

Hi David,

Re: Private Plan Change Request (Ref: PC0003/23) – Coniston Park Ltd – Infrastructure assessment RFI

As discussed, we have reviewed what was considered/stated in our infrastructure design/servicing report and how this relates to the questions asked from Council in the RFI. Please see below a summary of Selwyn's findings which can be used as a response to the RFI:

RFI Question:

Reliance on Concept Subdivision Scheme Plan

1. The assessment of the proposed change in zoning, including various technical assessments, appears to be based on the scale of density shown in the Annexure 4 Concept Subdivision Scheme Plan ('Concept Plan'), rather than the full density that would be enabled through the Residential C zoning. In particular, the level of density in the Concept Plan is substantially lower than what the provisions in the District Plan enable, which allow for development down to 360m² per allotment. By contrast, the Concept Plan assumes 75% of allotments within the site would be 600m² or more. The Request, including several annexures have therefore only assessed the effects of the development of around 160 allotments, rather than assessing the full envelop of effects that could arise from the change in zoning. The Request also appears to rely on the detail contained in the Concept Plan in some instances, even though this is not linked to or guaranteed through the zone framework or Outline Development Plan ('ODP'). For example, the benefits of the proposal (paragraph 60 of the Request) appear to include matters which are related to the Concept Plan (particularly choice of section size and reference to where higher density is located). Paragraph 102 also refers to the ODP including medium and lower density areas, despite the ODP itself only including one overall "Proposed Residential Area".

- Please update the application to assess the effects arising from the density of development that would be enabled through the Residential C zoning, rather than assessing a particular subdivision concept. This should include, but is not limited to, an updated Traffic Impact Assessment and updated Infrastructure Report. Please also update the application to remove matters that relate to the detail contained in the Concept Plan, but which are not guaranteed through the rezoning sought. It is recommended that these reports, along with the overall Request are updated and re-submitted as replacements.

Our Response:

Following further assessment on three water services capacity from the effects arising from the density of development that would be enabled through the Residential C zoning.

WATER:

The water network in the development was designed to meet fire-fighting demand. This has been modelled with Council network able to maintain 300kPa at Farm Road watermain. As long as there is more than 300kPa at Farm Road, there is sufficient capacity to enable further density within the development. In the **Infrastructure Servicing Report page 14**, it mentioned potential further improvement to the water capacity, resilience and security of supply within the development for Council consideration for the watermain extension in North of Racecourse Road.

WASTEWATER:

In the **Infrastructure Servicing Report page 18 Table 13 – Pipe Flow and Capacity**, the table demonstrates the wastewater pipes in the network have plenty of capacity to allow for further density within the development. It is understood that the Council DN300 sewermain pipe that was

installed along Farm Road will also have sufficient capacity to collect and convey the wastewater from the development.

STORMWATER:

In the **Infrastructure Servicing Report page 25 and 26**, the weighted runoff coefficient 'C' value, used for sizing the soakage basin is C=0.664 for western soakage basin and C=0.662 for eastern soakage basin (i.e. therefore modelling assumes approx. 66% imperviousness from the residential land). In accordance to Ashburton District Plan Section 4.9.2 Building coverage are shown below:

- Residential B – 45%
- Residential C – 35%
- Residential D – 15%

The runoff coefficient that was applied in our servicing assessment is still larger than the building coverage even if say +20% hardstand was added (e.g. Res C = 35% max building coverage, plus 20% hardstand = total of 55% impervious coverage which is less than 66% or C value of 0.66). It is important to note that even if the larger lots were to be subdivided, the building coverage will still need to comply with the District Plan, and therefore the C value governed by the Res C zone will still remain the same and manage runoff as anticipated. Therefore, the calculation demonstrated in the Infrastructure Servicing Report having a higher runoff coefficient than the Ashburton District Plan Building Coverage for the Res C zone being applied for, has provided sufficient capacity assessment to allow further density within the development than that shown on the proposed outline plan (i.e. to at least the density anticipated by the Res C zone).

Regards,

SELWYN CHANG / Senior Civil Engineer / selwyn@do.nz / BEng(Civil), CMEngNZ, CPEng

I trust this is all you need as a response, however if there is anything more, just get back to us.

Kind regards,

GLEN MCLACHLAN / Director / glen@do.nz / Licensed Surveyor, BSurv(Hons), MS+SNZ

DAVIS OGILVIE (AORAKI) LTD
ENGINEERS / SURVEYORS / PLANNERS

MOB: 0297756030 / Freephone: 0800 888 350 / Web: www.do.nz
14 The Terrace / P O Box 359 / Timaru 7940

Offices in Christchurch, Nelson, Greymouth and Timaru



Davis Ogilvie is proud to be carboNZero accredited. Please don't print unless necessary.

Email Disclaimer:

The information contained in this email message is private and confidential. If you are not the named recipient any use, disclosure, copying or distribution of the information is prohibited. Opinions expressed herein are those of the writer and do not necessarily reflect the Davis Ogilvie (Aoraki) Ltd policy. It is also not guaranteed to be virus free. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and erase all copies of the message (including any attachments).