

**Before the Hearings Panel
At Kapiti Coast District Council**

**Statement of evidence of Charles Edward McDermott on behalf Kāpiti Coast
District Council (Geotechnical Engineering)**

Date: 03 November 2025

INTRODUCTION:

1 My full name is Charles Edward McDermott. I am employed as Technical Director of Geotechnical Engineering at Miyamoto New Zealand Limited.

2 I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of the Kāpiti Coast District Council (**Council**) in respect of technical related matters arising from the submissions and further submissions on the Private Plan Change 4 (PPC4) to the Kāpiti Coast District Plan (District Plan).

3 Specifically, this statement of evidence relates to the following matters:

3.1 Geotechnical engineering as related to the proposed (Private) Plan Change 4 – 65 and 73 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga - Welhom Developments Ltd.

4 I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

5 I hold the qualifications of BEng(Hons) CEngNZ CPEng IntPE(NZ).

6 I have worked for Miyamoto New Zealand Limited since 2017.

7 I am a member of Engineering New Zealand.

Code of conduct

8 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023¹. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing my evidence and will continue to comply with it while giving oral evidence before the Environment Court. My

¹ <https://environmentcourt.govt.nz/assets/Practice-Note-2023-.pdf>

qualifications as an expert are set out above. Except where I state I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

SUMMARY

- 9 My name is Charles Edward McDermott.
- 10 I have been asked by the Council to provide geotechnical engineering evidence in relation to the proposed (Private) Plan Change 4 – 65 and 73 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga - Welhom Developments Ltd.
- 11 My statement of evidence addresses Geotechnical Engineering matters only and has been formed based on review of the following documentation:
- 11.1 Riley 'Geotechnical Assessment – Plan Change' Report (November 2024).
- 11.2 KCDC Summary of Decisions Requested by Submissions (15 August 2025).

INVOLVEMENT WITH THE PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 4

- 12 I have been involved in the PPC4 since November 2024.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 13 My statement of evidence addresses the following matters:
- 13.1 Geotechnical Engineering.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 14 I am satisfied that the existing District Plan provisions in addition to the proposed PPC4 provisions, alongside the ‘further matters’ detailed in Paragraph 17 herein are appropriate and adequate to manage any geotechnical effects arising from the development.
- 15 Regarding Submission 11 (Allan Kelly) *“That the large sand dune which straddles the northern boundary of the Site, and which wraps around the submitter’s property boundary on the eastern side of the Site, is not removed, undercut, scraped, or otherwise developed so as to remove any sand whatsoever from the dune”*:
- 15.1 From a geotechnical perspective the primary considerations are as follows:
- 15.1.1 If the dune is deemed ‘stable’ in its present condition (in accordance with appropriate design requirements), it being left as is should pose no significant risk to the development.
- 15.1.2 If the dune is deemed ‘unstable’ in its present condition (in accordance with appropriate design requirements), and no stabilisation works are to be undertaken to the dune itself, other mitigation measures may be required (e.g. implementation of a ‘no build zone’ at the toe of the dune, installation of a ‘catch fence’ to impede slip debris etc.).
- 15.1.3 Any works proposed in proximity of the dune shall not have a detrimental impact on its stability.

16 I consider the Riley 'Geotechnical Assessment – Plan Change' Report (November 2024) and the works presented therein adequate for purpose (i.e. in support of plan change).

17 Further matters which in my opinion may be addressed at resource consent stage are as follows *(please note this is not an exhaustive list, but rather commentary on the assessment presented to date in the Riley Report (November 2024). My expectation would be that further geotechnical assessment will be undertaken, and a more comprehensive geotechnical report will be prepared in support of resource consent)*:

17.1 The Riley Report discusses groundwater levels in terms of 'below ground level', without consideration of elevation. We recommend that Riley provide commentary around groundwater as related to elevation and how this may affect the liquefaction assessment considering the variable ground levels across the site.

17.2 We recommend Riley provide commentary around the effects that earthworks (once known) will have on the liquefaction assessment (and other geotechnical assessments).

17.3 We recommend Riley provide commentary around the static and seismic stability of the reasonably steep slopes around the site (not only those associated with 'open face features').

17.4 The Riley Report states the 'near surface founding soils' have a geotechnical ultimate bearing capacity (GUBC) of 200 kPa. We recommend that Riley provide commentary on how they have assessed the GUBC and how the assessment considers foundation type and geometry.

17.5 There are areas of the site that likely include unsuitable founding material (e.g. organics, non-engineered fill, etc.).

Although the removal of such material is included in the
'Earthworks' Section of the report, it is recommended that
this is made clear as related to GUBC and CBR.

Date: 03 November 2025

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of stylized, overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke at the bottom.