

Before the Independent Hearings Panel  
at Waimakariri District Council

---

*under:* the Resource Management Act 1991

*in the matter of:* Proposed private plan change RCP31 to the Operative  
Waimakariri District Plan

*and:* **Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited**  
*Applicant*

Evidence of Chris Thompson

---

Dated: 6 July 2023

---

Reference: JM Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)  
LMN Forrester (lucy.forrester@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com  
T +64 4 499 5999  
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 993  
Wellington 6140  
New Zealand

Auckland  
Wellington  
Christchurch



## **EVIDENCE OF CHRIS THOMPSON**

- 1 My full name is Christopher Samuel Thompson.
- 2 I hold a Bachelor of Science (Technology) degree and am a member of Engineering New Zealand and the New Zealand Geotechnical Society. I have over 15 years of geotechnical consulting experience. During this time, I have held positions at Foundation Engineering Consultants (Graduate Geologist and Engineering Geologist), Balfour Beatty Ground Engineering (Contracts Engineer) and Coffey / Tetra Tech Coffey (Engineering Geologist to Associate Engineering Geologist). I have undertaken a wide range of geotechnical consulting work in New Zealand, Australia and England, including design and construction monitoring for many subdivisions and developments in the Canterbury region and across New Zealand, and have also worked on large infrastructure projects at Lyttelton Port and Kawarau Falls Bridge in Queenstown. In these projects I have carried out geotechnical hazard assessments for settlement (both liquefaction induced and static) and slope stability, which are both relevant to this project.
- 3 I am familiar with the plan change application by Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited (*the Applicant*) to rezone approximately 156 hectares of land bordered by Bradleys Road, Whites Road, Mill Road (*the Site*) and to the south by rural residential and farmland. I prepared the Geotechnical Assessment that was submitted as part of the Plan Change application.

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 4 Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, I note that in preparing my evidence I have reviewed the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in Part 9 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. I have complied with it in preparing my evidence. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where relying on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 5 My evidence relates to the geotechnical aspects of the Site and existing environment.

## SUMMARY

- 6 The Applicant engaged Tetra Tech Coffey (NZ) Limited to carry out a geotechnical investigation and assessment of suitability for the proposed Ōhoka Plan Change, near Ōhoka, Canterbury. I am the Project Manager for the geotechnical investigation and design for this Site.
- 7 The Site investigations and preliminary liquefaction assessment indicates that the site is predominantly TC1-like. Other geotechnical hazards (static settlement, erosion, slippage and inundation) are considered low risk with appropriate future engineering design.
- 8 My assessment has considered the items required by Section 106 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and in our opinion the site is considered geotechnically suitable for Plan Change and future subdivision. Further investigations and design will be carried out at the subdivision consent stage which is (or would be) typical for a residential subdivision.

## EVIDENCE

- 9 My evidence for this rezoning request remains the same as my report submitted with the application and I will not repeat its contents here. Instead, I refer to this report which is attached to the Section 32 report for the plan change application.
- 10 The constraint map showing 'Liquefaction Risk Areas' attached to **Mr Walsh's** evidence highlights the site location relative to a report commissioned by ECan in 2012 (and prepared by GNS Science) that provides a review of liquefaction hazard information in Eastern Canterbury (ref. R12/83). This mapping indicates liquefaction damage is unlikely on the Site which is consistent with the findings from our Site investigation which concluded the risk of liquefaction was negligible.
- 11 I have read the relevant sections (6.5.16 and 6.5.17) of the Section 42A report prepared by Andrew Willis.
- 12 No further geotechnical issues about the Site were raised in in these sections and the officer concluded that: *'I consider that there are no known geotechnical issues that would obstruct the plan change,'* of which I agree.

## **CONCLUSION**

- 13 From a geotechnical perspective, the proposed development is considered low risk (TC1-like for foundation design) due to the dense underlying gravel deposits and the ability to design future structures to cope with the seismic and static settlement demands.

Dated: 6 July 2023

**Chris Thompson**