

Before Kaipara District Council

In the Matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

And

In the Matter of an application for Private Plan Change 84 (**PC84**) by **MANGAWHAI HILLS LIMITED** to rezone 218.3 ha of land between Tara Road, Cove Road, Moir Road and Old Waipu Road, Mangawhai from Rural Zone to the Mangawhai Hills Development Area.

Summary Statement of Steven Brent Rankin on behalf of Mangawhai Hills Limited

(Civil Engineering)

Dated 28 May, 2024

Jeremy Brabant
Barrister
Foundry Chambers
Level 4, Vulcan Buildings
PO Box 1502, Shortland St
Auckland City
021 494 506
Email: jeremy@brabant.co.nz

Introduction

1. This summary statement is provided to summarise the items of agreement and areas of disagreement between myself and the other experts within my areas of expertise.
2. This document relates to my evidence in chief dated 29 April, 2024 and the rebuttal evidence dated 13 May, 2024 in reply to Paige Farley.

Introduction

3. My full name is Steven Brent Rankin. I hold a Bachelor of Environmental Engineering (**BE(Env)**) from Unitec. I am also a chartered member (**CM**) and chartered professional engineer (**CPEng**) of Engineering New Zealand since 2012 and the Fijian Institute of Engineers as well as holding international registration (IntPE/APEC).
4. I have 17 years' experience and am a Director and the Principal Civil Engineer with Chester Consultants Ltd (**Chester**). I have been in the principal civil engineer role since 2008. I became a Director of Chester in 2014. Chester is a multi-disciplinary consultancy working in the built environment throughout New Zealand and the Pacific. Most of my professional experience and expertise is specific to the civil engineering matters related to land development. I have expertise in 3-waters infrastructure, stormwater management, roading, earthworks and sediment & erosion control.
5. I was instructed by Mangawhai Hills Limited in November 2022 to provide civil engineering advice and services in support of this Private Plan Change Application (**PC84**).¹ I am familiar with the area to which the application

¹ Chester produced a Draft Stormwater Management Plan dated 23 February 2023, a Flood Risk Assessment dated 23 February 2023 subsequently updated by the assessment dated 22 March 2024 and produced the infrastructure response to Council's further information request dated 12 May 2023. Prior to the hearing both the Flood Risk Assessment and the Stormwater Management Plan have been amended to align to expert comments and a rainfall adjustment. The current documents are Flood Risk Assessment Rev 2 dated 30 April 2024 and Stormwater Management Plan Rev 1 dated 13 May 2024.

relates. I have visited the site and surrounds on multiple occasions, most recently on 13 December 2023.

6. Although this is not a hearing before the Environment Court, I record that I have read and agree to and abide by the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as specified in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I rely upon the evidence of other expert witnesses as presented to this hearing. I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

Summary

7. Natural Hazards – Flooding
 - a. We have agreement with the Council Expert Carey Senior,
 - b. An expert submission was provided (Berggren Trustee) expert Paige Farley which has since been withdrawn. My rebuttal evidence responded to Paige Farley and no changes were considered necessary regarding the comments made on flooding.
8. Stormwater Management
 - a. We have agreement with the Council Expert Carey Senior,
 - b. An expert submission was provided (Berggren Trustee) expert Paige Farley which has since been withdrawn. My rebuttal evidence responded to Paige Farley's evidence. So, whilst the evidence has been withdrawn the amendments agreed in my rebuttal evidence should be retained. The specific items were:
 - i. Updated SMP to be consistent with the Flood Risk Assessment.
9. Water
 - a. We have agreement with the Council Expert Melissa Parlane,

- b. An expert submission was provided (Berggren Trustee) expert Paige Farley which has since been withdrawn. My rebuttal evidence responded to Paige Farley. So, whilst the evidence has been withdrawn the amendments agreed in my rebuttal evidence should be retained. The specific items were:
 - i. Renaming of the Water Tank Table DEV1-2 to include the term “Potable” for clarity.

10. Wastewater

- a. We have agreement with the Council expert Clinton Cantrell, except for the onsite wastewater provisions.
- b. The Council expert Clinton Cantrell and myself do have a difference of opinion on the application of a minimum lot size for onsite wastewater disposal; Mr Cantrell supports a minimum lot size of 3000m² and I do not support such a prescriptive position.
- c. I have reviewed the rebuttal evidence from Mr Cantrell, and I am not persuaded that a 3000m² minimum lot size has been qualified.
- d. My position remains that the minimum required site size for onsite wastewater disposal has many variables to be considered eg. wastewater flow, infiltration rate, slope, offset from boundaries, streams and wetlands.
- e. The use of a minimum lot size infers compliance for the use of onsite wastewater disposal, when a specific site could require more or less area meaning an applicant could need a resource consent for a 2900m² site which is compliant with the design standard, or an applicant doesn't need a resource consent due being greater than 3000m² but then designs a house which doesn't comply to standard at building consent. In my view the minimum site size infers compliance to the lay person and some designers who are unfamiliar with onsite wastewater design.

- f. I acknowledge that the demonstration of compliance at Resource Consent is more work at the consent stage, but it provides specifics on what is anticipated on the site.
- g. I do not strongly oppose the use of a minimum site area, my opinion is that a minimum site size is as oversimplification of a specific assessment, with the assessment being differed rather than being addressed upfront which would provide more clarity and certainty of outcomes for all parties.

Update

- 11. Paragraph 46 and 47 of my evidence in chief referenced the applicant's application to the Northland Regional Council for a wastewater discharge consent to enable a private wastewater treatment plant.
- 12. The wastewater discharge has been granted by the Northland Regional Council "File 45654 dated 16/05/2024".

Conclusion

- 13. The various experts and I are in general agreement, with no fundamental issues that prevents the re-zoning of PC84 in accordance with the proposed provisions.

Steven Brent Rankin

Dated 28 May, 2024

Attached:

Northland Regional Wastewater Discharge Consent File 45654