

MEMORANDUM

To:	Expert Consenting Panel – Ashbourne	From:	Michelle Seymour, Commute Transportation Consultants
Date:	11 December 2025		
Subject:	Response to Minute 4: Proposed Conditions		

1 Introduction

The following table provides a summary of the condition changes as proposed by Mr. Black, within Attachment B of Memorandum 6, in response to Minute 3 of the Expert Panel dated 21 November 2025 – Response to Request for Information on behalf of the Matamata Piako District Council (Transportation and Traffic).

The table provides confirmation of the acceptance of conditions where changes have been proposed, and in the case where changes are not agreed – the applicants proposed alternative condition.

1.1 Proposed Conditions Day Zero

No changes recommended by the review.

1.2 Proposed Conditions Solar Farm

	Changes as Proposed in Memorandum 6 (Transportation and Traffic)	Position of the Applicant
4.2 and 5.2	<p>Engineering Design and Approval</p> <p>(8) The Consent Holder shall submit engineering plans to MPDC for review by the Team Leader – Consents Engineer <u>at least twenty (20) working days prior to commencing construction</u>. The engineering plans shall be amended by the Consent Holder as required until stamped ‘Accepted’ by General Manager, Development or nominee prior to submission of any building consent application. The engineering plans shall include details of the proposed vehicle crossings, and proposed water, stormwater connections and systems, and associated details, as applicable.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
4.5 and 5.5	<p>Safe System Audits <u>The Consent Holder shall ensure that Safe System Audits are carried out and submitted to Matamata-Piako District Council in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines (October 2022)”.</u></p> <p><u>The following Safe System Audits shall be carried out:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>The detailed design stage of the Station Road/ solar farm access</u> b) <u>Post construction of the Station Road/ solar farm access</u> <p><u>The detailed design Safe System Audit shall separate out the decision tracking between designer, client – developer, MPDC safety engineer and MPDC as road controlling authority. The design shall be amended until the concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of MPDC as road controlling authority. The completed Safe System Audit shall be</u></p>	<p>Agree – in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe System Audits (SSAs) are typically best-practice design tools and requiring them as conditions shifts detailed engineering review into the RMA process, which is generally focussed on managing effects, not mandating specific design processes. This process is covered by the Engineering Plan Approval process. • The requirement to “address concerns to the satisfaction of MPDC”, creates an open-ended approval process. <p>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant supports a condition requiring a Safe System Audit – with the findings, where appropriate, to be incorporated into the subsequent detailed design.</p>

submitted with the detailed design engineering drawings accompanied by a statement explaining why any remaining safety concerns have not been addressed.

The post construction Safe System Audit shall separate out the decision tracking between designer, client – developer, MPDC safety engineer and MPDC as road controlling authority. The concerns identified in the Safe system Audit shall be addressed to the satisfaction of, and implemented within the timeframes agreed with, MPDC as road controlling authority.

Proposed condition below

Safe System Audits

The Consent Holder shall ensure that Safe System Audits are carried out and submitted to Matamata-Piako District Council in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines (October 2022)”.

The following Safe System Audits shall be carried out:

- a) The detailed design stage of the Station Road/ solar farm access
- b) Post construction of the Station Road/ solar farm access

A copy of the completed Safe System Audit shall be provided to Matamata-Piako District Council (as the Road Controlling Authority) together with the detailed engineering design drawings.

The Audit shall include a response table that identifies how each audit recommendation has been addressed, including where no change is proposed and the supporting rationale.

The Consent Holder shall incorporate into the final detailed design any reasonably practicable safety improvements identified through the Audit that are agreed in writing by the Council as necessary to address material road safety risks.

A copy of the completed Post Construction Safety Audit shall be provided to Matamata-Piako District Council (as Road Controlling Authority).

The Audit shall include a response table identifying the Consent Holder’s proposed actions for each finding, including where no action is proposed and the rationale for this.

The Consent Holder shall implement any reasonably practicable safety improvements identified through the Audit that are agreed by the MPDC as necessary to address material road safety risks.

Any agreed improvements shall be completed within timeframes mutually agreed between the Consent Holder and the Council.

	<p>43) Prior to the start of construction, a Communications Plan shall be prepared for the construction phases of the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The purpose of the Communications Plan is to set out how the public and stakeholders (including directly affected and adjacent owners and occupiers of land) will be communicated with throughout the Construction Works. b) The Communications Plan shall be submitted to MPDC s Communications Team at least 20 working days prior to any proposed closure of Station Road (or such other timeframe that is agreed in writing between the Consent Holder and MPDC). c) The Communications Plan shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Contact details of the Project Liaison Person (or persons) who has been appointed for the duration of Enabling Works and Construction Works to be the main and readily accessible point of contact for persons interested in or affected by Construction Works; ii. A list of stakeholders who will be communicated with. <u>This must include residents along all streets that will be used by construction vehicles for access;</u> iii. A list of previously contacted landowners and a website link to the Order in Council for the Project; iv. Details of communication activities already undertaken; v. Details of communication activities proposed; vi. Details of communications materials to be used to communicate details of the project to stakeholders and the public, including any proposed mail drop information, direct contact with stakeholders, the Project website, or equivalent virtual information source, for providing information to the public; vii. Details of the complaint management process including who is responsible for responding, how responses will be provided and the timeframes within which the 	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The requirement to provide “a list of residents along all streets that will be used by construction vehicles for access” is not practicable. It is also noted that there is a degree of uncertainty with timing and access options and I am of the view that the condition should be flexible enough to respond to this, and also to be integrated with the final CTMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A list of stakeholders who will be communicated with. <u>This must include residents along all streets that will be used by construction vehicles for access;</u> <p>This shall include all properties fronting the identified construction traffic routes in the CTMP.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>responses will be provided;</p> <p>viii. Details of the consultation requirements set out in other conditions where relevant; and</p> <p>ix. The process for ongoing review and amendment of the Communications Plan to maintain its currency.</p> <p>x. In relation to noise and vibration, the Communications Plan shall also address:</p> <p>xi. The potential for noise/vibration associated with the Construction Works and the associated timing; and</p> <p>xii. The methods used to mitigate the effects of noise/vibration from the Construction Works.</p>	
New	<p><u>Construction of the Southern Solar Farm shall not commence unless construction access can be obtained:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>via Station Road, aligning with future Road 1, or</u> • <u>via the proposed link to Firth Street.</u> 	<p>Disagree. This has been addressed previously. Access can be managed via the existing road network via the proposed CTMP provisions.</p>
5.5	<p><u>Upon completion of construction, and subject to approval by the MPDC roading department, the vehicle crossing providing access to the Southern Solar Farm shall be reduced in width from 10 metres to 5 metres.</u></p>	<p>Agree.</p>

1.3 Proposed Conditions Retirement Village_V2

Changes as Proposed in Memorandum 6 (Transportation and Traffic)		Position of the Applicant
4.4	<p>(40) That prior to commencing any construction of earthworks and/or civil infrastructure works for any Stage or Sub-Stage of the Retirement Village, the Consent Holder shall submit EPA to Council’s Team Leader – Consents Engineer at <u>least twenty (20) working days prior to commencing construction</u>, engineering details and drawings, generally in accordance with the RITS, prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced Engineering, including the following information:</p> <p>a) The provision of public/private roads and associated infrastructure including service connections and vehicle</p>	<p>Agree to 20 working days requirement.</p> <p>Partially agree – left turn lane As detailed in the previous assessments, the removal of the left turn deceleration lane should be considered prior to construction when there is greater certainty on the speed environment – which all parties agree should be reduced.</p>

	<p>entrances into the Retirement Village;</p> <p>b) <u>Removal of left turn deceleration lane at the Station Road intersection.</u></p>	<p>As such the condition should remain flexible to either outcome, as the speed reduction is not within the applicant’s control.</p> <p>40) That prior to commencing any construction of earthworks and/or civil infrastructure works for any Stage or Sub-Stage of the Retirement Village, the Consent Holder shall submit EPA to Council’s Team Leader – Consents Engineer at <u>least twenty (20) working days prior to commencing construction</u>, engineering details and drawings, generally in accordance with the RITS, prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced Engineering, including the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The provision of public/private roads and associated infrastructure including service connections and vehicle entrances into the Retirement Village; b) <u>Confirmation of the posted speed limit;</u> c) <u>Consideration of the removal of left turn deceleration lane at the Station Road intersection.</u>
<p>New</p>	<p><u>Safe System Audits</u> <u>The Consent Holder shall ensure that Safe System Audits are carried out and submitted to Matamata Piako District Council in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines (October 2022)”.</u></p> <p><u>The following Safe System Audits shall be carried out:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>The detailed design stage (pre-implementation) of the Station Road/ retirement village access</u> b) <u>Post construction of the Station Road/ retirement village access</u> <p><u>The detailed design Safe System Audit shall separate out the decision tracking between designer, client – developer, MPDC safety engineer and MPDC as road controlling authority. The design shall be amended until the concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of MPDC as</u></p>	<p>Agree in part as above. Proposed Condition below</p> <p><u>Safe System Audits</u> <u>The Consent Holder shall ensure that Safe System Audits are carried out and submitted to Matamata Piako District Council in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines (October 2022)”.</u></p> <p><u>The following Safe System Audits shall be carried out:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>The detailed design stage (pre-implementation) of the Station Road/ retirement village access</u> b) <u>Post construction of the Station Road/ retirement village access</u>

	<p><u>road controlling authority. The completed Safe System Audit shall be submitted with the detailed design engineering drawings accompanied by a statement explaining why any remaining safety concerns have not been addressed.</u></p> <p><u>The post construction Safe System Audit shall separate out the decision tracking between designer, client – developer, MPDC safety engineer and MPDC as road controlling authority. The concerns identified in the Safe system Audit shall be addressed to the satisfaction of, and implemented within the timeframes agreed with, MPDC as road controlling authority.</u></p>	<p><u>A copy of the completed Safe System Audit shall be provided to Matamata-Piako District Council (as the Road Controlling Authority) together with the detailed engineering design drawings.</u> <u>The Audit shall include a response table that identifies how each audit recommendation has been addressed, including where no change is proposed and the supporting rationale.</u> <u>The Consent Holder shall incorporate into the final detailed design any reasonably practicable safety improvements identified through the Audit that are agreed in writing by the Council as necessary to address material road safety risks.</u></p> <p><u>A copy of the completed Post Construction Safety Audit shall be provided to Matamata-Piako District Council (as Road Controlling Authority).</u> <u>The Audit shall include a response table identifying the Consent Holder’s proposed actions for each finding, including where no action is proposed and the rationale for this.</u> <u>The Consent Holder shall implement any reasonably practicable safety improvements identified through the Audit that are agreed by the MPDC as necessary to address material road safety risks.</u> <u>Any agreed improvements shall be completed within timeframes mutually agreed between the Consent Holder and the Council.</u></p>
New	<p><u>Insurance and Indemnity for Public Use of Private Roads</u> <u>The Consent Holder shall maintain appropriate public liability insurance, or equivalent indemnity arrangements, to cover risks associated with public use of the private roads and accessways within the retirement village. This insurance/indemnity shall:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>Provide sufficient coverage for any claims, loss, or damage arising from the public’s lawful use of the private roads and accessways within the village.</u> b) <u>Be held for the lifetime of the retirement village or for as long as the private roads are available for public use.</u> 	<p>Agree in Part</p> <p>Consider that this condition should only apply where Public services are required to enter and service the village. Updated wording proposed below.</p> <p><u>The Consent Holder shall maintain appropriate public liability insurance, or equivalent indemnity arrangements, to cover risks associated with public use of the private roads and accessways within the retirement village, if in fact triggered by Public services entering and servicing the village (otherwise this condition is not applicable). This insurance/indemnity shall:</u></p>

	<p><u>Written confirmation of the insurance or indemnity arrangement, including policy details and coverage limits, shall be provided to the consent authority:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>Prior to operation of the retirement village; and</u> b) <u>Upon request by the consent authority at any time thereafter.</u> <p><u>Any material change, lapse, or cancellation of the insurance or indemnity arrangements must be notified to the consent authority in writing within 10 working days, along with details of replacement arrangements to ensure continuous coverage.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) <u>Provide sufficient coverage for any claims, loss, or damage arising from the public’s lawful use of the private roads and accessways within the village.</u> d) <u>Be held for the lifetime of the retirement village or for as long as the private roads are available for public use.</u> <p><u>Written confirmation of the insurance or indemnity arrangement, including policy details and coverage limits, shall be provided to the consent authority:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) <u>Prior to operation of the retirement village; and</u> d) <u>Upon request by the consent authority at any time thereafter.</u> <p><u>Any material change, lapse, or cancellation of the insurance or indemnity arrangements must be notified to the consent authority in writing within 10 working days, along with details of replacement arrangements to ensure continuous coverage.</u></p>
New	(new condition may be required to facilitate vehicle access to wastewater) <u>Vehicle access to Easement E.</u>	Disagree. It is considered that access for maintenance is captured by the existing easement. Notwithstanding, the Applicant is happy to add an additional easement if deemed necessary by the Panel.
New	<u>Refuse Collection</u> <u>Prior to occupation of any part of the development, the Consent Holder shall submit a Refuse Collection Plan (RCP) to MPDC for approval. The RCP shall include details of refuse and recycling contractors, collection routes and access requirements, collection days and hours, and measures to ensure environmental compliance. The development shall operate in accordance with the approved plan.</u>	Agree
New	<u>Gate Access</u> <u>The design and operation of the proposed private roads and gates must:</u>	Agree partially. This condition is overly prescriptive, and it is unclear how confirmation of the operation of the gate would work in reality and it is noted that as technology changes this could change in the future. It is also noted that the final clause is not related to gate

	<p><u>get through the gates in their vehicles (e.g. PIN, swipe card, number plate recognition). This is important for access to the commercial node.</u></p> <p>b) <u>Ensure that all gates and all associated infrastructure are located within the boundary of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>c) <u>Provide safe access and manoeuvring for refuse collection, deliveries, and service vehicles.</u></p> <p>d) <u>Consider pedestrian and vehicle safety, including clear sightlines and low-speed operation.</u></p> <p>e) <u>Ensure that the ongoing maintenance of roads, gates, drainage, signage, and line marking remain the responsibility of the retirement village.</u></p>	<p>access, and as a private road all ongoing maintenance be the responsibility of the retirement village and as such this clause is considered unnecessary.</p> <p>Proposed condition refinement below to focus on effects:</p> <p><u>Gate Access</u> <u>The design and operation of the proposed private roads and gates must:</u></p> <p>a) <u>Ensure unrestricted emergency access, with override options. Confirm how retirement village residents will get through the gates in their vehicles (e.g. PIN, swipe card, number plate recognition). This is important for access to the commercial node.</u></p> <p>b) <u>Ensure that all gates and all associated infrastructure are located within the boundary of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>c) <u>Provide safe access and manoeuvring for refuse collection, deliveries, and service vehicles.</u></p> <p>d) <u>Consider pedestrian and vehicle safety, including clear sightlines and low-speed operation.</u></p> <p>e) <u>Ensure that the ongoing maintenance of roads, gates, drainage, signage, and line marking remain the responsibility of the retirement village.</u></p>
--	--	---

1.4 Proposed Conditions Residential

Changes as Proposed in Memorandum 6 (Transportation and Traffic)		Position of the Applicant
4.3	(45) The Consent Holder shall submit the following management plans to MPDC for approval in a technical certifying capacity. The Consent Holder shall prepare the management plans in accordance with the requirements of the relevant conditions and in general accordance with the draft management plans provided within Schedule 1, attached to this consent.	Agree MPDC has proposed changes from 10 working days prior to construction to 20 working days. Applicant accepts these changes.
5.1.1	<p>(9) That prior to the establishment of each stage the consent holder shall submit engineering plans detailing service locations, proposed and existing vehicle crossing, pavement formation, existing and any proposed water, wastewater and stormwater connections/system and all relevant information including but not limited to long sections, cross sections, design specifications, calculations, design certificates to the relevant MPDC (insert) Unit for review by the Development Engineering Unit Manager, or nominee <u>at least twenty (20) working days before commencement of construction</u>. The engineering design plans shall be amended by the Consent Holder as required until certified by the Development Engineering Unit Manager, or nominee prior to any building consent application or construction works commencing onsite (including earthworks).</p> <p><u>The engineering plans submitted for each Stage or Sub-Stage shall:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Ensure that the Road 1 approach to the Station Road/Road 1 intersection complies with the Development Manual. This will require changes to the proposed boundaries. The updated design shall include a minimum centreline radius of 80m and a refuge island on Road 1.</u> 	<p>Agree in part. Proposed amended condition below. Conditions refined to remove assessment related matters, and specific design details that should be considered within the detailed design reviews. The final bullet point has been amended to acknowledge that the approval required to relocate access is foremostly the impacted landowner – rather than MPDC.</p> <p><u>(9) That prior to the establishment of each stage the consent holder shall submit engineering plans detailing service locations, proposed and existing vehicle crossing, pavement formation, existing and any proposed water, wastewater and stormwater connections/system and all relevant information including but not limited to long sections, cross sections, design specifications, calculations, design certificates to the relevant MPDC (insert) Unit for review by the Development Engineering Unit Manager, or nominee at least twenty (20) working days before commencement of construction. The engineering design plans shall be amended by the Consent Holder as required until certified by the Development Engineering Unit</u></p>

- b. Include a refuge island on the Road 7 approach to the Road 1/ Road 7 intersection to support safe pedestrian access to the commercial node.
- c. Provide vehicle tracking at all intersections.
- d. Provide vehicle tracking at roundabouts including splitter island with complying pedestrian facilities.
- e. Include temporary turning heads within the development where any road terminates at a Stage or Sub-Stage boundary.
- f. Identify where no-stopping restrictions are required along curves to maintain two-way traffic.

Advice Note: If the properties on Chestnut Lane (insert legal descriptions here) are provided with direct vehicle access to Road 1 and the Chestnut Lane/ Station Road intersection is closed, with approval from MPDC it would be possible to relocate the Road 1/ Station Road intersection to avoid the curved alignment.

Manager, or nominee prior to any building consent application or construction works commencing onsite (including earthworks).

The engineering plans submitted for each Stage or Sub-Stage shall:

- a. Ensure that the Road 1 approach to the Station Road/Road 1 intersection complies with the Development Manual. This will require changes to the proposed boundaries. The updated design shall include a minimum centreline radius of 80m and a refuge island on Road 1.
- b. Include a refuge island on the Road 7 approach to the Road 1/ Road 7 intersection to support safe pedestrian access to the commercial node.
- c. Provide vehicle tracking at all intersections.
- d. Provide vehicle tracking at roundabouts including splitter island with complying pedestrian facilities.
- e. Include temporary turning heads within the development where any road terminates at a Stage or Sub-Stage boundary.
- f. Identify where no-stopping restrictions are required along curves to maintain two-way traffic.

Advice Note: If the properties on Chestnut Lane (insert legal descriptions here) are provided with direct vehicle access to Road 1 and the Chestnut Lane/ Station Road intersection is closed, with approval from MPDC it would be possible to relocate the Road 1/ Station Road intersection to avoid the curved alignment

Advice Note: In the event that the owners of the properties on Chestnut Lane (legal descriptions to be inserted) approve the relocation of direct vehicle access to Road 1, and the Chestnut Lane/Station Road intersection is subsequently closed, the alignment of the Road 1/Station Road intersection shall be modified to avoid the existing curved alignment.

<p>New</p>	<p>Safe System Audits</p> <p><u>The Consent Holder shall ensure that Safe System Audits are carried out for each Stage or Sub Stage of are submitted to Matamata Piako District Council in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines (October 2022)”.</u></p> <p><u>The detailed design Safe System Audit shall separate out the decision tracking between designer, client – developer, MPDC safety engineer and MPDC as road controlling authority. The design shall be amended until the concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of MPDC as road controlling authority. The completed Safe System Audit shall be submitted with the detailed design engineering drawings accompanied by a statement explaining why any remaining safety concerns have not been addressed.</u></p> <p><u>The post construction Safe System Audit shall separate out the decision tracking between designer, client – developer, MPDC safety engineer and MPDC as road controlling authority. The concerns identified in the Safe system Audit shall be addressed to the satisfaction of, and implemented within the timeframes agreed with, MPDC as road controlling authority</u></p>	<p>Agree in part as above. Proposed Condition below</p> <p><u>The Consent Holder shall ensure that Safe System Audits are carried out for each Stage or Sub Stage of are submitted to Matamata Piako District Council in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines (October 2022)”.</u></p> <p>Safe System Audits <u>The Consent Holder shall ensure that Safe System Audits are carried out and submitted to Matamata Piako District Council in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines (October 2022)”.</u></p> <p><u>A copy of the completed Safe System Audit shall be provided to Matamata-Piako District Council (as the Road Controlling Authority) together with the detailed engineering design drawings.</u> <u>The Audit shall include a response table that identifies how each audit recommendation has been addressed, including where no change is proposed and the supporting rationale.</u> <u>The Consent Holder shall incorporate into the final detailed design any reasonably practicable safety improvements identified through the Audit that are agreed in writing by the Council as necessary to address material road safety risks.</u></p> <p><u>A copy of the completed Post Construction Safety Audit shall be provided to Matamata-Piako District Council (as Road Controlling Authority).</u> <u>The Audit shall include a response table identifying the Consent Holder’s proposed actions for each finding, including where no action is proposed and the rationale for this.</u></p>
------------	---	--

		<p><u>The Consent Holder shall implement any reasonably practicable safety improvements identified through the Audit that are agreed by the MPDC as necessary to address material road safety risks. Any agreed improvements shall be completed within timeframes mutually agreed between the Consent Holder and the Council.</u></p>
New	<p><u>The parking layout at the commercial node (located within Stage 4) shall be designed to include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>Spaces with limited parking duration in parking bays near the childcare, to discourage longer-term parking.</u> b) <u>Dedicated parking spaces for staff away from the childcare centre, leaving the closest spaces available for caregivers.</u> c) <u>Clearly delineated pedestrian paths and signage to emphasise user priority and manage the location of pedestrians crossing parking areas.</u> d) <u>Traffic calming to maintain a low speed environment.</u> e) <u>Planting to be kept low to maintain visibility.</u> 	<p>Disagree – the Applicant agrees with the design requirements, however, consider the most appropriate place for these is under the Parking Management Plan condition below to enable certification by MPDC.</p>
New	<p>Parking Management Plan Prior to operation of the commercial node, the Consent Holder shall submit a Parking Management Plan (PMP) to Matamata-Piako District Council (MPDC) for certification. The PMP shall describe how parking will be managed across the shared parking area and shall include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Allocating specific spaces for childcare centre use at peak pick-up / drop-off times (spaces closest to the childcare centre). b) Using time limits on parking to discourage longer-term parking near the childcare centre. Dedicated staff parking away from the childcare centre, leaving the closest spaces available for parents. c) Requiring rubbish collection to take place outside of peak hours to reduce the risk of heavy vehicles manoeuvring at the same time as children. d) Clearly delineated pedestrian paths and signage to emphasise 	<p>Agree</p>

	<p>user priority and reduce the risk of pedestrians crossing in other locations.</p> <p>e) Clear signage that warns drivers of the presence of children.</p> <p>f) Traffic calming to maintain a low speed environment.</p> <p>g) Maintaining good visibility at the vehicle crossing and within the carpark by keeping any planting low (<1.1m in height).</p> <p>The development shall operate in accordance with the certified Parking Management Plan at all times.</p>												
	<p><u>Infrastructure Staging and ITA requirements</u></p> <p><u>Development shall proceed in accordance with the staging requirements set out in the following table, which identifies the infrastructure that must be delivered or made operational at each stage of development and specifies whether an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) is required prior to commencing that stage. No development within a given stage may commence until all infrastructure and assessment requirements for that stage, as listed in the following table, have been satisfied to the approval of MPDC.</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="353 960 1214 1439"> <thead> <tr> <th>Stage</th> <th>Required Infrastructure</th> <th>ITA Required</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Stage 1 (68 lots)</u></td> <td> <u>Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath.</u> </td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Stage 2 (145 lots)</u></td> <td><u>As for Stage 1.</u></td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Stage	Required Infrastructure	ITA Required	<u>Stage 1 (68 lots)</u>	<u>Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath.</u> 	No	<u>Stage 2 (145 lots)</u>	<u>As for Stage 1.</u>	No	<p>Agree in Part</p> <p>The table provided by MPDC is largely consistent with the Applicant’s response to Minute 3 – with the exception of two matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of a pedestrian refuge on Smith Street. The threshold to require a connection to either Firth Street or to Station Road. <p>In relation to the pedestrian refuge, it is considered that, in the long term, pedestrians will use the Applicant’s proposed shared path on the southern side of Station Road. Once the connection to Station Road is completed, pedestrians are expected to utilise this path and cross to Smith Street via the new refuge on Station Road.</p> <p>With respect to the threshold, it is maintained that, with construction vehicle movements removed from Stage 3 and the capacity available within the network, the thresholds proposed by the Applicant remain appropriate and should be retained.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1240 1257 2056 1439"> <tr> <td><u>Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)</u></td> <td><u>As for Stage 3 plus:</u> <u>— Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right turn bay on Station Road or construction of a new road connection to Firth Street.</u></td> </tr> </table>	<u>Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)</u>	<u>As for Stage 3 plus:</u> <u>— Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right turn bay on Station Road or construction of a new road connection to Firth Street.</u>
Stage	Required Infrastructure	ITA Required											
<u>Stage 1 (68 lots)</u>	<u>Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath.</u> 	No											
<u>Stage 2 (145 lots)</u>	<u>As for Stage 1.</u>	No											
<u>Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)</u>	<u>As for Stage 3 plus:</u> <u>— Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right turn bay on Station Road or construction of a new road connection to Firth Street.</u>												

	<p><u>Stage 3 (217 lots)</u></p>	<p><u>As for Stage 2 plus:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>All construction traffic to travel via a temporary access route from Station Road or construction of a new road connection from Firth Street.</u> - <u>Mitigation within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in ITA.</u> 	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>A formed connection to Station Road (including a right turn bay) must be completed by the earlier of:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>the first 400 residential lots</u> o <u>1,850 of commercial activities has been delivered</u> <p><u>unless:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>A structured road connection to Fifth Street has been completed.,</u> - <u>Should a formed connection to Station Road be provided then the following will also be required:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge).</u> o <u>Construction of a 3m wide sealed share path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1.</u> o <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection.</u> o <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets). –</u> - <u>Mitigation identified within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in the ITA.</u>
	<p><u>Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)</u></p>	<p><u>As for Stage 3 plus:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right-turn bay on Station Road or construction of a new road connection to Firth Street. Should a formed connection to Station Road be provided then the following will also be required: -</u> <u>Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to</u> 	<p><u>Yes</u></p>	

		<p><u>existing urban edge).</u> - <u>Construction of a 3m wide sealed share path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1.</u> - <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection.</u> <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets).</u> - <u>Mitigation identified within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in the ITA.</u></p>		
		<p><u>As per Stage 4 plus mitigation identified within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in the ITA.</u></p>		
		<p><u>As per Stage 5.</u></p>	<u>No</u>	
		<p><u>As per Stage 6.</u></p>	<u>No</u>	
		<p><u>As per Stage 7 plus the following works, unless they have been completed as part of an earlier stage:</u> - <u>Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right-turn bay on Station Road.</u> - <u>Urbanisation of Station Road</u></p>	<u>No</u>	

(southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge) - Construction of a 3m wide sealed shared path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1 - Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection = Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets).

Where required by this condition, each Stage of the development shall include an ITA.

All ITAs shall identify and evaluate the effects of all cumulative development in the development area on the surrounding transport network.

All ITA shall identify, evaluate the effects and where necessary propose mitigation (such as traffic calming, pedestrian crossing improvements, no-stopping restrictions, changes to intersection form/ priority, pavements, parking provisions, etc.) for cumulative effects on the following routes and intersections:

- a. SH27/ Station Road
- b. SH27/ Jellicoe Road
- c. Station Road/ Hampton Tce
- d. Jellicoe Road/ Hampton Tce
- e. Archford St/ Hampton Tce
- f. Archford St/ Peakedale Drive
- g. Station Road/ Smith Street
- h. Station Road

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Smith Streetj. Jellicoe Road	
--	--	--