


| PART 1: INTERNAL REFERRAL INFORMATION | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Comments due by: | 26 August 2020 | Processing Planner: | Place Group – Tim Wilson |
| Consent number: | PC/0009/20 | | |
| Address: | Growth Cell T2 – Frontier Road, Te Awamutu | | |
| Applicant: | Sanderson Group Limited and Kotare Properties Limited | | |
| Agent: | Bloxam Burnett & Olliver | | |
| Allocated to: | Tony Coutts | | |
| Date of site visit: | | | |
| Assessment undertaken by Development Engineering:- | | | |
| <p>Name: Tony Coutts</p> <p>Signed: 07/09/2020</p> <p>Date: </p> | | | |
| Comments | | | |
| <p>Earthworks:</p> <p>The provided cut fill contours plan prepared by Nicklin CE dated: 24th July, 2020 (Council reference: 10449413, Appendix H, Page 147 of 548) out lines a estimated 290,000m³ of cut and 207,000m³ (Conceptual figures at this point). The volume of earthworks triggers both District and Regional councils plans for various reasons but will appropriate conditions, can be managed accordingly. At time of relevant future consent, conditions will be recommended by development engineering to be mitigate potential effects created from the temporary to a less than minor affect. Conditions may include the need for a construction management plan and implementation of plan, sediment erosion controls, stockpiling locations away from residential development, Dust measures, Reinstatement, Archaeological, Abandoned works and hours of work conditions. Geotechnical completion report will also be recommended with is elaborated further within the Foundations comments.</p> <p>Roading/Access:</p> <p>As part of the application Development engineering provided early input into transportations current roading figures, existing plans in play and comment on the Development Engineering and transportation manager Bryan Hudson met with Stantec’s, Mark Appledorn on 30th of May, 2020 to discuss the various matters relevant to assess and mitigated the potential development would have on the proposed and wider roading network. Meeting agenda items related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Description of the transport assessments as they relate to the Structure Plan, Retirement and Residential Subdivisions areas ● A focus in on Frontier Road and the features Council would like to see on plans included with the application, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Carriageway cross section ○ Road markings ○ Western “gateway” management if necessary ○ Shared path north side | | | |

- Subdivision intersection
- Residential subdivision roading
- Ped/cycle access/links
- Parking
- Lighting
- Speed limit sign relocation
- Discussion of the separate Structure Plan approach to Pirongia Road, with the expectation that a lesser level of detail is required there. Still, discussions to include:
 - Carriageway width
 - Markings arrangements, i.e. centreline, edge lines, basic compliance/standard requirements
 - Intersection location
 - Shared path south side
 - Kerb and channelling both sides
 - Intersection form and control
 - Lighting

The meeting a subsequent following correspondence has led to finalisation of the Stantec's report dated: 11/08/2020 (Council reference: 10449413, Appendix F, Pages 235 – 272 of 548) and the Transportations manager has been requested to provide commentary. Further correspondence with Transportation has provided the following:

Matters that will need careful consideration in the PC and structure plan include;

1. *All references are to ITA. Page 13. A 3m shared path is proposed to run around the periphery of the retirement village to then link into the subdivision roads each side. While I have no issue with this approach there is a need to ensure good design principles of width, forward visibility, CPTED passive surveillance, easy wayfinding, easy access for maintenance etc*
2. *Shared paths that link to the T1 development will need a similar commitment from the T1 developer to ensure they are continuous into T1 and link with the shared path along the collector of T1.*
3. *Shared paths that cross streets should be on speed tables to reinforce the lower speed environment but also give greater safety and priority to pedestrians and cyclists.*
4. *Page 14, table refers to WDC parking requirements which have now been relaxed with Nation Urban Development Standards removing minimum parking requirements.*
5. *Tables 8.1 and 8.2 list road and berm widths etc. They will need to consider carefully the proposed landscaping and street tree planting if narrow road reserves and berms are to be used. This often means that there is no room for street trees and unless planting is proposed on an adjacent landscape strip this will not meet the requirements of RITS.*
6. *Some carriageway widths are also proposed to be quite narrow at 5.7m. This is good for encouraging low speeds and shared spaces but does present issues if there are tighter radii curves, cul de sacs and intersections where the rubbish and recycling truck will find it very difficult to operate without running over kerbs. Care will be needed to identify likely issues and detail design will have to compensate for these issues, e.g. banning parking from the street and trying to create crescents rather than very short cul-de-sacs.*
7. *RITS 1.5m minimum width footpaths are proposed. Care is needed to identify footpaths which might have higher use by mobility devices as these would benefit from 1.8-2.0m wide paths to accommodate users.*
8. *I support the ITA proposals to create thresholds which slow traffic at the rural/urban changes on both roads*
9. *I support the ITA proposal for a right turn bay for Pirongia Road/T2. I note that the proposed intersection location coincides with the narrowest part of the road formation where the river is close to the road and land falls away behind the trees to the river. Forming a right turn bay here may be difficult unless the east bound lane is left where it is and the west bound lane is moved over to accommodate the turn bay.*

This may need land from the T1 growth cell to be vested as road to accommodate the road widening and shared path.

Overall, I think the ITA covers off well the issues we raised with mark at our earlier contact.

With the information supplied above, it is agreed that the ITA provides relevant assessment of effects to proceed with the plan change. At time of relevant future consent, conditions will be recommended by development engineering to best mitigate potential effects, and reference appropriately relevant information provided in the report. Conditions will likely include Submit design, Construct, Quality assurance and Asbuilts.

Water Supply:

As demonstrated within the civil Infrastructure report provided by Nicklin Dated: July 2020 Council reference: 10449413, Appendix D, Page 135 - 190 of 548) connection will be made to existing council infrastructure. Modelling results from Opus (3-39433.00 WSP T2 Water Supply Assessment July 2020: 176 – 186 of 548) have determined that there is sufficient supply under the provision that upgrades are undertaken to the existing retaiation network via way of detailed design for booster pump installation/operation. At present, the booster supply design is being worked in to an IFS agreement with Opus and will service both the T2 initial stages an T1 developments later stages. At time of relevant future consent, conditions will be recommended by development engineering to be mitigate potential effects in conjunction with the information provided in the report. Conditions will likely include Submit design, Construct, Quality assurance and Asbuilts as well as separate connection applications if required.

Wastewater:

As demonstrated by the civil plans provided by Nicklin CE dated: 24th July, 2020 (Council reference: 10449413, Appendix H, Pages 148 - 152 of 548) and Infrastructure report Dated: July 2020 Council reference: 10449413, Appendix D, Page 135 - 190 of 548) residential/retirement village infrastructure will gravitate to a receiving wastewater pump station and then ultimately connect to infrastructure located along Pirongia Road (Likely receiving Asset ID: 20190725094422). The receiving council infrastructure was originally sized to cater for both T1 and T2 development and is still deemed adequate for connection.

At time of relevant future consent, conditions will be recommended by development engineering to be mitigate potential effects in conjunction with the information provided in the report. Conditions will likely include Submit design, Construct, Quality assurance and Asbuilts.

Concern has been raised in regards to the location of the pump station to the playground/reserve area. If this location is to remain, detailed design stage will have further emphasis to mitigate these effect by way of dosing control and odour air filtration systems and potential screen planting to mitigate amenity effects.

Stormwater:

As demonstrated by the civil plans provided by Nicklin CE dated: 24th July, 2020 (Council reference: 10449413, Appendix H, Pages 148 - 152 of 548) primary network infrastructure will be maintained within mainly the public access corridors with catch pits placed at low points and at spaced appropriate intervals to councils standards. Primary network conveyance will discharge to the proposed Lot 110 reserve which will be vest to council for local purpose stormwater and will be utilised as a wetland device to act as the main source of treatment/attenuation prior to discharge to existing systems. This is also close proximity recreation areas for added amenity.

As demonstrated by the civil plans previously mentioned above, and the overall stormwater management plans prepared by Wainui Environmental (Council reference: 10449413, Appendix H, Pages 191 - 234 of 548) Proposed Lot 110 will act as the main attenuation/treatment area for the site as well as a swale conveyance is proposed along the western boundary of the Country Club This has a catchment of approx. 4.4Ha which equates to approx. 25% of the development site. Further investigation and recommendations will likely be provided from WRC relative to their discharge consent to on the current WRC Low Impact Design Matrix provided to achieve a higher score than the 8 provided.

From a development engineering perspective, compliance with the technical review from WRC is heavily relied upon for assessment of effects as the discharge consent will eventually be owned by council. An outcome likely to occur, is the addition of lot devices being required, this will also be to meet the NZBC Clause E1 Surface drainage requirements at later building consent. With the statement above, compliance with Section 9 of the Waipa Stormwater Bylaw - Private stormwater systems, and council's business cases for stormwater enforcement of these systems, the effects of the proposed plan change are deemed less than minor when mitigated by way of conditions.

At the time of relevant future consent, conditions will be recommended by development engineering to mitigate potential effects in conjunction with the information provided in the report. Conditions will likely include Submit design with emphasis on treatment and volume control measures, Construct, Quality assurance, Asbuilts and relevant operation/maintenance plans/implementations.

Foundations:

As a result of the proposed earthworks mentioned above, the development will need to record, test, and investigate to provide a Geotech completion report compliant to council standards. NZS:4431:1989; Code of practice for earth fill for residential development, NZS:4404:2010 (schedule 2A) and Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (RITS): "Earthworks and Geotechnical Requirements" demonstrate appropriate means of compliance earth cut/fill practices and allow council to have assurance at building consent stage that the new lots are suitable for development. Completion report will be a condition requirement under the anticipated bulk earthworks consent, and will form as evidence for subsequent section 106 assessment of the subdivision.