Appendix F:

Infrastructure Report

Patterson Pitts Group



PATERSONPITTSGROUP

Surveying • Planning • Engineering



NEW ZEALAND CHERRY CORP (LEYSER) L.P.

REQUEST FOR A CHANGE TO THE OPERATIVE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN

INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT

"SHANNON FARM"

PROJECT: New Zealand Cherry Corp, 144 Ripponvale Road, Cromwell,

Request for a Change to the Operative Central Otago District Plan

PRINCIPAL: New Zealand Cherry Corp (Leyser) L.P.

OUR REF: C2528

DATE: May 2019

DUNEDIN:

P.O. Box 5933, Dunedin 9058. **T** 03 477 3245 CHRISTCHURCH: P.O. Box 160094,

Christchurch 8441. **T** 03 928 1533

ALEXANDRA: P.O. Box 103,

Alexandra 9340. **T** 03 448 8775 P.O. Box 84,

Cromwell 9342. **T** 03 445 1826 QUEENSTOWN:

P.O. Box 2645, Queenstown 9349. **T** 03 441 4715 WANAKA:

P.O. Box 283, Wanaka 9305. **T** 03 443 0110

PATERSONPITTSGROUP

REVISION / APPROVAL PANEL

Rev:	Date:	Prepared By:	Reviewed By:	Comments:
0	13/12/18	PLD	MG	Issued for client review
1	25/2/19	PLD	BG	Client reviewed
2	20/5/19	PLD	СВ	Rural Lifestyle references and areas changed

Job No: C2528
Date: 21 May 2019

Report Prepared For: New Zealand Cherry Corp

Prepared By:

Paterson Pitts Limited Partnership (Cromwell Office)

30 The Mall P O Box 84 Cromwell 9342

Telephone: +64 3 445 1826 Email: cromwell@ppgroup.co.nz Web: www.ppgroup.co.nz



CONTENTS

1.	Sco	pe		3
	·	•		
2.	Exe	cutive Su	ımmary	3
	2.1	Stormw	vater	3
	2.2	Wastev	vater	3
	2.3	Water 9	Supply	3
	2.4		k Utility Services	
3.	Stor	mwater		. 4
4.	Was	stewater	-	. 5
5.	Wat	ter Supp	ly	. 6
6.	Net	work Ut	ility Services	. 6
	6.1	Telecor	nmunications	. 6
7.	Con	clusion.		. 7
/	APPENI	DIX A -	Location Plan of Test Pits & Test Pit Logs	
	APPENI		Soakage Tests, Infiltration Calculations & Rainfall Intensity Calculations	
A	APPENI	DIX C -	Wastewater Impact Assessment	
A	APPENI	DIX D -	Water Impact Assessment	
P	APPENI	DIX E -	Confirmation of Telecom Supply	
1	APPENI	DIX F -	Confirmation of Power Supply	



1. Scope

Paterson Pitts Limited Partnership (PPLP) has been engaged by New Zealand Cherry Corp (Leyser) L.P. (NZ Cherry Corp) to provide an infrastructure report to support a private plan change request for a Rural Residential development at 144 Ripponvale Road, Cromwell. The private plan change seeks to re-zone approximately 130 ha of a 243ha site for a Rural Residential development.

Up to 160 dwelling units are planned, ranging from 0.2ha to 3 ha minimum lot size.

This report covers the availability of the following infrastructure elements:

- Wastewater
- Water Supply Potable and Firefighting
- Network Utility Services (electricity and telecommunications)
- Stormwater disposal from hardstand and roading. Please refer to the Geosolve Flood Hazard Report for the overall management of stormwater discharge off the site.

This report is to be read in conjunction with the Geotechnical and Flood Hazard Reports prepared by Geosolve Ltd in support of the plan change request and with the proposed structure plan for the development.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 Stormwater

Soakage tests and test pitting show the site is subject to highly variable sub soil conditions and permeabilities (soakage rates). However, the large size of the allotments planned means that the normal methods of stormwater disposal for a rural subdivision will be satisfactory. i.e.

- Road side drains (water tables) and grassed swales discharging to rock sump soak pits and/or natural drainage paths.
- Household roof and hardstand runoff will discharge to ground within each allotment by a variety of methods using Low Impact Urban Design and Development (LIUDD) principles.

2.2 Wastewater

It is proposed to connect the development to the Cromwell wastewater reticulation. Computer modelling of the Cromwell Wastewater reticulation by Mott MacDonald NZ Ltd shows that the Development will not have a detrimental effect on the existing network.

2.3 Water Supply

It is proposed to connect the development to the Cromwell water reticulation. Computer modelling of the Cromwell water reticulation by Mott MacDonald NZ Ltd shows that the development will not have a detrimental effect on the existing network.



2.4 Network Utility Services

Chorus New Zealand Ltd have confirmed that a suitable telecommunications (fibre) supply can be made available to the proposed development.

Aurora Energy Ltd have confirmed that it can make a power supply available to the development.

3. Stormwater

Test pits and soakage (permeability) tests have been undertaken over the site. See attached location plan, test pit logs and soakage test results.

Generally the site is overlain with good topsoil of depths varying between 0.20 and 0.30m.

Underneath the topsoil layer is usually a silty layer with traces of fine sands. This material generally has reasonable plasticity and can be quite compact when dry.

The foundation material is generally gravel based. This varies from alluvial outwash gravels, fairly permeable in nature, to very silty colluvial gravels with low to very low permeability. In all cases the gravels have low cohesion and would fret considerably when exposed to the elements.

In one case, (test pit 5), silts were found to underly the gravels at a depth of 1.4m.

Test pits generally had a terminal depth of between 2.0m and 2.7m.

Soakage:

Soakage results varied considerably, with infiltration rates beginning between 94mm/hr and 2000mm/hr. The average infiltration rate across the 9 tests was 584m/hr.

HIRDS gives a 1 in 20 year intensity of 56mm/hr (9.3mm depth in 10 minutes) and an 89mm/hr (14.8mm in 10 minutes) for 1 in 100 intensity (1%AEP).

The maximum hardstand (roof, paving, access roads) per lot will be approximately 1000m^2 . The area required to dispose of run off for this amount of hardstand in a 1 in 100 year (1% AEP) rainfall event is, on average $89/(584-89) \times 1000\text{m}^2 = 180\text{m}^2$.

Given the highly variable nature of the sub soil permeability, traditional kerb and channelling of roads into mud tanks is not recommended and is also not in keeping with the rural nature of the proposed development.

Stormwater discharge from road carriageways can be disposed of by the usual methods for rural roads i.e. side drains (water tables) and grassed swales discharging into natural drainage paths and/or rural rock sumps.

Low impact urban design and development (LIUDD) principles are proposed for the management of stormwater run-off from servicing the development for access roading and for roof / hardstand / driveways within allotments. The proposed lots are large rural properties (0.2ha to 3.0ha), so there

PATERSONPITTSGROUP

is ample area available for discharge of stormwater to ground entirely within each lot by a variety of methods, or combination thereof:

- Soak pits
- Attenuation using storage tanks with irrigation discharge to garden and lawns
- Discharge to natural drainage paths
- Direct to discharge to ground surface using dripper and soakage lines over the wider property (irrigation).

Total hardstand from roading, driveways, dwellings etc is expected to be approximately 5% of the total area of the site and will only have a marginal effect on overall peak flood flows off the site, which the Geosolve Flood Hazard Report addresses.

4. Wastewater

A Wastewater Assessment has been commissioned from Council's computer network modellers, Mott MacDonald. See Appendix C.

This concluded that the downstream pipework reticulation does have sufficient capacity to cope with the wastewater flows from the development.

There are three options outlined in the report to connect the Cromwell reticulation:

- The development discharges into a pump station which pumps into the Cromwell reticulation via the existing 50mm rising main in Ripponvale Road.
- As above, but a new 50mm rising main is constructed down Ripponvale Road.
- A new 150mm gravity only connection is constructed down Ripponvale Road

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 within activity area Rural Lifestyle 1 & 2 and a "distributed" pumped supply for the larger lots on the higher parts of the site within activity areas Rural Lifestyle 3,4 and 5.

"Distributed" systems utilize individual household wet wells with macerating pumps, pumping into a small diameter common rising main. Such systems are now very common and enable reticulated sewage to difficult sites, no matter the terrain, slope, environmental sensitivities or complex topography. It is possible that the entire development will be serviced by a "distributed" scheme.

It may also be feasible for some of the larger, more remote lots in activity area Rural Lifestyle 5 to dispose of wastewater on-site, subject to meeting the requirements of AS/NZS1547:2012.

Final design decisions on all the above matters will be resolved at the subsequent subdivision stage.



5. Water Supply

A Water Impact Assessment has been commissioned from Mott MacDonald NZ Ltd, see **Appendix D**. Computer modelling shows that the development can be adequately serviced without adversely affecting the existing Cromwell Town Network reticulation.

The development will need to be connected to the Cromwell reticulation by a new 150mm main along Ripponvale Road. To fully service the development above reduced level 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 within activity area Rural Lifestyle 1 & 2 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. The larger lots within activity areas Rural Lifestyle 3-5 in the upper parts of the site can be serviced to a rural supply standard with firefighting to FENZ's requirements for a rural dwelling ie. 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 a dwelling.

Final design decisions on the configuration of the water reticulation within the development will be made at the subsequent subdivision stage.

6. Network Utility Services

6.1 Telecommunications

Chorus New Zealand Ltd have confirmed that a suitable Air Blown Fibre (ABF) reticulation can be supplied to the proposed development. See **Appendix E**.

Individual home owners will also have the alternative option of the cellular network and several long-distance wi-fi providers for their telecommunications and computer media service.

6.2 Power

There are three possible options for a power supply to the development:

- An Aurora Energy Ltd supply with Aurora owning the subdivision infrastructure.
- "An embedded" supply from an alternative provider connected to a dedicated feeder off Aurora's Zone substation or a feed off Aurora's distribution network, with the alternative provider owning the subdivision infrastructure.
- An independent supply from an alternative provider from a Grid Exit Point (GXP) off the Transpower Cromwell substation, with the alternative provider owning the subdivision infrastructure.

Aurora Energy Ltd have confirmed that a supply can be made available from its distribution network with Aurora owning the subdivision infrastructure. Please refer to the attached supply availability letter. **Appendix F.**

C2528 Infrastructure Report 6 of 6 New Zealand Cherry Corp

PATERSONPITTSGROUP

7. Conclusion

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.

Peter L Dymock Principal, B.Sc, Dip Mgt, R.P. Surv, MNZIS, CSNZ Paterson Pitts Limited Partnership (Cromwell)



APPENDIX A

Location Plan of Test Pits & Test Pit Logs



Ground 0.00

Topsoil

compact

-0.30

Compact silts.

Mid plasticity

-1.00

Colluvium silty

broken <200mm



Ground

0.00

Topsoil

-0.20

Sandy silts

compact mid plasticity

-0.70

Otwash and colluvial gravels

compact broken

sandy silty

<200mm



Ground 0.00

Topsoil,

-0.30

Fine silts Low plasticity moist compact

-1.25

Outwash & colluvial gravels

Very Silty

<150mm



Ground

0.00

Topsoil

-0.25

Outwash & colluvial gravels

Compact Broken

Dry

free running

Quite sandy

<200mm



Topsoil

-0.30

Silty colluvium

moist
compact

-1.00

Silty allivium
compact

-1.40

Silts
compact

moist
moist
moist
moist
moist



0.00 Ground Topsoil -0.30 Silts compact -0.60 silty alluvium-1.80 gravels. among silts Compact -2.10 silty gravels -2.40



Ground 0.00
Topsoil

-0.30

Very silty gravels

compact

Poor binding

Sily lenses



0.00 Ground Topsoil -0.25 Sandy silts low plasticity -0.60 Sandy colluvial gravels with some silt poor cohesion -2.10



Ground 0.00

Topsoil

-0.25

sandy silts mid plasticity

-0.65

sandy colluvium, some silt.

poor cohesion





APPENDIX B

Soakage Tests, Infiltration Calculations & Rainfall Intensity Calculations

Length.				- 22	_		C2228	_	_		
The state of the s	2	1.4					07070				
Width 0.7	7.										
T											
Depth	o So O	dTime (s)		Soakage (I/s)		1/s/m ²					
	0 -0.07	7 240		-0.3		-0.2					
240 0.05	5 -0.07	180		-0.4		-03					
420 0.1	1 -0.07	300		-0.2		- 0.0					
720 0.15	5 -0.07			-0.2		-0.4					
1140 0.2	2		Average	-0.27		-0 19					
	0.28	1140		00		0.10		iu l	Intiltration Rate	632	
				0.2		0.7	0.2 For time period				mm/hr
									~		
								Av	Average across all tests:	Il tests:	5258
										284	584 mm/hr
Area to dr	Area to drain 1000m3 hardstand (1 in 100m)	hardstand	(1 in 100, r								
TC 10		יומותפוות	KOOT III T								
IC = TO MIN	u.	Area required	quired	164							
		(takes into account incident rain)	account in	cident rain)							
										200001000	
1 in 100 (F	1 in 100 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100))	- 2100))						C	2007	total volume	
14.8	14.8 mm in 10 minutes		89mm/hr		0-2 78Civ			area mz	1000	12.0 m3	m3
		T			ALOUAL			runoff	8.0	rate per second	puo
1 in 20 (RC	1 in 20 (RCPE 0 2081 - 2100))	210011		4	A = 0/2./8iC		0.060626 ha	depth	0.015	20	20 1/s
20	0 3 mm in 10 mintos	T	"				606.2566	seconds	009		
0.0	11 07 111 111111		opmm/nr		0.096351 ha	g		1 in	1 in 100 runoff	runoff per m2 per s	0.07 1/s/m2
					919.3538			1 in 20		runoff per m2 per s	0.012 I/s/m2
Soakpit Base =		0 785300 22	24						1 in 100	0	
g	@ 2m deen	19 63/195 27						Soakage Capacity		172.2364 m2	
7 0 29 000	222	10.00400		45 deg angle influence	nence			metres of road	8.611822	822 17.223644 two sided	two cided
		3.445		Soakage Rate 1/s	Ŋ			(20m carriageway)	\dagger		nanic Own
		3.445	-	check				202	(6)		
									1 in 20		
								Soakage Capacity		277.8007 m2	
								metres of road	13.89004	304 27.780071 two sided	two sided
								(20m carriageway)		1	



														2000	mm/hr					total volume	12 m3	rate per second	3/102		runoff per m2 per s 0.02 1/s/m2			545.4154 m2	27.27077 54.54154 two sided			0	879.7022 m2	8511 87.97022 two sided	↓
														Infiltration Rate							area m2 1000		0	ls	1 in 100	1 in 20 runof		Soakage Capacity 545.4	metres of road 27.2.	(20m carriageway)		1 in 20	Soakage Capacity 879.7		(20m carriageway)
C2528															For time period						J. B.	מ	0.060626 ha de	606.2566 se				S	Ē	(2)			So	JU U	(20
2			(1/s) 1/s/m²	-2.3	-1.2													4/				Q=2.78CiA	A = 0/2.78iC		0.096351 ha	919.3538			45 deg angle influence	ate I/s					
Test Pit	1.4		s) Soakage (I/s)	30	09	50	70	06	06	130	140	150	Average			(1 in 100vr)	Area required	ייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייי	(takes into account incident rain)			89mm/hr			56mm/hr		38 m2				check				
Area	2	0.7			0.05 -0.07	0.1 -0.07	0.15 -0.07	-0.07	0.25 -0.07	0.3 -0.07 1			0.45	0.63		Area to drain 1000m3 hardstand (1 in 100vr)	min		(takes in	1 in 100 (RCDE 0 2001	1002 - 2001	14.0 IIIIII III TO MINUTES		1 In 20 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100))	9.3 mm in 10 minutes		0.785398 m2	2m deen	ליוו מככל	10.90	10.908				
Pit Dimensions	Length	Width	Time (s) Depth			06							810 0.			Area to	TC = 10 min			1 in 100	75	77) 07 ULT			Soakpit Base =	Fffective snakage @	a name a man in						

																					/s/m2	/s/m2										
												mm/hr				O J	n3	puo	/s		0.02 I/s/m2	0.012 I/s/m2			wo sided					wo sided		
											1077	-				total volume	12 m3	rate per second	20 1/s		n2 per s	n2 per s		m2	14.68426 29.36852 two sided				m2	47.36858 two sided		
											Rate										runoff per m2 per s	runoff per m2 per s	1 in 100	293.6852 m2	14.68426			1 in 20	473.6858 m2	23.68429		
											Infiltration Rate						1000	0.8	0.015	009	1 in 100	1 in 20		apacity	road	ageway)			apacity	road	ageway)	
																	area m2	runoff	depth	seconds				Soakage Capacity	metres of road	(20m carriageway)			Soakage Capacity	metres of road	(20m carriageway)	
														1					-													
C2528												e period							0.060626 ha	999												
				-0.4	-0.6	-0.4	-0.3	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	34	0.3 For time period							0.0606	606.2566												
3			1/s/m ²	우	٩	0-	Q.	Q	9	우	-0.34	0						đ	8iC		l ha	8										
,																		Q=2.78CiA	A = 0/2.78iC		0.096351	919.3538			fluence	s/I						
Test Pit			Soakage (I/s)	-0.6	-0.8	9.0-	-0.5	-0.3	-0.3	-0.3	-0.48	0.4		06	ident rain)										45 deg angle influence	Soakage Rate	check					
											Average		(1 in 100yr)	quired	account inc			89mm/hr			56mm/hr			m2								
Area	1.4		dTime (s)	120	90	120	150	210	240	240		1170	hardstand	Area required	(takes into account incident rain)		- 2100))	Г		.2100))				0.785398 m2	19.63495 m2	5.874	5.874					
			dVolume	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07		0.49	Area to drain 1000m3 hardstand (1 in 100yr)	ے			1 in 100 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100))	14.8 mm in 10 minutes		1 in 20 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100))	9.3 mm in 10 minutes				m deep							
sions	2	0.7	Depth	0	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.2	0.25	0.3	0.35		Area to dr	TC = 10 min			1 in 100 (R	14.8		1 in 20 (RC	9.3			.se =	Effective soakage @ 2m deep							
Pit Dimensions	Length	Width	Time (s)	0	120	210	330	480	069	930	1170													Soakpit Base =	Effective s							

.

1.4	Pit Dimensions	ons		Area		Tect Dit	-		f					
Figure States collapsed in making further soakage analysis unrefiable. Scalege (I/s) 1/s/m²	ength	2				1 1 1 1 1 1	4		J	2528				
Metalog Macro Ma	Vidth	0.7		1.4		10.00								
Marcage 1/5/m²						sides collapse	ed in making fu.	ther soak	age analysis	unreliable.				
Average U/S 100			Wolume	dTime (c)		1 1 1								
120 120 06 06 004	9	1	011000			Soakage (I/s)	<u> </u>	:/m²						
Average -0.3 -0.2	5	Э	-0.07		٠	, O	9	-0.4			-			
Aretage -0.46 -0.38	120	0.05	-0.07			0-	3	0.0						
1.14 330 0.4 0.3 Fortime period 1.10	330	0.1			Average	-0.46) (0	-0.2						
Area required 1 in 100yr) Area required Area req			0.14		1	0		2000			Infiltra	tion Rate	1091	
Area required 89						5		C.0	or time per	po			Ē	m/hr
Area required 89	A	rea to drain	n 1000m3	hardstand	(1 in 100v	1								
(takes into account incident rain) Composition Compo	ř	C = 10 min		Area re	quired									
10 minutes 89mm/hr Q=2.78CiA 10066626 ha 1006 12 13 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15				(takes into	account in									
10 minutes 89mm/hr 24.2.78C/A 24.2.78C/A 24.2.200) 24.2.78C/A 24.2.200) 24.2.78C/A 24.2.278C/A 24.2.2828 m2 24.2.27828 m2 24.2.278						בותכוור ומווו)								
A = Q/2.78CiA D=	1	in 100 (RCF	26.0 2081	- 210011									total volume	
12 minutes 89mm/hr Q=2.78CiA A = Q/2.78iC 0.060626 ha depth 0.015 Condition 0.015 Condi		140		T						in the second		CC	**	
National State Second A = 0/2.78iC 0.060626 ha depth 0.015 0.0		14.6 II	III III III		89mm/hr		Q=2.78CiA			5	1	3	17 m	
Seconds Seco	-						0.01.01.0				-	0.8	rate per secor	p
10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 606.2566 seconds 600	1	in 20 (RCP6	5.0 2081 - 7	210011			A - 4/2./81C	o	.060626 ha			115	20 1/s	
1		0 3 3	m in 10 m		.,			9	06.2566	Se		00		
0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 20 runoff per m2 per s 0 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence Soakage Rate //s 1 in 100 1 in 100 1 in 100 5.950 Soakage Rate //s Check (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 5.950 Check Check 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 8.950 Check Check 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 8.950 Check Check 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 8.950 Check Check Check 23.99188 47.98376 m2 1 in 20 1 in 20 <td< td=""><td></td><td>5.0</td><td>OT III III</td><td></td><td>opmm/hr</td><td></td><td>0.096351 ha</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1 in 10</td><td>:T</td><td></td><td></td></td<>		5.0	OT III III		opmm/hr		0.096351 ha				1 in 10	:T		
0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 20 1 in 100 1 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence Soakage Capacity 297.4993 m2 1 5.950 Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 1 5.950 Check 1 in 20 1 1 6.950 Check 1 in 20 1 1 8.950 Soakage Capacity 479.8376 m2 1 9 Metres of road 23.99188 47.98376 two s 1							919,3538				TILL TOO		m2 per s	0.02 I/s/m2
0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence 5.950 Soakage Capacity 297.4993 m2 10.0100 10.03495 m2			_								1 in 20	runoff per	m2 per s	0.012 I/s/m2
19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence Soakage Capacity 297.4993 5.950 Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) 14.87497 5.950 check 10.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 23.99188 10.00 10.00 10.00	skpit Base	H		0.785398 r	n2							1 in 100		
5.950 Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) 5.950 check (20m carriageway) (20m carriageway) (20m carriageway) (20m carriageway) (20m carriageway)	ective soak	kage @ 2m	\vdash	19.63495 r		45 deg angle in	fluoros			S	akage Capacity	297.4993	m2	
check (20m carriageway) check 1 in 20 Soakage Capacity 479.8376 metres of road 23.99188 (20m carriageway)			\dagger	5 050		ישרב מווקוב ווו	indence.			m	etres of road	14.87497	29.74993 twi	cided
Check Soakage Capacity metres of road (20m carriageway)				0.00		soakage Kate	1/2		-)()	m carriageway			Since
				5.950		check					- carriageway)			
												1 in 20		
										So	akage Capacity	479.8376	m2	
										me	tres of road	23.99188	47.98376 two	sided
										(20	m carriageway)			

Pit Dimensions		Area		Test Pit	2		C2528					
Length 2		1.4										
Width 0.7												
Time (s) Depth	dVolume	dTime (s)		Soakage (I/s)	1/s/m ₂							
0 0	0.028	120		-0.2		-0.2						
120 0.02	2 -0.07	810		-0.1		-0.1						
930 0.07	7 -0.028	009		0.0		0.0						
1530 0.09	•		Average	-0.12		-0.09			Infiltration Rate	Rate	212	
	0.126	1530		0.1		0.1 For time period	period				±	mm/hr
Area to dra	Area to drain 1000m3 hardstand (1 in 100yr)	3 hardstand	(1 in 100y	ر.								
TC = 10 min	Ë	Arear	Area required	725								
		(takes into	account in	(takes into account incident rain)								
											total volume	
1 in 100 (R	1 in 100 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100))	1-2100))						area m2	1000		12 m3	~
14.8	14.8 mm in 10 minutes	minutes	89mm/hr		Q=2.78CiA			runoff	0.8		rate per second	þ
					A = Q/2.78iC	0.060626 ha	5 ha	depth	0.015		20 1/s	
1 in 20 (RC	1 in 20 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100))	- 2100))				606.2566	2	seconds	009			
9.3	9.3 mm in 10 minutes	minutes	56mm/hr		0.096351 ha				1 in 100	runoff per m2 per s	m2 per s	0.02 I/s/m2
					919.3538				1 in 20	runoff per m2 per s	m2 per s	0.012 I/s/m2
										1 in 100		
Soakpit Base =		0.785398 m2	, m2					Soakage Capacity	apacity	57.74986 m2	m2	
Effective soakage @ 2m deep	2m deep	19.63495 m2	m2	45 deg angle influence	nfluence			metres of road	road	2.887493	2.887493 5.774986 two sided	o sided
		1.155		Soakage Rate	1/s			(20m carriageway)	ageway)			
		1.155		check								
										1 in 20		
								Soakage Capacity	apacity	93.14494 m2	m2	
								metres of road	road	4.657247	4.657247 9.314494 two sided	o sided
								(20m carriageway)	ageway)			
						-						
	-				,		***************************************					

2.8	1.06 1.06	Pit Dimensions	sions		Area		Test Pit	9		C2E30						
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.05 0.0588 660 -0.1 0.00	ength	2.8	∞	1.9(9				07070						
pth dVolume fflme (s) Soakage (l/s) l/s/m² 0.038 −0.038 −6.0 −0.0 −	Public Ovcolume Grime (s) Soakage (l/s) Ovcolume Grime (s) Ovcolume Grime (s) Ovcolume Ovc	Vidth	0.7	7												
10 0.00588 2.00392 3.90 0.01 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00588 0.00583 0.00583 0.00588 0.00583 0.005	10 0.0058 2.0032 2.60 -0.1 0.00 0.0058 0.0032		4400	17.4	<u> </u>											
10 0.0058 660 0.01 0.00 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.004 0.005 0.004 0.004 0.005 0.004 0.004 0.005 0.004 0.005 0.004 0.005 0.004 0.005 0.004 0.005 0.0	0.02		undan	6		_	Soakage (I/s)	l/s/n	m ²							
10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	0.039 3.90 3.90 -0.1 -0.1 0.00	0				0	-0.1		0.0							
0.05 0.0392 600 0.01 0.06 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.00	10.05 0.0392 600 -0.1 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.06 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.06 0.04 0.06 0.04 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06 0.06	099				0	-0.1		- C							
10.07 Average -0.08 -0.04 Average -0.08	1007 Average -0.08 -0.04	1050				0	-0.1		1.0							
133 1650 1	0.1372 1650 0.1 0.0 For time period Infiltration Rate 153 Infiltration Rate 15	1650				Average	-0.08	~	200							
as to drain 1000m3 hardstand (1 in 100yr) = 10 min Area required 1397	State Color Colo			0.1372			0		1000	1		Infiltratio	n Rate	153		
100	Table Tabl								20.0	rime period					nm/hr	
1397 Area required 1397	100	-	Area to dr	ain 1000m3	hardstand	1 (1 in 100v	1									
(Takes into account incident rain) (Takes incident rain) (Ta	(takes into account incident rain) (takes into account rain) (takes into account rain) (takes into account rain)		TC = 10 mi	i	Arear	equired										
14.8 mm in 10 minutes 89mm/hr (CPG.0 2081 - 2100)) 14.8 mm in 10 minutes 89mm/hr (CPG.0 2081 - 2100)) 15.0 (RCPG.0 2081 - 2100)) 16.0 (RCPG.0 2081 - 2100)) 17.0 (RCPG.0 2081 - 2100)) 18.0 min 10 minutes S6mm/hr (CPG.0 20826 ha base (CPG.0 20826 ha base)) 18.0 (RCPG.0 2081 - 2100)) 19.3538 m in 10 minutes S6mm/hr (CPG.0 2083) ha base (CPG.0 2083) 19.3538 m in 10 minutes S6mm/hr (CPG.0 2083) ha base (CPG.0 2083) ha base (CPG.0 2083) ha base (CPG.0 2083) ha had been as a solid and the second seco	14.8 mm in 10 minutes 89mm/hr 1.2 minutes 80mm/hr 1.2 minutes 80				(takes into	account in	Cident rain)					-				
100 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100) 212 M3 M3 M4 M9 M9 M9 M9 M9 M9 M9	1.00 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100) 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 2					o according to	Cident Ianni									
14.8 mm in 10 minutes 89mm/hr Q=2.78CiA 0.060626 ha runoff 0.0 12 m3 1.20 (RCPc.0.2081 - 2100)) 2.006625 ha 606.2566 seconds 600 10 l/s 20 l/s 9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 606.2566 seconds 600 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 20 l/s 9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56mm/hr 919.3538 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 0 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 0 <t< td=""><td> 14.8 mm in 10 minutes 89mm/hr 0.2-7.78i.q 1.0060626 ha 1.000f 1.0000f 1.0000f 1.0000f 1.0000f 1.0000f 1.0000f 1.0000f 1.0000f 1.0000f 1.0000f</td><td></td><td>1 in 100 (R</td><td>1CP6.0 2081</td><td>- 210011</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>total volum</td><td>a)</td><td></td></t<>	14.8 mm in 10 minutes 89mm/hr 0.2-7.78i.q 1.0060626 ha 1.000f 1.0000f		1 in 100 (R	1CP6.0 2081	- 210011									total volum	a)	
Column C	Compact Comp		1/1 8	mm in 10 a	1,000	,					area m2	1000		12 [n3	
20 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100]) A = Q/2.78iC 0.060626 a depth 0.015 20 Vs 2	3.20 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100]) A = Q/2.78iC 0.060626 ha depth 0.015 Coll/s 20 /s 9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 606.2566 seconds 600 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 20 /s ge @ 2m deep 1963495 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 100 1 in 20 2 in 20		0.11	107 111 111111	Sannin	samm/nr		Q=2.78CiA			runoff	0.8		ate ner cer	pud	
9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56mm/hr 606.2566 seconds 600 20 / 35 / 35 / 35 / 35 / 35 / 35 / 35 / 3	9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56mm/hr 606.2566 seconds 600 20 / ps 9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 20 / ps 9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56m/hr 919.3538 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 0 runoff per		20,00	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				A = 0/2.78iC	0.0	50626 ha	depth	0.015		100	51.5	
9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 10 min 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 11 no 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 11 no 10 moff per m2 per s 0 11 no 10 per s 11 no 1	9.3 mm in 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 0.096391 ha		1 111 20 (RC	. Po.U 2U81 -	2100])				909	.2566	caronde	009		2	0	
Soakage Capacity 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 100 2 in 2 per x	1 in 100		9.3	mm in 10 n	ninutes	56mm/hr		0.096351 ha				1 : 100				
ge @ 2m deep 10.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 100 1 in 2499 two 100 1 in 200 1 in 20	ge @ 2m deep 10.785398 m2 Lin 100 Lunoff per m2 per s ge @ 2m deep 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 100 1 in 20 1							919 3538				007 111 7	runont per r	nz per s	0.02 1/s/	m2
ge @ 2m deep 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence 10.002 10.033 2.082495 m2 10.02495 m2 10.020 m2 10.02495 m2	ge @ 2m deep 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence 10.00 10.033 2.082495 m2 10.02495 m2 10.020 m2 10.02495 m2							00000				1 in 20	runoff per n	n2 per s	0.012 1/s/	,m2
ge @ 2m deep 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence Metres of road 2.082495 0.833 Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 0.833 check 1 in 20 1 in 20 0.833 check 50akage Capacity 67.17726 m 1 in 20 20akage Capacity 67.17726 m 2 (20m carriageway) 3.358863 G	ge @ 2m deep 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence Soakage Capacity 41.6499 metres of road 2.082495 0.833 Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 check Soakage Capacity 67.17726 m metres of road 3.358863 G (20m carriageway) 3.358863 G	skpit Base	e ==		0.785398	m2							1 in 100			
0.833 Soakage Rate /s (20m carriageway) 2.082495 0.833 check 1 in 20 0.833 check 50akage Capacity 67.17726 metres of road 3.358863 67.27726	4.3 deg drigle Influence metres of road 2.082495 0.833 Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 0.833 check 1 in 20 50akage Capacity 67.17726 m metres of road 3.358863 G (20m carriageway) 3.358863 G	ective so	akage @ 2	m deen	19 63/195		AE don out to				Soakage C	apacity.	41.6499 r	n2		
Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 check 1 in 20 1 in 20 metres of road 3.358863 6 67.17726 m (20m carriageway) 3.358863 6	Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) In 20 check 1 in 20 1 in 20 metres of road 3.358863 67.17726 metres of road 3.358863 6 (20m carriageway) 3.358863 6			2	0.00		45 deg angle in	Muence			metres of	road	2.082495	4.16499	No sided	
check 1 in 20 Soakage Capacity 67.17726 metres of road 3.358863 (20m carriageway)	check (20m carriageway)				0.833			l/s			(70m carri	(veweei			200	
1 in 20 67.17726 3.358863	1 in 20 67.17726 3.358863				0.833		check					decay)				
67.17726	67.17726												1 in 20			
3.358863	3.358863										Soakage C.	apacity	67.17726 n	27		
											metres of	road	3.358863	6.717726 tv	vo sided	
											(20m carri	ageway)				

			T	T															/m2	/m2										
										mm/hr				е	m3	puo	s/I		0.02 I/s/m2	0.012 I/s/m2			two sided					two sided		
									94					total volume	12 m3	rate per second	20 1/s		m2 per s	m2 per s		. m2	2.566661 two sided				, m2	2.069888 4.139775 two sided		
									Rate										runoff per m2 per s	runoff per m2 per s	1 in 100	25.66661 m2	1.28333			1 in 20	41.39775 m2	2.069888		
									Infiltration Rate						1000	0.8	0.015	009	1 in 100	1 in 20		apacity	road	ageway)			apacity	road	iageway)	
															area m2	runoff	depth	seconds				Soakage Capacity	metres of road	(20m carriageway)			Soakage Capacity	metres of road	(20m carriageway)	*
C2528										period							26 ha	99												
								0		0.0 For time period							0.060626 ha	606.2566												
7				1/s/m²	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.03	0.0						.78CiA	2/2.78iC		51 ha	.3538										
							0	0	10	0						Q=2.78	A = Q/2		0.096351 ha	919.35			influence	s/I/s						
Test Pit				Soakage (I/s)	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.0-	0.0	,	17391	(takes into account incident rain)										45 deg angle influence	Soakage Rate 1/s	check					
									Average		(1 in 100yr	quired	account in			89mm/hr			56mm/hr			m2	m2							
Area	1.68			dTime (s)	420	360	420	330		1530	Area to drain 1000m3 hardstand (1 in 100yr)	Area required	(takes into		(- 2100)	minutes		- 2100))	minutes			0.785398 m2	19.63495 m2	0.513	0.513					
				dVolume	-0.0336	-0.0168	-0.0168	0		0.0672	ain 1000m3	L			1 in 100 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100))	14.8 mm in 10 minutes		1 in 20 (RCP6.0 2081 - 2100))	9.3 mm in 10 minutes				@ 2m deep							
ions	2.4	0.7		Depth	0	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.04		Area to dra	TC = 10 min			1 in 100 (R	14.8		1 in 20 (RC	9.3			= 65	oakage @ 2							
Pit Dimensions	Length	Width		Time (s)	0	420	780	1200	1530													Soaknit Base =	Effective soakage							

.

.

13 12 12 12 12 12 12 12			Area	_	T.c.+ Dit	(
150 Soakage (l/s) l/s/m²	4		- 1		ובאו אונ	×			C2528					
150 Soakage (I/s) I/s/m²	_+		2.28	8										
150														
150 Soakee (1/s) 1/s/m² 180														
150 -0.6 -0.3 -0.2 -		융	dTime (s)		Soakage (I/s)		1/s/m ²							
300 -0.4 -0.2 -			150	_	-0.6		-0.3							
270 -0.4 -0.2 -0.2 -0.4 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.16 -0.3 -0.16 -0.3 -0.16 -0.3 -0.16 -0.3 -0.16 -0.3					-0.4		-0.2							
330 -0.3 -0.2 -0.1 -0.2 -0.3 -0.2 -0.3 -					-0.4		-0.2							
Semm/hr Cooker					-0.3		-0.2							
Accrage -0.2 -0.1	_				-0.2		-0.1							
Average -0.36 -0.16	-	-0.114			-0.2		-0.1							
220 0.3 0.1 For time period	6			Average	-0.36		-0.16				In Cilement			
Introduction Intr	_	0.6612			0.3		0.1	Tortimo a	10.00		Inflittratio	п кате	470	
100 1 in 100 1 i							7.0	or unite p	eriod					mm/hr
Into account incident rain 233	ן וס	in 1000m3	hardstand	(1 in 100y	1									
	.≔	_	Area re	equired										
S9mm/hr Q=2.78CiA Interpretation Interpretation	-		(takes into	account in	cident rain)									
10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	 -				,									
Semm/hr A = 0/2.78CiA D.06626 ha A = 0.015 D.00 D.015 D.	¥ ⊱	7P6.0 2081	-2100))										total volum	a
Seconda A = 0/2.78 C 0.060626 ha depth 0.015 20 /s	1-3	mm in 10 m	initec	20mm/hr		0.000				area m2	1000		12	m3
A = Q/2.78iC 0.060626 ha depth 0.015 xeconds 600 xeconds 600	-+-		minutes	111/111111/1111		U=2./8CIA				runoff	0.8		rate per sec	puo
56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 606.2566 seconds 600 20.05 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 0 199.3538 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 0 198 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 100 1 in 100 195 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 100 1 in 100 195 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 100 1 in 100 195 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 100 1 in 100 195 m2 check 1 in 100 1 in 100 196 m2 1 in 100 1 in 100 1 in 100 196 m2 1 in 100 1 in 100 1 in 100 196 m2 1 in 100 1 in 100 1 in 100 196 m2 1 in 100 1 in 100 1 in 100 196 m2 1 in 100 1 in 100 1 in 100 197 m2 1 in 100 1 in 100 1 in 100 198 m2 1 in 100 1 in 100 1 in 100 198 m2 1 in 100 1 in 100	⊣ ક				-	A = Q/2.78iC		0.060626	ha	depth	0.015		20	/c
10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 1 in 100 runoff per m2 per s 1 in 20 runoff per m2 per s 0.785398 m2 1 in 100 runoff per s	L	6.0 2081 -						606.2566		seconds	009		04	0
0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 20 runoff per m2 per s 0 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence Soakage Capacity 128.2463 m2 12.82463 m2 2.565 Soakage Rate I/s (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 1 in 20 2.565 check 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 8 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 9 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 10 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 10 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 10 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 1 in 20 10 1 in 20 10 1 in 20	-1	mm in 10 r		56mm/hr		0.096351 h	E E				1 in 100			
0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence 1 in 100 1 in 20 2 in 2						919.3538					1 III 100	runon per	nz per s	0.02 I/s/m2
0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence Soakage Capacity 128.2463 r 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence metres of road 6.412316 2.565 check (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 2.567 Soakage Capacity 206.8489 r 1 in 20 metres of road 10.34245 1 in 20 metres of road 10.34245											77 ULT	runom per	n2 per s	0.012 I/s/m2
19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence Soakage Capacity 128.2463 raction of the control of the cont			0.785398	m2								OOT UIT		
2.565 Soakage Rate 1/s (20m carriageway) 6.412316 2.565 check (20m carriageway) 1 in 20 2.565 check 1 in 20 2.566 check 1 in 20 2.567 check 1 in 20 2.568 Capacity 206.8489 in 204.34245	15	n deep	19.63495	m2	45 deg angle int	6110000				Soakage (apacity	128.2463	m2	
Soakage Kate I/S (20m carriageway) Check 1 in 20 Soakage Capacity 206.8489 Metres of road 10.34245 (20m carriageway)	\vdash	-	י בעב		to deg angle III	וחבוורב				metres of	road	6.412316	12.82463 t	wo sided
check 1 in 20 Soakage Capacity 206.8489 metres of road 10.34245 (20m carriageway)	\perp		2.202		ge Kate	s/ı				(20m carr	iageway)			
1 in 20 206.8489 10.34245			2.565		check									
206.8489	- 1											1 in 20		
10.34245	- 1									Soakage C	apacity	206.8489	n2	
										metres of	road	10.34245	20.68489 t	wo sided
	- 1	+								(20m carr	ageway)			
								-						

Figure 1	Pit Dimensions	SI	Area		Test Pit	6		C2528						
12 12 12 12 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	Length	2.1	2.52											
All time (s) Soakage (l/s) V/s/m² Soakage Ca Soakag	Width	1.2												
Continue Continue								Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna						
156 90 -0.8 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.2 -0.					Soakage (I/s)	1/s/m _z								
26 160 -0.8 -0.3 26 230 -0.5 -0.2 26 320 -0.4 -0.2 26 300 -0.4 -0.2 26 -1410 -0.5 -0.2 26 -1410 -0.5 -0.2 26 -1410 -0.5 -0.2 16 -1920 -0.4 -0.2 16 -1920 -0.4 -0.2 16 -1920 -0.4 -0.2 36 -1410 -0.54 -0.2 36 -1410 -0.54 -0.2 36 -1.24 -0.2 -0.2 36 -1.24 0.2 -0.2 38 -1.24 0.2 -0.2 38 -1.24 0.2 -0.2 38 -1.24 0.2 -0.2 38 -1.24 0.2 -0.2 38 -1.24 0.2 -1.24 38	0				-0.8		-0.3							
26 230 -0.5 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2	06				-0.8		-0.3							
26	250				-0.5		-0.2							
26 300 -0.4 -0.2 Condition -0.4 -0.2 Condition Condition -0.3 -0.1 Condition	480				-0.5		-0.2							
04 1770 -0.3 -0.1 Co.2	750				-0.4		-0.2							
56 -1410 -0.5 -0.2 -0.2 Cond	1050				-0.3		-0.1							
16 -1920 -0.4 -0.2 36 2820 -0.54 -0.21 Cot time period Cot time period m3 hardstand (1 in 100yr) Area required 194 Cot time period Cot time period stakes into account incident rain) (takes into account incident rain) Cot time period Cot time period l0 minutes 89mm/hr Q=2.78CiA Cot time period Cot time period l0 minutes 89mm/hr A = Q/2.78iC Cot	1410				-0.5		-0.2							
36 2820 Average -0.54 -0.21	1920				-0.4		-0.2							
36 2820 0.4 0.2 For time period	2820	0.43		Average	-0.54	T	0.21			Infiltration Rate	Rate	549		
M3 hardstand 1 in 100yr)		1.08			0.4		0.2 For time	period					mm/hr	
m3 hardstand (1 in 100yr) m3 hardstand (1 in 100yr) 194 m9 hardstand (1 in 100yr) 194 metres required 194 metres required 194 metres required 194 metres required metres of required metres														
Area required 194	Ar	ea to drain 1000	m3 hardstanc	1 (1 in 100yr										
(takes into account incident rain) 1981 - 2100) 281 - 2100) 281 - 2100) 281 - 2100) 381	5	= 10 min	Arear	equired	194									
1911 1912 1914 1915			(takes into	account in	cident rain)									
10 minutes 89mm/hr Q=2.78CiA 0.060626 ha area m2 1.00ff 1.00ff												total volume	a)	
10 minutes 89mm/hr Q=2.78CiA Defended A = Q/2.78iC Defend	H	n 100 (RCP6.0 20	181 - 2100))						area m2	1000		12 m3	n3	
11 - 2100)) A = Q/2.78iC 0.060626 ha depth 11 - 2100)) 606.2566 seconds 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha seconds 10 minutes 56mm/hr 919.3538 metros 0.785398 mc mc seconds 19.63495 mc mc seconds 19.63495 mc mc seconds 2.994 check l/s seconds seconds 2.994 check mc seconds seconds 1 metros of reck mc seconds seconds		14.8 mm in 1	.0 minutes	89mm/hr		Q=2.78CiA			runoff	0.8		rate per second	puo	
11 - 2100)) Seconds Seconds 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 606.2566 seconds 10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha metal metal 10 minutes 10 minutes metal metal metal						A = Q/2.78iC	0.06062	.6 ha	depth	0.015		20 1/s	s/	
10 minutes 56mm/hr 0.096351 ha 0.096351 ha 0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence Soakage Cantie 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence metres of metres of cantie 2.994 check (20m carrie 2.994 check Soakage Cantie a 2.994 metres of metres of cantie	11	n 20 (RCP6.0 208	31 - 2100))				606.256	9:	seconds	009				
0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence 2.994 Soakage Rate /s 2.994 check		9.3 mm in 1	.0 minutes	56mm/hr		0.096351 ha				1 in 100	runoff per m2 per	n2 per s	0.02 I/s/m2	/m2
0.785398 m2						919.3538				1 in 20	runoff per m2 per s	n2 per s	0.012 I/s/m2	/m2
0.785398 m2 45 deg angle influence 19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence 2.994 Soakage Rate I/s 2.994 check											1 in 100			
19.63495 m2 45 deg angle influence 2.994 Soakage Rate /s 2.994 check	Soakpit Base	11	0.785398	3 m2					Soakage C	apacity	149.6991 m2	m2		
Soakage Rate I/s check	Effective soak	age @ 2m deep		i m2	45 deg angle in	fluence			metres of	road	7.484956	7.484956 14.96991 two sided	wo sided	
check					Soakage Rate	s/I			(20m carri	iageway)				
			2.994		check									
Soakage Car metres of ro											1 in 20			
metres of ro									Soakage C	apacity	241.4502 m2	m2		
									metres of	road	12.07251	24.14502 two sided	wo sided	
(20m carriageway)									(20m carr	iageway)				



APPENDIX C

Wastewater Impact Assessment



Quentin Adams, Central Otago District Council 1 Dunorling Street PO Box 122, Alexandra 9340 New Zealand

NZ Cherry Ripponvale - Development Impact Assessment

10 September 2018

Mason Bros. Building Level 2, 139 Pakenham Street West Wynyard Quarter Auckland 1010 PO Box 37525, Parnell, 1151 New Zealand

T +64 (0)9 375 2400 mottmac.com This letter summarises the results of the assessment undertaken for a proposed development consisting of 160 residential units on 112 Ripponvale Rd, on the west side of the Cromwell water network.

1 Background

Mott MacDonald was commissioned by Central Otago District Council (CODC) to assess the system performance in terms of Level of Service (LOS) and firefighting capacity in the proposed development.

In this analysis, the latest Cromwell water supply model was used. The existing scenario was investigated with additional demand from the proposed development. The project location is shown in blue in Figure 1-1 below.

Figure 1-1: Proposed Development Location



MOTT MACDONALD

2 Assumptions

2.1 Demand Calculations

The demand for the development has been calculated based on the CODC addendum to NZS4404-2004, considering the following:

- 160 residentials units
- Daily consumption of 500 l/person/day
- Peak hour factor of 5
- Density: 3 persons per dwelling in residential areas.

Based on these assumptions, the following demand has been considered in the proposed development:

Table 2-1: Demand Calculation

	Demand (I/s)
Average Daily Flow (I/s)	2.8
Instantaneous Peak Flow (I/s)	13.9

2.2 Proposed Connection Points

The development's elevation ranges between 225m and 440m. It was assumed that the development would be connected, via a new 150mm ID main, to the existing 200mm pipe along Waenga Drive, as the existing 100 mm main along Ripponvale Rd is too small to provide adequate fire supply (connection point 1). It was assumed that the new 150mm pipe would be connected at the end of the 100mm pipe (connection point 2) to improve conveyance and system performance.

Figure 2-1 below shows the proposed connection points and the new 1.8 km of 150mm watermain (in red) parallel to the existing 100mm pipe.

Pumps

Estimate

Pumps

Tank

Model Pipe Dlameter

100 - 149 mm

200 - 249 mm

Existing Ø200mm main

Existing Ø200mm main

Figure 2-1: Development Location, Proposed Connection Points and Network

3 Scenarios Investigated

The scenarios investigated were based on the Cromwell base scenario (existing peak day - 13.1 MLD), including consented development in the area (namely McNulty Rd developments). The level of service achieved in the proposed residential development were assessed in terms of pressure, head loss and fire flow. The impact of the proposed development was verified in terms of pressure and head losses in the remaining of the network.



Fire flow was based on the NZ Fire Service Code of Practice (SNZ PAS 4509:2008). FW2 classification (residential requirements) has been tested for the development zone based on 25 l/s at 2/3 of the peak demand.

4 Model Results

Results have been analysed to check that LOS (minimum pressure and maximum head losses) can be met in the proposed development. LOS were verified for the minimum and maximum elevation, and the maximum ground level that can be serviced from the existing network was identified.

4.1 System Performance in the Proposed Development

Table 4-1 below summarises the minimum and maximum pressure, the maximum head loss as well as the fire flow capacities forecasted at the minimum and maximum elevations in the development.

Table 4-1: Forecasted System Performance in the Development

	Press	ure	Head Losses	Fire Flow
	Minimum	Maximum	Maximum	
Development min elevation (225m)	58.9	65.6	2.3	Can meet residential fire flow (FW2 –25 l/s with 10m residual pressure)
Development max elevation (440m)	0	0	-	Cannot meet residential fire flow (FW2 –25 l/s with 10m residual pressure)

The normal operating pressure and maximum head loss set by the NZS4404:2004 Standard (Development ad Subdivision Engineering Standards) are respectively 30 to 90m and 5m/km. As shown in the table above, minimum pressure and maximum head loss in the proposed development is within the recommended LOS for the development minimum elevation of 225m. For the maximum development elevation LOS are not met.

FW2 fire flow was tested at the end of the proposed 150mm line. The model predicts that the fire flow (FW2 - 25 l/s) can be provided with enough residual pressure (40m) at the development minimum elevation of 225m but not at the maximum elevation level of 440m.

4.2 Maximum Serviceable Elevation

The model predicted that the maximum ground level that can be serviced while providing sufficient LOS is 250m RL. Table 4-2 below summarises the minimum and maximum pressure and fire flow capacities forecasted at 250m RL in the development. To allow for additional local head losses and potential model inaccuracy, a residual pressure of 15m was considered for fire flow instead of the required 10m. It was assumed that the development internal network would include a 150mm loop to provide residential fire flow.

Table 4-2: Forecasted System Performance at 250m RL

	Pressure		Head Losses	Fire Flow
	Minimum	Maximum	Maximum	
Development at 250m elevation	33.8	40.6	2.3	Can meet residential fire flow (FW2 –25 I/s with 10m residual pressure)

MOTT MACDONALD

4.3 System Performance Analysis in the Remaining Network

The section below describes the results of the system performance in the remaining of the Cromwell network. Results have been analysed to assess the effect of the proposed development. Figure 4-1 below shows the maximum head loss and minimum pressure conditions for the current peak demand, without the development, while Figure 4-2 shows the forecasted system performance with the development.

Figure 4-1: Current Peak Day System Performance – No Development





Figure 4-2: Current Peak Day System Performance – With Development



The Table 4-3 below summarises the maximum head losses along Ripponvale Rd and the minimum pressure forecasted at the connection points, before and after the proposed development:

Table 4-3: Forecasted System Performance at the Connection Points

	Min	imum Pressure	Maximum Head Losses		
	Connection 1	Connection 2	100mm pipe	150mm pipe	
Existing	72.1	44.8	0.1		
Post Development	72.0	40.7	2.4	2.3	
Drop/Increase	-0.1m	-4.1m	+2.3m/km	-	

As shown in the Figure 4-1, Figure 4-2 and Table 4-3, the proposed development is predicted to have a negligible impact on most of the remaining of the water network with a maximum pressure drop of 0.1 m forecasted at the connection point 1



(Waenga Dr). A larger pressure drop (4.1m) is predicted at the connection point 2 (Ripponvale Rd) however LOS remain satisfactory. Pressure is expected to remain above 40 m at the end of the 100 mm pipe along Ripponvale Rd and above 50 m in the remaining of the network. Head losses are predicted to increase to 2.4 m/km in the existing 100 mm pipe along Ripponvale Rd, below the recommended 5m/km. No other significant head loss increase is expected in the remaining of the network.

5 Conclusion and Recommendation

Additional residential demand for the proposed NZ Cherry Ripponvale development (160 lots at 112 Ripponvale Rd) was added to the network for the current peak day model to determine if suitable LOS could be obtained. It was assumed that the development would be connected, via a new 150mm main, to the existing 200mm pipe along Waenga drive.

The system performance at the proposed development site was first assessed. LOS are predicted to be met in terms of pressure, head loss and fire flow (FW2 - 25 l/s) for elevations up to 250m RL.

The system performance in the remaining of the network was also verified. The proposed development is predicted to have a negligible impact on most of the network (pressure drop of 0.1m) with the exception of the connection point 2 (112 Ripponvale Rd) where a pressure drop of 4m is expected. However, pressure is expected to remain above 40 m at the end of the 100 mm pipe along Ripponvale Rd and above 50 m in the remaining of the network. Head losses are not predicted to increase above the recommended LOS.

Kori Ditmeyer Hydraulic Engineer Kori.Ditmeyer@mottmac.com

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
A	10/09/18	Kori Ditmeyer	Julie Plessis	Chhan Chau	Draft for client review

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

M MOTT MACDONALD

Quentin Adams, Central Otago District Council 1 Dunorling Street PO Box 122, Alexandra 9340 New Zealand

NZ Cherry Ripponvale - Development Wastewater Assessment

Our Reference 385321

Mason Bros. Building Level 2, 139 Pakenham Street West Wynyard Quarter Auckland 1010

T +64 (0)9 375 2400 mottmac.com 29th October 2018

1 Background

Mott MacDonald was commissioned by Central Otago District Council (CODC) to undertake a hydraulic modelling analysis to assess the impact of the Cherry Ripponvale development in Cromwell, located on the west side of the Cromwell wastewater network. This memo outlines the assumptions made and findings of this investigation.

The scope of work included the following:

 Update the existing Cromwell wastewater model to include the Cherry Ripponvale development.



Figure 1: Development Location

- Model the new Pump Station which will service the development
- Estimate the additional wastewater discharge resulting from the development. There are approximately 160 residential lots.
- Simulate the current dry weather and wet weather (10-year ARI storm) scenarios with and without the new development.
- Perform system performance analysis in terms of capacity of the wastewater system to accommodate the proposed development.
- Assess the impact of the new development against the existing network to examine if there are any detrimental effects.
- Carry out option

Mott MacDonald New Zealand Limited Registered in New Zealand no. 3338812



• Report on investigation and results.

2 Flow Calculation and Routing

Calculation of the wastewater loads were based on the New Zealand Standard for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure NZS 4404:2010:

- Daily consumption = 250 L/person/day
- Peaking factor (residential) = 2.5
- Density (residential) = 3 persons per dwelling in residential areas
- Infiltration & inflow scaling factor = 2

The flows are predominantly residential, and no commercial and/or industrial loads are expected from the development. A standard 24-hour diurnal profile having a peak factor of 2.5 was applied to the residential flow as shown in Figure 2. The resulting design peak dry and wet weather flows are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Flow Calculation

Parcels	Population	Manhole GIS Asset ID	Peak Wet Weather Flow (L/s)	Average Daily Flow (m³/d)
160	480	CherryRipponvale _Dummy	6.9	120

The residential flows were applied the following diurnal pattern.




Figure 2: Residential diurnal profile



Three options were considered to connect the proposed development: two pressurised options (options 1a and 1b) and one gravity option (option 2).

Option 1a:

The development discharges into a pump station which pumps the flow to Waenga Street. No details were provided regarding the pump station, but Mott MacDonald believed it was relevant to model a dummy one with assumed characteristics providing the significant distance between the development and the connection point. The following assumptions were made:

- Manhole Diameter = 4m
- Ground Level is equal to closest manhole downstream (node ID 6989999)
- Constant flow = 6.5 l/s
- 500 mm difference between pump start and pump stop levels

Option 1b:

The residential development discharges straight into the existing 50 mm pressurised pipe along Ripponvale Road via a proposed rising main from a proposed pumping station.

The development connection is illustrated in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Network Connection - Options 1a and 1b

Option 2:

The 50mm pressurised pipe will be replaced with a new 150mm or a larger size (as the model recommends) gravity pipe. The new gravity sewer will serve all flows served by the existing 50mm pressurised pipe including existing connections and proposed development.

The layout for option 2 is shown in Figure 4 below.

M MOTT MACDONALD




Figure 4: Option 2 layout

The following assumptions have been made for option 2:

- 1. Upgrade the existing 50mm uPVC pressurised main to a 150mm gravity pipe as shown in Figure 4.
- 2. New 150mm diameter pipe which will take flow from the proposed development to the upsized 150mm gravity pipe.

3 Scenarios Modelled

The primary objective of the system performance is to assess the wastewater network capacity and overflow occurrences under a few different scenarios as follows:

- 1. Existing model (Cromwell base scenario)
- 2. Option 1a (existing + Cherry Ripponvale)
- 3. Option 2 (existing + Cherry Ripponvale)

Table 2: System Performance Scenarios

Scenario ID	Network Load	Flow Scenarios
	0047	DWF
Existing	2017 network	10-year storm
	2047 mahusak	DWF
Option 1a	2017 network	10-year storm
Option 2	2017 network	DWF
		10-year storm

4 Pipe Capacity in Dry and Wet Weather

Pipe capacities were evaluated in two ways. Firstly, by comparing the modelled peak flow with the theoretical pipe full capacity (Qmax/Qf) and secondly, by comparing the modelled peak depth with the pipe diameter (Hmax/Diameter). Peak flows above the theoretical pipe capacity indicate that the pipe is undersized and cannot convey the peak flows that are required through the network.



Option 1a:

An analysis of option 1a results indicated that the Cherry Ripponvale development caused very little detriment to the overall network capacity under dry and wet weather events. The number of pipes in the network that are surcharged in the model scenarios is presented in Table 3 and Figure 5 below. As illustrated in the graph, there is almost no difference between the pre-development and post-development scenarios with regards to both pipe flow capacity (Qmax/Qf) and pipe filling (Hmax/Diameter). The additional discharge causes a slight increase of levels downstream the connection point which fills 3 additional pipes for the DWF and 7 additional pipes for the WWF. However, it is not concerning in terms of pipe flow capacity since the only additional pipe under capacity for the WWF simulation corresponds to the dummy link located upstream of the Cherry PS.

Table 3: Option1a: Number of surcharged pipes in dry and wet weather

Scenario	No of Pipes Qmax/Qf > 1	%Total	No of Pipes Hmax/Dia > 1	%Total
	Dry Weather Flow	N		
Existing	8	0.6	170	13.5
Existing + Cherry Ripponvale	8	0.6	173	13.8
	Wet Weather Flo	w		
Existing	11	0.9	203	16.2
Existing + Cherry Ripponvale	12	1.0	210	16.6




Figure 5: Option 1a Surcharged pipes in dry and wet weather







Figure 6: Option 1a Long Profile Location

M MOTT MACDONALD



Mott MacDonald New Zealand Limited Registered in New Zealand Figure 7: Option 1a - Impact of development along Waenga Road until Antimony Cres intersection (10-year ARI)



The long section above shows the maximum water level in the pipe from upstream the connection at Waenga road until the Antimony Cres intersection (illustrated in Figure 6) before and after the development. It can be seen that the proposed development has minimal impact on the capacity of the local wastewater network.

Option 2:

Dry Weather Flow:

The model predicts no issues with the proposed 150mm diameter gravity pipe (refer to Figure 9 and Figure 10).

Wet Weather Flow:

The model predicts no issues with the proposed 150mm diameter gravity pipe: downstream flow has slightly increased, but the increase is not significant and has no noticeable impact on the downstream system (refer to Figure 12).

Table 4 Result of Option 2: Number of surcharged pipes in dry and wet weather

Scenario	No of Pipes Qmax/Qf > 1	%Total	No of Pipes Hmax/Dia > 1	%Total
	Dry Weather Flow			
Existing	8	0.6	170	13.5
Option 1a	8	0.6	173	13.8
Option 2	8	0.6	170	13.5
	Wet Weather Flow	1		
Existing	11	0.9	203	16.2
Option 1a	12	1.0	210	16.6
Option 2	12	1.0	212	16.9



Figure 8 Long Section Profiles

M MOTT MACDONALD




Figure 9 Option 2 - Long Section - DWF - A to B.

Mott MacDonald New Zealand Limited Registered in New Zealand no. 3338812

M MOTT MACDONALD




Figure 10 Option 2 - Long Section - DWF - B to C

29th October 2018 | Page 2 of 4




Figure 11 option 2 - Long Section - WWF - A to B

29th October 2018 | Page 3 of 4

M MOTT MACDONALD




Figure 12 Option 2 - Long Section - WWF - B to C

29th October 2018 | Page 4 of 4



5 Overflows

The total number of spill locations for the dry weather and the 10-year ARI storm events are presented in Table 5. There is no additional uncontrolled dry weather and wet weather overflows occurring in the network.

Table 5 Option 1a Number of overflows (10-year ARI)

Scenario	Number of Overflows	Overflow Volume (m³)	
Dry Weather			
Existing	0	0	
Existing + Cherry Ripponvale (Option 1a)	0	0	
Existing + Cherry Ripponvale (Option 2)	0	0	
Wet Weather			
Existing	2	220.4	
Existing + Cherry Ripponvale (Option 1a)	2	220.4	
Existing + Cherry Ripponvale (Option 2)	2	220.4	

6 Conclusions and Recommendation

A high-level system performance assessment was undertaken to analyse the effect of the Cherry Ripponvale development on the network capacity for three different options.

Option 1a

The analysis yielded very similar results between the pre-development and post-development scenarios for both dry weather and wet weather events. Based on this high-level study, it is concluded that the Cherry Ripponvale development is unlikely to have a detrimental effect to the existing network with Option 1a.

Nevertheless, before proceeding with any further work, it is recommended to confirm the validity of the assumptions undertaken regarding the dummy pump station.

Option 1b

This option was briefly investigated and it was noted that the maximum top water level at the 50mm pressurised pipe at manhole 6990426, Ripponvale Road and at the proposed pumping station has increased by approximately 10 to 20m.

The connection from the proposed pumping station to the 50mm pressured main is assumed; proposed local system serving the 160 lots have not been included in the model and proposed pump operational regime has not been considered either.

The current connections from local pumping stations connecting to the existing 50mm pressurised main have not been modelled in detail.

No information was available regarding the proposed pump station and the pump operational regime; therefore it was not possible to undertake a detailed assessment of the pressurised main capacity. There is a possibility that the additional flow may exceed the pipe pressure rating and causes pipe burst, or surge in the existing 50mm pressurised main.

The model predicts no issues in the downstream system if the proposed pumping station is to be discharged to the current 50mm pressurised pipe. However, it is



noted that the 50mm pressurised pipe limits the flow discharge to the Waenga Road manhole.

It is recommended that if the proposed 160 lots are to be discharged directly to the current 50mm pressurised main, further investigation should be undertaken regarding the effect of the additional flow on the existing 50mm pressured main. Detailed information would be required such as rising main characteristics, proposed pumping station information including wet well dimensions and pump operational regime. The current local connections to the existing 50mm pressurised main should also be reviewed and updated in the model.

Option 2

The model predicts no issues with option 2, the proposed 150mm gravity sewer replacing the 50mm pressurised main has capacity to convey the dry weather and wet weather flow without causing any detriment to the downstream condition.

Based on this high-level study, it is concluded that option 2 is unlikely to have a detrimental effect to the existing network.

Chhan Chau Principal Hydraulics Engineer D +64 (0)9 375 7466 Chhan.Chau@mottmac.com

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
Α	11/09/2018	Tom Lecomte	Chhan Chau	Julie Plessis	Draft for client review
В	16/10/2018	Chhan Chau	Tom Lecomte	Julie Plessis	Draft for client review
С	19/10/2018	Chhan Chau	Tom Lecomte	Julie Plessis	Draft Final submission
D	29/10/2018	Chhan Chau	Tom Lecomte	Julie Plessis	Final submission

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.



APPENDIX D

Water Impact Assessment



Quentin Adams, Central Otago District Council 1 Dunorling Street PO Box 122, Alexandra 9340 New Zealand

NZ Cherry Ripponvale – Development Impact Assessment

10 September 2018

Mason Bros. Building Level 2, 139 Pakenham Street West Wynyard Quarter Auckland 1010 PO Box 37525, Parnell, 1151 New Zealand

T +64 (0)9 375 2400 mottmac.com This letter summarises the results of the assessment undertaken for a proposed development consisting of 160 residential units on 112 Ripponvale Rd, on the west side of the Cromwell water network.

1 Background

Mott MacDonald was commissioned by Central Otago District Council (CODC) to assess the system performance in terms of Level of Service (LOS) and firefighting capacity in the proposed development.

In this analysis, the latest Cromwell water supply model was used. The existing scenario was investigated with additional demand from the proposed development. The project location is shown in blue in Figure 1-1 below.

Figure 1-1: Proposed Development Location



MOTT MACDONALD

2 Assumptions

2.1 Demand Calculations

The demand for the development has been calculated based on the CODC addendum to NZS4404-2004, considering the following:

- 160 residentials units
- Daily consumption of 500 l/person/day
- Peak hour factor of 5
- Density: 3 persons per dwelling in residential areas.

Based on these assumptions, the following demand has been considered in the proposed development:

Table 2-1: Demand Calculation

	Demand (I/s)
Average Daily Flow (I/s)	2.8
Instantaneous Peak Flow (I/s)	13.9

2.2 Proposed Connection Points

The development's elevation ranges between 225m and 440m. It was assumed that the development would be connected, via a new 150mm ID main, to the existing 200mm pipe along Waenga Drive, as the existing 100 mm main along Ripponvale Rd is too small to provide adequate fire supply (connection point 1). It was assumed that the new 150mm pipe would be connected at the end of the 100mm pipe (connection point 2) to improve conveyance and system performance.

Figure 2-1 below shows the proposed connection points and the new 1.8 km of 150mm watermain (in red) parallel to the existing 100mm pipe.

Connection point 2

New Ø150mm main
Connection point 1

Fumps
Fump Station
Tank
Model Pipe Diameter

0 - 99 mm
100 - 149 mm
Existing Ø100mm main
Existing Ø200mm main

Figure 2-1: Development Location, Proposed Connection Points and Network

3 Scenarios Investigated

The scenarios investigated were based on the Cromwell base scenario (existing peak day - 13.1 MLD), including consented development in the area (namely McNulty Rd developments). The level of service achieved in the proposed residential development were assessed in terms of pressure, head loss and fire flow. The impact of the proposed development was verified in terms of pressure and head losses in the remaining of the network.



Fire flow was based on the NZ Fire Service Code of Practice (SNZ PAS 4509:2008). FW2 classification (residential requirements) has been tested for the development zone based on 25 l/s at 2/3 of the peak demand.

4 Model Results

Results have been analysed to check that LOS (minimum pressure and maximum head losses) can be met in the proposed development. LOS were verified for the minimum and maximum elevation, and the maximum ground level that can be serviced from the existing network was identified.

4.1 System Performance in the Proposed Development

Table 4-1 below summarises the minimum and maximum pressure, the maximum head loss as well as the fire flow capacities forecasted at the minimum and maximum elevations in the development.

Table 4-1: Forecasted System Performance in the Development

Pressure		Pressure Head Losses		Fire Flow
	Minimum	Maximum	Maximum	
Development min elevation (225m)	58.9	65.6	2.3	Can meet residential fire flow (FW2 –25 l/s with 10m residual pressure)
Development max elevation (440m)	0	0	<u></u>	Cannot meet residential fire flow (FW2 –25 l/s with 10m residual pressure)

The normal operating pressure and maximum head loss set by the NZS4404:2004 Standard (Development ad Subdivision Engineering Standards) are respectively 30 to 90m and 5m/km. As shown in the table above, minimum pressure and maximum head loss in the proposed development is within the recommended LOS for the development minimum elevation of 225m. For the maximum development elevation LOS are not met.

FW2 fire flow was tested at the end of the proposed 150mm line. The model predicts that the fire flow (FW2 - 25 l/s) can be provided with enough residual pressure (40m) at the development minimum elevation of 225m but not at the maximum elevation level of 440m.

4.2 Maximum Serviceable Elevation

The model predicted that the maximum ground level that can be serviced while providing sufficient LOS is 250m RL. Table 4-2 below summarises the minimum and maximum pressure and fire flow capacities forecasted at 250m RL in the development. To allow for additional local head losses and potential model inaccuracy, a residual pressure of 15m was considered for fire flow instead of the required 10m. It was assumed that the development internal network would include a 150mm loop to provide residential fire flow.

Table 4-2: Forecasted System Performance at 250m RL

	Pres	sure	Head Losses	Fire Flow
	Minimum	Maximum	Maximum	
Development at 250m elevation	33.8	40.6	2.3	Can meet residential fire flow (FW2 –25 l/s with 10m residual pressure)

MOTT MACDONALD

4.3 System Performance Analysis in the Remaining Network

The section below describes the results of the system performance in the remaining of the Cromwell network. Results have been analysed to assess the effect of the proposed development. Figure 4-1 below shows the maximum head loss and minimum pressure conditions for the current peak demand, without the development, while Figure 4-2 shows the forecasted system performance with the development.

Figure 4-1: Current Peak Day System Performance - No Development





Figure 4-2: Current Peak Day System Performance – With Development



The Table 4-3 below summarises the maximum head losses along Ripponvale Rd and the minimum pressure forecasted at the connection points, before and after the proposed development:

Table 4-3: Forecasted System Performance at the Connection Points

	Minimum Pressure		Maximum Head Losses		
	Connection 1	Connection 2	100mm pipe	150mm pipe	
Existing	72.1	44.8	0.1	× -	
Post Development	72.0	40.7	2.4	2.3	
Drop/Increase	-0.1m	-4.1m	+2.3m/km	-	

As shown in the Figure 4-1, Figure 4-2 and Table 4-3, the proposed development is predicted to have a negligible impact on most of the remaining of the water network with a maximum pressure drop of 0.1 m forecasted at the connection point 1



(Waenga Dr). A larger pressure drop (4.1m) is predicted at the connection point 2 (Ripponvale Rd) however LOS remain satisfactory. Pressure is expected to remain above 40 m at the end of the 100 mm pipe along Ripponvale Rd and above 50 m in the remaining of the network. Head losses are predicted to increase to 2.4 m/km in the existing 100 mm pipe along Ripponvale Rd, below the recommended 5m/km. No other significant head loss increase is expected in the remaining of the network.

5 Conclusion and Recommendation

Additional residential demand for the proposed NZ Cherry Ripponvale development (160 lots at 112 Ripponvale Rd) was added to the network for the current peak day model to determine if suitable LOS could be obtained. It was assumed that the development would be connected, via a new 150mm main, to the existing 200mm pipe along Waenga drive.

The system performance at the proposed development site was first assessed. LOS are predicted to be met in terms of pressure, head loss and fire flow (FW2 - 25 l/s) for elevations up to 250m RL.

The system performance in the remaining of the network was also verified. The proposed development is predicted to have a negligible impact on most of the network (pressure drop of 0.1m) with the exception of the connection point 2 (112 Ripponvale Rd) where a pressure drop of 4m is expected. However, pressure is expected to remain above 40 m at the end of the 100 mm pipe along Ripponvale Rd and above 50 m in the remaining of the network. Head losses are not predicted to increase above the recommended LOS.

Kori Ditmeyer Hydraulic Engineer Kori.Ditmeyer@mottmac.com

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
Α	10/09/18	Kori Ditmeyer	Julie Plessis	Chhan Chau	Draft for client review

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.



APPENDIX E

Confirmation of Telecom Supply

Chorus Network Services

PO Box 9405 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton 3200

Telephone: 0800 782 386 Email: tsg@chorus.co.nz

27 November 2018

NZ Cherry Corp (Leyser) LP C/- Paterson Pitt Group

C H • R U S

Chorus Ref #:

CMW49464

Your Ref #:

Attention: Peter Dymock

Dear Sir / Madam

SUBDIVISION RETICULATION - CMW: 112 Ripponvale Road, Cromwell. Shannon Farm. 160 Lots (Simple Estimate)

Thank you for your enquiry regarding the above subdivision.

Chorus is pleased to advise that, as at the date of this letter, we would be able to provide ABF telephone reticulation for this subdivision. In order to complete this reticulation, we require a contribution from you to Chorus' total costs of reticulating the subdivision. Chorus' costs include the cost of network design, supply of telecommunications specific materials and supervising installation. At the date of this letter, our estimate of the contribution we would require from you is \$294,400.00 (including GST).

We note that (i) the contribution required from you towards reticulation of the subdivision, and (ii) our ability to connect the subdivision to the Chorus network, may (in each case) change over time depending on the availability of Chorus network in the relevant area and other matters.

If you decide that you wish to undertake reticulation of this subdivision, you will need to contact Chorus (see the contact details for Chorus Network Services above). We would recommend that you contact us at least 3 months prior to the commencement of construction at the subdivision. At that stage, we will provide you with the following:

- confirmation of the amount of the contribution required from you, which may change from the estimate as set out above;
- a copy of the Contract for the Supply and Installation of Telecommunications Infrastructure, which will govern our relationship with you in relation to reticulation of this subdivision; and
- a number of other documents which have important information regarding reticulation of the subdivision, including for example Chorus' standard subdivision lay specification.

Yours faithfully

Hollie Jackson

Property Development Coordinator



APPENDIX F

Confirmation of Power Supply

AURORA ENERGY LIMITED

PO Box 5140, Dunedin 9058 PH 0800 22 00 05 WEB www.auroraenergy.co.nz



22 February 2019

Peter Dymock Paterson Pitts Group PO Box 84 Cromwell 9342

By email only: peter.dymock@ppgroup.co.nz

Dear Peter

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY AVAILABILITY FOR 160 LOT SUBDIVISION
112 RIPPONVALE ROAD, CROMWELL – LOT 2 DP 330709 & SEC 4, 11, 98, 101, 103 BLK III CROMWELL SD & PT SEC 5, 25 BLK III CROMWELL SD & PT RUN 1201R

Thank you for your inquiry outlining the above proposed development.

Subject to technical, legal and commercial requirements, Aurora Energy can make a Point of Supply¹ (PoS) available for this development.

Disclaimer

This letter confirms that a PoS **can** be made available. This letter **does not** imply that a PoS is available now, or that Aurora Energy will make a PoS available at its cost.

Next Steps

To arrange an electricity connection to the Aurora Energy network, a connection application will be required. General and technical requirements for electricity connections are contained in Aurora Energy's Network Connection Standard. Connection application forms and the Network Connection Standard are available from www.auroraenergy.co.nz.

Yours sincerely

Richard Starkey

COMMERCIAL MANAGER

¹ Point of Supply is defined in section 2(3) of the Electricity Act 1993.