

**BEFORE A HEARINGS PANEL
OF THE FAR NORTH DISTRICT COUNCIL**

I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA MOTUHAKE O TE HIKU O TE IKA

Under the	Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
In the matter	of a request for rezoning of land in the Kerikeri-Waipapa area under the proposed Far North District Plan

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF VICTOR GEORGE HENSLEY HENSLEY IN
SUPPORT OF SECTION 42A REPORT FOR HEARING 15D**

INFRASTRUCTURE

6 October 2025



Sarah Mitchell / Tim Fischer

T: +64-9-358 2222

sarah.mitchell@simpsongrierson.com

tim.fischer@simpsongrierson.com

Private Bag 92518 Auckland

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Victor George Hensley. I prepared a statement of evidence in relation to a rezoning request by Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited (**KFO**) in the Kerikeri-Waipapa area under the proposed District Plan of the Far North District Council (**Council**). I refer to my qualifications and experience in my original statement, dated 10 September 2025, and do not repeat those matters here.

1.2 The purpose of this statement is to provide a brief summary of my evidence.

2. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

2.1 By way of summary, I consider that the PDP-R option for intensification is able to be supported and enabled in the short term by both existing capacity available within the public infrastructure network, as well as identified upgrades and improvements which are currently planned and funded.

2.2 Recently, the district councils in Northland resolved to form a council-controlled organisation to own and manage water supply and wastewater assets in the region (**Northland Waters CCO**). Stormwater will continue to be delivered by the Far North District Council. A water services strategy will be prepared (including a 10-year capex programme) around 2027 and, as a result, water supply and wastewater activities will not be included in the next 2027-37 Long Term Plan of the Far North District Council.

2.3 The PDP-R option for intensification requires investment in water treatment plant capacity in the short-term (with funding already allocated through the 2024-2027 Long Term Plan), and reservoir capacity, water and wastewater network capacity and wastewater treatment plant capacity in the medium to long-term. Medium and long-term investment relating to water supply and wastewater infrastructure will be planned and funded through the newly established Northland Waters CCO. Sufficient raw water resources are available to service growth. Council's existing stormwater infrastructure and pipe network will require investment for both upgrades and extensions over time in order to cater for anticipated future growth.

2.4 I consider there remains uncertainty as to how – and indeed if – the proposed infrastructure servicing plan proposed by KFO is able to be consented, funded and delivered. If it can be, I am of the opinion that while the site may be able to be serviced in the future to support potential urban growth, significant further work is required to demonstrate how the necessary infrastructure upgrades will be funded, by whom, and how the KFO servicing plan will support the wider plans and strategy for infrastructure servicing and funding for the benefit of the wider Kerikeri-Waipapa community.

2.5 In relation to the servicing strategy proposed by KFO, I note the following:

- (a) A significant water supply extension would be required to feed into the development, either from Golf View Road or Waipapa road. Additional pipeline upgrades are also likely to be needed. Servicing this area would likely result in a dead-end line which is not desirable from a pressure/quality perspective.
- (b) An extension of the Kerikeri wastewater network would also be required to service the development. Upgrades of existing wastewater pipes on Golf View Road are also likely to be needed. The development would likely require a pump station and long rising main. In the early stages of the development, problems may be likely with the low flows coming into the pump station causing septicity in the line and downstream network. A stand-alone wastewater treatment plant development within the site (as suggested by the submitter), as a temporary option until public reticulation is funded and installed, is not preferred due to the on-going maintenance and operational requirements. It is also noted that the capital cost of such a wastewater treatment plant per property is much higher (for smaller stand-alone schemes) when compared with larger plants servicing the wider community. Any such temporary stand-alone scheme will also likely generate the need for site rehabilitation and remediation works, at the time of switching from the 'stand-alone' scheme to reliance on the wider public network infrastructure. At this

stage, there is no detail provided in relation to how these rehabilitation and remediation works would be undertaken, what would be required, and who would fund such works. This could involve costs to the responsible entity (e.g. the Northland Waters CCO) and may run the risk of diverting important funding away from investment into network improvements which benefit the wider community, in favour of allocation of funds for the primary benefit of one developer / development.

- (c) An extensive new road network is required with parts of the network inside flood prone areas. Two new bridges and an upgrade to the Golf View Road bridge would be necessary. A major new intersection (roundabout) on State Highway 10 is required to facilitate access.

2.6 To date, KFO has not provided binding commitments or evidence confirming responsibility for funding the full infrastructure which would likely be required to support development of the site. While it is expected that some costs could potentially be recovered through development contributions, developer agreements, or similar mechanisms – in the absence of such certainty, I consider that rezoning the KFO site for urban use presents a significant financial risk to the responsible entities.

Victor George Hensley

6 October 2025