



te kaunihera ā-rohe o
matamata-piako
district council



Hetana Street Reserve Classifications

Submissions by Submitter

This document captures the submissions received on the Hetana Street Reserve Classifications.

The public consultation period was from 6 September 2022 - 14 October 2022.



Submissions

Submission #1

Individual name/Organisation name: Royce Wiles

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: Ad hoc and reactive nature of planning requests like this which will reduce piecemeal public green spaces and therefore public amenity at the heart of Matamata. A broader context than just garaging potential needs to be taken into consideration.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? No

Comment: Lack of clarity and limited consultation about longer term planning, implications and decision-making related to this significant area. Lack of sufficient backgrounding available in MPDC documents which suggests less than adequate research into, and therefore awareness of, the original importance/value/purposes of this public resource, i.e., limitations on the information available to MPDC and others on which to base decisions may mean inappropriate decisions now.

Submission #2

Individual name/Organisation name: Brett Hodge

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: Emailed submission received: I do not support the reclassification of the Reserve as the proposal does not meet the objectives in The General Policies Reserve Management Plan 2019. Firstly, I 100% support the Health Shuttle and everything that they do! The volunteers are unsung heroes in our community. I think that the record needs to be set straight from the health shuttle submission to the council dated 29 June 2022.

Poor governance when this 2-bay garage was built, has led to an inappropriate building being built in an inappropriate place. The centre of the business district in the middle of what should be a green community hub/reserve and should not be used for an ugly 2/4 bay versatile style garage on public land. The reason the health shuttle now needs to move, is the Railside Trust has major plans to add to the building foot print to expand on the fantastic facility that they make available to the community.

The statement of Proposal states that council has considered a range of alternative locations and determined that another location on Hetana is its preferred option to support the Health Shuttle to continue out of a single facility. Our submission is that Hetana St should be the very last site to be considered and then discarded. Reserve reclassification could cost the rate payer upwards of \$30,000.00 (as a minimum if there is no appeal of the reclassification) where Pohlen park would only be permit fees.

The objectives: To ensure the design and scale of any new buildings are appropriate to the character and purpose of the reserve. There is no design. A Colour steel utility type storage / garages are very secondary design elements. For the Health shuttle to commission a building that is sympathetic to the current design objectives would be cost prohibitive (in excess of \$300,00 in my opinion, I am in the building trade)

The existing garage to be relocated, MPDC acknowledges does not comply with these design objectives and needs to be screened, which must negate the building being re-sited in Hetana St. A condition that the garages have to be screened answers the council's own question that this is not appropriate placing of ugly buildings when there are other sites in Matamata more suited to a garage complex. Definitely not in the centre of a community reserve. A building that meets the design objectives but has to be hidden is a contradiction. Railside Trust will be extending their building facilities sympathetically with the original Railway station.

I challenge the council to name any building on public /recreational land that has been constructed in the last 10 years that needs screening as a planning consent condition. They are all purpose built with materials of architectural and design merit
I also challenge the council town planners/urban planners that would sign off on a new construction on reserve land with a Versatile garage design? The council must be free and uninhibited, without ugly garaging, to continue with the Hetana Reserve Master Plan Project to facilitate public recreation and enjoyment in keeping with the purpose of the reserve.

The proposed buildings do not promote this objective. They obstruct it. In this day and age to have the resource of a green area reserve in the middle of our central business district is something that should be cherished and developed very carefully, and not squandered on an ugly garage no matter how sympathetic we are to the fact the tenants do such a great job.

I believe that there is enough public objection to this proposal(I get to talk to an awful lot of people during the course of my business day) that if the council does go ahead with the health shuttle request, that obviously does not comply with the councils own design objectives or use of reserves would leave the council open to appeal.(a huge waste of rate payers money and council time and resources) To me there is really only one option available to the council and that is to deny the proposal. IT IS ONLY A GARAGE THAT CAN BE PLACED IN A FAR MORE APPRPRIATE, FIT FOR PUPOSE LOCATION!

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Partially

Comment: The whole 1.6051ha should be classified as reserve.

Submission #3

Individual name/Organisation name: Peter Jacobsen

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: n/a

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: n/a

Submission #4

Individual name/Organisation name: Matamata Community Health Shuttle Trust

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: This will enable the Health Shuttle to continue to operate from this central location.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: n/a

Submission #5

Individual name/Organisation name: Lynely Jobe

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: Excellent use of the area for what has become an essential community resource.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: Great screening and continuation of use.

Submission #6

Individual name/Organisation name: Beau Timberland

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? Partially

Comment: I think this will certainly help this community group to operate, I support the idea but urge council to place architectural caveats on the building proposal. The space has some natural beauty with potential for improvement, I think it's important that the building doesn't look too industrial and adds to the beauty of the reserve instead of degrading its beauty.

Perhaps the building could be constructed with quality materials, or in an attractive style, if this isn't possible, perhaps it could be disguised by planting tall, attractive plants to hide an unattractive building. The space is in our towns centre and really ought to be attractive and functional.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: I think this is a great idea and will allow the community group to expand its facility.

Submission #7

Individual name/Organisation name: Peter Colmore-Williams

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? Partially

Comment: As long as it does not take the csc freedom camping parking area away.

Towns require an area for overnight freedom csc camping of a minimum of 2 nights so that Homeland tourists can come and spend the many thousands they do on our shops and cafes. Too often this important part of the economy is overlooked by people who don't see the huge value these people provide to the businesses. There are many reasons why Homeland tourists come to the area and they must be welcomed by providing good quality spaces to spend their time at. Each day around NZ there are about 10,000 csc Homeland tourists spending their cash, we want them to come here to our district and spend on our business. In town overnight stays are way better than letting go to camping ground as once there they rarely leave and there are no camps in Matamata.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Partially

Comment: As per response to proposed local purpose (community facility) reserve.

Submission #8

Individual name/Organisation name: Derek Bown

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: n/a

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: n/a

Submission #9

Individual name/Organisation name: Clive Williams

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: This is an essential service that needs to be strongly supported and help in any way possible to maintain the excellent work these volunteers give to our community

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Yes

Comment: n/a

Submission #10

Individual name/Organisation name: Transition Matamata

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: Transition Matamata places great value on the service provided by the Matamata Community Health Shuttle Trust. We congratulate the trust for serving the local population to a high standard, free of charge.

We understand the trust needs a permanent home for its garaging and we would assume the trust rightly feels Matamata-Piako District Council is the logical partner in this search, given the council's role in community wellbeing. However, Transition Matamata is disappointed by the council's proposal to allow permanent access to a piece of the central business district's Hetana Reserve for expanded garaging that will detract from enjoyment of the overall park-like atmosphere.

We are concerned that the council could set a precedent for other community leaseholders of its green spaces. We also consider it incorrect, in the run-up to this proposal, to have targeted Pohlen Park, Swap Park and the dog park as possible "blank canvases" for the addition of buildings. These areas' amenity value lies in the fact they are green spaces. Lastly, we would note that it hardly seems necessary to use a prime site for the purpose of garaging and would hope that an alternative arrangement, perhaps in an industrial area, can be found.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Not stated.

Comment: n/a

Submission #11

Individual name/Organisation name: David Irwin

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: I do not support the proposed reclassification of Hetana Street Reserve and support the submission by Keep Matamata Beautiful. In my experience challenging situations often result in the best outcome. There is a design solution for everything. A problem shared is a problem solved.

As a result of KMB's submission being distributed to other interested parties a suggestion has been made for the neglected corner at Tainui and Tui streets opposite the Civic centre. In my view there are three possible ways this area could accommodate the garages. There would be no additional impermeable required or trees to manage. Good visibility and one removed from the police station offers excellent security for both the drivers and the buses. Or is the additional parking more important than our green spaces?

MPDC would be a supportive landlord offering long term security and leasing terms. Personally I am disturbed at the ease in which MPDC are prepared to sacrifice established green space when there are clearly other available options.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Not stated.

Comment: n/a

Submission #12

Individual name/Organisation name: Centennial Drive Committee

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: Centennial drive supports the protection of Matamata's green spaces.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? No

Comment: n/a

Submission #13

Individual name/Organisation name: Tom Grant Drive Incorporated

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: We wish to add our support to, Keep Matamata Beautiful's submission opposing the reclassification of Hetana Street Reserve. We would be very concerned to see this green space reduced in size to accommodate garaging.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? No

Comment: n/a

Submission #14

Individual name/Organisation name: Keep Matamata Beautiful

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: We do not support the reclassification of the Reserve as the proposal does not meet the objectives in The General Policies Reserve Management Plan 2019.

The applicant MSHST requires garaging to house the shuttle buses at night or when they are not in use. When in use they leave their housing to pick up passengers at predetermined locations and then take them to and from the hospitals. The shuttles are then returned to their safe and clean storage.

The statement of Proposal states that council has considered a range of alternative locations and determined that another location on Hetana is its preferred option to support MSHST to continue out of a single facility.

We do not support the above statement. In addition to not meeting the objectives we are confused why a budget conscious applicant would pursue, in our opinion, such a compromised and expensive option given the generous offer by St John's to accommodate the garages on their property in Rawhiti Avenue. The development located at St John's is likely to only require a Building Consent. We note that Reserve reclassification could cost the rate payer upwards of \$27,000.00.

The objectives:

To ensure the design and scale of any new buildings are appropriate to the character and purpose of the reserve. There is no design. Colour steel utility type storage / garages are very secondary design elements. The existing garage to be relocated has flat slabs of metal walls. There are no penetrations apart from doors to break the impact and give relief and shadow. There is no roof overhang the walls to give relief. No self-respecting town or urban planner would consider the existing or proposed garaging to be design of worth or a visual asset in any situation.

MPDC acknowledges this which is why the garages have to be screened.

A building that meets the design objectives but has to be hidden is a contradiction.

In the broader landscape, RAILSIDE will be extending their 'not for profit' building facilities sympathetically with the original Railway station. The I site stands alone with good design. The public toilets have more design and presence than this proposal. Generous community volunteers have planted a camellia hedge along the eastern side of the rail track with the express purpose to screen out the typical visual pollution of the commercial mess of buildings on the western side of the rail track and yet MPDC deem that similar cheap commercial elements are acceptable for a yet to be established development.

WE know of no other building on public /recreational land that needs screening as they are all purpose built with materials of architectural and design merit.

With this proposal MPDC fails to comprehend that the influx of thousands of international visitors to Hobbiton puts Matamata on the world stage and every opportunity should be taken to look like it.

The proposed development will use visually recessive colour steel and planned screen planting. The existing cream colour shed would need painting to comply. The design is fit for purpose only which is why planted screening is required. It is a contradiction to state that design has been considered when it has to have screen planting. This screening in all probability will be an essential requirement made by every submitter that supports the proposal. A well-considered development that will compromise existing natural resources should not need screening.

The size of the buildings could be considered an acceptable scale. The oak trees will scale the development down with the added advantage that the canopy of two protected oak trees (omitted on the figure 2 diagram in the Statement of Proposal) overhang the proposed development further reducing the scale of the buildings into the landscape.

To facilitate public recreation and enjoyment in keeping with the purpose of the reserve. The existing reserve already does that. The proposed buildings do not promote this objective. They obstruct it. The buildings are not interactive for recreational use, it is simply a storage / garaging facility occupying an already established natural green space resource.

Council are still working on a master plan for this park and the public have already been invited to make suggestions for its development. This ad-hoc approach compromises design potential and negates the public consultation and future direction for this master plan. To optimise the use of existing buildings where practical. One would assume that 'existing buildings' means those that already exist in location on the reserve. Currently there are no buildings on the reserve to 'optimise.'

Observations over the proposed development and issues that will need to be well considered / addressed if the proposal is granted. The proposed development requires approximately 108sqm of additional road tar seal to accommodate access into the proposed garages. This additional 108sqm of stormwater catchment with the existing 108sqm road way gives a total of 216sqm of surface water which will have to find its way to the nearest existing stormwater outlet near the complex entry from Hetana street which is approximately 54 metres from the development, thus shedding this additional surface water into the public area. This outlet requires regular MPDC maintenance throughout the year particularly in autumn to keep clear so drainage is not impeded. Additional to this is the eventual proposed 128sqm of roof catchment which will have to be directed to stormwater soakage tanks. The proposed 3m gap between the development and the existing private building to the south provides no useful amenity for the public or the remaining reserve and should have been included in the 223sqm reclassification. This area would need to be sealed adding another 24sqm to 39sqm of impermeable surface to be managed at the existing stormwater outlet.

The foundations for the proposed buildings and soak hole drainage trenching will need to be considered with regard to damage to the existing two oak trees anchor and feeding roots, the latter of which will no longer be able to nourish the trees as they will be covered by development.

This will need Arbourist input. Given MPDC bias toward the proposal this should be an independent Arbourist. The new seal in front of the proposed buildings will need to be cut into the existing seal otherwise the edge of that existing seal will very quickly erode. The overhanging tree canopies will drop tree litter, leaves, pollen and acorns. If the two buildings are interlocked together an internal gutter will be required resulting in continuous maintenance.

If the buildings are butted together – gutter to gutter the same maintenance issues will persist with the added disadvantage that litter will build up in the gap between the buildings. To resolve this issue the buildings would need to be placed at least 1m apart so there is access for cleaning out the build-up. As the proposal is about screening unsuitable buildings there will need to be a solid gate to hide this mess.

The I Site, Chamber of Commerce and Sue Whiting will be able to advise on the challenges of building near and under oak trees that drop tree litter and acorns constantly and have a long autumn shedding of leaves. The proposed location will result in the drivers negotiating the buses into the garages with hard 90 and 180 degree U turns at the end of each tiring day.

To proceed with this proposed reclassification and development sets an ugly precedent. What next. Butchering the canopies of the two lovely protected 80 plus year old oak trees that overhang the garages creating on going and regular maintenance, or worse declassification of the heritage protection so the trees can be removed.

Where next. Allowing a garage/s for one community group at a recreation reserve will create expectations from other user groups to expect the same. Who next. The complacent rate payer who expects their elected members to be robust on their behalf but get to find out too late when they are not acting in the best interests of their established natural resources.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? No

Comment: n/a

Submission #15

Individual name/Organisation name: Bede Stevens

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: Submission was attached to Keep Matamata Beautiful. Personal additional submission: My first question is: As Treaty Partners have you asked the Tangata Whenua [the people of the land], in this case Ngati Hinerangi, what they believe to be the best path forward for this piece of land which was historically surveyed out of their possession or is this another example of ignorance of partnership? If so you need to learn a little more about your treaty obligations as a council.

My second question is: Why are we here? When did it become council's core business to find alternative sites for any business whether for profit or not for profit [that is an emotive red herring]. In my experience having worked in not for profit organisations when it became necessary, for whatever reason, to find new premises it was the responsibility of that organisation to find its own new premises. The fact that MCHST has to relocate is not your business. I have read a document which itemises the progression of events which have led to the point where this notification has been deemed necessary.

I have also read that other positions in the town have been offered up as more appropriate for the intended use, which at its most prosaic is as a garaging facility. The intended use of the reclassified land is for garaging [tin sheds] which will need screening, not some beautiful designer structure that will add visual interest to the reserve or adjacent green. This at best trivialises the value of the reserve and the green as being spaces of little to no value to the greater community. This is wrong this reserve helps frame the green [as does the oak grove opposite it]. The reserve also screens the green from the adjacent commercial buildings. Having travelled extensively I cannot recall the like of this kind of abomination in a tourist centric area in any part of the world I have been to. In my experience towns with a potentially commercially bankable environ make the most of them.

In no way do I wish to trivialise the excellent work done by the MCHST volunteers who are heroes in my mind. I get that change is something that most of us resist and the shuttles have been housed beside Railside by the Green for 12 years. I understand that the need to move the garaging has been an unwanted upheaval but also understand that the land occupied by the garaging is now needed for building facilities that will benefit the greater community as the Matamata Community Resource Trust [MCRT] moves forward to build a community hub.

If the reclassification does go ahead my ongoing concerns are: (i) given that oak trees shed leaves almost constantly, they drop acorns and produce copious amounts of pollen, will the next reclassification be for the destruction of the oaks planted by our forebears to enhance our lived in environment because the trees, [which were there first], are inconveniently clogging up gutters on garages that shouldn't even be there?

(ii) So we have reclassified approximately 223m² is this the thin edge of the wedge? Suddenly it is thought we need land in town for something else, well if we can have something as ugly as tin garages on the old reserve surely we can reallocate it as commercial Oust a scenario I wonder about]. I understand that issues of safety have been raised. Given that the drivers and volunteers arrive to get the shuttle and park the shuttle sometimes in the dark before the rest of us wake up I am sure they already have strategies that keep them safe and these would logically be transferable.

The St Johns site, or the site at the corner of Tainui and Tui Street, both of which I understand have been offered as alternatives are well lit and readily observable in terms of site security [better than the Rainside by The Green area] and thus probably safer. As to the safety of the shuttles if someone decided determinedly to have a go at them no location would possibly be safer than any other, however, in fact, with screening and the doors facing toward the railway line they are potentially more vulnerable in the intended new position. Another offered alternative I believe was next to Headen Stadium which already has excellent parking and lighting but that to has been deemed unsuitable.

It beggars belief that three more appropriate spaces, that do not require destroying green space, have been offered and yet the most costly in terms of rate payers money, accessible usage for the Health shuttle vans and visual pollution is being pursued. It does make me wonder what drives such destructive determination? Perhaps you also should wonder about that as you have joined yourselves to it. I write this believing you have already made up your minds as to how things are going to proceed. I submit this objection in part as evidence to the youth of this town, the future voters who have an environmental view of the future and who will be interested to know how little their council cares for preserving green spaces in the centre of our township, that I did my best to save their heritage from the mundane and ill-conceived blot on the landscape that this garaging will be in this proposed position.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? No

Comment: n/a

Submission #16

Individual name/Organisation name: Robin Burr

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: I wish it to be known that I do not support the proposed reclassification and fully support the submission of Keep Matamata Beautiful. I believe the alternative site of St Johns on Rawhiti Avenue has been rejected by the MNSHST Trust on the grounds that they may be asked to move on from there at a later date. I would have thought that with any Lease Agreement, negotiations could be entered into to agree to a mutually satisfactory amount and term and that it would not be unreasonable for the Trust to expect a small rental fee considering they are a not for profit organisation providing an outstanding service for public good.

I wish it to be known that I do not support the proposed reclassification and fully support the submission of Keep Matamata Beautiful. I believe the alternative site of St Johns on Rawhiti Avenue has been rejected by the MNSHST Trust on the grounds that they may be asked to move on from there at a later date. I would have thought that with any Lease Agreement, negotiations could be entered into to agree to a mutually satisfactory amount and term and that it would not be unreasonable for the Trust to expect a small rental fee considering they are a not for profit organisation providing an outstanding service for public good. Also the Trusts investment in garaging on the St Johns site would be noted as belonging solely to the Trust and that the Trust would require surety of a long term lease that cannot be altered in the future by subsequent St John powers that be.

I would like to suggest the MSHST at least give more consideration to this option. Also the activities of St John and MSHST are aligned in that one is emergency health care and transportation to hospital and the other is non-urgent elective transportation to the hospital. Another reason to have them operating from the same site. Another reason I am not happy about reclassifying the Hetana Street Reserve apart from all the reasons set out in the Keep Matamata Beautiful submission, is that a considerable amount of money has already been spent by the Council on consultation for better use of the former sculpture park area - larger green space, seating, play areas, BBQs, etc which would all further enhance what is already there. I am over money being spent on consultation and then nothing coming of it. I would like MPDC to finish what they started with their intention to create a better use of the Sculpture Park and maintain the area as a reserve.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? No

Comment: n/a

Submission #17

Individual name/Organisation name: Misty Smith

Support Local Purpose (Community Facility) Reserve classification? No

Comment: I want it known that I oppose the proposal of changing the reserve Classification of the 223m2, Lot 2 DPS 86435 for the purpose of accommodating a garage to house the community shuttle.

The intent of the area is for community use and engagement, not a parking facility. Am sure there are other area's in Matamata that are better suited to accommodate their Van's.

Support Recreation Reserve classification? Not stated.

Comment: n/a