

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of **Private Plan Change 28** to the Nelson Resource Management Plan

**INTERIM JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT (JWS) IN RELATION TO:**

**INFRASTRUCTURE (1) – Water and Wastewater**

**20 May 2022**

Expert Conferencing Held on: 20 May 2022

Venue: Directly and by email

Independent Facilitator: Marlene Oliver

**1 Attendance:**

- 1.1 The list of participants is included in the schedule at the end of this Statement.  
**Note from Facilitator:** The experts engaged directly and completed this JWS between themselves. Signed versions were emailed to the Facilitator – who then completed some minor formatting changes.

**2 Basis of Attendance and Environment Court Practice Note 2014**

- 2.1 All participants agree to the following:
- (a) The Environment Court Practice Note 2014 provides relevant guidance and protocols for the expert conferencing session;
  - (b) They will comply with the relevant provisions of the Environment Court Practice Note 2014;
  - (c) They will make themselves available to appear before the Hearing Panel;
  - (d) This statement is to be filed with the Hearing Panel and posted on the Council's website.

### **3 Matters considered at Conferencing – Agenda and Outcomes**

#### **3.1 Reticulated Water**

##### **3.1.1 Water Mains**

*A new section of water main connecting at Tasman Street and running along Nile Street and Maitai Valley Road through to the reservoirs which will service the Maitahi Bayview development. Two options have been provided for the alignment between Maitai Valley Road and the proposed reservoir site: one via the Dennes Hole Track and one via Ralphine Way.*

*Council confirmed that the proposed water main connection location and water main sizes are consistent with what was previously discussed and with the expectations of Council.*

**The experts agree** that the size and location of the mains connection appear appropriate for the principle of a plan change. More detailed design can be addressed at the subdivision stage, in the event that PPC28 is successful.

##### **3.1.2 Reservoir size**

*The reservoir size in the PCCR Infrastructure report and addendum is different to that previously discussed prior to lodgement with NCC (1,300m<sup>3</sup> instead of 2,500 m<sup>3</sup> or 2 x 1,250m<sup>3</sup> previously discussed). It should be noted that this greater volume size is to help with future developments and is larger than what is required to service the proposed development. NCC acknowledges that site constraints may dictate the number and size of reservoirs and is comfortable with either the bigger reservoir being constructed or a site provided that will allow construction of the two smaller tanks to match wider development timing and demands.*

**The experts agree** that the reservoir size as stated in the PPC 28 application is sufficient to service the PPC area.

##### **3.1.3 Site feasibility**

*The PCCR provides adequate information around the hydraulic feasibility of the proposed larger reservoir but does not cover site feasibility. There is a risk that it is not feasible to construct reservoirs of the proposed sizes due to geotechnical constraints or as the impacts resulting from earthworks may not be consentable under the NRMP and proposed changes in the PPC, particularly for the larger size that was discussed with NCC.*

Outcome – subsequent to the PPC 28 application being lodged, further geotechnical investigations have been carried out, which included a test pit to a depth of 3.5m in the approximate location of where the 1,300m<sup>3</sup> reservoir might be located.

Based on the test pit investigations, this location is suitable for a reservoir tank with suitable engineering and planning.

**The experts agree that it is highly likely that suitable reservoir sites can be found for the smaller volumes required for PPC28, and that any impacts from this reservoir construction could be appropriately addressed by the NRMP at the subdivision stage.**

- 3.1.4 *If the full size cannot be accommodated, it could affect/limit NCC's water supply plans for future developments.*

Assessing and making provision for NCC future requirements is not part of the PPC 28 application process.

- 3.2 Reticulated Wastewater

Nil

- 3.3 Other services?

Nil

- 3.4 Public Submissions

- 3.4.1 *Effects from earthworks required to install water main*

*Several submitters (Save the Maitai Incorporated, Mike Tasman Jones, Friends of the Maitai) raised concerns about potential impacts resulting from the installation of the proposed water mains, particularly in the vicinity of the Dennes Hole area. This is because the Infrastructure Report identified a potential alignment that passes near Dennes Hole.*

**The experts agree that** details on the extent of earthworks etc can be determined at the subdivision stage. The installation of water mains would be subject to the provisions of the NRMP. In the event that adverse installation effects could not be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated, it is highly likely that alternative routes could be used for water supply purposes.

- 3.4.2 *Rainwater Tanks*

*Two submitters (NMDHB Public Health Service, Stephen Mullins) requested that rainwater tanks or greywater recycling are put in place for the development to reduce the demand on the water supply and reduce climate change impacts.*

*Council confirmed that they consider that PPC28 is serviceable under the water treatment plant raw water abstraction rates in the current Resource Consent. This means there would be sufficient additional capacity in the abstraction consent to provide water for the proposed development.*

**The experts agree** that any impacts from the abstraction of water for the water supply of the proposed development would be adequately covered by the existing Resource Consent.

The issues of rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling are Council policy decisions which are unable to be addressed in this Joint Witness Statement.

#### **4 PARTICIPANTS TO JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT**

4.1 The participants to this Joint Witness Statement, as listed below, confirm that:

- (a) They agree that the outcome(s) of the expert conferencing are as recorded in this statement; and
- (b) They have read Appendix 3 of the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it; and
- (c) The matters addressed in this statement are within their area of expertise; and
- (d) As this session was held directly between the experts, and each expert emailed their signed agreement to the Facilitator, their confirmed position was recorded by the Facilitator in the schedule below.

**Confirmed by email 20 May 2022:**

EXPERT'S NAME	PARTY	EXPERT'S CONFIRMATION - REFER PARA 4.1
Maurice Mills (E)	Applicant	Yes
Mike Yarrall (E)	NCC	Yes