

 Reply  Reply All  Forward



Mon 01/04/2019 16:50

Harkness, Richard <richard.harkness@aecom.com>


RE: Plan Change 50 – Hobbiton Development Concept Plan: Evidence from J Swap Contractors Limited

To Kelly Moulder


Cc Dudley Clemens (dudley.clemens@jswap.co.nz); Mark Hamilton

 Follow up. Start by Tuesday, 02 April 2019. Due by Tuesday, 02 April 2019.

 Message

 J Swap Contractors Ltd PC 50 Submission 03.05.18.pdf (827 KB)

 J Swap Contractors Ltd PC 50 MPDC Further Submission 20 June 2018.pdf (479 KB)

 Statement of Evidence of Richard George Harkness PC50_1.4.19.pdf (490 KB)

Hi Kelly

Greetings

Please find **attached** the planning evidence prepared on behalf of J Swap Contractors Limited (Submitter) for Proposed Plan Change 50 – Hobbiton Development Concept Plan.

Please note that J Swap Contractors Limited reserve the right to provide further comment at the Hearing in support of their submission and further submissions; and that a time slot at 10am has been requested on Tuesday 9 April 2019.

Best wishes

Richard Harkness

Associate Director - Planning

D +64 7 927 3731 M +64 21 279 4430

richard.harkness@aecom.com

AECOM

Level 1, 115 Cameron Road, Tauranga 3110

PO Box 13161, Tauranga 3141

T +64 7 927 3080 F +64 7 927 3082

aecom.com

Imagine it. Delivered.

[LinkedIn](#) [Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [Instagram](#)

BEFORE A HEARING: MATAMATA-PIAKO DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Plan Change
50 to the Matamata Piako
District Plan

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD GEORGE HARKNESS
ON BEHALF OF J SWAP CONTRACTORS LIMITED
1 APRIL 2019**

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Richard George Harkness. I am a qualified planning consultant, and an Associate Director – Planning at AECOM New Zealand Limited (**AECOM**).
- 1.2 I have a Diploma in Town and Country Planning, a BA Degree (Geography), Affiliate membership of the NZPI and over 25 years' experience in planning and resource management. I was employed by Hutt City Council as a Policy Planner (5 years) to help prepare the first proposed district plan under the Resource Management Act 1991. I then worked as a consultant planner in the Bay of Plenty and surrounding regions while employed by Alandale Associates (8 years), MWH New Zealand (4 years) prior to joining URS New Zealand Limited 12 years ago, which since 2015, has been owned by AECOM. I am also qualified as a Resource Management Act Decision Maker under the Ministry for the Environment and Local Government NZ certification programme for Making Good Decisions.
- 1.3 I have considerable experience with policy planning and consenting under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA or the Act). I have assisted with many quarry related projects including Holcim (NZ) Limited, and Ridge Road Quarry Limited (Auckland), and J Swap quarries within the Bay of Plenty and Waikato regions (Hyndmans Quarry, Matamata Metal Supplies, Taotaotoroa Quarry, Katikati Quarry, Wautu Quarry and Awakeri Quarry).
- 1.4 AECOM assisted J Swap Contractors Limited in preparing a submission and further submissions on Proposed Plan Change 50 (Development Concept Plan – Hobbiton Tourism Venue, Buckland Road, Matamata) to the Matamata-Piako District Plan (**PPC50**). The submission was lodged on 3 May 2018 (**Attachment A**). The further submissions were lodged on 20 June 2018 (**Attachment B**).

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 1.5 I have read and agree to abide by the "Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses" issued by the Environment Court of NZ, Practice Note, 2014. This evidence has been prepared in accordance with that Code. I confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express and that this evidence is within my area of expertise. The evidence I am giving is within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I understand it is my duty to assist the Commissioner(s) impartially on relevant matters within my area of expertise.

2. BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1** I am presenting this planning evidence in support of the submission and further submissions by J Swap Contractors Limited (**J Swap**) lodged with Matamata-Piako District Council (**MPDC**) to PPC50. J Swap also reserve the right to present further comment in support of their submission and further submissions.
- 2.2** The Swap Group of companies has had a long association in contracting, quarrying, heavy haulage, bulk storage and stockfeed supplies. In particular, J Swap has a long association with the Matamata Piako District, with the company being founded in 1937 through river gravel extraction within the District. The Company head office, transport depot, bulk stores, workshop and contracting yard is located in Matamata township, serving as the base for the company operations. Closer to the Hobbiton Movie set, the J Swap Taotaoroa Quarry is located approximately 5 km away; and is the largest of the ten hard rock quarries that are run by J Swap, and involves the most traffic movements to and from site.
- 2.3** Accordingly, J Swap is committed to seeing the best for Matamata and the surrounding district, as a local business, employment generator, and local economy contributor.
- 2.4** J Swap generally supports PPC50 given the positive impacts on the District that the tourism venture has generated. J Swaps submission and further submissions were generally concerned with the lack of physical mitigation proposed for local roads and intersections that will be affected by the proposed plan change, the impact on the infrastructure currently in place particularly in the Matamata town centre and surrounds, and how these improvements will be provided for and/or funded.
- 2.5** In preparing my evidence, I have reviewed the following details and documents:
- (a) J Swaps submission and further submissions
 - (b) Section 42A Report – Proposed Plan Change 50 to the Matamata Piako District Plan (March 2019) (including relevant parts of Appendix A, B and C)
 - (c) Relevant provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
- 2.6** My evidence focuses on the J Swap submission and further submission relating to the following aspects of PPC50:
- Significant Resource Management Issues;
 - Objectives and policies;
 - Roading Hierarchy; and
 - Development Concept Plan Provisions.

3. DISCUSSION

Significant Resource Management Issues:

- 3.1 J Swap (Point # 14.2.7) supported the addition of wording to Section 2.3 'Significant Resource Management Issues' to articulate the types of measures that may be used to *"avoid, remedy and mitigate the localised environmental effects of tourist attractions."* Examples included physical improvements to the roading network, and provisions under the Council's Development Contributions policy or a targeted rate.
- 3.2 I note that this submission point is accepted in Appendix A of the Section 42A report (page 5) and that this change is reflected in Appendix B of the Section 42A report (page 1). As such J Swap supports the insertion of a new section 2.3.9 'Tourism' as provided for in Appendix B of the Section 42A report (page 1):

Add the following bullet point to Section 2.3 'Significant Resource Management Issues':
"2.3.9 Tourism

- *Enabling the growth of the District's tourism industry is important to maximise the value of tourist expenditure within the District which has flow on effects throughout the District's economy. A significant resource management issue that the District Plan must address is seeking to encourage tourism whilst ensuring that adequate measures are in place to avoid, remedy and mitigate the localised environmental effects of tourist attractions including:*
 - *Improvements to the District's road network, infrastructure networks and community facilities utilised by the tourists; and:*
 - *Considering making provision within the Council's Development Contributions Policy under the Local Government Act 2002 for the purpose of recovering from those undertaking development related to tourism, a fair, equitable, and proportionate portion of the total costs of capital expenditure necessary to service growth of tourism:*
 - *or a targeted rate under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to fund the District-wide impact of tourism growth."*

Policies:

- 3.3 J Swap (Point # 14.2.7) proposed that an additional policy be included in the proposed plan change which recognised the impact of major tourist attractions on the wider community including increased traffic movements throughout the District; particularly the town centre, and impacts on other infrastructure that may be utilised by tourists.
- 3.4 I note that this submission point is accepted in Appendix A of the Section 42A report (page 5) and that this change is reflected in Appendix B of the Section 42A report (page 2 - 3). As such J Swap supports the insertion of the new policies P3 and P4 in Section 2.4 related to Tourism:

P2 Development Concept Plans shall be used for major tourist attractions to recognise their significance to the District whilst managing the adverse effects of tourism developments.

P3 The impact of major tourist attractions shall include consideration of adverse effects on the wider community including increased traffic movements on the District's road network, adverse effects on amenity values, and the impact on town centres, community facilities, and other infrastructure utilised by tourists.

P4 Methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects of tourist attractions shall include consideration of:

- physical improvements to the road network, infrastructure, and community facilities utilised by tourists,*
- provision within the Council's Development Contributions Policy under the Local Government Act 2002 for the purpose of recovering from those undertaking development related to tourism, a fair, equitable, and proportionate portion of the total costs of capital expenditure necessary to service growth of tourism:*
- or a targeted rate under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to fund the Districtwide impact of tourism growth.*

Roading Hierarchy:

3.5 J Swap (Point # 14.2.8, 14.4.5, 14.5.5, and FS #14.3.4) supported the eastern end of Buckland Road and also Puketutu Road being classified as a Collector Road under Rule 9.1.1 Roading Hierarchy clause (i)(c), by adding the following rows, as recommended in the s 42A Report:

- Amend Rule 9.1.1 ('Roading hierarchy') in Part B to include Buckland Road and a section of Puketutu Road as a 'Collector Road', as follows:

Add the following row items to the Collector Road table under Rule 9.1.1 'Roading hierarchy' clause (i)(c) 'Collector roads':

<i>Road name</i>	<i>Start</i>	<i>End</i>
<i>Buckland Road</i>	<i>Western boundary to Part Section 137 Block V Tapapa Survey District</i>	<i>Puketutu Road</i>
<i>Puketutu Road</i>	<i>Hopkins Road</i>	<i>Buckland Road</i>

3.1 J Swap (Point # 14.2.7 & 8) also sought that further consideration be given to roading improvements, including the provision of double lanes, road straightening works, and funding mechanisms; as well considering other local roads and intersections to ensure physical improvements (e.g. road straightening, widening, safe turning provisions) were also considered for the following roads (both within the Matamata-Piako and Waipa Districts):

- Western end of Buckland Road;
- Karapiro Road;
- State Highway 29/Puketutu/Hopkins intersections;
- State Highway 29/Taotaoroa Road intersection;
- State Highway 29/Karapiro RoadPuketutu/Hopkins intersections.

3.2 I acknowledge that this submission point is 'accepted in part' in Appendix A of the Section 42A report (page 19) with amendments proposed to PPC50 to require additional improvements to Buckland Road East, and noting that a number of improvements have already been implemented by the applicant and MPDC.

- 3.3** I also recognise that state highway related intersections are managed by NZTA, and fall within their jurisdiction to manage safety, capacity and funding of roading upgrades necessary; and that the western area of this local roading network and some of the intersections fall within Waipa District Council jurisdiction. Hence MPDC is reliant on work being undertaken by NZTA or a different territorial authority. This matter can then be addressed by way of a 'cross boundary' matter, pursuant to s75(2)(f) RMA where MPDC can identify a process to address roading improvements on roads common to both territorial authorities.
- 3.4** In my opinion, such cross boundary issues should be investigated further, and on an ongoing basis - in conjunction with NZTA initiatives for state highway improvement works, and Waipa District Council upgrades to local roads to the west of Hobbiton.
- 3.5** Although J Swap's submission point requesting physical improvements to the carriageway of Buckland Road West was rejected, J Swap supports the other proposed amendments to PPC50, as set out in Appendix B and in the Memorandum of Understanding (**MOU**) between MPDC and Rings Scenic Tours Ltd to require additional road marking and road safety signage along Buckland Road (Appendix B of the Section 42A report (Performance Standard 1.1.7, page 8 - 10).
- 3.6** Specifically 1.1.7 (j) *'The upgrading of the affected road network, including signage, road improvements, traffic and pedestrian safety measures and road markings shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement (MoU) between the Matamata-Piako District Council and Rings Scenic Tours Ltd yet to be dated. The terms of the MoU shall be binding on any successors of Rings Scenic Tours Ltd that take over the responsibility of Site Operator'*.
- 3.7** The description of the works are set out in Schedule 1 of the MOU; and a signage strategy is provided for under Schedule 2 of the MOU (provided on page 66 of the Integrated Traffic Assessment, January 2018, prepared by Bloxam Burnett & Olliver Ltd as part of the application for the proposed plan change). In addition Appendix 1 of the MOU provides the drawings of the proposed safety improvements for Buckland Road.
- 3.8** In this regard, I recognise the intention to incorporate the MOU provisions within the district plan; and I would seek clarification on whether this is under Part 3, s 30(1)(c) of Schedule 1 of the RMA for 'Incorporation of documents by reference in plans and proposed plans'; which is used where the technical matters are too large or impractical to include in the district plan. Under Part 3, s 30(3) of Schedule 1 of the RMA, any such material incorporated by reference in a plan (or proposed plan) has legal effect.

3.9 However, I would question whether this is the most effective mechanism. Should any MOU provisions require updating, or further (future) change(s), or require final designs and/or interpretation of what is required, then it is not clear if this is undertaken by way of a plan change process under the RMA. In my opinion, there may well be a simpler way to achieve the outcome sought – and that is by using the actual wording from the MOU within the plan provisions, without describing this as an MOU itself; with clear descriptions of what is expected.

3.10 J Swap supported the use of vehicle movements as the tool to measure and manage the number of visitors to the site. I note that the s42A report identifies that the Transportation Review (Appendix C of the s42A report) recommends that a cap is an appropriate control (page 25, s42A report). Therefore J Swap supports the addition of performance standards '1.1.7 k, 1.1.7 l, and 1.1.7 m':

k) Total trip generation resulting from all activities undertaken at the DCP site shall not exceed 387,000 trips per calendar year.

l) Peak trip generation resulting from all activities undertaken at the DCP site shall not exceed a maximum peak of 2,084 trips within any 24 hour period starting at 6am and finishing at 6am on the following day.

m) The Site Operator shall accurately monitor and record daily, weekly, monthly and annual trip generation by vehicle type (i.e. split between light vehicles, buses, and heavy commercial vehicles) and shall make the records available to the Matamata Piako District Council as part of the Site Management and Monitoring Plan and upon request.

3.11 J Swap also supports performance standards '1.1.7 n and 1.1.7 o' which guide visitors to use the eastern end of Buckland Road, and not the western roads:

n) The Site Operator shall ensure that vehicles under its direct control including Hobbiton staff and tour buses and deliveries **avoid** the use of:

- the section of Buckland Road west of the DCP site;
- Rangitanuku Road.

o) The Site Operator shall at all times use all reasonable endeavours and shall take such steps as are practicable to:

- discourage Hobbiton traffic from using the section of Buckland Road west of the DCP site; and;
- encourage Hobbiton traffic to use the eastern section of Buckland Road; and;
- discourage Hobbiton traffic from using Rangitanuku Road.

Such measures shall include but shall not necessarily be limited to:

- (i) Sending out annual notices to all tour bus operators reminding them that the recommended travel route is via the eastern end of Buckland Road and that Rangitanuku Road should be avoided.
- (ii) Placing advisory information on the Site Operator's website.
- (iii) Printing advisory information on booking tickets.
- (iv) Maintaining advisory signage at the Precinct 1 vehicle exit.
- (v) Requesting internet-based mapping sites to direct Hobbiton traffic via the eastern end of Buckland Road and via the state highway network so as to avoid Rangitanuku Road.

Other Development Concept Plan Provisions:

- 3.12** J Swap supported the provision of limited on-site accommodation and noted that this would potentially alleviate the concerns of local residents in terms of overnight parking that currently occurs in the local area. As such J Swap supports the inclusion of performance standard 1.1.16 in Appendix B of the Section 42A report (page 16).
- 3.13** J Swap supported the addition of a performance standard to ensure that parking is within the site rather than the road reserve. As such J Swap supports the amendments to performance standard 1.1.7 i in Appendix B of the Section 42A report (page 9).
- 3.14** J Swap supports the addition of performance standard 1.1.15 c regarding vehicle movements associated with earthworks, construction and/or development avoiding the deposit of dirt or loose materials onto the carriageway (Appendix B of the Section 42A report, page 15). This measure is intended to ensure no hazard to the travelling public and aligns with the traffic safety concerns that J Swap has raised regarding the PPC50.
- 3.15** J Swap supports the addition of performance standards 1.1.17, 1.1.18, and 1.1.19 (Appendix B of the Section 42A report, page 16 - 17). J Swap had submitted in favour of a traffic management plan in relation to events and also sought that notification be provided to J Swaps regarding the date, time and type of events. It is anticipated that the Site Management and Monitoring Plan will assist in this regard, combined with the community liaison.

4. CONCLUSION:

- 4.1** J Swap has a very long history in this area, and is committed to seeing the best for Matamata and the surrounding district, as a local business, generator for employment, and contributor to the local economy.
- 4.2** J Swap has their offices in Matamata and owns Taotaoroa Quarry, near the Hobbiton Movie set. Any significant increase in visitor numbers in Matamata and associated traffic movements generated by the Hobbiton Movie set affects the town facilities and local roading network.
- 4.3** The concern is twofold for J Swap. Firstly, there is a safety risk of incidents where visitors from out of town/overseas are not familiar with local roads, corners, appropriate speeds and local conditions. Secondly, the impact of increased traffic on local roads will lead to ongoing maintenance issues and upgrades being required.

- 4.4** While J Swap generally supports PPC50, given the positive impacts on the District that the tourism venture has generated, J Swaps seeks that through PPC50, the district plan provides appropriate mechanisms to address the following aspects:
- (a) Impacts on the Matamata town facilities identified, and adequately addressed by increased development at Hobbiton;
 - (b) Schedule of works required for local road maintenance, upgrades and safety improvements on all local roads and intersections surrounding Hobbiton, including:
 - Buckland Road – East and West.
 - Puketutu Road.
 - Hopkins Road.
 - State Highway 29.
 - Taotaoroa Road.
 - Todd Road.
 - Karapiro Road.
 - (c) Effective funding established for local road maintenance, upgrades and safety improvements; and
 - (d) Appropriate funding contributions provided for town centre and local road maintenance and improvements from Hobbiton Movie set.
- 4.5** The s 42 A Report identifies how these outcomes (set out above) can be achieved, through the amendments now proposed to PPC50. These recommended amendments are shown in Appendix B to the Hearing Report; and supported by J Swap, as follows:
- (a) Section 2.3 Significant Resource Management Issues – additional text to address localised environmental effects of tourist attractions, including impacts on road network, infrastructure and community facilities; and also the mechanism under LGA to recover funds from those undertaking tourism related development, or a targeted rate to fund District-wide impact of tourism.
 - (b) Section 2.4: 9.O1 Tourism Outcome sought – to provide for sustainable tourism growth while addressing adverse effects on the environment (no change).
 - (c) Section 2.4.9 Policy 2 – additional Policy 3 to address adverse effects of major tourist attractions (increased traffic, amenity values, and impact on town centre and community facilities/infrastructure).
 - (d) Section 2.4.9 Policy 2 – additional Policy 4 to identify methods to address adverse effects of tourist attractions, including the mechanism under LGA to recover funds from those undertaking tourism related development, or a targeted rate to fund District-wide impact of tourism.
 - (e) Rule 9.1.1 Roading Hierarchy, clause (i)(c) Collector Roads (Buckland Road east, and Puketutu Road).

- 4.6** Accordingly, J Swap seeks that recommended changes be adopted through PPC50 into the MPDC district plan provisions, and that further consideration be given to cross boundary issues relating to roading improvements required at state highway intersections and roads to the west of Hobbiton within Waipa District Council.



Richard George Harkness
Associate Director - Planner
AECOM New Zealand Limited
1 April 2019

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: J Swap Submission

Attachment B: J Swap Further Submission

Attachment A: J Swap Submission

Attachment B: J Swap Further Submission

Form 5

**Submission on Proposed Private Plan
Change 50: Development Concept Plan for Hobbiton
Movie Set, Buckland Road, Matamata**

Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991



Submitter's details:

Name: J Swap Contractors Ltd

(Organisation / Individual)

Contact person: Richard Harkness, AECOM

(If different from above)

Address for correspondence: PO Box 13161, Tauranga 3141

Phone: +64 7 927 3080

Fax: +64 7 927 3082

E-mail: richard.harkness@aecom.com

**This is a submission on Private Plan Change 50: Development Concept
Plan for Hobbiton Movie Set, Buckland Road, Matamata.**

The specific provisions of the plan change that my submission relates to are: _____

Please see attached submission

My submission is (include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them
amended, and the reasons for your views; attach additional pages if necessary): _____

Please see attached submission

Office use only:

TRIM # _____ NAR # _____ Container: 18/3197



I seek the following decision from Council (please give precise details):

☐ Accept the plan change

☐ Decline the plan change

☒ Accept the plan change with the following amendments:

☐ If the plan change is not declined, make the following amendments:

Please see attached submission

I wish to present at the council planning hearing:

☒ Yes ☐ No

PLEASE NOTE: IF YOU DO NOT TICK EITHER "YES" OR "NO" ABOVE, THEN IT WILL BE ASSUMED THAT YOU DO NOT WISH TO BE HEARD.

I would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with others making a similar submission:

☒ Yes ☐ No

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission:

☐ Yes ☒ No

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of this submission that—

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

☐ Yes ☐ No

Signed: [Signature] Date: 3 May 2018

Notes:

- ☐ The submission and decision you wish Council to make should only relate to the contents of the proposed plan change.
- ☐ Submissions close at **5.00pm, Thursday 3rd May 2018.**
- ☐ Please send the completed form before the closing date to: Matamata-Piako District Council, 35 Kenrick Street, PO Box 266, Te Aroha or email to submissions@mpdc.govt.nz or complete online at www.mpdc.govt.nz/plan-your-town or drop it off at any Council office.
- ☒ I accept that by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public. After the closing date, all submissions received will be available for public viewing.

Submission on Proposed Private Plan Change 50

Development Concept Plan for Hobbiton Movie Set, Buckland Road, Matamata

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This is a submission made by J Swap Contractors Ltd to Proposed Plan Change 50 ("PPC50") pursuant to clause 6 of the Schedule One of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

The Swap Group of companies (J Swap) has had a long association in contracting, quarrying, heavy haulage, bulk storage and stockfeed supplies. J Swap has a long association with the Matamata Piako District, with the company being founded in 1937 through river gravel extraction within the District. Company head office, transport depot, bulk stores, workshop and contracting yard is located in Matamata township. This serves as base for the company operations Nationwide and within the District.

Closer to the Hobbiton Movie set, the J Swap Taotaoroa Quarry is located approximately 5 km away. Taotaoroa Quarry is the largest of the ten hard rock quarries that are run by J Swap and involves the most traffic movements to and from site.

Accordingly the roading network in and around Matamata township and the wider District is used extensively for the whole range of business purposes.

In general terms our submission is concerned with the lack of physical mitigation proposed for wider roads and intersections that will be affected by the proposed plan change, the impact on the infrastructure currently in place particularly in the Matamata town centre and surrounds and how these improvements will be provided for and or funded.

By and large the major contributor to tourism within Matamata Township is the Hobbiton Movie Set, as represented by advertising and the conversion of the town information centre to resemble part of the movie set. Overall this is positive for the town. However capacity in certain parts of the town and wider roading network is being strained or pushed towards its maximum reasonable, safe or enjoyable use.

Enabling further tourists to arrive, especially at peak times (e.g. lunchtime) without additional capacity, will create effects that are at a level unacceptable to those residents and other through traffic users (J Swap and others), whom also need to use those facilities. Ultimately without acceptable facilities, the tourist experience will also decline, as capacity of current infrastructure should grow with additional growth in volume.

Please see our submission points in the following table. Please note that the page references are made in relation to Schedule 2 of Proposed Plan Change 50: Proposed Changes to the Matamata-Piako District Plan.

SUBMISSION POINTS

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought (additions <u>underlined></u>)	Reasons
56	Section 2.3 'Significant Resource Management Issues' AND Section 2.4: 9.O1 Tourism Outcome sought	Support in part	Enabling the growth of the tourism industry is supported. However it is unclear what measures have been considered to "avoid, remedy and mitigate the localised environmental effects of tourist attractions." We would support the addition of wording that clearly articulated the types of measures that would be considered. For example physical improvements to the roading network and provisions within the Council's Development Contributions Policy.	Tourist attractions generate additional impacts not only in relation to a particular site but also on the wider roading network. It is unclear how these effects will be mitigated or how they will be funded. We acknowledge that on site effects will be addressed through either the proposed provisions in the plan change or through a resource consent. However the increase in tourists to the Matamata-Piako District will also place greater strain on the infrastructure network within the town centre and surrounds. This includes effects on parking, traffic flows, public toilets and other community facilities. These effects should be recognised through the plan change and adequate funding provided to require increased, and or, upgraded facilities, either through the direct addition of new facilities by the applicant, Council's Development Contributions Policy or the addition of a specific rate for tourist attractions.
57	Section 2.4:9 Policy 2	Support in part	This policy is supported in part. We propose that an additional policy is included in the proposed plan change which recognises the impact of major tourist attractions on the wider community and the specific matters to be considered. This would include consideration of increased traffic movements throughout the District; particularly the town centre, and impacts on other infrastructure that may be utilised by tourists.	As it currently stands Policy 2 allows consideration of the importance of major tourist attractions to the District and consideration of the effects of the development concept plan. It is unclear whether this provides for a more holistic view to be considered of the effects that these attractions may have on the wider community and the infrastructure within areas such as the town centre.

Page No.	Reference	Support/Oppose	Decision Sought (additions <u>underlined></u>)	Reasons
57 - 58	Rule 9.1.1 'Roding hierarchy' clause (i)(c) 'Collector roads'	Support in part	The proposed plan change has identified several physical improvements for the eastern end of Buckland Road. We would support the addition of physical road carriageway (for example road straightening) improvements within both the eastern and western end of Buckland Road and for further consideration to be given to the impact of the increased traffic movements on surrounding roads and the intersections with the State Highway network (both within the Matamata-Piako and Waipa Districts).	Increased traffic movements are one of the main effects that will be created by the inclusion of Hobbiton as a Development Concept Plan. The site has seen a significant increase in visitor numbers and this is set to increase (based on the numbers proposed as a permitted activity). The impact of this increase should result in improvements to other parts of the roading network within the vicinity of Hobbiton. This is particularly prevalent with foreign tourist drivers using rural roads that are poor in nature and not previously designed for the traffic volumes and type of use anticipated. Where these tourist drivers interact with heavy vehicles, such as road trucks, road safety for both parties can be compromised. Examples include the western end of Buckland Road and the intersections with State Highway 29 at Puketutu Road and Taotaoroa Road and Kapapiro Road with State Highway 1. Adequate funding for these improvements should be included in the consideration of the Development Concept Plan or through another mechanism to ensure that the costs are predominantly borne by the proposed plan change applicant (internalised) and not the wider community (externalised).

Further Submission on Proposed District Plan Change (Form 6)

Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991



Further submitter's details:

Name: J SWAP CONTRACTORS LTD
(Organisation / Individual)

Contact person: RICHARD HARKNESS, AELCOM
(If different from above)

Address for correspondence: PO Box 13161, TAURANGA 3141

Phone: +64 7 927 3080 Fax: +64 7 927 3082

E-mail: richard.harkness@aelcom.com

This is a submission on Private Plan Change 50 - Development Concept Plan for Hobbiton Movie Set, Buckland Road, Matamata.

I am (tick one):

☐ A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest (please explain how you fall within this category):

☒ A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest that the general public has (please explain how you fall within this category):

MADE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

I support /oppose the submission of:

Original Submission Number: PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

Name of Original Submitter: FURTHER SUBMISSION

Original Submitter's Address: _____

The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:

Office use only:

TRIM # _____ NAR # _____ Container 16/3633

The reasons for my support or opposition are (attach additional pages if necessary): _____

I seek the following decision from Council. That:

☐ The whole ☐ The part (please give precise details): _____

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED FURTHER SUBMISSION

Of the original submission be:

☐ Allowed ☐ Disallowed

I wish to present at the council planning hearing:

☒ Yes ☐ No

I would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with others making a similar submission:

☒ Yes ☐ No

Signed: _____ Date: 20/06/2018

Notes:

- Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- A copy of your further submission must be sent to the original submitter within five working days of sending your further submission to Council.
- Please send the completed form to: Matamata-Piako District Council, 35 Kenrick Street, PO Box 266, Te Aroha 3342, scan and email it to submissions@mpdc.govt.nz, or drop it off at any Council office before the closing date.
- **Further submissions close at 5pm on Wednesday, 20 June 2018.**
- I accept that by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public. After the closing date, all submissions received will be available for public viewing.

Further submission from J Swaps Contractors Limited - Plan Change 50 – Hobbiton Development Concept Plan, June 2018

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
<p>2. Monique Moore 719 Buckland Road RD2, Matamata rmmooore@farmside.co.nz</p>	<p>Accept the Plan Change with the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70 km/hr speed limit along all of Buckland Road; • 50 km/hr speed limit through the Hobbiton Area. • Improve visibility at the exit from Hobbiton (remove hill/ straighten road). • Provide judder bars at both ends of the Hobbiton Area. • Provide a pedestrian crossing at the Buckland Road frontage of the Hobbiton Area. • Provide painted arrows on all road corners to direct traffic (including Cambridge end). • Provide white lines along all of Buckland Road. 	Support	<p>The impact on the roading hierarchy was identified in the J Swap submission and the need for physical improvements to be undertaken. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the roading hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding mechanism.</p>
<p>3. David Reichmuth, 21 Buckland Road, RD2, Matamata dreich@gmail.com</p>	<p>Decline the Plan Change in its entirety for the reasons outlined in the submission</p>	Oppose in part	<p>J Swaps do not support declining the plan change. However J Swaps do support some of the points the submitter has made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads cannot handle the traffic and are shocking as is. • The town is ill equipped to handle the extra visitors. • There is barely enough parking in town (even for a bicycle). • Noise pollution from cars and busses racing up Buckland Road. • Foreign drivers are a danger to other motorists. <p>The impact on the roading hierarchy was identified in the J Swap submission and the need for physical improvements to be undertaken. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the roading hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding</p>

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
			<p>mechanism.</p> <p>J Swaps note that the impact on the District's infrastructure notably that within the Matamata town centre was also identified in J Swaps submission.</p>
<p>5. Kaye Ring, 330 Rangitanuku Road kaye.spence@sealedair.com</p>	<p>Require the addition of a turning bay on State Highway 29 (southbound) into Rangitanuku Road, and double-laning of Rangitanuku Road in order to prevent accidents caused by drivers unused to NZ road rules and single lane roads.</p>	Support	<p>The impact on the roading hierarchy was identified in the J Swap submission and the need for physical improvements to be undertaken. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the roading hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding mechanism.</p>
<p>7. Carolyn and John Evans 8. John Evans 156 Buckland Road, RD 2, Matamata silvermistmatamata@gmail.com</p>	<p>Accept the plan change with the following amendments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An 80km/hr speed limit for Buckland and Puketutu Roads. 2. Road modifications at 399 and 385 Buckland Road for clear view and access. 3. Roundabout at the corner of Hopkins Road and SH 29. 4. Monitoring and checks on the effects of traffic volumes due to the addition of accommodation at Shires Rest, especially at night. 	Support	<p>The impact on the roading hierarchy was identified in the J Swap submission and the need for physical improvements to be undertaken. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the roading hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding mechanism.</p>
<p>9. New Zealand Transport Agency, PO Box 973, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, 3240 Att: Claudia Jones hamiltonplanning@nzta.govt.nz</p>	<p>1. Retain Plan Change 50 as notified with the exception of the specific changes below:</p> <p>Include a new Performance Standard under Table 1.1 that states the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle movements shall not exceed 387,000 per year. If vehicle movements exceed the 387,000 cap, the activity becomes a Restricted-Discretionary Activity under Performance Standard 1.2.2. Discretion 	Support in part	<p>The impact on the roading hierarchy was identified in the J Swap submission and the need for physical improvements to be undertaken. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the roading hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding mechanism.</p>

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
	<p>is restricted to the assessment of an ITA that addresses the non-compliance.</p> <p>3. The Agency would accept alternative wording to achieve the same relief.</p>		<p>J Swaps support the principle of a cap on vehicle movements. It is unclear how this would be monitored and therefore when the standard would be triggered.</p>
<p>10. Grogan Family Trust, 774 Buckland Road, RD 2, Matamata Att: Denis Grogan dennisgrogan@hotmail.co.nz</p>	<p>Accept the Plan Change with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. That the section of road adjacent to 385 Buckland Road have designed parking bays constructed and that the entranceway be reconfigured in the interests of safety; b. That consideration be given to pedestrian safety on Buckland Road; c. That consideration be given to the construction of a vehicle underpass at the Hobbiton entrances; d. That the speed limit on Buckland Road be reduced to 80km/hr or less; e. That Hobbiton make full disclosure of its intentions for public functions that may cause nuisance; and; f. That community meetings be held at least annually in the interests of transparency and community involvement. 	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The impact on the roading hierarchy was identified in the J Swap submission and the need for physical improvements to be undertaken. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the roading hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding mechanism.</p>
<p>11. Gasquoine Holdings Ltd, 696 Buckland Road, RD 2, Matamata, 3472 Att: David Gasquoine tekereru.farm@xtra.co.nz</p>	<p>That MPDC take into account the concerns as stated in the submission and take note of the inadequate infrastructure that MPDC is responsible for and have been made well aware of, by a number of concerned residents over a period of time.</p> <p>Specific points from the submission:</p> <p>Questions exist over MPDC's intentions regarding providing a user-friendly and safe road user environment.</p> <p>The section of road at Buckland Road West is inadequate for the volume and type of tourist traffic that it carries. There are minimal road markings/</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The impact on the roading hierarchy was identified in the J Swap submission and the need for physical improvements to be undertaken. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the roading hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding mechanism.</p> <p>J Swaps note that the impact on the District's infrastructure notably that within the Matamata town centre was also identified in J Swaps submission.</p>

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
	<p>signage until the road enters the Waipa District adjacent to the Taotaoroa Quarry.</p> <p>Buckland Road West is frequently used by tourist buses. The section of road is barely adequate for farm-related traffic, let alone tourist buses with drivers unfamiliar with the road. The section of road already serves two chicken growing farms, dairy farms, dry stock farms and many lifestyle blocks all of which contribute to the ever-increasing traffic flow.</p> <p>The excuse that Buckland Road is "not wide enough" to justify a centreline or more road markings/ signage is not reasonable. The road section needs at least a centreline. Speed is not an issue, but it is the lack of directional arrows that causes many near misses. MPDC should provide the same level of road signage and markings as are already provided on the section of Buckland Road West within the Waipa District.</p> <p>The ITA's reliance on no "fatal and injury crashes" is not an appropriate road engineering model to apply to an existing rural road that has become a busy service industry and tourist route. The "near misses" are too numerous to report as they occur on most days.</p> <p>Tourists frequently park overnight on farm tracks, gateways, and front verges. "No Camping" signs need to be erected at all off-road areas.</p> <p>The public toilet facilities in Matamata are inadequate. A modern "user pays" ablution block should be developed.</p>		
12. Glenda O'Sullivan, 127 Buckland Road, RD 2, Matamata	Decline the Plan Change as it will be premature to accept the Plan Change without careful consideration being given to road status changes and what this fully	Oppose	Oppose the relief sought however J Swaps supports the submitter's comments regarding the impact on the roading hierarchy as identified in the J Swap submission. Further

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
greenanne@xtra.co.nz	entails for all. More time is needed to fully investigate this matter.		investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the road hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding mechanism.
<p>13. Matamata-Piako District Council PO Box 266, Te Aroha, 3342 Att: Mark Hamilton MHamilton@mpdc.govt.nz</p>	<p>3. Amend the "General" provision (d) on Sheet 1 of the DCP.</p> <p>d) For restricted discretionary and discretionary activities the matters of discretion within DCP Rule 1.2 shall <u>be used as a guide</u> apply.</p> <p>15. Amend Performance Standard 1.1.6 "Access" (Sheet 4 of the DCP).</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure that both commercial vehicle crossings to Buckland Road are located in accordance with their indicative position on the DCP.</p> <p>a) Precinct 1 shall have no more than two commercial vehicle crossings to Buckland Road <u>located in accordance with the DCP.</u></p> <p>19. Amend Performance Standard 1.1.7(g) relating to sign posting of parking and loading spaces (Sheet 4 of the DCP).</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The suggested amendment to the performance standard is intended to help ensure that best practice will be followed for the layout and smooth operation of the Hobbiton carpark.</p> <p>g) Parking areas and loading spaces shall be clearly signposted at the road frontage <u>in accordance with the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual.</u></p>	Support	<p>3. Clarification is sought as to what is meant by "shall be used as a guide".</p> <p>15. Support the amendment regarding the location of two commercial vehicle crossings in accordance with the DCP.</p> <p>19. Support the amendment of the performance standard to ensure that signage shall be in accordance with the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual.</p>

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
	<p>20. Amend Performance Standard 1.1.7(i) relating to on-site parking (Sheet 4 of the DCP).</p> <p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>The suggested amendment to the performance standard is to ensure that vehicles associated with Hobbiton will be parked within the boundaries of Precincts 1 and 2, not the farmland which makes up the balance of the DCP.</p> <p>i) All vehicles associated with the activities occurring on the Hobbiton Movie Set Development Concept Plan (DCP) site shall be parked on the DCP site <u>within Precincts 1 and 2</u>. No vehicles shall be parked in the road reserve.</p> <p>21. Add new Performance Standard 1.1.Y "Traffic Management" (Sheet 4 of the DCP).</p> <p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>A new performance standard covering the matters within the Proposed Memorandum of Understanding is required, to ensure that these matters are enforceable, in perpetuity.</p> <p>1.1.Y Traffic Management</p> <p><u>The applicant and Council have agreed to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that requires the ongoing maintenance of the affected road network, including signage, traffic safety measures and road markings. This agreement shall be reflected in the DCP's performance standards so that in the event of the change of ownership of the site, the MOU will be enforceable in perpetuity.</u></p> <p>22. Amend Performance Standard 1.1.8 "Visitor Numbers" (Sheet 4 of the DCP).</p> <p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>The proposed amendment provides clarity over the maximum daily number of visitors to the site.</p> <p>a) Visitor numbers shall not exceed 3,500 people per</p>		<p>20. Support the performance standard to ensure that parking is within the site rather than the road reserve.</p> <p>21. Support in principle. However it is unclear what is included in the Memorandum of Understanding and what has been agreed to in terms the ongoing maintenance of the affected road network, including signage, traffic safety measures and road markings. It is also unclear if the MOU can be relied on when it sits outside of the District Plan. J Swaps seeks that the MOU provisions are included in the plan change as performance standards. J Swaps also suggests that a funding arrangement could be provided for where the applicant and the Council agree to a percentage share for the works that are required. J Swaps also seeks clarification on the mechanisms to address cross boundary issues, particularly in relation to funding necessary roading improvements along the western extent of Buckland Roads and also the intersection of SH1 with Karapiro Roads.</p> <p>22. Support the inclusion of the maximum limit for daily visitor numbers however J Swaps note that this could then be in conflict with the proposed cap on vehicle movements of 387,000. Agreement should be reached as to the measurement which will be used regarding this matter –</p>

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
	<p>day, excluding visitors attending events which finish more than one hour before the first movie set tour commences or begin one hour after the final movie set tour has finished.</p> <p><u>For the avoidance of doubt, the 3,500 daily visitor maximum limit shall include all event patrons within the time period specified above.</u></p> <p>26. In regard to Performance Standard 1.1.12 "Signage" (Sheet 5 of the DCP), Council considers that there is insufficient assessment in relation to Hobbiton-related traffic using Rangitanuku Road.</p> <p>Further assessment is required to ensure that the effects of Hobbiton-related traffic using Rangitanuku Road are mitigated.</p> <p>29. Include new Performance Standard 1.1.15 "Accommodation" (Sheet 5 of the DCP).</p> <p>Reason: The proposed new performance standard provides suggested maximum visitor numbers permitted in each of the visitor accommodation sites in Precinct 1. The figures are calculated on the basis of likely capacity for both accommodation areas based on the draft plans sighted for each.</p> <p><u>a) A maximum of 86 visitors per night are permitted in Hobbiton Movie Set Visitor Accommodation area as detailed on the DCP.</u> <u>b) A maximum of 30 self-contained mobile camping vehicles are permitted per night in the Hobbiton Movie Set located within the "Overnight Park-Over Camping Area" detailed on the DCP.</u> <u>Include location of Hobbiton Movie Set Visitor Accommodation and Overnight Park-Over Camping</u></p>		<p>vehicle movements or daily visitor numbers. J Swaps would support the use of vehicle movements as this would encourage a greater use of shared transport.</p> <p>26. Support further assessment to ensure that the effects of Hobbiton-related traffic are considered.</p> <p>29. Support the provision of limited on-site accommodation. Providing this service should alleviate the concerns of local residents in terms of overnight parking around the local area.</p>

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
	<p><u>Area on Sheet 2 of the DCP.</u></p> <p>30. Amend Restricted-Discretionary matters 1A(a) and 1A(d) (Sheet 6 of the DCP).</p> <p>A. Events: Any application shall be assessed upon consideration of the following:</p> <p>a) Traffic Management Plan for events over 500 people without buses, or over 1,000 people in all circumstances</p> <p><u>The traffic effects and mitigation measures, including effects on the road network, parking, access, loading and signage.</u></p> <p>d) <u>Set up and Clean up</u></p> <p>A. Events: Any application shall be assessed upon consideration of the following:</p> <p>g) <u>Visual</u> h) <u>Signage</u> i) <u>Fireworks</u></p>		<p>30. Support the requirement for a traffic management plan. Also seek that notification is provided to J Swaps regarding the date, time and type of events.</p>
<p>15. Derrys Farm Ltd, 496A Puketutu Road, RD 2, Matamata, 3472 Att: Nola Broomhall nolabroomhall@hotmail.co.nz <u>Late submission</u></p>	<p>1. Introduction of planning framework:</p> <p>Support introduction of planning framework with consideration of the affected local community (e.g. Buckland Road residences) in the decision making process regarding the objectives, policies and rules.</p> <p>2. Increase in visitor numbers, movie screenings, amplified music events and on-site visitor accommodation:</p> <p>Oppose the increase in visitor numbers to 3,500 per day, 12 movie screening and 6 amplified music events and on-site visitor accommodation and overnight camping facilities. Buckland Road and surrounding areas are in a rural environment and of natural scenic</p>	Support	<p>Support the submitter's comments regarding traffic safety concerns. The impact on the roading hierarchy was identified in the J Swap submission and the need for physical improvements to be undertaken. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the most appropriate physical changes to the roading hierarchy including an investigation of double lanes. It is also necessary to determine how these should be funded e.g. via Council's Development Contribution Policy, a targeted rate or some other funding mechanism.</p>

Submitter	Decision that the submitter wants Council to make	Support/ Oppose	Reason
	beauty. With the increase in visitors, events, and traffic, the Submitter has major concerns that this will impact the natural environment, create major traffic safety concerns (many traffic or near traffic accidents go unreported) and will have adverse impacts on environmental pollution e.g. increase in roadside rubbish, damage to native vegetation due to cars stopping to take photos. As a land owner in the affected area, the Submitter is concerned the land value will be negatively impacted, due to reduced desirability to live in the area; in addition rates are likely to increase to manage infrastructure improvements.		