

**Appendix C**  
**Pre-Hearing Minutes**

# I Report on Pre-Hearing for Proposed Plan Change 31 Precinct F - Matamata

## 1.0 Background

In accordance with Clause 8AA of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, a pre-hearing meeting was held on from 9.00am -11.00am on 22 September 2009 to help clarify, mediate and facilitate the resolution of any matters pertaining to the submissions and further submissions received on Proposed Plan Change 31.

## 1.1 Attendees

Paula Rolfe, Community Development Manager, Council  
Michael Payne, Policy Planner, Council  
Robert Brodnax, NZTA  
Stephen Howard, Planner NZTA  
Robert Swears, Opus  
Susan Frischknecht, Acting Rooding Manager, Council  
Brian Sutton, Director Eldonwood Ltd  
Shaun O'Neil, Geometrix  
Mark Tollemache  
Will Hyde, Traffic Design Group

## 2.0 Issues Discussed

Below are the issues that were raised/resolved

- Following introductions Paula provided some background information on the Proposed Plan Change from Councils perspective and Mark followed up with a few comments from the developer's perspective.
- NZTA's main concern is intersection safety at the Hinuera Rd / State Highway 27 Intersection
  - Works to improve the intersection would be expensive because of the railway
  - For this to be considered the project would need to be included in the Regional Land Transport Plan and have a large proportion of the funding supplied by Council and the Developer's.
  - Creating Beatty Road as a through road to Hinuera Rd is a bad idea
  - If roads connecting Precinct F and Hinuera Road are created they need to link to Hinuera Rd as far south as possible.
- Paula asked if Kiwi rail has looked at the proposal and what their position is?
  - Robert B said they were not opposed to remodelling the intersection but would not fund it all.
  - Paula mentioned that council has not looked at funding for upgrading the intersection at this time.
- Discussion moved back a step to the expected impacts of the development on traffic.

- Mark stated the development is expected to produce 5 extra car movements a minute during peak times along Jellicoe St and the surrounding streets, when Precinct F is fully developed. Similar movements would occur if an intersection with Hinuera Rd if it were to proceed.
- The current traffic movements down Jellicoe Road and Hampton Terrace are very low.
- Susan mentioned that upgrading may be require before Precinct F traffic used Hampton Terrace and Jellicoe Street. Widening and traffic calming measures may need to be put in place
- NZTA stated that even with the increased traffic from the Precinct the roads within the precinct, Jellicoe Road and Hampton Terrace will still be classed as local roads due to the number of traffic movements.
- Susan – Councils needs to see the increase in traffic movement figures.
- Rob Opus\_ would be happy if the objectives and policies in the plan talk about design and final layout encouraging traffic to flow northward into town rather than using SH27/ Hinuera Rd.
- Re-word policy – 5.2, Change the wording of local collector road.
- Change map remove collector road, change it to local road with special amenity and talk about a dispersed local network.
  - For dispersal to work well all roads must be equally attractive to drivers.
- Intersection SH27/Hinuera Rd could be paid for by Development Contributions for work to be undertaken in 10 years as it relates to Council roads.
- Services can connect from Hinuera Road through Beatty Road, Haig Road, and Birchwood Lane through the walkways / access reserve and into the Precinct.
- Eldonwood will put words together and come back to NZTA and council.
- Paper road south of Haig Road to be vested in council and will be wider than would normally be expected to allow for future road changes.
- There is potential for conflict as an MPDC councillor lives in Hampton Terrace. It is suggested that it would be a good idea for that councillor to excuse themselves from the hearing
- Steve Howard will get some costs for intersection upgrades to council.

### **3.0 Conclusion**

By the conclusion of the meeting many of the issues raised had been resolved. Eldonwood will provide some word changes to some policies and NZTA will be providing some costing. A decision regarding a hearing will be made in due course.

# II Report on Pre-Hearing for Proposed Plan Change 31 Precinct F - Matamata

## 1.0 Background

In accordance with Clause 8AA of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, a pre-hearing meeting was held on from 11.00am -1.00pm on 22 September 2009 to help clarify, mediate and facilitate the resolution of any matters pertaining to the submissions and further submissions received on Proposed Plan Change 31.

## 1.1 Attendees

Paula Rolfe, Community Development Manager, Council  
Michael Payne, Policy Planner, Council  
Mr Odlum  
Mrs Odlum  
Rhea Dasent, Policy Planner, Federated Farmers  
John Vosper, Cleavedale Farms  
Ross Sainsbury, Federated Farmers  
Shaun O'Neill, Director of Geometrix Ltd  
Brian Sutton, Director of Eldonwood Ltd

## 2.0 Issues Discussed

Below are the issues that were raised/resolved

- Following introductions we went through the Odlums issues.
- Mr & Mrs Odlum – Want to have the option to continue their current operation.
  - Shaun: No one will make them develop and they can continue their current activities under existing use rights provided they were established lawfully.
- Mr & Mrs Odlum – Do not want their rates to increase with the land re-zoning
  - Paula – With a change in zone there is potential for a change in rates but Council can not predict whether it will be an increase or decrease.
  - Shaun - One block, one sewer connection one rates fee
  - Paula will talk to Quotable Value and get an indication of what may happen with rates and see what can be done.
- Mr & Mrs Odlum – Do not want to have a road running through their property and if they do want it then it is to be at their discretion.
  - Brian – The roads on the structure plan are indicative of where roads could go, not where they have to go.
- Rhea – The zone does not follow property boundaries, what is the reason for this?
  - Brian: There have been many conversations with the property owners and they agreed to the zoning and the structure plan.
  - The reason for where the zones are is to create a long term boundary for the town with a shape that reflects good urban design.

- Is this a Council initiative or is it a developer initiative.
  - Paula – Council has identified that we needed to allow for controlled and planned growth with good urban design in Matamata.
- John Vosper asked why the development has been suggested to be on class 1 and 2 soils
  - Paula – All towns in our district are surrounded by class 1 & 2 soils, therefore to extend the town boundaries development must occur on these soils. To put it into perspective less than 1% of the class 1&2 soils in our district have been rezoned as part of this plan change
  - Council has identified that they want growth and they want it close to existing towns.
- Rhea – The buffer and yard does not internalise the reverse sensitivity e.g Cleavedale Farms
  - Mark said that rural residential sections are proposed to be near the boundary with rural to create a low density zone and reduce the effects of reverse sensitivity.
  - Possible solutions to deal with reverse sensitivity were suggested they are listed below:
    - No complaint covenants
    - Possible consent notices
    - Possible consent notices for the spreading of effluent
- Rhea would like to see staff recommendations before they remove their wish to be present at a hearing.
- Mark will amend rule 3.11 building envelope
- Buffer rule can change to apply from rear yard boundary so that a 40m buffer exists
- Stormwater was raised as an issue and the following are the main points from the discussion
  - The SW section of the precinct will be internalized for up to a 1 in 100 yr event.
  - Central section is best dealt with by way of storm water ponds at subdivision stage.
  - Rules that apply – Policy 5 Page 6
    - Assessment Criteria 1.4.20.A (now 1.4.21 as a result of a submission) page 10 (includes storm water and soil contamination)

### 3.0 Conclusion

As a result of the submissions received, a pre-hearing meeting was held to clarify, mediate and facilitate the resolution of the matters that were raised in the submissions and further submissions. By the conclusion of the meeting many of the issues raised had been resolved. Ross Sainsbury was satisfied by the information discussed and withdrew his submission. Council will follow up information on rates for the Odlums and other attendees were generally satisfied by the end of the meeting.

# III Report on Pre-Hearing for Proposed Plan Change 31 Proposed Precinct F - Matamata

## 1.0 Background

In accordance with Clause 8AA of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, a pre-hearing meeting was held on from 1.30pm -5.00pm on 22 September 2009 to help clarify, mediate and facilitate the resolution of any matters pertaining to the submissions and further submissions received on Proposed Plan Change 31.

## 1.1 Attendees

Paula Rolfe, Community Development Manager, Council  
Michael Payne, Policy Planner, Council  
Stuart Broomhall  
Raewyn Broomhall  
Gavin Harris, Director of Barr & Harris  
Graham Robertson, Council  
Mark Tollemache, Planner representing Eldonwood Ltd  
Shaun O'Neill, Director of Geometrix Ltd  
Brian Sutton, Director of Eldonwood Ltd  
Kelly Bosgra, Geometrix Ltd

## 2.0 Issues Discussed

Below are the issues that were raised/resolved

### **BROOMHALL & PIPPIN SUBMISSION**

- Stuart – The collector road should follow the boundary to act as a further buffer between rural and residential land to better control traffic flows.
  - Stuart - Is concerned about dogs and motor bikes using the buffer reserve and the possibility of many different fence heights having a negative impact on visual amenity, for these reasons he believes the road should follow the boundary
  - Brian – Placing the road along the boundary would limit the number of properties that can use it for access. If the road is in its proposed location then it can provide access to lots on both sides of the road.
  - Brian – If the road ran along the boundary then it would have to be on the Broomhall's Property and they would have less land available for lots.
  - Stuart- said it may be better to leave the road in its proposed location.
- It was suggested that an allowance be made for some 1500m<sup>2</sup> sections along the "collector road" on the Broomhall's property.
- Stuart – has the fact that our strawberry farm and shop closing been taken into account in terms of traffic flows. This will cause a reduction particularly in summer afternoon peak times.

### **BARR & HARRIS SUBMISSION**

- Gavin – There is a high water table in NW catchments of the Precinct – there will be problems removing stormwater.
- Graham – Not enough soakage tests have been done
- Gavin – There is a stormwater issue in the northern catchments, this could be resolved with discharge consent and a designated overland flow path.
  - Paula- Will put the idea of discharge consent and easements to Council.
- Gavin – Roads running along common boundaries may be an issue. Particularly if only one property owner wishes to develop.
  - Mark - Road patterns are only indicative
  - Brian - Changes can be made as long as connectivity is achieved

### **3.0 Conclusion**

Stormwater in the Northern Catchments of the Precinct was raised as an issue. Council indicated that it will look into the feasibility of discharge consent and designated overland flow path for this catchment to potentially resolve the stormwater issue. An area zoned rural residential has been re-zoned to allow for some 1500m<sup>2</sup> sections in the south eastern corner of the Precinct where there is good drainage. In general the roading issues raised in submission were satisfied by the explanation that the roads shown on the Proposed Structure Plan are only indicative and that the Plan Change allows for flexibility in road locations.