

Appendix 2

Pre-application Meeting Minutes

Minutes of Pre-Application Meeting PRL2100039 held at Council offices 09 August 2021 at 2:00pm.

PRL Number:	PRL2100039
Development/ Applicant:	Hurupaki Heights Limited
Date & Time:	09 August 2021 2:00pm
Site Location:	131 Three Mile Bush Rd & 189 Three Mile Bush Rd, Kamo (Lot 2 & 3 DP 99045) Dip Road, Kamo (SEC 1 SO 65970)
Proposal:	<p>Three Mile Bush Rd: Combined SL - 77 residential lots, 6 reserve lots, new road, relocate stone walls, cafe, earthworks, 3 waters & transport</p> <p><i>Issues from applicant's perspective: Split zoning of the site GRZ/RPZ, integrated three waters assessment, integrated transport assessment, vesting of reserves, consultation with hapu, development contributions</i></p> <p>Dip Rd: Combined SL - 85 residential lots, access and servicing</p> <p><i>Issues from applicant's perspective: GRZ/RPZ, integrated three waters assessment, integrated transport assessment.</i></p>
Present	<p>Council: Alister Hartstone (Consultant Planner), Mary Willson (Scribe), Murray McDonald (Manager – RMA Consents), Pat Sugrue (Development Engineer), Nadia de la Guerre (Team Leader – Development Engineering), Pat Sagrue (Development Engineer), Lynne Dahl (Team Leader – Development Contributions), Casper Kandori (Waste & Drainage Engineer), Mazza Aziz (Stormwater Engineer), David Drummond (Distribution Engineer – Water Services), Nick Marshall (Team Leader – Road Safety & Traffic Engineer), Sarah Brownie (Infrastructure Planning), Alicia Lawrie (Strategic Urban Design)</p> <p>Applicant: Melissa McGrath (Agent – Barker and Associates), Mark Holland (Applicant), Dayle Widdup (Project Manager/Civil Engineer – Project Civil Ltd), Dean Scanlan (Traffic Engineer – Engineering Outcomes Ltd), Mike Farrow (Landscape Architect – Littoralis), Charlotte Nijssen (Surveyor – Blue Wallace), Aaron Holland (Geotech & Three Waters Engineer – LDE)</p>

Main discussion on Three Mile Bush Rd below:

No	Topic	Information
1	Background/Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-complying rural production zone • Will be lodged as SL application • Refer to the plan provided • 400+ sections at totara parklands – almost complete • 'The James' – 115 TMB – finalised in Jan – 66 lots • Site covers 5hc to the west of The James – another 9hc adjoining also purchased • 600m sites on average – flat contour and sloping • Discussion on the zoning – copy the map • Stonewalls to be relocated – discretionary activity • Lot sizes compliant • Ponds x3 • Stream through the middle – reserve to vest including the ponds. Walking track through the middle. Propose small café for the residents at the top of the reserve (to be included in the proposal). Pedestrian access to The James only. • Also vesting all up the hill to the north as well and planting this.

- Stone walls on the road will be staying
- Will be notice on the large lots that they can't be subdivided in future. Different living opportunities for people is the intent of the design
- Non-complying section up the slope as rural zone.
- Environmental benefit – pathway planned, should not have stock on the slope.
- Ecologist report – all good – Mel – already pest/weed management under way.

2 Rooding

Comments summary supplied by Nick M post meeting:

- In favour of pedestrian link to James subdivision
 - Concrete walkway to parks section 7 standard 2.2m wide path 6m reserve and lit as a road to road walkway. Will need to tie into The James development path, whatever that was.
- Intersection treatment? Like a right turn bay required due to predominance of flow direction. May want a roundabout instead.
- Downstream impacts? TIA...
 - 3 mile bush / Kamo Rd
 - Kamo Rd / Whau Valley
- Parking bays
 - In favour as long as designed to in take into account driveways and tree pits
- Need for guidance from Musheer on lighting standards, but likely P3 for roads and walkway lighting for path
- ROW standard – non-compliance to be covered in ITA, I believe a good mitigation would be wider reserve width and wider footpath
- Road standards – agree loop road would be class B, cul-de-sac is borderline class C, given the ROW coming off the end request footpaths both sides, but same road and reserve width as class A. main road connection may be a higher standard, but Class B is acceptable.
- Want to understand what walkways/shared paths/cycle trails will be provided to support active transport to shops, school and community
- How pedestrians managed
 - Speed limit – 30km/h or 40km/h
 - Raised table crossing at main intersection
 - Traffic calming
- Road frontage – upgrade to Class D standard for 3 mile bush road as per The James
- Connectivity to northern block?
 - LOT 203 drainage reserve
 - Future road or pathway link?
- **Public Transport**
 - If/when PT is extended can the busses make the loop road as a convenient turn around. Make NRC an affected party please. **Dean**

I expect that the ITA should cover most of these elements.

3 Water/Wastewater/Stormwater

Wastewater:

- Casper - good to come from the James. Largely gravity system but may require pump ups on some individual lots (approx. 12 of the 70 lots). Could look at pressure system, vesting to council will depend on number and configuration. Casper will send council pressure sewer policy to Charlotte. Casper to check if this site has been allowed for in the wastewater model and any capacity concern on the downstream 150mm section of gravity sewer line. May require capacity assessment of the 150mm network from the school.
- Additional discussion after the meeting: Shift sewer manhole from lot 55 into the drainage reserve lot 203 for easy access to extend the network if required in future.

Stormwater:

- Nadia – will need access to the SW ponds – need to comply with standards and David – good idea to split out the lots to reserve (recreation) and stormwater pond (with access) – potentially with easement. Sarah can review this and get back to. Lots and easements dependant on the size of the lot – get back to them.

Water:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - David – plenty of water but issue re pressure. In the process of building new reservoir – complete in 2 years? Still in design stage – 1km up the road approx. Provisional only and will then give adequate supply. Mark – timeframe should work. As it stands will not be adequate to standards – 10 metres can run but standard is 25ms (agreed standard) – would have to model and consider fire fighting – David – could give pressure at the takeoff of the development at the point and developer can model. Based on the contour levels of the development and the reservoir (David). Do some modelling and think it could work – not a showstopper (David) – adding 30ms so would need to reduce.
4	Landscape
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape plan – paper one in meeting– need a copy (not received as yet) • Connections from the natural landscape forest and further down the catchment • Non-compliant activity – rural character – strip between the two areas that is currently clear – community space potential. Will be refined as part of the application, linkage between. • Streetscape – low speed and pedestrianised and feature of stream. Stormwater ponds – ways they can bring some amenity value as well as functional. Community and connection with the James. • Contours – starting to elevate over lots 62-70. Won't see a lot from the road. • Water flow from the hill? Alister? How will manage – to be planted out and diverted around the reserve at the bottom. Cat B soil for drainage. No sign over overland flow paths. Mel – Ecologist involved – no wetlands on site. And will have report as part of application • No quarry set back applies
5	Site Suitability/ Geotechnical Reports/Earthworks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earthworks – 4000 excess cut lots 6-13 area. Aaron – Stormwater – 3 ponds. Sewer line and water from the James • Attenuation – manage it through the 3 ponds if possible -preferred rather than putting on to some lots (avoid the cost on the owners). • Platform levels on 90% of sites • 14m wide roading • NRC – earthworks and culverts – discussed and no contaminates – archaeological report all good.
6	Development Contributions
	<p>Copy as attachment</p> <p>Comment re offset for the reserve – need to be aware can't double-dip</p>
7	Other Planning Considerations:
	<p>Urban Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alicia – scheme is pretty good from UD aspect, considerations to visual and physical connections to surrounding context - will be interested in the development and design of individual lots. - Fencing - there will be no front fencing (must be open) and developer needs to approve designs. No high fencing or close boarding (Mark). - Refer to the design guidelines on the website as a useful resource. - Pedestrian access to the James – just the one? - Yes, just the one (Mark). - Link to Urban Design guidelines on WDC website - Urban Design Guidelines – Residential Development – Chapters 1-3 particularly relevant with guidance on fitting in to the local context and subdivision design. <p>Iwi consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation and liaising back and forth – doing as much as can (Dick and Georgina) – taken onboard feedback and they will only consider once application lodged. Formal consultant document after that – 6 weeks to complete. Will keep trying to work with them. May opt to public notify. <p>Parks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sarah – on balance pretty happy – interested in fencing and how the reserves will be treated – what will be in them – footpaths, playgrounds and the intent of use. Lighting etc. Any standards by council on fencing against council reserves? No. safety appropriately addressed. 2.5m contained path (like Totara)

- Fencing on the back of the lots – want to have the enjoyment of the outlook of the trees etc – don't want a big wall.(Mark)

Ongoing: - water/traffic assessment

Could vest land should the stonewall on road be part on road/property – Murray – preference is not to have on both and council own

Café will be on residential lot (part of the LU) – DC considered as residential

Re parking requirements changing in Jan

8 Onoke – Tip Road comments:

General residential zone – no infringements etc

Building companies are asking for smaller sites. Potentially over 55s community - Private access (gated) and freehold access – 410m2 average size

Covenants over significant trees

Traffic report – best location for site access (visibility)

Bury the power lines (high tension)

Alister – road capacity? Mel – needs ITA (Nick – comment could become through road) – pedestrian path access.

Overland flow path in vacant areas –

Timeline – asap – end of this month to lodge aim

Water – David – no need to move connection and potential to run up the new road? Is an overflow for the reservoir need to be aware of. Reservoir expansion – will be a second one, may need more land and not confirmed yet and can let know as soon as poss. Needs to stay on level with existing one, may not fit in current property owned.

Casper – connection at the boundary and anything in the private area can't be vested but can have easement for access. Older lines – 150mm – need to check condition – camera check?

Additional comments provided by Nick M – post meeting:

Comments for this development:

- In favour of walkway connecting Tuatara to Dip Rd, noting this is part of the Hodges Walkway from Kamo Village
- Upgrade of Dip Rd frontage to Class C at least including lighting V-cat
- Tuatara Rd extension would likely be Class C, but minimum match Tuatara Drive
- Walkway should be concrete 2.2m wide given flooding issues.
- ITA needed; new intersection with Dip Rd, impact to Tuatara Drive and onto 3 mile bush road, impact on 3 mile bush / Dip intersection (needs to be aroundabout).

Closed 3.40pm