

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: DDS-14-05-12.02 / 241218225274

DATE: 18 December 2024

MEMO TO: Hearing Panel

FROM: Mark Buckley

SUBJECT: Evidence from Mr Fletcher regarding Fawcetts Road Development Area

Introduction

1. It should be noted that Mr Fletcher met with myself to discuss issues associated with the proposed Fawcetts Road Development on the 23 August 2024. Discussion occurred but it was ultimately determined that no additional conferencing was needed as there was no traffic evidence and no amendments were proposed subsequent to the hearing.

Traffic

2. Due to his availability, Mr Binder has not considered the traffic assessment provided by Mr Boaretto from Urban Connection in any detail. Mr Binder did provide some cursory comments which are listed below. :
 - a. Max Wallace Drive is not classified a high-volume driveway¹, but is classified as a local road;
 - a) Noting that 250 vpd does not correspond with Council's understanding of traffic volumes that would be expected for a driveway,
 - b. Mr Boaretto's assessment of visibility has used a standard (NZTA RTS6) that is not relevant to the road layout;
 - c. Fawcetts Road is a strategic road, this is a higher classification than Tram Road, and also has constraining issues associated with direct access onto the road from private ROWs; and
 - d. Need to consider spacing between the proposed road onto Fawcetts Road and Max Wallace Drive.
3. The original layout plan (figure 2)² had a significant number of ROWs that service most of the proposed development. The alternative layout plan (figure 4) is a significant improvement on the original plan. This will require an update to the proposed condition to be accepted.

Sequencing of Development

4. While I understand the reasoning as to why Mr Fletcher wanted to enable independent development of the area by respective land owners without having to rely on their neighbours, I consider that the proposed approach presents a range of technical issues

¹ This appears to be based on the present occupancy and does not account for the upzoning of Residential 4b (1ha average) to LLRZ (5,000m² average).

² Urban Connection report.

that cannot be easily resolved without some coordinated development occurring across all of the properties.

5. While this is a common practice in areas where service mains are either existing or are constructed at the time of development, they are usually designed for the whole of the development. Enabling piecemeal development could potentially lead to each individual property building their own water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure, potentially compromising neighbouring properties. Those properties along Fawcetts Road wanting to develop are reliant on the northern properties for the development of the road to enable complete subdivision, and those on Fawcetts Road are relied on for stormwater infrastructure. Should one property owner choose not to subdivide in a timely manner, this could potentially impact the whole development.

Conditions

6. There are a number of proposed built form standards. I have commented below as to whether they will address key issues raised in the s42A Stream 12C LLRZ Rezoning Requests officer report.
7. DEV-ADA-BFS1(1) states that a gravel pathway along Boundary Road should be constructed. The issue of pedestrian access through the proposed development was previously raised with Mr Fletcher, having a proposed footpath on land outside the development does not address the lack of connectivity within the development for those properties serviced via ROWs on Fawcetts Road.
8. I consider that DEV-ADA-BFS2(1) requiring Council to approve a reticulated services plan prior to any subdivision application as a permitted activity is confusing, as there is no trigger for a resource consent. This issue could have been addressed as part of the rezoning process in accordance with the criteria in SUB-P6(2)(a).
9. I consider DEV-ADA-BFS3(1) creates the same issues. DEV-ADA-BFS3(2) and (4) require Council to identify on-site and off-site stormwater disposal where it is required, however I consider that this should be the responsibility of the developers' engineers.
10. The ODP does not meet the requirements of SUB-P6. There is a reliance on Council to address wastewater, stormwater and roading issues prior to any subdivision or development. However, it is acknowledged that the design details are often sorted out at resource consent stage.

Recommendation

11. In my opinion the approach of wanting to enable individual property owners to develop on a piecemeal basis result in a range of complex engineering issues. Despite this the proposed amendment to the development rules to generally align with the traffic evidence, means that the main concern with respect to traffic of Council has been addressed.
12. From a planning perspective the proposed development could produce a good outcome and provide additional LLRZ housing for the district.