

**BEFORE THE COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY  
THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL**

RC210142

**IN THE MATTER** of an application under section  
88 of the Resource  
Management Act (the **Act**)

**BETWEEN** **DOUGLAS DEVELOPMENTS  
LIMITED**

**Applicant**

---

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LLOYD DOUGLAS MORRIS**

---

---

---

**GALLAWAY COOK ALLAN  
LAWYERS  
DUNEDIN**

Solicitor on record: Bridget Irving  
Solicitor to contact: Bridget Irving  
PO Box 143, Dunedin 9054  
Ph: (03) 477 7312  
Fax: (03) 477 5564  
Email: [bridget.irving@gallawaycookallan.co.nz](mailto:bridget.irving@gallawaycookallan.co.nz)

## **1 Introduction**

### **Qualifications and experience**

- 1.1 My full name is Lloyd Douglas Morris. I am a Director and Shareholder of Douglas Developments Limited along with my Wife, Susan.
- 1.2 My career as a civil engineer in the construction industry has been largely focused on the delivery of large civil infrastructure and commercial building projects in the Auckland region for the private sector. Management of the professionals necessary to place 'shoes on the feet' of these projects and to then walk them into being has been a passion, matched only by a very 'old school' hands on approach to pre-empting and solving technical problems.

### **Scope of Evidence**

- 1.3 The following statement provides a brief overview of our aspirations for the property and the objectives of the proposed subdivision.

## **2 Background**

- 2.1 Historically our forbears were miners on the West Coast before moving to the North Island following the work opportunities. More recently various members of our family have been migrating back to the South Island and we being of the same mind are planning to do the same.
- 2.2 We have always lived on farms and small holdings. We currently reside on 2ha (5 acre) property which means we are well used to the intricacies of country living including septic tanks, tank water, stock, and managing the challenges of distance. We have found that the time to maintain a small holding to a high standard is similar irrespective of the size of the holding.
- 2.3 We spent quite some years looking in the Central Otago region for the right property before being besotted with and purchasing this farm early in 2019. We particularly liked that it is equally distant from Wanaka and Cromwell. We then set about designing and obtaining a consent for a home, building an implement shed, drilling a new water bore and planning an infrastructure upgrade that includes extension to the existing internal power and potable/stock water network.

- 2.4 We have also obtained consent for an airstrip on the large flat top terrace that will assist travelling for both private and business purposes. Flying is a passion of ours and we have a small aircraft that we use to travel around in the Country. The airstrip is in both a discrete and unobtrusive location set within one of the Lucerne paddocks and is consistent with other aviation activities occurring on nearby farms. The implement shed has been constructed to house our aircraft when necessary.
- 2.5 We have leased the Farm operations to Jonny Trevathan, a local farmer who has an excellent understanding of the local farming conditions, has a passion for the land and a young family. This approach ensures the property will continue to be a successful farming operation given our absence from the property. We expect that this approach would likely continue under the Farm Park model.
- 2.6 Since purchasing the property external influences, that include Covid, pending changes to water regulations and the future of the Lindis Irrigation scheme have created challenges and uncertainty. The subdivision is in a small way a reflection of that uncertainty.

### **3 Design of the Subdivision**

- 3.1 We are aware that many people are seeking an opportunity to live in the rural environment and have a connection to the land. However, many consider that they do not have the 'experience' to take on a large farm block themselves or have other careers that would not allow them to run a farm at the same time.
- 3.2 The Farm Park idea is neither new or unique, but it is not one Councils generally anticipate or actively promote within their District Plans. We imagined the opportunity for a like minded group of people to live on a working farm, to be able to take an interest in their environment and the running of the Farm through the Farm Management Company and to enjoy all the benefits of a rural family lifestyle while only having to look after a smaller personal landholding set within the larger Farm.
- 3.3 Looking for a way to minimise earthworks, roading and the visual clutter of new residences, a common by product of subdivision, we selected the upper terrace of the property because that could be accessed discreetly from the back of the property off Jolly Road, the new homes could be carefully clustered behind existing shelter plantings and the infrastructure

services could be managed efficiently. The location is discrete and unobtrusive, designed to make the most of both the internal and external view lines, amenity of the farm, whilst retaining the productive potential of the land.

- 3.4 The upper terrace is the driest area of the property and the least productive (relatively speaking). We have not utilised irrigation on this area since purchasing the property and instead focus on dryland cropping of drought tolerant lucerne crops. The lower terraces currently produce good grass, are cropped and irrigated with the limited irrigation that we have via shares in the Lindis Irrigation Company.
- 3.5 The upper terrace It is also well located to enable development that can be contained with limited to no external visibility from the more highly trafficked and higher speed public places surrounding the site, such as the State Highway 8 & 8A
- 3.6 We set the number of 16 residential lots to hold faith with the expectation of the District Plan density rules and have promoted the 17<sup>th</sup> Lot as the Farm Lot.

#### **4 Administration of the subdivision**

- 4.1 We intend to establish a company that each lot owner (Lots 1-16) will jointly own. This Company will be responsible for the management of the common infrastructure and the Balance Lot.
- 4.2 We also intend to register a private covenant between the Lot owners. This is intended to address internal matters such as storage of vehicles, keeping of pets that might affect the farming operations and secure other controls associated with buildings and housekeeping issues that go beyond those in the District Plan.
- 4.3 The purpose of this will be to achieve an overall subdivision outcome that is coherent and of a high quality. Many of the matters that we are contemplating for these covenants are not specifically addressed in the district plan rules or are more stringent – hence they are not proposed to be conditions of the consent. However, each Lot owner will need to obtain a consent under the District Plan to construct their dwelling in the normal manner.

4.4 Despite this, I do understand the need for some baseline level controls as discussed in the section 42A report and do not oppose the inclusion of consent notice conditions addressing matters such as building height.

## **5 Wastewater System**

5.1 As I have set out in the introduction, I am a civil engineer and have some understanding of the matters associated with the design and construction of wastewater treatment systems.

5.2 In light of this I do have some concerns about the condition to require a single communal wastewater system to be constructed on the site. This is because:

- (a) There is relatively little fall across the site which will mean that any such system will likely require pumping to the central point.
- (b) Pumped systems are obviously reliant on electricity and power outages are problematic. Weather conditions can affect electricity supply in this area periodically.
- (c) Issues associated with low flow solid drop out, concentrated dose loading, differences in timeframes for houses to be built will increase the maintenance requirements over the alternative - being an onsite solution for each residence.
- (d) It is my preference to design a simple twin treatment gravity system that can be designed for each specific residence and located appropriately on each lot. These can then be designed and built when required as part of the house contract.
- (e) These systems are unlikely to require pumping and therefore able to remain operational when electricity has failed.
- (f) Such a system can have the level of treatment in place that is considered necessary by the section 42A Report writer and the submissions from ORC and Iwi.
- (g) We have already got some experience in designing a system for this site through the design process for our own residence. We are utilising a gravity twin (secondary) treatment system for our house

and I can see no reason why such a system would not be appropriate on the other residential sites.

- 5.3 For this combination of reasons it is our preference that the condition of consent specify the need for treatment, but that it does not require installation of a single communal system. Mr Costello proposes an alternative condition in his evidence.

**Lloyd Morris**

Director – Douglas Development Limited

21 January 2022