

**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.

---

**Right of Reply**  
**Evidence of Steven Brent Rankin on behalf of Mangawhai Hills Limited**

**(Civil Engineering)**

**Dated 19 June 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](mailto:jeremy@brabant.co.nz)

## **Introduction**

1. This evidence has been prepared by Steven Brent Rankin. My qualifications and experience as set out in our Evidence in Chief (“EiC”) dated 29 April 2024.
2. As per my EiC, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and I agree to comply with it. In that regard we confirm that this evidence is within my sphere of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.
3. The purpose of this statement is to provide comment on changes to the precinct provisions since the hearing and reply to matters raised by Mangawhai Matters in regard to stormwater management.

## **Updated Precinct Provisions**

4. I have reviewed the amended precinct provisions which relate to my area of expertise, and I agree with the provisions as amended.

## **Mangawhai Matters Reply**

5. I provide the following comments in reply to the submission by Mangawhai Matters during the PC84 hearing.
6. The submitter proposed the adoption of the Auckland Council Stormwater Code of Practice inferring that this standard is required to achieve the desired stormwater outcomes.
7. I disagree. This code covers the design and construction of hard infrastructure, specifically the conveyance systems. I draw specific attention to an engineering code of practice versus a Design Guideline, they are not coupled, where the design guideline cannot be used with the KDC engineering standards. The proposed provisions bring through the Auckland stormwater thinking and apply it to the plan change area, and the KDC

engineering standard (current or future) doesn't preclude the outcome being achieved.

8. The submitter indicated that the stormwater management plan has not listed the NPS-FW in the statutory documents noted in the report.
9. The submitter is correct, the NPS-FW is not listed, but I can confirm the Stormwater Management Plan outcomes are aligned with Policy 22 and 23 of the NPS-FW.
10. The submitter indicated that the Stormwater Management Plan was being aligned with the existing KDC Stormwater Network Discharge Consent expressing that that approach was not suitable.
11. I can confirm that the SW approach being applied is above the existing KDC discharge consent. The application is not relying on the existing consent, the development is aligned to current best practise. Eg. treatment of all contaminant generated surfaces, stream erosion mitigation through the management of the 1/3 of the 2-year storm event.
12. The submitter suggested that the Stormwater Management Plan treats contaminants, but it fails to address silt; silt being the submitters major concern.
13. I can confirm that silt is being addressed by the Stormwater Management Plan, as silt is a contaminant as defined by GD01. The Stormwater Management Plan seeks to manage all contaminants so including silt with treatment prior to discharge.
14. As a general comment on silt, the stormwater approach is to avoid the creation of silt from the small events, so rather than allow it and capture prior to discharge we seek to prevent it being eroded in the first instance. So, the control is one of avoidance as a primary response rather than capture as mitigation. The 1/3 of the two-year stormwater control is specifically engineered for this purpose.
15. This silt management approach doesn't appear to be understood by the submitter, and the submitter mentioned the use of online downstream

ponds. Online ponds are not the solution for silt, large turbulent flows during larger storm events will likely re-suspend captured silts and mobilise them into the receiving environment.

16. I maintain we seek to prevent silt generation through the 1/3 of 2-year mitigation from the PC area and the stormwater provisions represent best practise engineering knowledge in this space

## **Conclusion**

17. After the hearing I maintain my opinion that there are no engineering limitations within my area of expertise that prevent the re-zoning of PC84 in accordance with the proposed provisions.

Steven Brent Rankin

Dated 19

June 2024