

## Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the City Development Committee — OPEN

Time and date:	9.00am, Monday, 22 September 2008.
Venue:	Council Chamber, 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor, Council Building, Garden Place, Hamilton.
Committee Members:	Councillors G M Saunders (Chairperson) J R Gower R E Hennebry P M Mahood A R O'Leary
In Attendance:	Councillor Di Maio Ms Joanna Smith, Urban Design Consultant. City Planning Unit Manager, Consultant Planner and Planner.
Committee Advisor:	Ms F M Yates
Apologies:	Councillors Chesterman & Westphal
Resolved:	(Crs Mahood/O'Leary) That the apologies be accepted.

### SECTION B: RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ADOPTION BY THE COUNCIL

#### 1. 124/8/15. Variation No. 15: Subdivision Connectivity, Heritage, Special Provisions in Growth Areas & Miscellaneous Provisions

The Committee to hear submissions and consider a report and recommendations from the General Manager Environmental Services.

The Chairperson, in presenting the matter to the Committee, asked if members of the Committee had any Conflicts of Interest. No Conflicts of Interest were declared.

At the invitation of the Chairperson, Ms Alice Morris, Consultant Planner, presented an overview of Variation 15 including the issues to be considered and covered the following:

Variation 15 responds to and recognises key changes in Council's Strategic Policy direction, LTCCP, and CityScope/Access Hamilton; promotes accuracy of the Proposed District Plan and contributes to purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.

There are four parts to Variation 15:  
Part A — Subdivision Connectivity  
Part B — Heritage  
Part C — Special Provisions in New Growth Awards  
Part D — Miscellaneous Provisions.

The main issues raised by written submissions and further submissions for Parts A-D are listed below.

- Part A — Subdivisions Connectivity: Narrow focus of proposed urban design principles, city wide approach vs Greenfields only, content of design guidance, 10+ lot threshold, and detail required for concept plans.
- Part B — Heritage: negative impact on private property rights, not enough protection, inadequate justification of 'financial hardship', interiors, relocation and demolition, and ranking of buildings.
- Part C — Special Provisions in New Growth Areas: unwarranted and premature to delete Rule 4.1.1(e), contrary to stance Council took to defend Rule at Environment Court, loss of development opportunities, and specific focus on a Tramway Road site.
- Part D — Miscellaneous Provisions — Correction of proposed change as notified "The proposed amendment within Variation No. 15 incorrectly inserts the Frankton Railway Village Heritage Precinct Overlay notation over Lot 1 DPS 82739 with Appendix 2.4-1 of the proposed District Plan. This is a mistake. The amendment should be redrawn the extent of the overlay on Planning Map 10 to excluded Lot 1 DPS 82739 from the Precinct".

The Consultant Planner also presented a summary of staff recommendations for Parts A-D and then clarified the contents of the staff report.

## SUBMITTERS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

The following submitters appeared in support of their submissions and responded to questions from Councillors.

### **Submission V15/06/13: Rob Davison, Cycle Action Waikato**

Submitter believes the majority of the Hamilton City Council recommendations will assist greater subdivision connectivity for walking, cycling and the mobility impaired. Concerned by the new proposal for a plain English definition proposed for the start of the principles section, providing the rationale of why connected street are important for providing more sustainable subdivisions. The proposed definition of connectivity that only caters for reducing travel distances for walking and pedestrian only routes needs to be widened to also include reducing travel distances for cycling and provision of accessways for cycling. Seeks an amendment to the proposal. Submitter believes providing shared-use pedestrian/cycle accessways is a tangible way of encouraging more cycling.

### **Submission V15/06/6: Warren Stace, Tui 2000**

Submitter contends that there are examples about the City of a proliferation of cul-de-sacs and lost opportunities to facilitate easy and convenient movement about a neighbourhood which has lead to the need to provide specific design guidance for connectivity and permeability in the District Plan. Tui 2000 supports this direction and proposed Change No. 15.

classification proposal by the Hamilton City Council places a  
members. The proposal is untenable. The Historical Places  
classification on the building called St Pauls Methodist Church is a 'B'. The Hamilton City  
Council's proposal interferes with this statutory regulation. St Paul's Methodist Church is  
unconditionally opposed to the HCC proposal to unilaterally change the property owner  
obligations to Historic classifications.

**The Meeting adjourned for lunch 11.30pm-1.30pm.**

**Submission V15/06/14: Joan Forret, Harkness Henry & Co, representing Parkwood Retail  
and Office Limited**

Parkwood Retail and Office Limited owns land on the eastern corner of the intersection with  
Wairere Drive Extension and Tramway Road. The Parkwood site is the subject of a sale and  
purchase agreement with delayed settlement terms. The purchasers intend to develop the site  
for a commercial activity. Should Variation 15 be approved by Council, the land will  
effectively lose the present ability to develop a commercial activity as a permitted activity.  
There will be a significant adverse effect on the value of that site. Urges Council to retain  
Rule 4.1.1e as it applies to the Parkwood/Gokul site.

**V15/06/10: Murray Wallace, Blue Wallace Surveyors Limited &**

Submits that Design Guideline almost precludes the use of cul-de-sacs which is not desirable  
in Hamilton. The use of cul-de-sac's suits the low density residential environment of  
Hamilton. Grid development forms and highly connected development forms as required by  
the proposed Design Guideline are more suited to high density residential environments as  
would be found in heavily populated cities. Full connectivity as depicted in the diagrams  
within the design guideline result in too much roading which is very expensive. Recommends  
that Part A of Variation 15 be withdrawn, and in particular the Attachment A — design  
Guidance for Residential Subdivisions, be completely withdrawn or redeveloped to align with  
a balance of all key design outcomes of Vista, and to remove the heavy emphasis on  
connectivity and vehicle movements.

**V15/06/15: John Curtis, McPherson Goodwin Surveys Limited**

Requests the withdrawal of Variation 15 (A) and the initiation of more extensive consultation  
(including workshops) to cover all the broad issues involved in Urban Residential Development  
such as living standards, densities, transportation (including vehicle, pedestrian and cycle) and  
recreation/open space be first considered before introduction of a further suite of rules on a  
small element of a city's suburban fabric. Believes that work initiated by Hamilton City on its  
Urban Design Strategy (CityScope) and subsequent tools such as Vista (an outcomes  
document) and Urban Design Panel must be commended. The use of Variation 15 Part A is  
not.

**The Extraordinary Meeting was declared closed at 3.45pm.**

The above minutes of an Extraordinary meeting of the City Development Committee before  
the Council.

**Resolved:** (Crs Saunders/Hennebry)  
That the decisions be noted.