

**BEFORE A HEARING PANEL
CONSTITUTED BY NELSON CITY COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER

of an application by **CCKV Maitahi Development Co LP** and **Bayview Nelson Limited** for a change to the Nelson Resource Management Plan (Plan Change 28)

IN THE MATTER

of Part 5 and Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

VERBAL SUMMARY STATEMENT OF STUART FARRANT

Applicants' Consultant:

Landmark Lile Limited
PO Box 343
Nelson 7040
Attention: Mark Lile
Email: mark@landmarklile.co.nz
Tel: 027 244 3388

Counsel acting:

John Maassen
— BARRISTER —

✉ john@johnmaassen.com
🌐 johnmaassen.com
☎ 04 914 1050
📠 04 473 3179

Table of Contents

Summary Statement	3
-------------------------	---

Verbal Summary Statement

My name is Stuart Farrant. I am an Ecological Engineer with 15 years experience with the planning, design and delivery of water sensitive design, stream restoration and urban ecology. This includes being involved in a number of national, regional and local design guidelines.

[1]

I prepared a statement of evidence relating to the potential effects of Proposed Plan Change 28 (PC28) in terms of Water Sensitive Design and potential impacts on downstream receiving environments. This included discussion on stormwater management and works to protect and enhance the Kaka Stream. I also presented a statement of rebuttal evidence on the same topic.

[2]

I do not require any corrections or additions to be made to my submitted statements.

[3]

I was involved in pre-hearing conferencing discussions on water sensitive design and stormwater with Mr David Wilson, Ms. Kate Purton and Mr. Dali Suljic and have read their statements of evidence. The majority of their evidence relates to the on-site management of stormwater, and on-site flood risk

[4]

[5]

During conferencing, and in subsequent evidence, there was general agreement that the existing site is subject to impacts related to rural land use and that there are nationally recognised methods (supported by technical guidelines) to appropriately manage stormwater from urban development to protect freshwater receiving environments. Generally referred to as 'Water Sensitive Design' this approach takes a holistic approach to development planning to mitigate impacts of water quality and quantity. The adoption of an approach to development grounded on water sensitive design has been the intent from the outset and has informed the schedule 9 provisions which provide a clear statement of intent.

[6]

Through conferencing a request was made for the applicant team to prepare a SMP. This was subsequently prepared to demonstrate the high level feasibility of delivering on the aspirations for a water sensitive design

approach aligned with X9 and national 'best practice'. In preparing the SMP there was refinement of the structure plan to reduce the extent of development and increase the extent of revegetation on the steeper slopes.

I conclude that there are no reasons to suggest that the site cannot be designed and developed to support stated intentions to protect and enhance Kaka Stream and downstream environments.

[7] Based on rebuttal/supplementary evidence there remain some outstanding matters as follows;

- [8]
- (a) Realignment of lower Kaka Stream and corresponding ecological benefits
 - (b) Suitability of stormwater treatment devices (wetlands and raingardens) being co-located within broad Kaka Stream green corridor
 - (c) Understanding of specific hydrological and geomorphological conditions in Kaka Stream to inform stormwater flow requirements (retention)
 - (d) Level of information provided in SMP to demonstrate ability to achieve X9 provisions

[9]

I also note that Mr. Suljic has raised a number of queries relating to the impact of compaction and effects on infiltration potential. This is addressed further by Mr Foley but I note that I see no reason to doubt potential to achieve retention of stormwater through a combination of on-lot rainwater re-use and soakage.

[10]

[11] I note that it is my opinion that the realignment of the lower Kaka Stream can accelerate ecological and operational improvements through immediate shading which would take years to achieve in existing or alternate alignment. Mr Markham provides further discussion on this.

Similarly it is my opinion that the proposed green spine through the development is an optimal location to locate at least some of the expected

consolidated treatment devices. These can be collaboratively designed to support wider community connection, amenity and multi-functional spaces in line with principles of water sensitive design. Mr Markham will discuss this from an ecological perspective.

[12] Whilst it is noted that refined hydrological modelling of the Kaka Stream will be required as part of future consenting it is my opinion that based on a high level visual assessment of Kaka Stream, positive effects of extensive revegetation of previously grazed land, low density across large areas of the plan change area and commitment to provide retention of initial stormwater depth from impervious surfaces the proposed residential development can mimic a more natural frequent flow hydrology.

[13] The level of information provided at this stage is a reflection of the very conceptual level of design undertaken given the Plan Change stage. Therefore analysis has been based on demonstrating feasibility rather than providing explicit solutions which will be developed as the design progresses through consenting. Given the comparatively low density (compared to many urban centres) and extensive areas of undeveloped land it is my opinion that the level of analysis demonstrates the ability to deliver development which demonstrates water sensitive design and provides an exemplar of good urban stormwater management.

[14]

I am pleased to answer any questions about my Evidence.