

# Memo

**To:** Damien McGahan – Aurecon

---

**From:** Chris Hardy - WSP **Date:** 10 December 2025

---

**Subject:** Private Plan Change 17 – Te Rapa North Industrial – Supplementary Technical Specialist Memorandum (Revision 1 updated post hearing)

---

**Technical Area:** Water & Wastewater

---

**Version:** Final – Revision 1

---

## Purpose

1. This supplementary memorandum has been prepared to provide further assessment and comment on Private Plan Change 17 (PPC17) following the applicants and submitters hearing evidence.

This memorandum was initially tabled at the Plan Change Hearing on 3 December 2025. The memorandum has been updated to Revision 1 to reflect discussions between the Section 42A author and the Applicant, and the revised provisions presented with the '*Addendum Section 42A Summary Report*'. Paragraphs 2-13 below are unchanged from the 3 December 2025 version tabled.

## Introduction

2. My name is Christopher Hardy. I am a Technical Principal – 3 Waters with WSP NZ Ltd. My qualifications and experience were set out in the Section 42A Technical Memorandum dated 9 September 2025 which I authored on behalf of Hamilton City Council ('HCC' or 'the Council').

## Code of Conduct

3. I reconfirm that I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and I agree to comply with it.

## Scope

4. This addendum covers the following:
  - a. Existing District Plan Provisions related to infrastructure requirements in the Infrastructure Table and associated section 3.9.3.3.
  - b. The inclusion of indicative network plans in the Plan Change beyond the boundary.

## **Infrastructure requirements in the Infrastructure Table**

5. Mr Grala has proposed that items related to water allocation and treatment capacity are removed from Section 3.9.3.3 and the associated Infrastructure Table as they are matters of process. Mr Grala also stated that existing District Plan information requirements in Volume 2 Appendix 1, Section 1.2.2.5 already require such considerations.
6. Existing District Plan information requirements under Volume 2 Appendix 1, Section 1.2.2.5 are proposed to replace provision related to availability of water allocation and treatment capacity and to avoid duplication of information requirements. I agree that inclusion of the reference is helpful and avoids duplication of requirements and detail.
7. I note however that the District Plan information requirements do not specifically require confirmation of water allocation or treatment plant capacity. I do not agree that the aspects of water allocation and treatment capacity are adequately addressed.
8. The Infrastructure Overlay requirements in 1.2.2.5 triggers a higher-level confirmation from HCC that there is capacity and additional information requirements. This relates to network capacity in terms of current overlays in the District Plan for wastewater. PC17 is not in an infrastructure overlay so this higher standard would not apply – and in my opinion would be more appropriate for the allocation and treatment limitations that potentially apply here.
9. Notwithstanding, my position is that the allocation and treatment capacity references in the Infrastructure Table should be maintained as these are critical issues associated with the original deferred status that are not adequately addressed in the existing District Plan information requirements.
10. The following are my reasons for recommending the inclusion of the water allocation and treatment capacity aspects in the infrastructure table:
  - a. I do not agree that these are simply matters of process. The items are included as they are a potential infrastructure ‘limitation’ related to the provision of servicing so are relevant in the context of the table.
  - b. The items are important inclusions to link the Infrastructure Table and those potential limitations to the Infrastructure Plan requirements that follow (and backwards to the Objectives and Policies).
  - c. It is important that the infrastructure table and associated indicative staging highlight these key issues (at each stage) and reference the subsequent Infrastructure Plan, not the reverse. I believe the table will become a key reference point and it is important these significant potential constraints are clear in all relevant sections, particularly with the upcoming separation of water services from Council.
11. The proposed requirements in the Council version of the plan change should be maintained as this is a key issue for Council and maintains the intent of the original deferred status. I recommend reinstating all the struck-out text in the infrastructure table.

## **Indicative network plans**

12. Regarding the plans of the indicative networks covering the wider area beyond the Plan Change boundary. Council has had input into the plans, and they are relevant as they give

context to assessment requirements which must include integration with adjacent (future) areas and impacts on the adjacent network, in a future consenting process.

13. I prefer a note on context of areas outside the plan change area as opposed to removal of the plans from the Plan Change.

## **Proposed provisions and conclusion**

14. I have reviewed the proposed provisions presented with the '*Addendum Section 42A Summary Report*' and note that the reinstatement of text associated with Section 3.9.3.3 and the associated Infrastructure Table are included but remain in contention.
15. I support the provisions proposed by HCC which are attached to the '*Addendum Section 42A Summary Report*'.