

## **Appendix B – PPC17 Addendum (Water & Wastewater Review)**

# Memo

To:	Damien McGahan – Aurecon		
From:	Chris Hardy - WSP	Date:	26 November 2025
Subject:	Private Plan Change 17 – Te Rapa North Industrial – Addendum Technical Specialist Memorandum		
Technical Area:	Water & Wastewater		
Version:	Final		

## Purpose

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

## 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. A summary of, and update to key issues and matters raised as part of my Technical Specialist Memorandum for Section 42A Reporting, dated 9 September 2025.
  - b. Consideration of and analysis of evidence relevant to my area of expertise including:
    - Evidence lodged by the Applicant (Fonterra Limited);
    - Evidence lodged by submitters; and
    - Rebuttal evidence lodged by the Applicant.
  - c. Any remaining technical issues or matters requiring resolution.
  - d. Recommended amendments of PPC17.

## Documents and further information considered

5. The following documents have been considered in the preparation of this assessment:
  - a. Evidence from the applicant:
    - i. Statement of Expert Evidence of Matthew Charles Farrell on Behalf of Fonterra Limited, 7 October 2025.
    - ii. Statement of Expert Evidence of Nicholas Colyn Grala on Behalf of Fonterra Limited, 7 October 2025.
  - b. Evidence from submitters:
    - i. Statement of Evidence of Briar Alayne Belgrave on behalf of Empire Corporation Limited and Porter Group
    - ii. Statement of Evidence of Dean John Morris on behalf of Porter Group and Empire Corporation Limited
    - iii. Statement of Evidence of Briar Alayne Belgrave on Behalf of Sam and Alisa Coleman, Scott Mathieson, Graeme Boddy, Hayden Porter, Paul and Gloria Stone and Wen Sen Shih & Hsiu-Jung Huang.
  - c. Tabled Statement:
    - i. Waikato Regional Council Submission to Proposed Plan Change 17 – Te Rapa North Industrial to the Operative Hamilton City District Plan, Waikato Regional Council (WRC), 29 October 2025 (referred to as “WRC’s Statement” in the below).
  - d. Rebuttal Evidence of Mr Matthew Farrell.

## Summary of Section 42A Technical Memorandum

6. Section 6.13, 6.15 and 6.17 of the S42A report noted concern around the removal of the Infrastructure Plan requirement. The requirement for the Infrastructure Plan produced as part of the first land use or subdivision consent (stage) and covering the whole site has been subsequently reinstated by Fonterra. Proposed information requirements are discussed in Paragraph Error! Reference source not found..
7. Section 6.14 of the S42A report notes that the staging relationship between all strategic infrastructure requires further consideration. This issue remains and is discussed further in Paragraph 23.

## Review and analysis of evidence

### Fonterra Evidence

8. Minor engineering planning and design aspects of Mr Farrells evidence will need to be considered and agreed to by the Council. For example, the number of wastewater pump stations and the permanence of interim infrastructure. However, these can be addressed in planning and design, and the subsequent consenting and engineering approval processes, or a Private Developer Agreement.

9. Mr Farrell notes in Paragraph 7.1(a) that details of the wastewater treatment should not be included in the Infrastructure Plan as requested in the Section 42A Report. I understand this requirement was included in case alternative treatment solutions would be sought for interim servicing. Details of wastewater treatment are not required for solutions discharging to the Pukete Wastewater Treatment Plant.
10. Mr Farrell notes at Paragraph 6.1 that the conclusion the Plan Change Area can be serviced through the Council's existing citywide water reticulation network was reached following a detailed review of the current network, including the location and capacity of existing water mains. I note that a detailed review has not been undertaken as described. The Council has agreed that the Plan Change Area will be serviced by the city network, but detailed assessment is required to finalise connection requirements and new or upgraded pipeline sizes which are defined indicatively at the time of writing.
11. Mr Farrell states at Paragraph 7.1 (g) and (h) that the need for Fonterra to obtain and transfer a water allocation is rejected on this basis that this is HCC's responsibility. This aspect is dealt with as a 'Remaining Technical Issue' in Paragraph 21.
12. The 'Strategic Infrastructure Table' referred to throughout Mr Grala's evidence '*identifies the dependencies between them without locking in a specific development sequence*'. This is related to staging which is discussed further in Paragraph 23.
13. I have no further comment on the rebuttal statement of Mr Farrell dated 30 October 2025.

#### Submitter Evidence

14. The submitter's evidence listed in Paragraph 5b above generally do not raise any new technical matters related to water and wastewater but seek inclusion of submitter's land in the PPC17.
15. Inclusion of the land will be subject to the same considerations already captured in the Section 42A report and my previous Technical Memorandum, related to infrastructure capacity, staging, further assessment, and integration.
16. In my opinion, there is no significant technical reasons to object to these requests and so responses to the submitter's evidence are planning related matters and I refer to Mr McGahan's S42A Addendum Report.
17. Paragraph 5.4 of Mr Dean Morris' evidence notes uncertainty regarding the capacity of an existing 150 mm diameter wastewater gravity main. I am not clear what this is referring to and note that it is proposed that the TRINZ area connects directly to the Pukete WWTP via new infrastructure, not existing infrastructure. I understand that some of the Porter's land may be able to connect to existing 300 mm diameter wastewater infrastructure in the vicinity of Ruffell Road Arthur Porter Drive, subject to confirmation of capacity. This does not need to be resolved through the plan change.
18. Paragraph 4.1 of Mr Dean Morris' evidence states that the water demand assumptions are insufficient for potential wet-industrial operations. I note that wet industries are not proposed to be allowed within the TRINZ area. I also note that detailed network modelling and planning water infrastructure is yet to be undertaken and is a requirement of the Infrastructure Plan.

## Tabled Statement – Waikato Regional Council

19. Waikato Regional Council (WRC) agree that further information is needed before a final recommendation is provided on the plan change, that infrastructure and servicing effects are properly assessed, and that the plan change provides clear staging direction.
20. WRC support the recommendation that provisions requiring the preparation of an Infrastructure Plan for three waters should be reintroduced to the plan change.

## Remaining technical issues or matters requiring resolution

### Water Allocation

21. Water allocation will remain an issue for the city as development continues in the period until the current consent expiry in 2044. Council's preference remains that the applicant obtain additional allocation for surety of supply as per the Strategic Water and Wastewater Memorandum<sup>1</sup>.
22. In my opinion the proposed Private Plan Change can be approved provided there is a requirement for the applicant to demonstrate 'water allocation availability' at each stage via the proposed Infrastructure Plan. Development may need to be deferred if the availability of allocation cannot be demonstrated at the time of development of any stage.

### Development Staging

23. I acknowledge a desire for flexibility in the order and timing of development from the applicant. However, a better estimate of the staging order and timing of development would assist with planning for the provision of wastewater treatment capacity, water allocation and integration with other development in the area north of the city.
24. Notwithstanding, the proposed Private Plan Change can be approved provided infrastructure requirements are assessed and confirmed for each stage through the proposed Infrastructure Plan and implemented prior to staged development occurring.

## Proposed Provisions

25. I have been involved in preparing the current provisions as they relate to water and wastewater, appended to the Addendum S42A Report. I am satisfied these provisions address the relevant issues raised for water and wastewater, and the Infrastructure Plan.

## Recommendations

26. In my opinion the Private Plan Change can be approved provided there is adequate requirement for the assessment of infrastructure impacts and requirements via the Infrastructure Plan and associated Water Impact Assessments for each stage.
27. In my opinion the technical issues have now been resolved based on the current provisions as appended to the Addendum S42A Report being adopted. I therefore recommend that these provisions be adopted in the PPC17.

---

<sup>1</sup> Strategic Water and Wastewater for the PC17 Area, 19 May 2025