

To: Sue Simons – Ashbourne Expert Panel Chair  
From: Fraser McNutt – Barker & Associates Limited  
Date: 23 March 2026  
Re: Invitation to Comment on Draft Conditions Ashbourne

---

Dear Panel Members,

This Memorandum sets out the applicant's response to the draft consent conditions received from the Expert panel.

It is noted that the Applicant has reviewed these draft conditions without consultation with the Matamata-Piako District Council and Waikato Regional Council (**MPDC** and **WRC**, or **the Councils**) and would welcome the opportunity to conference (or similar) on these conditions to reach resolution if there remain areas of disagreement following the receipt of all comments. We emphasise the changes required to be made post draft decision required the expert input and updating of multiple documents, civil and scheme to cater for the refinement of the proposal to allow the issuing of the residential and commercial node in particular.

In relation to the Expert Panel's draft conditions, we supply tracked change versions of the conditions for ease of reference. Comments are provided within the tracked change documents and are repeated and/or expanded on as appropriate below.

#### Reiteration of separate Land use consents.

Our client has reiterated its delivery model for which the application was referred and then applied through the EPA. Although Ashbourne was lodged as a masterplanned application, Unity's intended delivery model has always contemplated separate delivery vehicles for different components of the project. The residential development is intended to be delivered by one entity, and each of the two solar farms is intended to be delivered and operated by separate solar operators. Each solar farm is therefore a discrete infrastructure component, capable of separate ownership, funding, construction and operation, with its own servicing and commercial pathway. I expand on this further below in relation to further justifying the need for separate land use consents.

As sated, comments are provided in the track changed version for the Panel to view. Three key draft conditions are expanded on below for the panels consideration.

#### Proposed condition 74 (MPDC LUC Residential)

*74. The Consent Holder must complete the following external transport network upgrades to service the development of the Site:*

*a. Prior to commencing construction on the Site (including Site enabling works), EITHER:*

*i. Construct a collector road to Firth Street consistent with the Eldonwood South Structure Plan (Matamata-Piako District Plan). OR*

*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. 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.

This was not a condition that was discussed with Council(s), proposed as a draft nor assessed through expert traffic conferencing set down via the EPA. It's acknowledged through the evidence of Alastair Black that as an example, via a **future assessment** that a roundabout could help mitigate future potential adverse effects. Further Mr Black's evidence suggests *"In my view, the need for some of the pedestrian and traffic calming improvements would be reduced if a connection to Firth St was provided early in the development staging and development related traffic used that route instead of this existing network."* I attach MPDC response to minute 3 from Mr Black. His comments and conditions do not reflect that of the proposed condition (74) in discussion here.

No information has been provided on the viability and ability to cater for a roundabout at the intersection of Jellicoe Road and Hampton Terrace i.e. enough land to cater for one, impacts on adjacent and adjoining residential properties and modelling to support this as a viable solution, noting the refined proposal in front of the panel. Similarly, the ability to construct a road that is not designated, over land that is not in the control or ownership of the applicant is problematic. No consultation with NZTA has taken place as a key stakeholder in forming this connection and no expert conferencing has been directed on this option. We are unable to require a designation nor compel a landowner outside of this Fast Track application to develop, sell or designate their land holdings.

The issue of constructing and vesting a collector road prior to site enabling works/commencing of construction is not best practice and will give rise to several concerns which I highlight below.

It is generally not appropriate to vest a road before construction is complete because doing so could expose the developer to unnecessary risk, cost, and practical constraints. Once a road is vested, it becomes a legally public roading asset and must meet council standards at the point of vesting. If construction of the road is still ongoing, heavy vehicles and machinery are likely to damage the road surface, meaning the developer may need to carry out costly repairs to bring it back up to standard before final acceptance.

There are also legal and regulatory complications with early vesting. A vested road must be free of encumbrances such as easements or service crossings. However, during staged development, additional utilities or infrastructure may still need to be installed across the road. Securing approvals to modify a vested road can be time consuming and expensive. Further, under the Resource Management Act, vesting is tied to completion and deposit of survey plans, which is often impractical to finalise before all construction works are complete.

From a construction perspective, keeping the road unvested allows it to function as a working surface. Developers typically rely on temporary road treatments during construction, with the final pavement installed at the end to avoid damage. Completing and vesting the road too early can restrict site access, disrupt construction logistics, and interfere with the installation and testing of underground services.

Finally, early vesting can create financial and operational risks. Developers may still be responsible for maintenance or remediation if the road does not meet council standards, even after vesting. In addition, bonds tied to the road's completion may be at risk if further damage occurs, potentially leading to repair costs that exceed the bond value.

In summary, keeping the road private until the end of construction ensures it can be used efficiently during development and handed over in a compliant and high-quality condition.

### Proposed Condition 124 (MPDC LUC Residential)

Condition 124 - No less than 5% of all dwellings constructed in the Site must be sold as 'affordable housing' being dwellings with a value corresponding to no more than 30% of the average District (Matamata-Piako) Mean Household Income.

The condition set out above was neither discussed nor proposed by the Applicant, and its wording did not form part of any expert economic conferencing. The Applicant acknowledges the affordable housing target set by Iwi in the CVA and responded directly to the Panel's queries on this issue in Minute 14 (refer: Panel Request for Further Information and Panel Planning Advice, dated 13 February 2026, and Response to Minute 14: Economic Response to Planning Review of Housing Affordability Assessment, dated 13 February 2026). No further comments or questions on this matter were subsequently raised by the Panel to the Applicant.

We have since obtained further expert economic advice from Market Economics on *proposed Condition 124*. They have suggested two alternative wordings for the condition which the Applicant would like to include (preference is Option 1):

*Option 1:*

*No less than 5% of dwellings constructed in the Site must be sold as 'affordable housing'.*

*In this context, affordable housing is defined as the sales price that is equivalent to the mortgage that can be afforded by a household on the mean income (Matamata-Piako).*

*Option 2:*

*No less than 5% of dwellings constructed in the Site must be sold as 'affordable housing'.*

*In this context, affordable housing is defined as the sales price that is equivalent to the mortgage that can be afforded by a household on the mean income (Matamata-Piako). For illustrative purposes, the mortgage is based on a 20% deposit, 30 year term and at 5.32% interest rate and returns a sales price of \$653,000 (in 2025).*

**Development Controls** – Our expert UD team has reviewed the alternative development standards and provided a detailed expert response via memo attached to this response. We support in part the amendments but seek further consideration from the Panel on these.

### Waikato Regional Council

The Applicant has no objection to the Regional Council conditions being combined to be site-wide. It was understood during informal discussions with the Council that there was a preference for activities to be separated to streamline monitoring processes. The Applicant also considers that this is the most efficient way to manage effects across multiple activities, noting that the Solar Farms have very different effects than the Residential Subdivision and Greenway. Separate consents with an interpretation of the Panel's conditions have therefore been provided and remains our preference.

Along with the tracked change versions enclosed, the Applicant makes the following comments on the draft conditions:

- Temporary Discharge Consent – with guidance from WRC, the Applicant had incorporated the discharge elements of dewatering and land disturbance activities into the relevant consents. It is noted that the Panel has opted to separate this consent, and the Applicant will defer to WRC on this matter.

- National Environmental Standard for Freshwater Management – Consent conditions were provided by the Applicant in relation to land disturbance within 100m and vegetation clearance within 10m of an identified wetland. This consent trigger is confirmed in the Panel’s Appendix B document, however on review of the conditions it is not apparent that these conditions of consent have been captured within the Panel conditions.
- We remind the panel that should land be vested then the transfer of the relevant regional consents i.e. Discharge consent, structure in a water body (dam/outlet), groundwater and damming (greenway) would need to accompany such vesting. The issuing of consents need to factor this in and take into account the varying stages of transfer that may occur during this project.

### Matamata-Piako District Council

The Applicant maintains that the most efficient and appropriate way to address consent conditions for consents under the Matamata-Piako District Plan are as separate consent conditions for each activity, being:

- Subdivision consent for the Day 0 subdivision
- Subdivision consent for the Residential, Commercial, and Greenway
- Land Use consent for the Residential, Commercial, and Greenway
- Land Use consent for the Northern Solar Farm
- Land Use consent for the Southern Solar Farm.

The reasons for this are as follows:

- With respect to the subdivision consents:
  - As set out within Appendix A2 of the Panel’s Draft Conditions, the Day 0 is subject to discrete and separate consent conditions for both s223 and s224(c). For efficiency and to avoid any confusion, it is considered that the extraction of these from Appendix A2 to form a separate subdivision consent is the most logical.
  - The Applicant’s updated proposed conditions for the Residential Subdivision include a condition requiring that the Day 0 subdivision receive s224(c) from the Council prior to the issue of any s224(c) certificate for any Stage of the Residential Subdivision:

*(45) Prior to the issue of the Section 224(c) certificate for any Stage, the Consent Holder must:*

*a. Provide confirmation that the Day 0 subdivision consent (SUBXXXX) has received Section 224(c) from the Council.*

- With respect to the land use consents:
  - In accordance with the RMA, the Solar Farms have a specified duration given that they are renewable energy infrastructure. It is common practice for consents with specified durations to be separate to consents in perpetuity.
  - The Solar Farms will be given effect to at different times due to access constraints, and it is considered that the solar farms should be held as separate consents to enable efficient monitoring of the activities.
  - Further, the Solar Farms will be operated by different entities which as mentioned above could quite likely be given effect to separately.

- The Solar Farms are geographically separate and not contiguous. Each Farm will have a separate connection to the national grid which have separate grid routes/connections.
- Attachment to Record of Title, resource consents, including land use and subdivision, stay with the property title upon sale. Separate, specific consents allow new owners to understand their exact compliance obligations. Given the separate ROT being created by Day Zero and the intention from the applicant to develop as separate activities (as referred and applied for via the EPA) separate approvals with their own suite of conditions is desired.

# Memorandum 6

**To:** The Expert Panel for the Ashbourne Fast-Track Application

**From:** Alastair Black (Gray Matter Ltd) and Susanne Kampshof (Assets & Projects Manager – Matamata-Piako District Council)

**Date:** 27 November 2025



## **Fast Track Application FTAA-2507-1087: Ashbourne Development, Matamata**

### **Minute 3 of the Expert Panel dated 21 November 2025 - Response to Request for Information on behalf of Matamata-Piako District Council (transportation and traffic)**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

This Memorandum has been prepared for the Matamata-Piako District Council in response to the Expert Panel's request as set out in Minute 3 dated 21 November 2025, for information pursuant to section 67 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 20024 (FTAA).

The Memorandum addresses matters pertaining to transportation and traffic.

The numbering below refers to the paragraph numbers in the Expert Panel's Minute 3.

#### **2.0 Transportation**

##### **2.1 Information request [25]**

*[25] The Panel notes the advice within the UDM that there are ongoing discussions with MPDC regarding pathways on Station Road. This would appear to relate also to comments in Appendix 5N regarding the NPS-UD (Objective 8 and Policy 1) and the WRPS (IM-05) regarding provision for active modes from the site to the Matamata centre. The Panel awaits the outcome of those discussions.*

##### **2.2 Response**

The Applicant (Commute Traffic Memo dated 18 November 2025, Section 1.4) now proposes:

- A 3m wide sealed, shared path along Station Road, between the retirement village and Smith Street.
- A pedestrian refuge island on Station Road.
- Kerb extensions and footpath connections at the Hampton / Jellicoe intersection.

We support the above improvements.

In addition, we recommend a pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street be required as a consent condition, to be located at the Smith Street/ Station Road intersection.

##### **2.3 Request [27] (g)**

In response to the Panel's query [27] (g), we note that there are no dedicated cycleways on the street network within the development or in the neighbouring area. A shared path is to be provided along Station Road.

### **3.0 Traffic**

#### **3.1 Information request [26]**

*[26] Does the application need to address any remaining concerns regarding traffic following review of Commute Transportation's Traffic Memo dated 18 November 2025, and whether such concerns are considered capable of being appropriately managed through consent conditions?*

#### **3.2 Response**

The Applicant has provided further information to address the transportation aspects. Alastair Black's review of the proposed new staging, infrastructure provision and staging requirement, and engineering plans is at Attachment A.

He considers that the remaining concerns can be addressed through consent conditions. The Applicant's proposed condition for infrastructure to be provided as part of Stage 4 requires modification to ensure that urbanisation of Station Road and the pedestrian refuge islands on Station Road and Smith Street are implemented.

Recommended changes to proposed conditions are included as Attachment B.

### **4.0 Firth St Link**

MPDC has sought offers of service to commence designation of the Firth Street link. However, MPDC does not have funding to progress the designation. It is proposed that the cost of designating the route is included within the PDA at the sole cost of the Developer (subject to the DC Offsets).

### **5.0 Conclusion**

The Applicant has provided further information that generally addresses the transportation aspects of the development. The remaining concerns can be addressed through changes to the engineering plans and changes to the consent conditions.

The recommended changes to proposed conditions are included as Attachment B.

## **Attachment A: Review of Additional Information by Alastair Black**

I have reviewed the additional information related to transport provided to support the fast track consent application for the proposed Ashbourne development.

I previously reviewed the transportation aspects of the proposal. I concluded that in general, the proposed residential subdivision layout is appropriate. I raised some concerns about connectivity, vehicle tracking and safety at some intersections. I recommended some changes to improve access and safety, and a more detailed review of the proposed conditions.

The Applicant has provided further information that addresses the transportation aspects.

- = Memorandum from Michelle Seymour, Commute, 18 November 2025
- = Updated roading drawings for the retirement village (Attachment 10C in the response folder)
- = Updated roading drawings for the residential development (Attachments 11A, B, C, D in the response folder)

The following tables summarise my review of the:

- = Information provided in the above-referenced memo.
- = Proposed staging, infrastructure provision and ITA requirement, provided in the above-mentioned memo.

Table 1 Review of additional information provided

Topic	Previous review comments / request	Applicant response and Gray Matter comments.	Recommendation
Smith Street	Recommended additional modelling at Smith / Station intersection, and pedestrian provision.	<p>Additional modelling carried out, and traffic redistributed to use Smith Street. No additional turning lanes needed.</p> <p>Applicant stated that because limited pedestrian movements were observed crossing the intersection, they do not consider a formal crossing to be needed but support a pedestrian refuge and upgraded pedestrian facilities on Station Road.</p> <p>Future demand is likely to be higher than existing, so basing the assessment on current pedestrian movements is unlikely to reflect future needs.</p> <p>Applicant does not agree to a pedestrian refuge on Smith Street, considering it more appropriate to encourage pedestrians to use the existing crossings on Smith Street and Station Road outside the schools. The existing crossings referred to are shown below. They are both around 120m from the Smith Street/ Station Road intersection, and are kerb cut outs for kea crossing, with no refuge island.</p>  <p>The footpath on the southern side of Station Rd is incomplete meaning that all pedestrians will be using the footpath on the northern side of the road.</p> <p>Using the existing crossing means that people walking from the development must cross two streets (Station Road and Smith Street), rather than just walking westbound along Station Road then up the western side of Smith Street to the school.</p> <p>People may not use the kea crossings outside school peak times when they are not actively staffed. In my opinion it is likely that people will cross at the intersection. The 120m distance between the intersection and the existing facilities mean that conflict is likely to be minimal.</p>	<p>Accept.</p> <p>Refuge island not on drawings – require as consent condition.</p> <p>Require a refuge island on Smith Street as a consent condition.</p>
Road safety	Submissions raised safety as a concern.	Crash history provided for Station Road from Smith Street to Firth Street/State Highway 27 (SH27). Additional analysis was undertaken over a 50m radius around each of the Station Road/Smith Street, Station Road/SH27, Jellicoe Road /SH27 and Jellicoe Road/Hampton Terrace intersections.	Accept.

Topic	Previous review comments / request	Applicant response and Gray Matter comments.	Recommendation
		Applicant concluded there are no existing safety concerns.	
Expected Traffic Volumes		Applicant states that ITA is conservative, given that the updated staging now requires an additional connection at Firth Street or Station Road once 400 dwellings are reached.	Agree – noting different view of dwelling threshold.
		Applicant stated that applying blanket road classifications based solely on traffic volumes can be problematic, because in practice some lower-order roads legitimately carry higher volumes while some higher-order roads carry less, meaning volume alone doesn't always reflect how a road is designed to function or perform. Agree – however it does provide a guide as to what level of infrastructure can be expected and what MPDC expects to be provided for varying traffic levels.	Comment noted. No action.
		The Applicant has provided a list of reasons why traffic effects can be managed, including available capacity, availability of alternative routes, and the proposed staging approach. The Applicant supports the use of supplementary ITAs at development stages to confirm when alternative access routes including Firth Street connection can be implemented. I agree that ITA's should be required at development stages – this should be sufficient to capture any effects.	Agree. See further comments in response to recommended staging details.
Pedestrian / cycle connections		Proposal now includes: = Sealed 3m shared path between the Retirement Village and Smith Road (was previously proposed to be unsealed). = A pedestrian refuge on Station Road to facilitate crossing. = Kerb cut down/pram crossings and footpath connections at the intersection of Hampton Terrace and Jellicoe Road. I agree with the proposed changes, however, note that: = Station Road refuge isn't currently shown on the drawings – where is it proposed?	Agree, noting that the Station Rd path is not shown on the drawings.
Future connections	Raised concern regarding connectivity to the south.	The development plans have been updated to enable a connection to the south of the site, should development continue in the future.	Support.
Commercial Node	Supported commercial node.	Commercial node confirmed.	Support.
Recommended Stages and Upgrades	Suggested changes to staging	Applicant has proposed alternative staging, infrastructure provision and requirement for ITAs. I generally agree, with the exception of the infrastructure provision required for Stage 4 (including commercial node). Recommend deleting the following: = <i>A formed connection to Station Road (including a right-turn bay) must be completed by the earlier of:</i> - <i>completion of the first 400 residential lots</i> - <i>1,850 m<sup>2</sup> of commercial activities delivered</i>	Recommend amended wording. See further comments in response to recommended staging details.

Table 2 Review of proposed staging, infrastructure provision and ITA requirements

Development Stage	Required Infrastructure to Enable This Stage	ITA Required	Total Peak Traffic Volume <sup>1</sup>	Lot Increase	Gray Matter Comments
Stage 1 (68 lots)	Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road) = Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath.	No	58 (residential)	58	Accept – high volume increase but capacity / safety effects ok.
Stage 2 (145 lots)	As for Stage 1	No	123 (residential)	65	
Stage 3 (217 lots)	As for Stage 2 plus: = 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	184 (residential)	61	Accept. ITA should capture any additional mitigation.
Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)	As for Stage 3 plus: = 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 <del>= A formed connection to Station Road (including a right-turn bay) must be completed by the earlier of: — completion of the first 400 residential lots — 1,850 m<sup>2</sup> of commercial activities delivered unless: = A structured road connection to Firth Street has been completed.</del> Should a formed connection to Station Road be provided then the following will also be required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge)</li> <li>- Construction of a 3m wide sealed shared path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1</li> <li>- Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection</li> <li>- Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets)</li> <li>- Mitigation identified within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in the ITA</li> </ul>	Yes	235 (residential) 66 (commercial) <b>301 total</b>	117	Accept intent – recommend modifying as per tracked changes.  Note Firth Street impact has not been assessed but will be assessed as part of designating the Firth St link.

<sup>1</sup> Based on 0.85 peak trips / dwelling, and commercial trip generation from ITA. Excluding retirement village.

<i>Development Stage</i>	<i>Required Infrastructure to Enable This Stage</i>	<i>ITA Required</i>	<i>Total Peak Traffic Volume<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Lot Increase</i>	<i>Gray Matter Comments</i>
Stage 5 (337 lots)	As per Stage 4 <u>plus mitigation within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in ITA.</u>	Yes	286 (residential) 66 (commercial) <b>352 total</b>	51	Agree, as ITA here would include new baseline that includes commercial node.
Stage 6 (389 lots)	As per Stage 5	No	331 (residential) 66 (commercial) <b>397 total</b>	44	Agree
Stage 7 (451 lots)	As per Stage 6	No	383 (residential) 66 (commercial) <b>449 total</b>	53	Agree
Stage 8 (518 lots)	As per Stage 7 plus <u>the following works, unless they have been completed as part of an earlier stage:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>= <u>Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right-turn bay on Station Road (if not completed as part of an earlier stage)</u></li> <li>= <u>Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge).</u></li> <li>= <u>Construction of a 3m wide sealed shared path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1.</u></li> <li>= <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection.</u></li> <li>= <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets).</u></li> </ul>	No	440 (residential) 66 (commercial) <b>506 total</b>	57	Agree

# Attachment B: Recommended Changes to Consent Conditions

The additional information provided included the following documents outlining proposed conditions:

- = Appendix 2D\_Proposed Conditions\_Day Zero V2
- = Appendix 3L\_Proposed Conditions\_Solar Farms\_V2
- = Appendix 4L\_Proposed Conditions\_RV\_V2
- = Appendix 5O\_Proposed Conditions\_Resi\_V2

I have reviewed the conditions in the above four documents and recommend some changes to ensure that transport effects are appropriately managed. Changes are shown in red text underline and ~~strikeout~~.

Appendix 2D_Proposed Conditions_Day Zero V2	
	No amendments recommended.

Appendix 3L_Proposed Conditions_Solar Farms_V2	
4.2 and 5.2	Engineering Design and Approval (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.
4.5 and 5.5	<p><b>Safe System Audits</b></p> <p><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"> <li>a) <u>The detailed design stage of the Station Road/ solar farm access</u></li> <li>b) <u>Post construction of the Station Road/ solar farm access</u></li> </ul> <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>
5.4.1	(43) Prior to the start of construction, a Communications Plan shall be prepared for the construction phases of the Project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>

Appendix 3L_Proposed Conditions_Solar Farms_V2	
	<p>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).</p> <p>c. The Communications Plan shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>ii. A list of stakeholders who will be communicated with. <b>This must include residents along all streets that will be used by construction vehicles for access;</b></li> <li>iii. A list of previously contacted landowners and a website link to the Order in Council for the Project;</li> <li>iv. Details of communication activities already undertaken;</li> <li>v. Details of communication activities proposed;</li> <li>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;</li> <li>vii. Details of the complaint management process including who is responsible for responding, how responses will be provided and the timeframes within which the responses will be provided;</li> <li>viii. Details of the consultation requirements set out in other conditions where relevant; and</li> <li>ix. The process for ongoing review and amendment of the Communications Plan to maintain its currency.</li> <li>x. In relation to noise and vibration, the Communications Plan shall also address:</li> <li>xi. The potential for noise/vibration associated with the Construction Works and the associated timing; and</li> <li>xii. The methods used to mitigate the effects of noise/vibration from the Construction Works.</li> </ol>
New	<p><b><u>Construction of the Southern Solar Farm shall not commence unless construction access can be obtained:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>via Station Road, aligning with future Road 1, or</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>via the proposed link to Firth Street.</u></b></li> </ul>
5.5	<p><b><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></b></p>

Appendix 4L_Proposed Conditions_RV_V2	
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 <b>at least twenty (20) working days prior to commencing construction</b>, engineering details and drawings, generally in accordance with the RITS, prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced Engineering, including the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The provision of public/private roads and associated infrastructure including service connections and vehicle entrances into the Retirement Village;</li> <li>b. <b>Removal of left turn deceleration lane at the Station Road intersection.</b></li> </ol>

Appendix 4L_Proposed Conditions_RV_V2	
New	<p><b>Safe System Audits</b></p> <p>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)”.</p> <p>The following Safe System Audits shall be carried out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The detailed design stage (pre-implementation) of the Station Road/ retirement village access</li> <li>b) Post construction of the Station Road/ retirement village access</li> </ol> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
New	<p><b>Insurance and Indemnity for Public Use of Private Roads</b></p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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.</li> <li>2. Be held for the lifetime of the retirement village or for as long as the private roads are available for public use.</li> </ol> <p>Written confirmation of the insurance or indemnity arrangement, including policy details and coverage limits, shall be provided to the consent authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to operation of the retirement village; and</li> <li>• Upon request by the consent authority at any time thereafter.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>
New	<p>(new condition may be required to facilitate vehicle access to wastewater)</p> <p>Vehicle access to Easement E.</p>
New	<p><b>Refuse Collection</b></p> <p>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.</p>
New	<p><b>Gate Access</b></p> <p>The design and operation of the proposed private roads and gates must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure unrestricted emergency access, with override options.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 4L\_Proposed Conditions\_RV\_V2

- 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.
- Ensure that all gates and all associated infrastructure are located within the boundary of the retirement village.
- Provide safe access and maneuvering for refuse collection, deliveries, and service vehicles.
- Consider pedestrian and vehicle safety, including clear sightlines and low-speed operation.
- Ensure that the ongoing maintenance of roads, gates, drainage, signage, and line marking remain the responsibility of the retirement village.

## Appendix 5O\_Proposed Conditions\_Resi\_V2

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.

*Table 3: Management Plans*

Management Plan	Regulatory Authority	Condition Reference	Documents to Council for Certification – Minimum Timeframe
Construction Management Plan	MPDC	51	<del>10</del> 20 wd. prior to construction
Construction Traffic Management Plan	MPDC	52	<del>10</del> 20 wd. prior to construction
Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan	MPDC	53	<del>10</del> 20 wd. prior to construction
Earthworks Management Plan	MPDC	54	<del>10</del> 20 wd. prior to construction

5.1.1

(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 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:

- 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

Appendix 50_Proposed Conditions_Resi_V2	
	<p><u>updated design shall include a minimum centreline radius of 80m and a refuge island on Road 1.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>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.</u></li> <li>• <u>Provide vehicle tracking at all intersections.</u></li> <li>• <u>Provide vehicle tracking at roundabouts including splitter island with complying pedestrian facilities.</u></li> <li>• <u>Include temporary turning heads within the development where any road terminates at a Stage or Sub-Stage boundary.</u></li> <li>• <u>Identify where no-stopping restrictions are required along curves to maintain two-way traffic.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>Advice Note:</b></p> <p><u>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.</u></p>
New	<p><b><u>Safe System Audits</u></b></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>
New	<p><u>The parking layout at the commercial node (located within Stage 4) shall be designed to include:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Spaces with limited parking duration in parking bays near the childcare, to discourage longer-term parking.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Dedicated parking spaces for staff away from the childcare centre, leaving the closest spaces available for caregivers.</u></li> <li>3. <u>Clearly delineated pedestrian paths and signage to emphasise user priority and manage the location of pedestrians crossing parking areas.</u></li> <li>4. <u>Traffic calming to maintain a low speed environment.</u></li> <li>5. <u>Planting to be kept low to maintain visibility.</u></li> </ol>
New	<p><b><u>Parking Management Plan</u></b></p> <p><u>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:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Allocating specific spaces for childcare centre use at peak pick-up / drop-off times (spaces closest to the childcare centre).</u></li> <li>2. <u>Using time limits on parking to discourage longer-term parking near the childcare centre.</u></li> </ol>

## Appendix 5O\_Proposed Conditions\_Resi\_V2

	<p>3. <u>Dedicated staff parking away from the childcare centre, leaving the closest spaces available for parents.</u></p> <p>4. <u>Requiring rubbish collection to take place outside of peak hours to reduce the risk of heavy vehicles manoeuvring at the same time as children.</u></p> <p>5. <u>Clearly delineated pedestrian paths and signage to emphasise user priority and reduce the risk of pedestrians crossing in other locations.</u></p> <p>6. <u>Clear signage that warns drivers of the presence of children.</u></p> <p>7. <u>Traffic calming to maintain a low speed environment.</u></p> <p>8. <u>Maintaining good visibility at the vehicle crossing and within the carpark by keeping any planting low (&lt;1.1m height).</u></p> <p><u>The development shall operate in accordance with the certified Parking Management Plan at all times.</u></p>															
New	<p><b>Infrastructure Staging and ITA requirements</b></p> <p>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.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 927 1406 1986"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 927 576 1039">Development Stage (cumulative number of lots)</th> <th data-bbox="576 927 1273 1039">Required Infrastructure to Enable This Stage</th> <th data-bbox="1273 927 1406 1039">ITA Required</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1039 576 1229">Stage 1 (68 lots)</td> <td data-bbox="576 1039 1273 1229"> <u>Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road):</u>            = <u>Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath.</u> </td> <td data-bbox="1273 1039 1406 1229">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1229 576 1279">Stage 2 (145 lots)</td> <td data-bbox="576 1229 1273 1279">As for Stage 1.</td> <td data-bbox="1273 1229 1406 1279">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1279 576 1509">Stage 3 (217 lots)</td> <td data-bbox="576 1279 1273 1509"> <u>As for Stage 2 plus:</u>            = <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> </td> <td data-bbox="1273 1279 1406 1509">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1509 576 1986">Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)</td> <td data-bbox="576 1509 1273 1986"> <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>  <u>Should a formed connection to Station Road be provided then the following will also be required:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge).</u></li> <li>- <u>Construction of a 3m wide sealed share path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1.</u></li> <li>- <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection.</u></li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1273 1509 1406 1986">Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Development Stage (cumulative number of lots)	Required Infrastructure to Enable This Stage	ITA Required	Stage 1 (68 lots)	<u>Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road):</u> = <u>Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath.</u>	No	Stage 2 (145 lots)	As for Stage 1.	No	Stage 3 (217 lots)	<u>As for Stage 2 plus:</u> = <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>	Yes	Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)	<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> <u>Should a formed connection to Station Road be provided then the following will also be required:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge).</u></li> <li>- <u>Construction of a 3m wide sealed share path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1.</u></li> <li>- <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection.</u></li> </ul>	Yes
Development Stage (cumulative number of lots)	Required Infrastructure to Enable This Stage	ITA Required														
Stage 1 (68 lots)	<u>Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road):</u> = <u>Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath.</u>	No														
Stage 2 (145 lots)	As for Stage 1.	No														
Stage 3 (217 lots)	<u>As for Stage 2 plus:</u> = <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>	Yes														
Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)	<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> <u>Should a formed connection to Station Road be provided then the following will also be required:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge).</u></li> <li>- <u>Construction of a 3m wide sealed share path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1.</u></li> <li>- <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection.</u></li> </ul>	Yes														

Appendix 5O_Proposed Conditions_Resi_V2			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets).</u></li> <li>- <u>Mitigation identified within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in the ITA.</u></li> </ul>	
	<u>Stage 5 (337 lots)</u>	<u>As per Stage 4 plus mitigation identified within the existing residential areas surrounding Ashbourne as identified in the ITA.</u>	<u>Yes</u>
	<u>Stage 6 (389 lots)</u>	<u>As per Stage 5.</u>	<u>No</u>
	<u>Stage 7 (451 lots)</u>	<u>As per Stage 6.</u>	<u>No</u>
	<u>Stage 8 (518 lots)</u>	<u>As per Stage 7 plus the following works, unless they have been completed as part of an earlier stage:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right-turn bay on Station Road.</u></li> <li>- <u>Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge)</u></li> <li>- <u>Construction of a 3m wide sealed shared path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1</u></li> <li>- <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection</u></li> <li>= <u>Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets).</u></li> </ul>	<u>No</u>
<p><u>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:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>SH27/ Station Road</u></li> <li>• <u>SH27/ Jellicoe Road</u></li> <li>• <u>Station Road/ Hampton Tce</u></li> <li>• <u>Jellicoe Road/ Hampton Tce</u></li> <li>• <u>Archford St/ Hampton Tce</u></li> <li>• <u>Archford St/ Peakedale Drive</u></li> <li>• <u>Station Road/ Smith Street</u></li> <li>• <u>Station Road</u></li> <li>• <u>Smith Street</u></li> <li>• <u>Jellicoe Road</u></li> </ul>			