

## MEETING 1

### PREHEARING MEETING AGENDA – ROXBURGH PLAN CHANGE

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION POINTS WITH FRANCES HOLDINGS LIMITED

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>12 FEBRUARY 2025</b>
<b>TIME:</b>	<b>2-4PM</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>COUNCIL CAB BUILDING</b>
<b>COUNCIL ATTENDEES:</b> Jono Ferguson-Pye (JFP) (Facilitator) Eamon Guthrie (EG) (Reporting Planner) Andrea Harris (AH) (Consultant Planner) Aaron Phillips (AP) (Parks and Reserves) Chris McDonald (CM) (Urban Design) Chris Groom (CG) (Transportation) Mary Wood (MW) (Stormwater)	PNCC – City Planning Manager PNCC – Senior Planner WSP – Planning Consultant PNCC – Activities Manager-Parks McIndoe Urban – Urban Designer WSP – Transport Planner GHD – Stormwater Consultant
<b>FRANCES HOLDINGS ATTENDEES:</b> Paul Thomas (PT) Madoka Yamauchi (MY) Oliver Harper (OH) Kevin Judd (KJ)	Thomas Planning Ltd – Planner Higgins - Property & Projects Administrator Resonant Consulting - Planner Resonant Consulting – Manager Land Development

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

- Welcome by Jono Ferguson-Pye, Council Facilitator.
- Round table Introductions of all attendees.
- Brief overview of meeting purpose and format.

#### 2. Discussion of Key Issues

- Discussion on specific aspects of the submission to better understand the issues in relation to:
  - i. S11.001, S11.017-S11.021, S11.014 – Storm water flows, Permeability requirements & standards in Stormwater Servicing Report and Provisions.

*Discussion Points*

- *Concerned about creating permeable services when site is 100% impervious, concerns about feasibility of SW provisions.*
- *KJ has concerned about proposed permeability standards, restricting use of land.*
- *Concerns SW pipe would service an area wider than Roxburgh. Concerns around delay of the pipe upgrade.*
- *KJ believe soak pits are a better option than permeable savers. 750 dia met going through the site wants it moved.*
- *MW outlines that there is not enough SW capacity in the system, purpose of permeability standards are to manage capacity of the network before pipe is upgraded. Pipes now cover a 1 in 10 year event.*
- *FHL want more flexibility with options, although Council is providing it via a consent process.*
- *Council (Veni) to provide comments about SW through the stop bank.*
- *KJ outlines that there is an updated Horizons report from 2022, within the SW Servicing Report.*

#### *Actions*

- *MW update through her evidence the reference to stopbank failure if this 2022 report is relevant to matters raised in the original Stormwater Assessment Report.*
- *MW to consider whether the addition of a Stormwater Management Plan at the time of subdivision is necessary or not.*
- *MW to address why you look beyond the site when determining stormwater solutions.*
- *PT to provide a response to proposed 17.3 to change the wording*
- *Veni Demado (Council's Service Manager Stormwater) to provide comments about storm water upgrades through the stop bank. Outline whether council has plans or not to move the existing SW pipe going towards the river.*
- *PT to provide a response to proposed 17.3 to change the wording*

#### *ii. S11.002 Road Corridor within Structure Plan*

- i. Discussions about width of the existing road corridor*
- ii. Details of the road design required as part of plan change*
- iii. Car Parking Numbers*
- iv. S11.004 – Figure 4-8.*

#### *Discussion Points*

- *KJ has concerns about narrow width of the road proposed. Has there been a parking space study been undertaken? Concerns that narrow road is not desirable for developing land.*
- *Council to amend structure plan to amend road corridor to be a minimum of 13 metres. Infrastructure to provide a memo about services and potential diagram. Potential for FHL to enter into Developer agreement for services and road width development.*
- *Potential to change structure plan and whether there is flexibility in terms of provisions? Council to investigate.*

#### *Action Points*

- *CG to investigate how many car parks would there be if you developed area in accordance with structure plan and 250m2 lot sizes.*
- *EG to amend structure plan to amend road corridor to be a minimum of 13 metres.*
- *Council's Infrastructure Unit to provide a memo about services and potential diagram as part of evidence.*

- Council to investigate potential to change structure plan and whether there is flexibility in terms of provisions.
- 

iii. Structure Plan

- S11.008 – Structure Plan flexibility.
- S11.012 – Proposed Policy 11.1.
- S11.013 – Proposed Policy 11.4.

*Discussion Points*

- FHL concerned that the current structure plans are overly prescriptive and do not provide flexibility if a 'better' design option is available.
- Council requested clarification as to what a better outcome looks like.
- FHL have no other design options drafted as of the time of the meeting.
- FHL has concerns that policies are over prescriptive.
- FHL what to know from council how the pedestrian and cycle ways work as land is currently private?

*Actions*

- FHL to provide some wording regarding revision policies to provide for better outcomes/flexibility with the structure plan.
- EG/AH to determine if the policies are overly prescriptive (i.e. does general accordance provide enough flexibility for the structure plan?).
- During subdivision stage, AP to investigate whether there are plans to acquire the pedestrian/cycleway accesses to be owned by council?

iv. S11.016 – Proposed Rule 7.6.2.6 Bullet Point 2

*Discussions*

- PT clarified that he was referring to Matter of Discretion under R7.6.2.6(b) General accordance with Roxburgh Residential Area structure plan and roading cross sections.
- PT wanted to know if the wording is consistent with other areas in the residential zone.

*Actions*

- EG to investigate if the wording is consistent with other areas in the residential zone.

v. S11.006 & S11.007 Lot Size (R7.6.2.6) and Net Site Area (Rule 10.6.1.8(c)(iii) – Discussion about appropriateness of the standard

*Discussions*

- FHL requested flexibility to increase minimum lot size (Rule 7.6.2.6(c)) and site area (Rule 10.6.1.8(c)(i)(b)) to 600m<sup>2</sup>.
- PT was further unsure if rule 10.6.1.8 (c)(iii) had been drafted correctly as it may be confusing for plan users.
- Council outlined that they have undertaken master planning process and 250-500m<sup>2</sup> generates higher yield and meets plan change requirements.

#### *Action*

- *FHL to investigate how 600m2 maximum is a better option than current provisions.*
- *EG/AH to review wording of Net site area rule under residential zone rule 10.6.1.8 (c)(iii) to ensure it provides clarity for plan users.*

#### *vi. S11.010 DOC Land Exchange – Confirm timing of land exchange between Council and DOC.*

##### *Discussions*

- *Council clarified that its intention was to exchange land during the subdivision stage once plan change has been settled (if the plan change is approved).*
- *However, the matter is outside the scope of the Plan Change process.*

##### *Actions*

- *No further actions are required*

#### *vii. Non-Residential Activities*

##### *i. S11.022 – Proposed Policy 15.5.*

##### *Discussions*

- *PT clarified that he meant to reference Policy 16.3 in the notified provisions, not 15.5.*
- *PT clarified that there may be an error in the policy as he believes council's meant to say Policy 16.3..... (a) Ground floor and residential living is above, 'or' instead of 'and'.*

##### *Actions*

- *EG/AH to investigate the connection between Policy 16.3 (a) and (b), and whether it should be an RD or D activity.*

### **3. Next Steps and Process**

- Discussion of potential further engagement or information sharing.
- Confirmation of any agreed actions.
- Close of meeting.
- Council to organise second meeting date in next 3-4 weeks to discuss storm water matters with Rangitane and Horizons Regional Council.

## MEETING 2

### PREHEARING MEETING AGENDA – ROXBURGH PLAN CHANGE

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION POINTS WITH FRANCES HOLDINGS LIMITED

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>14 MARCH 2025</b>
<b>TIME:</b>	<b>8.30-9.00am</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>MICROSOFT TEAMS</b>
<b>COUNCIL ATTENDEES:</b> Jono Ferguson-Pye (JFP) (Facilitator) Eamon Guthrie (EG) (Reporting Planner) Andrea Harris (AH) (Consultant Planner)	PNCC – City Planning Manager PNCC – Senior Planner WSP – Planning Consultant
<b>FRANCES HOLDINGS ATTENDEES:</b> Paul Thomas (PT) Madoka Yamauchi (MY) Neil O'Hara (NH) Kevin Judd (KJ)	Thomas Planning Ltd – Planner Higgins - Property & Projects Administrator Higgins – Project Manager Resonant Consulting – Manager Land Development

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

- Welcome by Jono Ferguson-Pye, Council Facilitator.
- Round table Introductions of all attendees.
- Brief overview of meeting purpose and format.

#### 2. Discussion of Key Issues

- Briefly discussed the amended drafting supplied by submitter.
- Noted that no new evidence has been supplied to support these changes, noting that the stormwater meeting was occurring on the 28<sup>th</sup> where further discussions would take place.
- Discussed the indicative layout for the site provided by the submitter. Noted that this is just an example of how the site could be developed differently to the structure plan.

#### 3. Next Steps and Process

- Discussion of potential further engagement or information sharing.
- Paul Thomas to provide updated set of provisions
- Council to organise second meeting between FHL, Horizons, and Rangitane o Manawatu to discuss storm water matters.
- Close of meeting.