

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission by **AMBURY PROPERTIES LIMITED** on the **PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT PLAN** pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Act seeking the rezoning of land at Ohinewai

**JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT OF EXPERTS IN
RELATION TO LANDSCAPE AND URBAN DESIGN MATTERS**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 On 18 June, 2020, an expert conferencing session in relation to landscape and urban design was undertaken by Matthew Jones, Michael Graham and Jonathan Broekhuysen. This Joint Witness Statement is a record of the outcome of this session.

1.2 The session was facilitated by Hearing Panel members, Dr Phil Mitchell and Paul Cooney.

1.3 Also in attendance as observers were:

(a) Chloe Trenouth, planning consultant to the Waikato District Council;
and

(b) John Olliver, planning consultant to Ambury Property Ltd.

1.4 Notes were taken by Chloe Trenouth.

Agenda - issues considered at conferencing

1.5 The aspects identified as forming the agenda for the conferencing were:

(a) The number of vehicle connections / intersections onto Tahuna Road is appropriate.

- (b) The further urbanisation of Ohinewai is justified based on the existing patterns of development along SH1.
- (c) The proposal integrates with the existing Ohinewai settlement in relation to development patterns and connectivity.
- (d) The revised location of the neighbourhood centre is appropriate.
- (e) The density shown in the illustrative masterplan is appropriate.
- (f) The alignment and mechanism of delivering the shared path connection to the existing Ohinewai settlement is appropriate.
- (g) A site-specific design guide is not required as part of the plan change.
- (h) The proposal suitably allows for any future development of the OLL land if it eventuates.

1.6 The following sections of this joint witness statement address each of these issues or questions, noting where agreement has been reached and, in the event of disagreement, the nature of the disagreement and the reasons for that disagreement.

1.7 Note that the basis of assessment is the Masterplan dated 6 May 2020 Revision N and the Structure Plan dated 07 May 2020 Revision H.

2. **ISSUE ONE – TAHUNA ROAD VEHICLE CONNECTIVITY**

The number of vehicle connections / intersections onto Tahuna Road is appropriate.

2.1 On this issue, the experts were unable to reach an agreement.

2.2 The reasons for the disagreement were:

- (a) MJ is concerned that if there is only the eastern most access point on Tahuna Road this effectively creates a giant cul-de-sac and reduced connectivity for the residential area. This is because all traffic must come off the one access. If the third eastern access point identified on the original masterplan was reinstated then this issue would be alleviated.
- (b) JB is of the view that the number of accesses is sufficient considering the fact that traffic will generally be travelling west.

Recent masterplan updates include additional local roads which further direct traffic to the retained Tahuna Road intersection and across to the industrial area and the intersections on Lumsden Road. JB does not consider there to be sufficient benefit to justify the expense of an additional intersection on Tahuna Road. If traffic is heading west to the state highway then makes no difference in travel time.

- (c) MG – a third eastern intersection would only service a small number of residential properties within the eastern extent of the OSP. Should they be wanting to turn east onto Tahuna Road from the development, then the effect on travel time would be considered relative to their destination.

3. **ISSUE TWO– URBANISATION OF OHINEWAI**

The further urbanisation of Ohinewai is justified based on the existing patterns of development along SH1.

- 3.1 Agreed that Ohinewai can urbanise because it is an existing village.
- 3.2 MJ raises concerns, however, around how urbanisation occurs at Ohinewai so that the wider urban development pattern integrates with the existing settlement.

4. **ISSUE THREE– INTEGRATION WITH EXISTING OHINEWAI**

The proposal integrates with the existing Ohinewai settlement in relation to development patterns and connectivity.

- 4.1 On this issue, the experts were unable to reach an agreement.
- 4.2 The reasons for the disagreement were:
 - (a) MJ acknowledges the Tahuna Road vehicle connection and proposed pedestrian/cycle connection to Ohinewai West (across SH1 + NIMT). Pedestrian and cycle connection important. OSP is a standalone settlement separated from the existing Ohinewai settlement by SH1 and NIMT infrastructure.
 - (b) MG existing Ohinewai village is ribbon development but when moving to a larger development move away from this format. The development is separated by the transport corridor, so the level of connectivity is always going to be restricted. Given the relationship

and scale of development in Ohinewai West relative to the scale at Ohinewai East, I consider the proposed level of connectivity is appropriate.

5. **ISSUE FOUR– NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE LOCATION**

The revised location of the neighbourhood centre is appropriate.

5.1 On this issue, the experts were unable to reach an agreement.

5.2 The reasons for the disagreement were:

- (a) MJ concerned about the lack of a community hub to improve amenity and provide community facilities for local residents and reduce car trips. The location of the neighbourhood centre does not create a community hub, particularly for the residential component of the proposal;
- (b) JB notes that location is centrally located to serve employment areas and residential area and is accessible to residents. Provides local shops to serve the local community, including the wider Ohinewai community;
- (c) JB also notes that the masterplan identifies a corner shop centrally to the residential land (#16); and
- (d) JB notes there are economic reasons to also be considered in identifying appropriate location. Further discussion outside of conferencing can occur to clarify this.

6. **ISSUE FIVE– RESIDENTIAL DENSITY**

The density shown in the illustrative masterplan is appropriate

6.1 Agreement that masterplan street network provides strong grid and responds well to topography.

6.2 The reasons for the disagreement were:

- (a) JB notes that masterplan is comprehensively designed including high quality open spaces, street network, mixed land use with access to employment that provide high amenity so can deliver higher density residential. Geotechnical challenges to site development affect the ease to which the land can be developed affordably, therefore smaller lots make sense. JB notes that the

plan change is applying for a general residential zone and that the density as shown in some areas of the masterplan would be subject to an additional resource consenting stage with additional assessment standards.

- (b) MJ acknowledges masterplan landscape led design approach and understands the density proximate to open space but is struggling to see how this anticipated density is appropriate in the rural setting at Ohinewai. Relates to the critical importance of a centre and connectivity. Density is making more homes that are reliant on limited facilities, reliant on Huntly.
- (c) JB notes a high level of walking and cycling throughout the OSP. All grey lines on structure plan have 2.5m shared paths. He questions what the negative effects from the currently shown density considering the overall masterplan amenity are?
- (d) MJ noted the proposal is a satellite settlement off the back of the industrial area. Does not create a self-sufficient village. If neighbourhood centre/hub was located more centrally so becomes more walkable. The current proposal will rely heavily on car trips.
- (e) JB location of density will be determined at the time of development / resource consent stage. Average density 300m² across the masterplan expect some attached product at 250m².
- (f) MG the density is located internally within the residential areas of the OSP with lower density on the edges. The higher density generally addresses open space. The experience of density will only be readily apprehended internally to the site.

7. **ISSUE SIX– SHARED PATH CONNECTION TO OHINEWAI**

The alignment and mechanism of delivering the shared path connection to the existing Ohinewai settlement is appropriate.

7.1 On this issue, the experts reached agreement.

7.2 MJ – the critical point is how that connection plays out within the OSP site, e.g. is there sufficient access and connectivity internally within the site to provide connection(s) to this external shared path?

7.3 JB confirms that shared path connection between OSP and the school is committed. But other indicative connections outside OSP are not committed but nice to have.

8. **ISSUE SEVEN – DESIGN GUIDELINES**

A site-specific Design Guideline is not required as part of the plan change.

8.1 On this issue, the experts are in general agreement that a site-specific Design Guideline may not be required if all the relevant elements are pulled through into assessment criteria applying to OSP.

(a) MJ considers that there may be value in having some additional site-specific guidelines.

(b) JB does not consider site-specific Design Guidelines to be necessary or helpful.

8.2 The experts note as follows:

(a) MJ wants certainty that the quality of built form will support the density proposed, unclear whether there are design guidelines or plan provisions to support this outcome; and

(b) JB considers this would be addressed at resource consent stage and existing residential zone.

8.3 Experts do agree that further liaison between themselves and the planners to ensure that the plan provisions (i.e. assessment criteria) provide sufficient design guidance would be beneficial.

9. **ISSUE EIGHT – OLL LAND**

The proposal suitably allows for any future development of the OLL land if it eventuates.

9.1 Experts note:

(a) MJ is concerned around the addition of extra residential development to the area and the extent to which it will rely on amenities within the APL site. MJ acknowledges the single vehicle connection across Tahuna Road to the OLL site;

- (b) JB eastern most road connection provides opportunity to link with OLL site and at subdivision there may be more information to enable further response.

10. PARTIES TO JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT

10.1 The signatories to this Joint Witness Statement confirm that:

- (a) They agree with the outcome of the expert conference as recorded in this statement;
- (b) They have read Appendix 3 of the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it; and
- (c) The matters addressed in this statement are within their area of expertise.

SIGNATURES:



Date: 23 June 2020

Matthew Jones



Date: 23 June 2020

Michael Graham



Date: 23 June 2020

Jonathan Broekhuysen