

Your Comment on the Ashbourne substantive application

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)	Pippins Development Limited Partnership		
First name	Aaron		
Last name	Bennett		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
Home phone / Mobile phone		Work phone	[REDACTED]
Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)	[REDACTED]		

2. We will email you draft conditions of consent for your comment			
<input type="checkbox"/>	I can receive emails and my email address is correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct

Please provide your comments below, include additional pages as needed.

1) Who we are / status

Pippins Development Limited Partnership (“Pippins”) owns land immediately east of the Ashbourne project site. The undeveloped adjoining Pippins Development land is described as [REDACTED]. The Pippins Development site is a staged residential development within the Matamata Piako District Plan Residential Zone and Eldonwood South Structure Plan area.

The applicant Matamata Development Limited proposes to run a wastewater rising main and a 33kV electrical cable along the structure-plan road corridor (through or beside our land) to reach Firth Street/Hinuera Road. Due to still to be determined development proposals and based on professional Planning, Land Surveying, and Engineering advice, Pippins has not provided consent for that connection. See the applicant’s description of the route (Road 4 alignment, behind future Lots 1–5, open trench preferred; HDD only if already developed).

Following research of the Ashbourne proposal, Pippins Development Partnership have major concerns in terms of the proposed development, staging and implementation.

2) Position and Summary

Pippins supports coordinated growth in principle, but do not consider that the current Ashbourne proposal adequately addresses infrastructure issues for the local development area, or in the most effective manner for the Matamata township as a whole. Pippins Development Limited Partnership do not agree to the requested services corridor or any form of “in-principle” consent at this stage.

3) Service Corridor Issues

- **Unresolved MPDC approvals and layout dependencies.** Structure-plan road link and reserve legalisation, stormwater basins/soakage locations, and final servicing layout on Pippins land are not confirmed; Council responses to date have been conditional/“without prejudice.” Fixing a private-land utilities corridor now risks foreclosing viable layouts and gravity servicing options.
- **Servicing risks (gravity sewer & stormwater).** The southern part of the Pippins site is close to gravity limits; fixed invert/grades of a rising main and the 33kV cable could constrain sewer design and stormwater soakage/overland flowpaths.
- **Network capacity uncertainty beyond the current Residential zone.** Capacity allocation and any upgrades triggered by the Ashbourne connection are not settled. The Fast-track decision could indirectly prejudice servicing available to Pippins.
- **Construction methodology conflicts.** The applicant prefers open trenching (HDD only if our site is already developed), with potential drilling pits/access within our land—this directly risks conflict with our bulk earthworks, roads and housing staging.
- **Panel’s own concerns align with ours.** Minute 2 seeks further information on stormwater soakage viability, groundwater mounding, pond/spillway details and cumulative construction effects (paras 2, 2–2, 2). We rely on and support the Panel’s information requests and will review the applicant’s responses once filed.

4) Traffic and sequencing

Residential staging changes to utilise Station Road and Structure Plan “Road Corridor” Collector Road connection to Firth Street must precede Ashbourne connection to that road.

The Ashbourne proposal advertised is based on access through the Eldonwood South Structure Plan road network for the initial 7 stages of residential development.

The following background to the Eldonwood South Structure Plan and area development was provided by Barr and Harris Surveyors Limited.

The Eldonwood South Structure Plan was developed over the course of reviews by Matamata Piako District Council of future development options on the south side of the Matamata township. After a series of zone change options and reviews by Gray Matter Traffic Engineers the need to set aside a “Road Corridor” for a future Collector Road between Firth Street and Station Road was identified. Two “indicative road link” routes were identified on the Peakedale/Pippins development area to the “local” roads to the north. Those link roads include Peakedale Drive and an extension of Hampton Terrace south of Jellicoe Road.

The “Road Corridor” Collector Road was provided for in the Eldonwood South Structure Plan based on the Traffic Engineers assessment that the proposed Residential Zone and Rural-residential Zone areas would generate traffic in excess of that capable of being accommodated in the “Local Road” network, including the Jellicoe Road and Hampton Terrace links to S.H.27 (Arterial Road). The Ashbourne development, including the residential greenfields development, commercial node and retirement village, will generate traffic well in excess of that assessed in the Structure Plan modelling.

If the Ashbourne proposal is approved the granting of that consent will significantly impact the urban growth pattern of the Matamata urban area over the coming 20 – 30 year period. The provision for alternative Residential development areas as proposed is considered positive for the township growth and choice. However, an unintended consequence of the Ashbourne development under the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land would be that any additional residential expansion area would be constrained. The Matamata township is located on and bordered by class I and II soils. All residential zone expansion options for the urban area are located on soils classified as highly productive, requiring assessment under the NPS on HPL in terms of 10 year residential demand.

The Ashbourne proposal, if granted, would effectively eliminate other current potential re-zoning options that include arguably superior infrastructure options, soils with more suitable groundwater separation and soakage capacity, and closer proximity to the Matamata town centre on the north side of Matamata township.

The granting of the Ashbourne development proposal would eliminate a comparative assessment of alternatives by Matamata Piako District Council under the NPS on HPL criteria, or the “market” in terms of demand and comprehensive infrastructure development costs.

The granting of the Ashbourne consent as a “fast track” proposal without comparative assessment of alternatives, or a change to the NPS on HPL, would effectively limit new

residential re-zoning and development to the south-west side of the Matamata township, under the NPS on HPS criteria, prior to the 10 year demand threshold being reached. That would significantly concentrate and accelerate demand on infrastructure services and roading at the south-west side of the Matamata township.

The Ashbourne proposal identifies road links on Station Road, Peakedale Drive, and to the Structure Plan “Road Corridor” through the Pippins development site. That “Road Corridor” extends south of the recreation reserve adjoining the south side of Haig Road to Hinuera Road.

No road connections or other connectivity is indicated to Highgrove Avenue, or the “private roads” Eldonwood Drive and Chestnut Lane within the Eldonwood development.

The residential development staging proposal identified in the Ashbourne application identifies 8 stages extending from the south-east end of the proposed development area, with the final stage 8 providing a connection to Station Road to the north-west. That proposal appears to indicate that the initial 7 stages, and potentially commercial development, would be reliant on road access from the Eldonwood Structure Plan area. The effects on the local road network, particularly Jellicoe Road and the historic part of Hampton Terrace would be well outside the “Local Road” intended use. The MPDC Development Manual assumes daily traffic movements of 200 – 1000 vehicle per day on Residential Local Roads (1000 vpd – 2500 vpd Collector Roads), NZS 4404: 2010 Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure identifies 1000 vpd for Local Roads (250 – 1500 vpd Collector Roads), NZ Road Efficiency Group One Network Road Classification (ONRC) identifies < 1000 vpd for Local Roads (> 1000 vpd Secondary Collect Road, > 3000 vpd Primary Collector Road).

The existing Eldonwood Structure Plan residential development area will result in traffic movements that exceed the recommended local road maximum on the “Local Roads” to the north including Jellicoe Road and Hampton Terrace.

As noted above, the Eldonwood Structure Plan identified the need for a Collector Road within the identified “Road Corridor” within the Structure Plan to address traffic effects of the current Residential and Rural-residential zoned areas in the Eldonwood Structure Plan area to address effects of that existing Eldonwood South Structure Plan area.

The Ashbourne development with the proposed residential development strategy would grossly exceed the Local Road vehicle movement design basis.

The Ashbourne proposal based on the stages of residential development and commercial node progressing from Peakedale Drive access is not considered appropriate.

The area south-west of the Eldonwood Structure Plan area is considered unsuitable for development until the Eldonwood Structure Plan “Collector Road” is provided between

Hinuera Road (Arterial Road Status) to the east (which links to S.H.29), and Station Road (Collector Road status) to the west.

Pippins Development seek a pre-commencement condition (see Conditions 2 and 3 below) for provision of the “Collector Road” connection within the Eldonwood South Structure Plan.

5) Relief and conditions sought (if the Panel is minded to grant)

Primary relief: Decline or defer any approval that relies on access or services through the Eldonwood South Structure Plan roads to a “Collector Road” link to Station Road. Access to Hinuera Road and Station Road as per the Structure Plan identified “Collector Road” link prior to road connection to Peakedale Drive or Hampton Terrace.

Alternatively, impose the following conditions to avoid prejudice to Pippins:

1. **Property-rights precondition** – No works on Pippins land (including trenching, HDD, or access) until a registered easement is executed by Pippins in its sole discretion.
2. **Road network precondition (Station Road and Hinuera Road links)** – The Ashbourne development (including Stage 1 and any utility installation within or adjacent to the eastern paper-road corridor) should not be solely reliant on Eldonwood South Structure Plan “Local Road” access at any point. Residential staging should either begin from the Station Road frontage with appropriate upgrade of that road formation, or the current residential staging proposal was retained the Eldonwood Structure Plan “Collector Road” link should be provided between Hinuera Road and Station Road prior to road connection to the Eldonwood South Structure Plan area “Local Roads”.
3. **Utilities-before-road prohibition** – No wastewater or 33 kV installations within the paper-road corridor until road formation levels and alignment are finalised and the road is programmed for construction.
4. **Design coordination & certification** – Prior to detailed design, the applicant must provide a Services Coordination Plan to MPDC and Pippins demonstrating no reduction in feasible gravity servicing or stormwater capacity for Pippins.
5. **Capacity non-prejudice** – The approval must not reduce network capacity that would otherwise service Pippins; any upgrades triggered by Ashbourne are at the applicant’s cost.
6. **Cumulative effects management** – A single Construction Management Plan must address cumulative effects across all Ashbourne stages.
7. **Reinstatement & indemnity** – Full reinstatement and indemnity for loss or damage arising from works.

8. **Relocation at applicant's cost** – If conflicts arise with Pippins' consented development, the applicant must relocate or adjust its assets at its own cost.

6) Process Requests

- Confirm that Pippins will be invited to comment on draft conditions (as per **Minute 1**).
- Notify Pippins when the applicant's response to **Minute 2** is received so a supplementary comment can be considered before the 11 November 2025 deadline.