

Prehearing Meeting Report for Plan Change 4: Tara-Ika – Structure Plan, Zoning and Stormwater

Nature and content of this Report

This report has been prepared as a summary of the discussions held at the prehearing meeting relating to the following prehearing meetings:

- Monday 19 July 2021 – Structure Plan and Zoning
- Tuesday 20 July 2021 – Stormwater

This report sets out the issues that were agreed at the meeting, as well as any issues that were outstanding. Copies of the minutes for the meeting are attached in Appendices 1 and 2 respectively.

Prehearing Meeting – Monday 19 July 2021 – Structure Plan and Zoning

Since the previous prehearing meeting in June on the Structure Plan and Zoning as proposed by the Plan Change, Councils reporting planner Lauren Baddock has reviewed the extent of zoning. This is particularly in response to the previous comments by submitters that the area should have full residential zoning in order to maximise the yield potential for the wider site. The change in zoning would see a yield of approximately 3500 new houses in total.

Lauren explained that she was not rezoning all land to residential. Some would stay as Greenbelt on the basis of submission scope and recognising some areas had already been developed in a way to make residential development difficult. Having more green spaces also helped with stormwater attenuation (noting this was to be discussed tomorrow). New open space areas had been included. This was due to the increase in density and need to provide for recreation spaces within walkable distance.

There was recognition by the parties that Council had listened to them at the last prehearing meeting, but some had additional comments to make.

Phillipa noted a greater area of open space had been identified on their land and wanted to know why. Lauren explained this created a buffer to the Waiopheu Reserve (which is an ecological space) and provided for open space in that area of Tara-Ika. There remains uncertainty for the exact location of the Maunu Wahine site near this corner of Tara-Ika, but the co-location of open space in this area made sense.

Brian sought confirmation of the sizes of each open space area. Lauren undertook to provide this information for the prehearing meeting tomorrow.

Ann sought clarification on the cycleways – were they shared paths and how wide. Lauren undertook to confirm the width of the cycleways and whether they are to be shared paths with the Council's transport team. Phillipa and Ann had further ideas for where the cycleway should be located and they were intending to raise their ideas for a different location for the shared path/cycleways at the hearing.

Phillipa sought clarification on the status of the open space areas if they are moved slightly during subdivision stage. Paul also questioned why the open space areas are zoned. Lauren considers that it is more appropriate to zone these areas, noting that they may need to be rezoned in the future once subdivisions have been approved.

Gwyneth raised concerns that the access to the Thomas' property from Pohutakawa Drive is not shown on the updated structure plan. Lauren explained that they had legal access to Pohutakawa and that she did not support a road being shown as Pohutakawa is not formed to be a key road servicing the wider Tara-Ika site.

Gwyneth also wanted to see the greenbelt zoning removed and replaced with full residential development. Lauren explained that she did not support this and did not consider she had scope within submissions to make that change.

Erin sought clarification on whether the special effects overlay still applied. Lauren explained that residential zoning applied to their property but the resource consent process would need to consider noise, access and other matters. The overlay did not mean no development.

Discussion occurred about the fairness for landowners to provide open space, roading and infrastructure required to facilitate growth. This links to development contributions (recently introduced by Council), and future development agreements between Council and landowners/developers. Many of these matters are to be dealt with at subdivision stage, rather than the plan change process. To assist plan users in the future an advice note could be included in the plan. Lauren was to consider this further in her report.

In terms of the roading layout, Lauren explained the intent behind identifying those roads which are of a fixed location (arterial and collector roads) and those that local roads could be flexible. Discussion was had on what this meant. For instance, moving the location of a collector road or arterial road would need consent, but moving a local road did not.

Karen opposes the collector road in her property and considers this should be a local road. She disagrees with the setback sought from the Redwood Grove residents as this would make the road go through buildings on her site. A 30m setback from the boundary would be more appropriate and allow a row of houses either side of the road. Lauren supports the 30m setback from the property boundary although I noted that this was not agreed to by the Redwood Grove residents.

Karen also opposed the reference to a local road through Redwood Grove. Lauren explained her rationale for retaining the local road. Tom Anderson (representing the Redwood Grove residents) agreed that keeping the road there was appropriate and that it did not mean a road would be built in that location.

Mike and Erin sought clarification on the connection to Liverpool Street noting that this impacted their property a lot depending on the road form. I understand the Council team has had conversations directly with Mike and Erin on this and I suggested that a further meeting is held.

Matters agreed

All submitters support the changes in zoning compared with the Structure Plan, however some parties want to see more of their land residential rather than open space or greenbelt. These points will be discussed further at the hearing.

Karen and Lauren agreed to show the Collector Road on the Prouse Property with a 30m setback from the Redwood Grove properties.

Matters outstanding

Parties did not fully agree on the extent of residential zoning, despite the extent of changes Lauren is recommending. Parties will be highlighting additional changes at the hearing for the Panel to consider. These largely relate to the open space on the Brown property and the retention of the Greenbelt zoning.

No agreement was reached on what type of road should be shown on the Prouse property. This is a matter to be covered at the hearing. It is noted that a transport report has not yet been completed.

Agreed Actions

The following actions were also agreed at the meeting:

1. Lauren to confirm whether the cycle ways are actually shared pathways and, if so, whether these could be relabelled on the plan. Lauren to come back with answer at tomorrow's meeting.
2. Lauren to confirm width of shared pathway and provide this tomorrow.
3. Lauren to consider adding an advice note about delivery of infrastructure, open space and how Council will work with landowners/developers.
4. Lauren to provide a copy of the map of submitters to Phillipa when it is ready.
5. Lauren to provide email to Brian about their ability to use their property down Pohutakawa Drive for access.
6. Lauren to come back tomorrow with a map showing approximate sizes of open spaces.
7. Officers to have an offline discussion with Erin and Mike re: Liverpool Street connection.

Prehearing Meeting – Tuesday 20 July 2021 – Stormwater

Lauren provided answers to the questions from the 19th on the width of cycleways, roads and the appropriate size of the new open space areas. The latter was shown on a new structure plan map that was distributed amongst the parties.

Since the first prehearing meeting on Stormwater, Council's technical team have completed a draft report on how stormwater should be managed within Tara-Ika. David Arseneau is the Council's expert for the plan change and he explained the work he has done and the draft report pre-circulated to the parties for this meeting.

Daniel (Councils Project Manager) confirmed that Council is not seeking to designate any stormwater management areas as part of the plan change process. David confirmed that a centralised approach to stormwater management is preferred as it is a more efficient use of space, more cost efficient and easier to maintain. Some of the open space areas could also be used for stormwater attenuation throughout the site. Photos showing detention areas and wetlands were shown.

David explained the stormwater solution for the site is for the water to be stored and soak away to groundwater. No discharge to Lake Horowhenua or Koputaroa Stream is proposed. This requires wetlands and detention areas. It is Council's intent to work with landowners through subdivision stage, including Waka Kotahi to utilise land not required for the new O2NL road (the area between the road and the designation boundary).

David confirmed that work undertaken has been done for a 1:100 year event plus climate change. Horizons confirmed that this is essentially a 1:200 year event and that what was identified as a solution to stormwater management (wetlands and detention areas) was well aligned with the One Plan.

John questioned what is happening with stormwater from existing lifestyle properties. Lauren explained that there would be no change for these properties unless they redeveloped.

Parties discussed further the location of the detention areas, how deep and where exactly they will be located. At this stage, work has been undertaken to show a solution is possible. The exact location will be via landowner/council negotiations. I noted in the meeting that there is a level of detail that submitters are seeking that Council cannot provide. I explained the purpose of the plan change and the level of detail required to show it is feasible and possible to manage stormwater onsite. That is the information Council has provided.

There were a number of site-specific questions raised by submitters that the Council team answered. These are covered in the detailed notes in Appendix 2.

Karen expressed concern for her property being at the 'bottom' of the site and that others will expect her to manage all stormwater for the wider site. She does not want to be forced to be the solution for stormwater. Lauren explained that each subdivision are responsible for mitigating their own effects and must manage stormwater. Daniel confirmed that the location of stormwater detention areas and wetlands will only occur where the landowner is willing.

Matters agreed

There were no matters of agreement reached.

Matters outstanding

While the meeting provided an opportunity for the parties to discuss the stormwater issues further, submitters are seeking specific details on the location and size of stormwater management solutions that would normally be covered through a subdivision consent.

Agreed Actions

Lauren is to provide the cycleway and road widths to Phillipa.

I did encourage submitters to be clear in their hearing evidence those changes that they support, and where they seek for the panel to make a different decision.

Andrea Harris

28/7/2021

Minutes: Pre-hearing meeting for Plan Change 4 - Zoning

Date: 19 July 2021

Location: Horowhenua District Council – Main Office

Attendees:

Andrea Harris (facilitator)

Lauren Baddock (reporting planner)

Wayne Gair (friend of submitters)

Ann and Brain Thomas

Erin and Mike Nijhuis

Phillipa Wickrenasinghe, Pasanka Wickrenasinghe (online) and John Brown

Vivienne Bold

Paul Turner (on behalf of Haddon Preston)

Brendan McDonnell

Charles Rudd

Gwyneth Schibli

Karen and Stephan Prouse

Stephan Martin (on behalf of McDonnell's)

Tom Anderson (on behalf of Redwood Grove residents)

Megan Kettle (on behalf of Waka Kotahi NZTA)

Reporting planner's update:

The meeting commenced with Lauren providing an update of what progress had been made since the last pre-hearing meeting on zoning. Lauren explained:

- The changes that have been made to the zoning map since notification, taking into consideration submissions and the last prehearing meeting.
- Some of the rationale behind the zoning being that Tara-Ika is an extension of Levin, with Residential transitioning across the plan change area to Rural and the zoning pattern reflecting this.
- Subsequent changes to roads as a result of the changes to zoning.
- Subsequent changes to open space and the rationale for the provision of open space (i.e. must be within walkable distance for residential properties).

Round table discussion:

Erin asked what the zoning would be for the Arapaepae Road special overlay area and Lauren confirmed it is standard Residential.

Brendan sought clarity on the funding of open space. Lauren explained Development Contributions.

Charles asked whether the land in the plan change area had already been subdivided. Lauren indicated that some areas had already been subdivided (Redwood Grove, Pohutakawa Drive etc.) but largely the land within Tara-Ika had not been developed. This plan change makes provision for around 3500 new houses.

Phillipa queried whether the location of roads and open space is fixed or whether they can be moved. Lauren outlined that Arterial/Collector roads are fixed but the location of local roads is not and that open space was also able to be moved.

Phillipa noted that the Brown land adjoins Waiopēhu Reserve and felt additional open space on their land was unnecessary. Also noted the size of the open space identified on their land appeared bigger than others.

Lauren explained that Waiopēhu Reserve was an ecological reserve and that recreational space was needed for residents. Explained open space had been identified to ensure residents would have reasonable access to it. Mentioned the Maunu Wahine site and that the co-location of open space with this site made sense.

Phillipa indicated that her family was not convinced the Maunu Wahine site is on their land and that it was more likely to be south of Waiopēhu Reserve. Lauren confirmed that the location of the Maunu Wahine site still needed to be confirmed and that Council would work with Muaupoko and the relevant landowners to determine this. Regardless open space was still needed for this area and the identified location makes sense as it would act as a buffer between residential properties and Waiopēhu Reserve.

Brian wanted to confirm the actual size of the open spaces. Lauren indicated that the sizes of the open spaces would be determined at subdivision stage. Brian still wanted to understand what would be considered to be a 'serviceable' size for an open space. Lauren advised him that this is based on use and would be determined at subdivision stage.

Brendan indicated that some of the open space would be used for stormwater attenuation, which Lauren confirmed and advised this could be discussed at tomorrow's prehearing meeting.

Ann asked why the cycle ways in the plan change area are not shared pathways. Lauren acknowledged that they could be shared pathways but was unsure.

Action: Lauren to confirm whether the cycle ways are actually shared pathways and, if so, whether these could be relabelled on the plan. Come back with answer at tomorrow's meeting.

Brian queried the width of a shared pathway. Lauren was not sure.

Action: Lauren to confirm width of shared pathway and provide this tomorrow.

Karen asked what redress would be provided to property owners by Council with shared pathways and/or open space identified on their property. Questioned fairness where some landowners had roads, shared pathways and open space on their property which would greatly reduce the area available for development.

Phillipa requested that the shared pathways on the Brown's property be amended to follow the Collector road. Based on the requirement to provide the shared pathway, subsequent service lanes and open space she is concerned it may not be economically viable for them to develop this property.

There was confusion around what the function and design of the service lanes for properties that fronted on to a strategic cycle ways would look like. Lauren drew a diagram on the whiteboard to better explain this requirement.

Phillipa asked why not require cycle path at the rear of the properties and vehicles access properties directly from the road. Lauren referenced crime prevention through design, indicating that cyclists would feel safer on a visible and well lit street.

Lauren indicated that at this stage she had not seen evidence to suggest that the strategic cycleway provisions would not be viable. She reference examples of where similar designs were successful in Nelson and Australia. Lauren reminded people that her role was to make recommendations and that she was not the decision maker.

Phillipa queried what zone would apply to land if they moved an open space. Lauren outlined that open space could be moved but that the land would still remain zoned for open space. It could be used for residential purposes (consent would be required) and another area could be used for open space. A future plan change would be required to 'tidy up' instances where this may occur. This has been anticipated and is not uncommon.

Paul suggested simply showing open space on the structure plan instead of zoning the land. Lauren felt that zoning was more appropriate as it gives certainty that open space provision will be made and this is important.

Paul questioned fairness to landowners in regards to the requirement to provide open space. Considered that uncertainty around process for them to be compensated could be enshrined in policy. Lauren considered this was a matter to be dealt with outside of the plan change process and that it needed to be discussed at the subdivision stage. Without knowing the detail of a development Council cannot understand the actual requirement for open space.

Andrea indicated that agreements at subdivision stage was typical.

Paul requested a policy statement to clarify this and Lauren indicated this was not appropriate but an advice note could be added.

Karen raise concern that some property owners would unfairly be required to provide infrastructure that would benefit the wider plan change area. Uncertainty around redress. She referenced matter of discretion – suggested Council was 'pre-loading' plan provisions. She indicated that landowners should only need to provide services appropriate for the subdivision they were proposing.

Lauren outlined the need to think longer term. Example that someone could do a 3 lot subdivision and therefore argue a road is unnecessary but then in the future come back with a proposal for 100 lots and this would require existing, insufficient infrastructure to be removed and replaced.

Karen considers the Collector road on her property to be excessive. A Local road would be sufficient for the development capability of their property and a Collector road is really for the benefit of the wider plan change area. She wanted more certainty around costs and redress.

Lauren reiterated that without knowing subdivision level detail that more certainty could not be provided. Referenced the reintroduction of Development Contributions, suggesting that Council is aware that fairness is a concern. Council is investing heavily in Tara-Ika which proves it's serious about supporting development in this area.

Karen suggested the policy previously mentioned by Paul.

Andrea directed Lauren to consider whether an advice note would be appropriate.

Action: Lauren to consider adding an advice note.

Stephan Martin indicated he was supportive of this approach and requested a copy of Council's Development Contributions Policy to understand cost breakdowns. Lauren directed him to Council's website, where the policy is available to view.

Gwyneth raised her concern that the access to the Thomas' property from Pohutakawa Drive has not been identified on the updated map and this was necessary as they required this access. Lauren confirmed that this property could be used as access for their property; altering the map is out of scope. While the property can be used for access to a future development an alternative access would likely be needed as Pohutakawa Drive was not designed to service significantly more vehicles.

Gwyneth considers the Greenbelt strip adjoining the Pohutakawa Drive development to be unnecessary as Pohutakawa Drive is Greenbelt and already provides a transition of Tara-Ika being residential and the rural land to the east of Pohutakawa Drive.

Gwyneth considers the existing Greenbelt properties within Tara-Ika to be excessive and a waste of horticultural land (quoted 60ha or 170 existing lots). She believes rural land (particularly class 1, 2 and 3 soils) should be better protected in this District. She is supportive of Redwood Grove being residentially zoned. Gwyneth talked about wanting to understand the location of infrastructure. She suggested Pohutakawa Drive could be further developed.

Andrea sought clarification on whether Gwyneth was suggesting Pohutakawa Drive could be rezoned Residential - which Gwyneth confirmed. Andrea directed Lauren to explain her reasons for not rezoning Pohutakawa Drive as part of this plan change. Lauren explained her reasons; pattern of development of Pohutakawa Drive (including location of existing houses), need to provide a variety of housing, and transition of development pattern. There is no scope to rezone Pohutakawa Drive.

Andrea referred to the changes that Lauren had made to the zoning and tested whether we would be able to reach some agreement today.

Phillipa indicated that she was pleased with the changes made but wanted entirely Residential for their land and referred to the Draft Master Plan that was released for consultation. Lauren confirmed that changes were made following consultation on the Draft Master Plan based on feedback from Pohutakawa Drive residents. Andrea advised we needed to focus on the notified version of the Master Plan and the changes that have been made since then. Again she asked whether we could have some agreement on the zoning changes.

Tom advised that the Redwood Grove submitters that he represented were still opposed to Residential zoning of Redwood Grove. There was confusion around which property owners he represented.

Lauren advised a map showing submitters was being developed and Phillipa requested a copy of this.

Action: Lauren to provide a copy of the map of submitters to Phillipa when it is ready.

Stephan Martin advised they were happy with the changes but more concerned about the location of roads and the O2NL corridor. Lauren confirmed that Waka Kotahi had changed their position on the treatment of the O2NL corridor since making their submission.

Karen confirmed that their submission was against any additional restrictions being applied to the properties within the O2NL corridor and sought confirmation from Waka Kotahi of what

was agreed at the last pre-hearing meeting. Megan outlined Waka Kotahi's revised approach.

Stephan Martin raised that O2NL would likely have design implication on developing McDonnell land. Megan acknowledged this and advised that this would need to be discussed and addressed through other processes.

Andrea indicated that she felt Lauren had made substantial changes to the zoning based on feedback received and this should be acknowledged. She touched on whether there were areas of agreement in relation to zoning that could be reached today.

Lauren outlined that her take away from discussions was that people were generally happy with the changes that had been made but that they also wanted more changes. Lauren provided direction that she is comfortable with the level of change that she has made to date and was not convinced that further change was necessary at this stage. She advised that if people wanted further changes then they needed to bring this forward at the hearing.

Brian requested Lauren provide in writing what she had said in relation to them using the site they own down Pohutakawa Drive for access as he would like to seek a legal opinion. Lauren said she would do this, however, a call would still need to be made at subdivision consent stage (when sufficient detail is known) whether access from Pohutakawa Drive for a portion of their development is appropriate.

Action: Provide email to Brian about their ability to use their property down Pohutakawa Drive for access.

Pasanka (someone online asked this – I think it was him?) asked for clarity on size of open spaces. Lauren advised she can provide approximate sizes but that at the subdivision consent stage the actual sizes will be based on use and number of properties serviced etc.

Action: Lauren to come back tomorrow with a map showing approximate sizes of open spaces.

Pasanka (?) wanted to understand the logic behind the sizing of open space. Lauren advised that logic can be provided but that sizes would be determined at the subdivision stage.

Erin asked whether there is still a need for the special effects overlay and Lauren said she felt there was still a need. Erin asked whether there could be a time limit on the overlay. Lauren advised it is possible and suggested this is something that Erin could raise at the Hearing.

Charles asked what the width of the service lanes would be. Asked whether properties would be paying higher rates as there would be twice as much road to maintain. Lauren/Tiffany explained rates are based on capital value and the cost of maintaining the service lanes would be absorbed into wider rates. Charles reconfirmed his point that ultimately additional roads meant higher rates. Lauren indicated that this was a trade-off.

Andrea asked Lauren to explain 'fixed' vs 'flexible' location of roads. Lauren talked about new roading terminology, the importance of arterial/collector roads and the need for their location to be relatively fixed. Whereas the location of local roads is more flexible and can be altered to best suit a subdivision whilst also providing anticipated connectivity.

Brendan asked how far an arterial/collector road could be 'moved' before it was considered to be out of line with the structure plan. Andrea explained court rulings around 'general accordance'.

Lauren advised a consent would be required to move arterial or collector roads but local roads were able to be moved without consent.

Phillipa asked whether the cycleway on their property could be moved to be in line with the collector road. Lauren advised this had been tested and was unlikely to change through this process but they could potential do it through a consent.

Mike queried around the need to provide lead infrastructure. Lauren indicated this was not her area of expertise but her understanding is that the design aims to avoid one landowner needing to go first.

Mike indicated they wanted a meeting with Council and had been expecting officers to come back to them with stuff around the connection to Liverpool Street. Lauren said she thought Council had been waiting for them to confirm whether they wanted us to explore the options available. Lauren suggested the need for an offline discussion.

Action: Officers to have an offline discussion with Erin and Mike re: Liverpool Street connection.

Karen raised concerns about the connector road on their property. She felt it would become the primary entrance to Tara-Ika and referenced an overpass and O2NL. The location of the collector road in relation to their heritage house, gardens and out buildings is a concern. Stephan had roughly measured it to be 40m-50m from the eastern boundary. Redwood Grove submission wanted to move the road 100m from their boundary west, which would place it 1m from Prouse house. The Prouse's want this road to be situated 30m from the boundary with Redwood Grove to avoid significant effects on the heritage farm buildings and still enable development on both sides of the collector road. She asked that the maps be amended now and for the collector road to be changed to a local road.

Lauren advised that the maps could be amended although the change would likely be indiscernible and was not necessary as the road could be moved 10m at subdivision consent stage. Lauren could not confirm whether Queen Street would be an overpass or underpass as Waka Kotahi had not confirmed this yet. Lauren indicated that the arterial road into Tara-Ika was likely to be built first and this would encourage people to use this entrance. At this stage Lauren was comfortable with this road being a collector road but this could be revisited at the subdivision consent stage when sufficient detail is known.

Karen wanted more certainty. Andrea suggested that Lauren could amend the map to show the road 30m from the boundary; acknowledging Redwood Grove would likely oppose this in the Hearing. Andrea also suggested Lauren investigate making this road a local road.

Karen describe ecological value of some of the native trees on their property, the road being 30m from the boundary would avoid the need for these trees to be removed. Karen asked why the roads adjacent the O2NL corridor only provided for houses to be built on one side.

Lauren advised that nothing precluded houses being built on both sides – local roads can be moved to achieve this as needed.

Karen asked how local roads worked across boundaries – who decides where they are located. Lauren said it would likely mean that the first to develop would dictate the location of connections between properties.

Karen questions the need for there to be a connection into Redwood Grove when this area was already developed. Asked that it be removed like the Pohutakawa Drive connection was. Lauren explained that a connection is shown because Redwood Grove is proposed to

be upzoned to Residential and has future development potential, whereas Pohutakawa Drive is remaining Greenbelt Residential. Lauren advised that Karen and Redwood Grove residents can raise this matter at the hearing.

Tom advised Redwood Grove was not opposed to the connection being shown as the residents understood it did not mean the connection would be built or if it is built that the location is set in stone.

Karen considered that it may be more viable to build the road along the boundary with Redwood Grove to avoid having to leave a bare section for a connection that may never be needed.

Erin asked for clarification – are the location of local roads set or are they just showing that Council wants connection between properties. Mike questioned whether the connection with Liverpool Street is necessary and indicated that it negatively affects their property. Lauren recommended this be discussed offline.

Break.

Andrea offered the opportunity to discuss burning issues before we wrap up for the day.

Paul questioned the need for subdivision to be restricted discretionary. Lauren indicated that she felt this is appropriate for the scale of Tara-Ika and provides flexibility.

Ann suggested removing the shared pathway diagonally crossing the Brown property and instead having it follow the boundary with Pohutakawa Drive – providing the buffer between this area and residential development. Lauren liked this idea but was not sure if there was scope for this change to be made. She suggested they raise it at the Hearing.

Andrea introduced Wayne Gair as the friend of submitters. Wayne briefly introduced himself, provided his contact details and outlined his role.

Andrea reminded submitters to let the Hearing Panel know the parts they agree with the officer's recommendations and then to focus on where they don't agree and what changes they want.

Charles asked about cultural sites. Lauren confirmed that discussions with Muaupoko and landowners were underway. The location of the sites need to be confirmed and then agreement needed to be reached on how to protect them.

Lauren outlined overview of tomorrow's pre-hearing meeting on stormwater.

Karen asked for a copy of the roading report which Lauren advised had not been complete.

Mike requested the contact details of the O2NL design team and Megan said she would come back to him in a few days.

Finish.

Minutes: Pre-hearing meeting for Plan Change 4 - Stormwater

Date: 20 July 2021

Location: Horowhenua District Council – Main Office

Attendees:

Andrea Harris (facilitator)
Lauren Baddock (reporting planner)
David Arseneau (Senior Water Engineer – GHD)
Daniel Haigh (Council officer - Infrastructure)
Tony Parsons (Council officer - Infrastructure)

Ann and Brain Thomas
Erin and Mike Nijhuis
Phillipa Wickrenasinghe, (online), John and Jeny Brown
Vivienne Bold
Paul Turner (on behalf of Haddon Preston)
Brendan McDonnell
Charles Rudd
Gwyneth Schibli
Karen and Stephan Prouse
Stephan Martin (online) (on behalf of McDonnell's)
Pen Tucker (Horizons Regional Council)
Jon Bell (Horizons Regional Council)
Chorus representatives (x2)

Reporting planner's update:

Lauren's update since yesterday's pre-hearing meeting:

- Explained that most of the cycleways shown on the structure plan would be shared pathways with the exception of the ones in the commercial or higher density areas which would be dedicated cycleways. The maps would not be relabelled at this point.
- Outlined the different legal and formed widths of the Arterial, Collector and Local roads. *Action: Phillipa requested these be emailed to her.*
- Advised that a map showing approximate sizes of open spaces is now available. Hard copies were available and it can also be circulated electronically.

Andrea reminder submitters to outline the changes they agreed with to the Hearing Panel and then focus on what further changes they wanted.

Water engineer's update and round table discussion:

David explained that the two primary receiving environments for stormwater for this development area were Lake Horowhenua and the Koputaroa Stream. Neither of these were good options and so a more creative stormwater solution was required for Tara-Ika as it is redeveloped over time.

Investigations have been undertaken and a stormwater solution has evolved over time. The area has good gravels for soaking up stormwater. David advised that more detailed work would be needed at the subdivision stage. Ultimately it was a balancing act between

maximising the development potential of Tara-Ika and ensuring the effective management of stormwater.

David briefly explained the report which had been pre-circulated and advised that areas shown as stormwater treatment/management areas were not necessarily where they would be.

Daniel confirmed that Council was not going to designate any stormwater management areas as part of the plan change process, which had been a concern raised by submitters at the last pre-hearing meeting on this topic. He felt that a common/centralised stormwater management approach was the best option but wanted to ensure landowners had flexibility around size and location of stormwater management areas.

David also confirmed that he considered a centralised approach to stormwater management to be preferred as it is; a more efficient use of space, more cost efficient and easier to use/maintain. It also allows for developers to work together and with Council.

Lauren summarised some key parts of the report.

David identified that there are two kinds of stormwater management areas proposed:

- Wetlands – these treat the stormwater but do not get rid of it. They control water quality.
- Basins – these dispose of the water. They control water quantity.

Karen questioned the location of the basins and wetlands. David advised that they would be located across Tara-Ika but that it made sense to locate them in or adjacent to the O2NL corridor where possible.

Lauren questioned the soakage rate for water in the basins and David advised it would usually take 2-3 days after a rainfall event.

Paul asked how landowners would connect to the basins if they didn't have any on their property. Daniel advised that work was underway to look at any required trunk infrastructure. The details were not yet known and temporary arrangements may be required depending on the speed of development.

Lauren advised that the basins were for overflow and that individual properties would require onsite soakage pits.

Gwyneth asked whether instead of having large basins would it be more efficient to have smaller ones at regularly intervals. David advised that this was an option.

Karen raised concern for the landowners adjacent or within the O2NL corridor and the use of their land for common stormwater management purposes. Unfair on these property owners.

Daniel advised that it makes sense to work with Waka Kotahi and leverage off the work they are doing for O2NL. Also water naturally flows in this direction anyway.

Andrea reminded people that there are areas identified across Tara-Ika as well.

David went through some photos showing examples of wetlands and basins. Explained how they could be used as recreation spaces as well.

Karen requested for clarity, whether they would be located on the land within or adjacent to the O2NL corridor.

Daniel advised it makes sense to locate them in this area but he could not confirm at this stage. Conversations needed to take place with landowners and Waka Kotahi. If they could not reach agreement then alternatives would need to be explored.

Paul understood this was a timing issue but it also created uncertainty for landowners and added complexity.

Lauren advised that the plan change only needed to identify a feasible option. The subdivision stage would be when the details would be worked through. The plan change's suggested approach also aimed to provide flexibility for developers. The timing was driven by the need to provide an opportunity for development now and Council did not want to wait for more certainty around O2NL.

Brendan asked whether Horizons Regional Council would be willing to consent overflow of stormwater into the Queen Street East Drain. David advised that the system had been designed to cater for a 1-100 year event + climate change. There would be overflow in an event beyond this but it would only be what could not be managed by the system.

Daniel referred to a recent event which was not a 1-100 year event but which had caused local issues. He advised that this situation would be improved by what was proposed.

Paul asked why they had not used 1-200 year event to align with the One Plan. Jon advised that what has been used was pretty well aligned and he didn't see it being an issue.

Jon asked at what stage would the location of the basins be confirmed. Lauren outlined the subdivision process and that Developer Agreements would likely be required. She clarified her role in the plan change process as a regulator and Daniel's role as a manager of Council's assets/infrastructure.

Karen wanted certainty around how landowners would be compensated if their property was going to be used for communal stormwater management purposes.

Daniel advised that they would be engaging with relevant landowners and wanted to work with them. If they are not able to get to a point of agreement for a communal stormwater solution to be created then developers will need to come up with their own solutions.

John asked what was happening with stormwater from existing rural lifestyle properties. Lauren advised there would be no change for them unless they redeveloped. If these properties are creating existing issues then this would need to be dealt with outside of the plan change as it would be a compliance issue.

Gwyneth indicated that the Pohutakawa Drive properties were already creating stormwater runoff that affected the Brown's property.

Karen stated that the Prouse property had no issues currently but is concerned that development in Tara-Ika will create a problem. Andrea outlined that while it may not result in existing issues being resolved, development in Tara-Ika could not make an issue worse. Developments would have to manage stormwater appropriately through the use of soak pits, tanks, basin and wetlands.

Brian asked what the depth of the water would be in the wetlands and whether they would always hold water. David gave him some figures and replied they are designed to always have some water in them. Brian indicated that he was concerned they would smell and have mosquitos. David advised that if wetlands were well designed, with appropriate plants then they functioned well in wet or dry conditions.

Andrea touched on the work that had been done since the last pre-hearing meeting on this matter. Submitters had not been supportive of areas being designated for communal areas at this meeting. Council had come up with a 'middle ground' – a centralised solution was still proposed by Council but they were not looking to designate areas.

Phillipa questioned whether the open space that was shown on the map actually locked in the stormwater management locations.

Lauren advised that open space could move and not all open space would be used as a stormwater management area. Someone questioned the zoning of open space and Lauren advised that this had been covered yesterday.

David indicated that open space would not be the primary means of managing stormwater, it would just be utilised when possible as the dual use of open space for recreation and stormwater management made sense.

Andrea outlined that the plan change and structure plan were there to provide an opportunity but allow for flexibility when people actually come to develop. She indicated that people were trying to get to a level of detail that just was not possible through the plan change process.

Gwyneth identified that traditionally stormwater went into Lake Horowhenua. Daniel clarified that the majority of stormwater goes in to the ground and this was not going to change.

Gwyneth asked how the tanks and soak pits would be sized. Lauren indicated that tank sizes are outlined in the proposed plan provisions. Soak pits were sized through the Building Act.

Gwyneth discussed how rock filled soak pits were not efficient and talked about alternatives including plastic cages. Suggested there needed to be the ability for people to use better solutions.

Daniel confirmed that people would be able to use alternative solutions. This would be assessed at the subdivision stage.

Brian suggested that a soak pit that was 30m³ was not large enough. Gwyneth concerned about ground water levels and how they are different across the plan change area. Gwyneth would like to see people do more on individual properties.

Andrea confirmed that Council was providing for individual properties to do more by introducing tanks. Being too specific with provisions around type of soak pit etc. reduces flexibility and the ability to easily utilise future innovations in technology.

Gwyneth concerned that landowners in the wider area were not managing the downstream effects of stormwater properly. Daniel made reference to the 1908 Land Drainage Act requirements.

Phillipa asked if landowners choose not to develop a communal system did this mean that individual properties would need bigger soak pits. David indicated that this would not be the case. Developers would just need to come up with their own solution.

Phillipa suggested the wetlands identified in the report seemed essential and yet there also seemed to be a lack of discussion with these landowners. Karen confirmed there had been no discussion with them and they wanted more certainty.

Stephan asked about runoff from the roads and whether rain gardens would be a better option than wetlands. David confirmed that rain gardens were an option but that these were typically expensive and more difficult to maintain.

Charles asked whether other options had been considered as he felt there was an obvious 'plan b'. After initially being reluctant to sharing his idea he said that stormwater should be piped to the Ohau River. David confirmed that pipping the water elsewhere was not considered a viable option.

Charles was concerned with the environmental impact of the proposal and that this was not being addressed. Daniel said the plan to develop wetlands and basins suggested that the desire to mitigate the environmental impacts of stormwater had outweighed the need for houses.

Charles was concerned that the basins and wetlands would not be big enough. He also referred to the earthquake risk to Tara-Ika.

Brendan asked whether stormwater from driverways could go into soak pits. David indicated that this was not ideal as it needed to be treated.

Karen referred to some notes she had made and covered the concerns she had for how the Tara-Ika development would impact their property. Issues included locating communal stormwater system on their land, effect of development on their heritage dwelling, lack of communication from Council, lack of certainty around redress for roads, open space and communal stormwater system, and evolution of process (different iterations of plans – lack of certainty). Considered Waka Kotahi and O2NL process was providing them with much more certainty and felt let down that Council was not doing the same.

Lauren explained that Waka Kotahi could provide more certainty because they were constructing O2NL. Council is not developing Tara-Ika, we are just undertaking the plan change and looking to provide or support the development of lead infrastructure.

Daniel said it made sense to try and locate the wetlands/basins within the O2NL corridor as this allows them to work with Waka Kotahi. Council will not just take land from landowners. Discussions between Council and relevant landowners will take place with agreements being made if possible. If Council cannot reach agreement with landowners then alternative solutions at the subdivision stage would be required.

Karen wanted to know whether there would be wetlands on their property and if so how will they be compensated. Daniel indicated that a wetland may be required if they decide to subdivide. Lauren also added if the Prouse's developed first then they may have the opportunity to provide a communal solution but otherwise they could just cater for their development.

Andrea suggested it was time to wrap up as matters were unlikely to be resolved today.

Karen stressed that she wanted certainty that Council wasn't going to negatively impact the ability of her children to benefit from their property in the future and develop it if they wanted to. Lauren could not speculate about the future too much but at this time subdivisions are responsible for mitigating their own effects and each one must have a way of dealing with stormwater.

Karen felt that they were particularly affected as their property was squashed between O2NL and Tara-Ika. She wanted it documented that they would not be forced to be the solution to others stormwater problems.

Daniel advised that this could be covered in his statement of evidence to some extent.

John talked about the natural basin on Gladstone Road that had been filled in the past and had created stormwater problems for his property. When David asked when/where this was. John confirmed it was when Pohutakawa Drive was developed.

Andrea closed the meeting and again reminded people to make it clear to the Hearing Panel what they were seeking to change from this point.