

Your comment on the Ashbourne project draft conditions

Please include all the contact details listed below with your comments and indicate whether you can receive further communications from us by email to substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz.

1. Contact Details			
Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.			
Organisation name (if relevant)	Matamata-Piako District Council (MPDC)		
First name	Marius		
Last name	Rademeyer		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
Home phone / Mobile phone	[REDACTED]	Work phone	[REDACTED]
Email	[REDACTED]		

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I can receive emails and my email address is correct		I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct
-------------------------------------	---	--	---

Introduction

MPDC wishes to thank the Expert Panel for the opportunity to provide comments on the Panel’s draft conditions. The comments below have been prepared by MPDC’s consultant planner, with input from the Council’s team of experts, internal staff, and legal counsel who have been involved since the lodgement of the Ashbourne project.

The comments reflect MPDC’s concern that the financial and environmental risks associated with the development are managed robustly, and do not transfer onto the Council, neighbours and ratepayers. To this end, MPDC maintains that the proposed “hold point” on exercising the consents until critical information is provided to Council, as alluded to in our comments, is crucial to the management of the project’s risks on Council and the community.

MPDC’s comments are provided in two parts:

- **Transportation review comments** – these comments relate to all transportation-related matters and are summarised below, and detailed in Attachments A and B.
- **Other review comments** – these comments relate to all other conditions, excluding those covered by the transportation review and are summarised below and detailed in Attachments C and D.

1. Transportation Review Comments

Alastair Black, MPDC's transportation expert, is concerned that:

- There is no longer a requirement for a temporary access road from Station Road, should the Firth Street connection not be available. This means that construction traffic may use existing residential streets.
- The requirement for an ITA for Stage 3 has been removed, despite the level of development at that stage increasing from what was previously proposed (commercial node now required with Stage 3 rather than Stage 4).
- The removal of the previously proposed infrastructure staging table has resulted in unclear triggers for required infrastructure improvements.
- The draft conditions do not include the requirement for a right turn bay on Station Road to Road 1.
- Some clarification is needed regarding Chestnut Lane. Condition 74b states that as part of Stage 8, Road 1 MUST be combined with Chestnut lane, however Condition 77c suggests that this is optional.

Mr Black's comments on the transport conditions of the LUC are below in Attachment A. He recommends that the infrastructure staging table is reinstated into the conditions, with modifications to reflect the combining of Stages 5 and 6, and the shift of the commercial node to Stage 3. Attachment B includes the recommended infrastructure staging table and requirements for ITAs.

2. Other review comments

The "other review comments" have been prepared with input from:

- **Stormwater, groundwater and geotechnical matters** – Tony Cowbourne and Bronwyn Rhynd, in consultation with WRC's experts, Megan Wood and Sheryl Roa.
- **Water and Wastewater** – Susanne Kampshof (MPDC Assets and Projects Manager), Santha Agas (MPDC Infrastructure Asset & Strategy Team Leader) and Krishna Acharya (MPDC Senior Consents Engineer).
- **Planning** – Marius Rademeyer (Consultant Planner for MPDC).
- **Legal** – Andrew Green (Counsel for MPDC).

The MPDC Team supports the Expert Panel's approach of an integrated landuse and subdivision consent for all activities applied for, as opposed to the Applicant's proposal for multiple separate consents.

The MPDC Team is also broadly in support of the draft conditions as circulated, but wishes to offer comments relating to the following issues for the Expert Panel's consideration:

- **"Hold point" on critical information** - to prevent the consents from being exercised until critical information that would usually be available prior to the grant of consent, has been made available;
- **Bespoke provisions for the certification of the stormwater management plan (SMP)** – given the extent of work required to finalise the document and the need for MPDC to be involved in the iterative development of the ultimate stormwater management approach;

- **Clarification of responsibility for ecological restoration requirements** – recommendation to require a home-owners association (or similar) to be formed to take responsibility for ongoing implementation of the ecological restoration requirements.
- **Removal of the “deemed certified” provisions** - recommendation that the “deemed certified” provisions be removed from the management plan conditions, in line with case law and in recognition that certification of the many management plans, will stretch MPDC’s resources.
- **Amendments to align with the Panel’s draft decision** – amendments to conditions for consistency with the Panel’s draft decision and changes resulting from combining Residential Stages 5 and 6, into one consolidated stage.
- **Inclusion of standard MPDC-specific conditions** – to assist MPDC staff in monitoring compliance with consent conditions.

The proposed amendments summarised above, are set out in Attachments “C” and “D”, as tracked changes and comments on the Panel’s version of the draft conditions circulated with the draft decision dated 11 March 2026, for the combined landuse (Appendix-A1-MPDC-LUC) and subdivision (Appendix-A2-MPDC-SUB) consents.

MPDC notes that it has not yet been provided with, and therefore has not been able to, comment on the amended scheme plans that the Applicant will need to prepare to align with the Panel’s draft decision. Should the FTAA process allows, MPDC will appreciate the opportunity to provide further comments on the amendments proposed in the Applicant’s final scheme plans, once these become available.

Attachment A: Transport comments from Gray Matter

Condition and No.	Comment
73. The Consent Holder must contribute to the cost of designating the Firth Street connection. The financial contribution will be determined through the development contributions process.	Ok.
74. The Consent Holder must complete the following external transport network upgrades to service the development of the Site:	-
<p>a. Prior to commencing construction on the Site (including Site enabling works), EITHER:</p> <p>i. Construct a collector road to Firth Street consistent with the Eldonwood South Structure Plan (Matamata-Piako District Plan).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>ii. Upgrade pedestrian facilities on Hampton Terrace, Peakedale Drive and Jellicoe Road to meet the DM 2010 and install a roundabout at the intersection of Jellicoe Road and Hampton Terrace.</p>	<p>Would prefer that construction access is specifically defined.</p> <p>Happy with (i)</p> <p>Condition in (ii) would result in construction traffic using existing residential streets.</p> <p>Would like the condition to require that should a Firth Street link not be available, a temporary access via Station Road is required.</p>
b. As part of constructing Road 1 through Stage 8, the Consent Holder must upgrade Chestnut Lane (off Station Road and currently held in Record of Title Lot 3 Deposited Plan 404835) and combine with Road 1. Provide vehicle crossings to #135, #129A and #129B Station Road, including driveways to tie in with the existing driveways.	Ok.
<p>c. Widening and urbanisation of Station Road to collector road standard (consistent with the DM 2010 for collector roads) along the southern side (only) from where these facilities end (at approximately 86 Station Road) to Road 1. The upgrade must include:</p> <p>i. A 3m wide (where possible) sealed shared path from the Road 1/Station Road intersection to the existing footpath.</p>	<p>Draft conditions defer the timing of this to ITAs, which are not required until the completion of Stage 4 (see proposed condition 75).</p> <p>Would prefer that this was required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the same time as the formed connection to Station Road.

Condition and No.	Comment
<p>ii. A pedestrian refuge island on Station Road (just east of Sheffield St) providing access across Station Road for pedestrians walking to/from Smith St.</p> <p><i>Advice note: See Maven plans:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Typical Road Cross Section” (Ref: C340-8, Rev C, dated January 2026) • “Proposed Roading Plan Station Road” (Ref: C300-30, Rev B, dated January 2026) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to development of Stage 4, unless the Firth St connection is in place.
<p>d. (removed, related to retirement village)</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>e. Construct a pedestrian refuge island on the Smith Street approach to the Smith Road/Station Road intersection to manage the speed of turning vehicles and improve safety for pedestrians.</p>	<p>Would prefer that this was required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the same time as the formed connection to Station Road. • Prior to development of Stage 4, unless the Firth St connection is in place.
<p>f. Further network upgrades (such as traffic calming, pedestrian crossing improvements, no-stopping restrictions, changes to intersection form/ priority, pavements, parking provisions, etc.) on the following routes and intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. State Highway 27/Station Road ii. State Highway 27/Jellicoe Road iii. Station Road/Hampton Terrace iv. Jellicoe Road/Hampton Terrace v. Archford Street/Hampton Terrace vi. Archford Street/Peakedale Drive vii. Station Road/Smith Street viii. Station Road ix. Smith Street x. Jellicoe Road 	<p>Draft conditions defer the timing of this to ITAs, which are not required until the completion of Stage 4 (see proposed condition 75).</p> <p>Happy for further network upgrades to be determined by an ITA, but would prefer that the ITA was required prior to Stage 3, not Stage 4. This is especially important as the commercial node is now timed with Stage 3, not Stage 4 as it was before.</p> <p>(edit – I now see that this is covered in Condition 76).</p>

Condition and No.	Comment
75. The timing of the network upgrades identified in Conditions [73(c)], [73(e)] and [73(f)] will be determined by updated Integrated Transport Assessments (ITAs) to be submitted to the Council at the completion of Stage 4 and every stage thereafter.	Should read 74c, 74e and 74f . ITA should be required earlier, prior to Stage 3.
76. Despite any infrastructure timing requirements set out in an ITA required by Condition [74], the Station Road widening and urbanisation works (required by Condition [X(c)]) must be completed to coincide the opening of Road 1 to Station Road (see Condition [76(a)]).	Agree, see comment for Condition 74c
77. That the following transport infrastructure requirements are met for the residential and commercial development: <i>Advice note: The following describes the water infrastructure that will vest in the Council. Requirements for the retirement village are addressed below.</i>	-
a. Road 1 must be formed and connected to Station Road (including a right-turn bay) by the earlier of: i. 400 residential lots being constructed, OR ii. 1,850m ² of commercial activities being operational.	As previously recommended, remove (i) and (ii). Station Road connection required either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Stage 4 unless Firth Street connection is in place, or • With Stage 8. (refer to attached table)
b. Construction of the southern solar farm must not commence unless construction access can be obtained via Station Road (Road 1) or via the collector road to Firth Street.	Ok.
c. If Road 1 is not combined with Chestnut Lane (off Station Road) (Condition [73(b)]), the Consent Holder must realign the intersection of Road 1 with Station Road to achieve compliance with the DM 2010.	Should read Condition 74b . This condition appears to contradict Condition 74b which requires Road 1 to combine with Chestnut Lane. Requires clarification.
d. Construct a pedestrian refuge island on the Road 1 approach to the Road 1/Station Road intersection to manage the speed of turning vehicles and improve safety for pedestrians.	Ok.
e. Provide a 3m wide shared path on one side of Road 1 and a 1.5m pedestrian path on the other side of Road 1.	Ok.

Condition and No.	Comment
<p>f. Provide roundabouts and pedestrian facilities at the following intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Road 1/Road 13/Peakedale Drive ii. Road 1/Road 10 (to access the commercial node and address insufficient sight distance) iii. Road 10/Road 14 (to access the commercial node) iv. Road 1/Road 3 v. Road 1/Road 2 (south) or alternatively realign the western portion of Road 2 to avoid a crossroads intersection). vi. Road 1/Road 9 	Ok.
<p>g. Provide pedestrian crossing facilities (e.g. kerb build-outs and/or refuge islands) along Road 1 to safely provide for pedestrian movements, for example, at the Road 1/Road 10 and Road 1/Road 7 intersections adjacent to the commercial node.</p>	Ok.
<p>h. Amend the design of all internal roads on the Site to provide 0.3 on-street parking spaces per dwelling.</p>	Ok.
<p>i. Ensure facilities for buses are possible throughout Site (along Road 1). These will only need to be constructed if a public bus service is operational in Matamata prior to the completion of works on the Site.</p> <p><i>Advice note: Bus facilities will need to be shown on plans but bus pull-ins etc can be used for on-street car parking (over and above the on-street car parking requirement specified in Condition [76(h)]).</i></p>	Ok.
<p>j. Identify where no-stopping restrictions are required along curves to maintain two-way traffic.</p>	Condition related to drawings.
<p>k. In the jointly-owned access lots (JOALs), provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Street lighting consistent with public street lighting requirements. ii. Vehicle calming measures, for example chicanes, variations in surface finish or texture or speed limits (20km/hr or less). 	Ok.

Condition and No.	Comment
l. Extend Roads 10 and 17 to the southern Site boundary.	Ok.
78. Include turning heads where any road terminates at a stage boundary or at the Site boundary (where the turning head will be permanent).	Ok - should this be (m) in above condition.
79. The Consent Holder must not construct any vehicle, cycle or pedestrian link to Eldonwood Drive or Highgrove Avenue.	Ok - should this be (n) in above condition.
80. The Consent Holder must complete a Safe System Audit at the detailed design stage for each stage and submit to the Council. The Safe System Audit must be undertaken in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines” (October 2022). The detailed design Safe System Audit must separate out the decision tracking between designer, developer, and the relevant Council roles (as safety engineer and road controlling authority). The design must be amended until the concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Council as road controlling authority. The completed Safe System Audit must be submitted with the detailed design engineering drawings accompanied by a statement explaining why any remaining safety concerns have not been addressed.	Ok.
81. The Consent Holder must complete a Safe System Audit at the detailed design stage of the Station Road/northern solar farm access and submit to the Council. The Safe System Audit must be undertaken in accordance with the procedures set down in the “Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines” (October 2022). The detailed design Safe System Audit must separate out the decision tracking between designer, developer, and the relevant Council roles (as safety engineer and road controlling authority). The design must be amended until the concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Council as road controlling authority. The completed Safe System Audit must be submitted with the detailed design engineering drawings accompanied by a statement explaining why any remaining safety concerns have not been addressed.	Ok.

Condition and No.	Comment
<p>107. The Consent Holder must complete a Safe System Audit following the construction of each stage and submit to the Council. The Safe System Audit must be undertaken in accordance with the procedures set down in the “<i>Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines</i>” (October 2022). The post construction Safe System Audit must separate out the decision tracking between designer, developer, and the relevant Council roles (as safety engineer and road controlling authority). The concerns identified in the Safe System Audit must be addressed to the satisfaction of, and implemented within the timeframes agreed with, the Council as road controlling authority.</p>	<p>Ok.</p>
<p>108. The Consent Holder must complete a Safe System Audit following the construction of the Station Road/northern solar farm access and submit to the Council. The Safe System Audit must be undertaken in accordance with the procedures set down in the “<i>Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Safe System Audit Guidelines</i>” (October 2022). The post construction Safe System Audit must separate out the decision tracking between designer, developer, and the relevant Council roles (as safety engineer and road controlling authority). The concerns identified in the Safe System Audit must be addressed to the satisfaction of, and implemented within the timeframes agreed with, the Council as road controlling authority.</p>	<p>Ok.</p>

Attachment B: Recommended infrastructure staging and ITA requirements

Stage	Required Infrastructure	ITA?
Stage 1 (68 lots)	<p>Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road) must be implemented prior to occupation of any Units.</p> <p>Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath must be implemented prior to occupation of any Units.</p>	No
Stage 2 (145 lots)	As for Stage 1.	No
Stage 3 (217 lots + commercial development)	<p>As for Stage 2 plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All construction traffic to travel via a temporary access route from Station Road or construction of a new road connection from Firth Street. • Mitigation within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in ITA. 	Yes
Stage 4 (277 lots)	<p>As for Stage 3 plus:</p> <p>A formed connection to Station Road (including a right turn bay) must be completed unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A structured road connection to Fifth Street has been completed., <p>Should a formed connection to Station Road be provided then the following will also be required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge). ○ Construction of a 3m wide sealed share path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1. ○ Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets). <p>Mitigation identified within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in the ITA.</p>	Yes
Stage 5 (337 lots)	As per Stage 4	Yes
Stage 6 (389 lots)	As per Stage 5.	No
Stage 7 (451 lots)	As per Stage 6.	No
Stage 8 (518 lots)	<p>As per Stage 7 plus the following works, unless they have been completed as part of an earlier stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right-turn bay on Station Road. – • Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge) 	No

Stage	Required Infrastructure	ITA?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 3m wide sealed shared path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1 Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets).	

Attachment C- MPDC comments on draft landuse consent conditions – see separate file:

- Attachment C – Panel Appendix-A1-MPDC-LUC with MPDC comments FINAL 18 03 26

Attachment D- MPDC comments on draft subdivision consent conditions – see separate file:

- Attachment D – Panel Appendix-A2-MPDC-SUB with MPDC comments FINAL 18 03 26

Thank you for your comments