

**BEFORE TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER OF**            the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act')

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF**            of an application for a Proposed Plan Change 37 Nukuhau

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT FOR HEARING BY MICHAEL CORDELL  
ON BEHALF OF TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Date: 5 November 2021

---

## **QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE**

1 My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence-in-Chief.

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**

2 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses outlined in the Environment Court's Consolidated Practice Note and have complied with it in preparing this evidence. I also agree to follow the Code when presenting evidence. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise and that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions.

## **BACKGROUND**

3 I have prepared or contributed to the following documents:

- The Section 42A Report Attachment E 3 Waters

4 In my 2021 report I provided comments on:

- The Plan Change Documentation as it relates to wastewater services.
- Comments on the following submissions:
  - Submitter 34 Peter Marshall on behalf of Tukairangi Trust
  - Submitter 11 Jennifer Stillman
  - Submitter 18 Thomas Hendricks
  - Submitter 46 John and Ali Wilks
  - Submitter 53 Jane Penton (LWAG)
  - Submitter 55 Garry McCarthy.

5 This summary statement is based on the above documents (although it does not replace them), along with consideration of the following:

- Submission of Warren Bird (3 Waters)

## **COMMENTS ON Warren Bird (3 Waters) EVIDENCE**

6 At Paragraph 33, Mr Bird notes that, "most significant of all is that the wastewater pipe across the Waikato River at the Control Gates Bridge is under-sized. Pipe upgrading is in TDC's Long-Term Plan for 2021-23, but until that happens the system is unable to receive Structure Plan area flows at peak times without risk of overflowing". I agree with this comment.

7 In Paragraphs 34 – 35, Mr Bird notes the wastewater options available for the developer and states that there are feasible options including, defer development until sewer upgrading is completed, and provide wastewater storage tanks for retention and off-peak release of wastewater flow. Mr Bird suggests that, “specific details can be considered during the future subdivisional consenting phase”. While I agree that solutions can be developed, I understand that managing this process through subdivision consent process may not be appropriate and that inclusion of a rule within the plan restricting development until a solution is available is considered to be the most appropriate response in my view. How this is best managed should be considered by planning experts as it is outside my core area of expertise. I also note that storage tanks and off-peak retention may not be accepted by Council as a suitable solution.

## **CONCLUSION**

8 The conclusion of my Evidence-in-Chief remains unchanged.

9 That the appropriate process to ensure development does not occur ahead of additional wastewater capacity being available is considered.

Signature

MICHAEL CORDELL  
10 November 2021