

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL  
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Hearing Streams 18  
– Stage 3b Proposed  
District Plan

---

**REPLY OF RICHARD ROBERT POWELL  
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**INFRASTRUCTURE - RURAL VISITOR ZONE – CORBRIDGE ESTATES LIMITED  
PARTNERSHIP (31021) REZONING**

**4 September 2020**

---

---

 **Simpson Grierson**  
Barristers & Solicitors

S J Scott / R Mortiaux  
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018  
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023  
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com  
PO Box 874  
SOLICITORS  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

## CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. CORBRIDGE ESTATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP REZONING.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>    Servicing of wastewater .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>    Servicing of potable water.....</b>	<b>2</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

**1.1** My name is Richard Robert Powell. I prepared a statement of evidence in chief<sup>1</sup> (**EiC**) and two statements of rebuttal<sup>2</sup>, filed in Hearing Stream 17 and 18. My qualifications and experience are set out in my EiC.

**1.2** I attended the hearing on 2 July 2020 and have been provided with reports of what has taken place at the hearing where relevant to my evidence.

**1.3** This reply evidence covers the following issues in relation to the Corbridge Estates Limited Partnership rezoning:

- (a) Servicing of wastewater; and
- (b) Servicing of potable water.

## **2. CORBRIDGE ESTATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP REZONING**

### **Servicing of wastewater**

**2.1** In my statement of rebuttal, I explained that the level of development on the site (if rezoned) is such that Council would require connection to council services and that an on-site private water supply or wastewater scheme would not be appropriate. As a result of that conclusion, I discounted the option of an on-site private wastewater scheme.

**2.2** I went on to explain that connection to the Council's network is possible, but that upgrades would be required to the network prior to this connection – however such upgrades are not included in the Council's planned works or Long Term Plan.

**2.3** At the hearing the Panel questioned Mr Botting (for the submitter) on whether adequate onsite servicing could be provided at the site. Mr Botting confirmed to the Panel that private infrastructure could feasibly service the site.

---

1 Dated 18 March 2020.

2 Dated 12 and 19 June 2020.

- 2.4** In response to this, I accept that the wastewater generated from the expected development (if the rezoning is accepted) could be treated and disposed of within the site via a privately owned centralised wastewater treatment system.
- 2.5** However, I note that this is not Council's preferred option, mainly because it requires consent from the Otago Regional Council, and Council does not have any certainty that this can or will be obtained.
- 2.6** In the absence of this, as per my earlier comments, the preference is that the submitter connect to Council's infrastructure. RM120572 grants a physical connection. However, as set out in my rebuttal, upgrades are required to the Project Pure treatment plan prior to such connection, in order to accept the flows generated from the proposed rezoning. Council currently has no plan or funding available to undertake upgrades of the treatment plant to deal with the potential increased flows from the rezoning.

#### **Servicing of potable water**

- 2.7** The submitter's evidence in chief concluded that connection to Council's water network was possible (and approved under resource consent).
- 2.8** The connection to Council's infrastructure as approved under RM120572 provides a physical connection however the potential demand of the rezoned land is significantly higher than what was previously consented. Council currently has no plan or funding available to upgrade the supply to the subject property to deal with the potential increase in demand from the rezoning.
- 2.9** In response to the discussion between the Panel and Mr Botting at the hearing as to an on-site system, I accept that potable water could be provided from a private network using the existing bores within the site.
- 2.10** This, however is not Council's preferred option for reasons set out in my EIC and rebuttal. One of the key issues this raises is the location of

this rezoning in proximity to existing council infrastructure. This RVZ rezoning request is different to other RVZs (where site specific networks currently exist), given they are located in remote landscapes. This rezoning is located 15 metres away from existing infrastructure. In Council's experience, this can result in an expectation that Council should take over the infrastructure in due course.

- 2.11** In addition, I note that it is likely that due to the upcoming revision of the drinking water standards local authorities could be forced to take over non-complying private water systems. Until Council has further certainty around this, its strong preference is to avoid the establishment of private networks where possible.



**Richard Robert Powell**

**4 September 2020**