. These types of services are increasingly becoming the norm for rural-lifestyle subdivisions.

Water and wastewater

- 17 Mott MacDonald, which has the exclusive right to operate the Council's Cromwell water and wastewater reticulation computer models, was commissioned by the Council to model the capacity of the existing networks to accommodate this development. The reports found that the existing Cromwell reticulations could accommodate the proposed development without any adverse downstream effects on the networks.
- 18 It is important to recognise that Mott MacDonald was commissioned directly by the Council to undertake this work (although costs were met by NZ Cherry Corp), and as such, the conclusions of the reports are the official independent position of the Council's three waters department.
- 19 There are three options for connecting the development to the Cromwell wastewater reticulation, two involving a pressure main down Ripponvale Road and under SH6 and a third, less likely, option involving a gravity main.
- 20 Within the development itself it is anticipated that there will be a combination of gravity reticulation for the smaller lots on the flatter part of the site and a "distributed" individual household pumped supply into a common small diameter

pressure main for the larger lots on the higher parts of the site. It may also be feasible for some of the larger, more remote lots to dispose of wastewater on-site, subject to meeting the requirements of AS/NZS1547:2012.

- 21 The development will need to be connected to the Cromwell water reticulation by a new 150mm main along Ripponvale Road. To fully service the development above 250m above sea level will require further on-pumping to a 90m³ reservoir located on the upper part of the site. It is anticipated that the smaller lots on the lower part of the site will be serviced to Fire and Emergency New Zealand's (FENZ) SNZ PAS4509:2008 standard requirements, i.e., an "on demand" high pressure fully reticulated service.
- 22 The larger lots on the upper parts of the site can be serviced to a rural supply standard with firefighting to FENZ's requirements for a rural dwelling, i.e., individual 30m³ reserve storage tanks with FENZ compatible couplings located within 90m of the dwelling, installed by the lot owner at the time of building.
- 23 Final design decisions on all the above matters will be resolved at the subsequent subdivision stage under the detailed design and approval process mandated by NZS4404, the Council's code of practice for subdivision and land development engineering. This will involve further detailed modelling of the internal reticulations proposed.

The submissions relating to infrastructure

- 24 The evidence that follows only deals with those parts of the submission that relate to infrastructure, not to the whole of the submission.

Submission #24 FENZ (supported by further submission of Public Health South)

- 25 FENZ is requesting an amendment to rule 4.7.2(ii)(vi) of the Central Otago District Plan to require that the water supply to subdivided lots shall comply with FENZ's firefighting code of practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. I disagree with this requested amendment for the following reasons:
 - (a) It would affect subdivision throughout the district, not just within the Site;
 - (b) It would only cover controlled activity subdivision, not discretionary and non-complying subdivision which are subject to different rules in the plan and which comprise the great majority of rural subdivision in the district; and
 - (c) It does not cover fire protection standards for new dwellings on existing rural allotments where subdivision does not take place (but a land use consent is still required).

- 26 All rural (and urban) subdivisions are subject to NZS4404, the Council's engineering code of practice for subdivision and land development. The Council's application of this standard already incorporates the provisions of SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as they apply to rural subdivision and land development. Council has also recently entered into a memorandum of understanding with FENZ such that Council will impose the requirements of SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as conditions of consent on all rural subdivisions and land use consents for rural dwellings. In my experience, for at least the last 12 years the Council has been doing this in any case under its amendments to NZS4404.
- 27 FENZ's submission is therefore already well provided for by existing Council processes at the subsequent subdivision resource consent stage and there is no need to incorporate this into the plan change itself.

Submission #29 David Griffin

- 28 Mr Griffin is concerned about possible adverse effects on the Ripponvale Rural Water Supply Scheme, which serves most of the properties in the Ripponvale area and which is connected to the Council's Cromwell reticulation.
- 29 There is no proposal to connect to the Ripponvale scheme. The water supply to the Site will come from a different connection point to the Cromwell reticulation. There cannot possibly be any adverse effect on the Ripponvale scheme.

Submission #64 Werner Murray

- 30 Mr Murray has submitted that extending public infrastructure services to this part of the Cromwell Basin is not economically viable for the community, that the waste water treatment pond capacity has not been taken into account and that there will be an adverse effect on wider community services. He has also expressed some concern about the potential for light pollution.
- 31 NZ Cherry Corp will fund the cost of extending services to and within the Site and on top of that will pay very substantial financial and development contributions which are for the benefit of the wider community. These contributions not only cover water and wastewater, but also include a roading contribution which is district-wide and a reserves contribution which includes provision for libraries, recreation areas and swimming pools.
- 32 PC14 will also result in up to a further 160 ratepayers to fund the ongoing maintenance of the infrastructure and to support the wider community services provided by Council.
- 33 With regard to the capacity of the wastewater treatment ponds, I attach as **Appendix 1** a copy of an email exchange with Council's Three Waters

Department which confirms that the Cromwell treatment plant, which has recently been upgraded, has the capacity to cater for the Site without any further upgrade being required.

- 34 With regard to light pollution, this is a rural subdivision development and street lighting is not proposed. This is addressed further in the evidence of Mr Tony Milne and Mr Brett Giddens.

Submission #68 Public Health South (PHS) on behalf of the Southern District Health Board

- 35 PHS's submission essentially requires that PC14 makes adequate provision for drinking water and wastewater with connection to a reticulated scheme to be a priority for all residential activity.

- 36 That is exactly what is proposed in the PC14 Request, as summarised above.

Submission #74- Daniel Scheibmair

- 37 Mr Scheibmair has submitted that the "circulation" plan submitted with the request shows a new "minor" road (dotted orange on the plan) connecting to an unformed legal road (commonly referred to as a "paper road") which links to McFelin Road, where he resides. McFelin Road is a narrow unsealed road that links to Burn Cottage Road. He is concerned that this will result in a through road being constructed from the Site to McFelin Road, with consequent adverse traffic effects.

- 38 Provision of road connections is addressed in Mr Carr's evidence. I understand that a pedestrian connection will be formed in this location, but that there is nothing in the plan change request which requires or precludes formation of a roading linkage. However, I have assessed the alignment of this unformed legal road and consider that it is impractical to form it to a motor road standard without deviating onto private land bordering the legal alignment. The road was alignment surveyed and laid off in the late 19th century, before the invention of the motor vehicle. Many parts of the top section will exceed the maximum 1 in 8 gradient permitted by Council's rural roading standards and large parts of the bottom section are actually within or too close to an eroding dry creek bed.

Submission #87 Richard Wallis and Catherine Woods

- 39 Mr Wallis and Ms Woods have submitted that a fire fighting plan or hydrants should be allowed for in the subdivision. This is what has been proposed in the Request whereby the smaller lots on the lower part of the site will have a full "on demand" pressurised system with fire hydrants in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008.

40 However it is impractical and uneconomic to reticulate the large allotments in the higher parts of the site in this manner and both SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and the Council's rural subdivision engineering standards allow the standard rural firefighting solution of 30m³ individual household firefighting water reserve storage tanks in this situation.

Section 42A report

41 The section 42A report (page 36) confirms that water and wastewater services can be provided from the Cromwell town reticulation; that stormwater disposal can occur within the site; and that power and telecommunication services are available from the relevant providers. The report concludes that any adverse effects in terms of servicing the development enabled by Plan Change 14 will be limited. There are no issues arising from the section 42A report that require further comment.

Conclusion

42 Suitable provision can be made for stormwater disposal from roading and hardstand / roof runoff within allotments and for wastewater, water supply and network utility services to the proposed development. Trunk water main and wastewater connections to the Cromwell town reticulations will be required to service the development. These will not create any detrimental impact on the existing reticulations.

Dated this 13 May 2020



Peter Langdon Dymock

Sarah Eveleigh

From: Peter Greenwood <peter.greenwood@codc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 20 April 2020 11:18 AM
To: Peter Dymock
Cc: Quinton Penniall; Quentin Adams; Jalal Kasi
Subject: FW: PC 14 Shannon Farm, Ripponvale Rd , Cromwell - Infrastructure Issues

Comments below in RED:

Any concerns let me know.

Peter

From: Peter Dymock <Peter.Dymock@ppgroup.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 16 April 2020 5:22 pm
To: Peter Greenwood <peter.greenwood@codc.govt.nz>; Quentin Adams <Quentin.Adams@codc.govt.nz>; Quinton Penniall <Quinton.Penniall@codc.govt.nz>; Jalal Kasi <Jalal.Kasi@codc.govt.nz>
Cc: Julie Muir <Julie.Muir@codc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: PC 14 Shannon Farm, Ripponvale Rd , Cromwell - Infrastructure Issues

Hi Peter

I'm basically asking two things

Can the Cromwell wastewater treatment plant cope with the 160 lots proposed in PC 14 without a further upgrade to the plant being required ?

Cromwell's reticulated wastewater network has sufficient capacity to accept the demand of the additional 160 lots created.

-
- Do the normal wastewater DC's cover PC 14's contribution to the recently completed upgrade of the plant and any future upgrades ?

Normal Development Contributions apply

Peter Dymock
Senior Planner
M 027 437 7910
T 03 445 1826

Paterson Pitts Limited Partnership, trading as:
PATERSONPITTSGROUP
Surveying • Planning • Engineering
Your Land Professionals

From: Peter Greenwood <peter.greenwood@codc.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 16 April 2020 4:32 p.m.
To: Peter Dymock <Peter.Dymock@ppgroup.co.nz>; Quentin Adams <Quentin.Adams@codc.govt.nz>; Quinton Penniall <Quinton.Penniall@codc.govt.nz>; Jalal Kasi <Jalal.Kasi@codc.govt.nz>
Cc: Julie Muir <Julie.Muir@codc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: PC 14 Shannon Farm, Ripponvale Rd , Cromwell - Infrastructure Issues

Is he asking me/us to confirm normal DC's apply.?

Peter.

From: Peter Dymock <Peter.Dymock@ppgroup.co.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 16 April 2020 4:24 pm

To: Peter Greenwood <peter.greenwood@codc.govt.nz>; Quentin Adams <Quentin.Adams@codc.govt.nz>; Quinton Penniall <Quinton.Penniall@codc.govt.nz>; Jalal Kasi <Jalal.Kasi@codc.govt.nz>

Cc: Julie Muir <Julie.Muir@codc.govt.nz>

Subject: PC 14 Shannon Farm, Ripponvale Rd , Cromwell - Infrastructure Issues

Dear Peter , Jalal , Quentin & Quinton

1. You will recall that , at our request , Council commissioned reports from Mott MacDonald on the wastewater & water infrastructure required to service this proposed development
2. I attach the relevant reports
3. Those reports confirm that the development can be served by the existing Cromwell water & wastewater infrastructure without any detrimental effects on the existing reticulations .
4. However some of the submitters on PC14 have raised the issue about possible detrimental impact on the capacity of the existing Cromwell wastewater treatment plant, a matter not dealt with in the Mott MacDonald reports
5. **Peter** : you will recall that you advised the PC13 hearing (via Mr David Whitney's sec 42A recommending report) that the recent upgrade of the wastewater plant has been designed to cope with the future anticipated growth of Cromwell and that the plant could cope with the additional 800 dwelling units lots proposed in PC13 and that the normal development contributions would cover PC13's contribution to the cost of the upgrade .
6. PC 14 proposes 160 dwelling units .
7. *Could you please written confirmation by return email that the upgraded Cromwell Waste Water Treatment Plant has sufficient capacity to cope with the additional load imposed by the 160 dwelling units/lots proposed in PC14 and that the normal wastewater development contributions would cover PC14's contribution to the cost of the recent upgrade.*
8. Shannon Farm's solicitors require a draft of my evidence to the hearing by 24th April 2020 , so a response by early next week would be appreciated

Peter Dymock

Senior Planner

M 027 437 7910

E peter.dymock@ppgroup.co.nz

Paterson Pitts Limited Partnership, trading as:

PATERSONPITTSGROUP

Surveying • Planning • Engineering

Your Land Professionals

30 The Mall, Cromwell

or P.O. Box 84, Cromwell 9342, New Zealand

T 03 445 1826

W www.ppgroup.co.nz

Alexandra Office:

6 Skird Street, Alexandra

or P.O. Box 103, Alexandra 9340, New Zealand

T 03 448 8775

Notice of Confidential Information

The information contained in this email message is CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION and may also be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED intended only for the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient you must not read or do anything else with this message. If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately by return email or telephone (Phone 0800 774 768) and then destroy the original message. Thank you.

You must scan this email and any attached files for viruses. PATERSON PITTS LP, trading as PATERSON PITTS GROUP accepts no liability for any loss or damage however caused, whether directly or indirectly arising from this message or the attachments