

Before an Independent Commissioner
appointed by the Timaru District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of Plan Change 21 to the Timaru District Plan (Broughs Gully
Outline Plan)

Statement of Evidence of Frazer James Munro

5 July 2017

Introduction

- 1 My name is Frazer James Munro.
- 2 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. I have complied with it in preparing this evidence and I agree to comply with it in presenting evidence at this hearing. The evidence that I give is within my area of expertise except where I state that my evidence is given in reliance on another person's evidence. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

Qualifications and experience

- 3 I hold a Bachelor of Science from Otago University (1999) and a Bachelor of Spatial Science from the University of Southern Queensland (2010). I hold a License to undertake Cadastral Surveys from the Cadastral Surveyors Licensing Board and am a full member of the New Zealand Institute of Surveyors.
- 4 I have 12 years' experience in surveying and land development, of which 8 years has been in New Zealand.
- 5 I am the Development Manager at Timaru District Council and I have held this position since March 2017. Prior to this I was Council's Land Development Surveyor, a position I had held since December 2008.

Scope of evidence

- 6 Plan Change 21 (Broughs Gully Outline Development Plan) proposes to facilitate a coordinated urban development approach for the provision of network servicing infrastructure across a site that is currently zoned residential (Res 1 and 4) but is held in multiple ownership. I have been involved in Plan Change 21 from its inception in March 2015, project managing Council infrastructure engineers and external consultants to formulate a servicing strategy, followed by engaging and collaborating with an external planning consultant to draft the Plan Change application and report.
- 7 This evidence provides additional information in response to submissions made on Plan Change 21 on the following:
 - (a) Roothing
 - (i) Comparison between a turning head and hammerhead at the end of Road 3
 - (ii) Location of extension of Lancewood Terrace / Road 1

- (b) Consequential effects of alternative stormwater attenuation areas
- (c) Enabling development and giving effect to the Plan Change
- (d) Functionality of proposed financial contributions model.

Roading

- 8 Port Bryson Property Ltd and Hilton Trust Ltd submission (Submission 2.4) seeks that the rounded cul de sac design at the end of Road 3 be replaced with a hammerhead design. I don't consider this is appropriate.
- 9 Cul de sac heads perform a number of functions. Those relevant to the layout being an allowance for parking, provision of space for wheelie bins, provision of space for access ways and sufficient space for manoeuvring.
- 10 A typical cul de sac head that provides access to 8 allotments requires an on-street parking availability for at least 2 vehicles, kerb space for 16 wheelie bins (16m length), at least 12m length of access ways and a turning circle of 12.5m for a rubbish truck.
- 11 Enabling a single turning manoeuvre for a rubbish truck avoids spot turning where the steering wheels are turned over a single spot which increases wear and asset consumption comparative to the turning motion whilst the truck is moving forward.
- 12 Tuning heads are acceptable design solutions where the road end is temporary due to the future intention to extent the road, and where a maximum of 2 – 3 properties have road frontage.
- 13 Mr Peter Olsen's submission (Submission 4.1) seeks that the extension of Lancewood Terrace be relocated to the bottom of the affected parcel due the severance issues it creates. The longitudinal grades required to relocate the road would exceed those commonly deemed acceptable in design guides such as NZS4404. It is also noted that the road extension will only be undertaken if and when the affected landowner chooses to subdivide their property

Consequential effects of alternative stormwater attenuation areas

- 14 Port Bryson Property Ltd and Hilton Trust Ltd seek that the Stormwater Retention Ponds and Swales area are not on its property. I don't consider this is appropriate. An alternative stormwater layout was assessed which provided for this. The effects of the alternative stormwater layout are described in the evidence provided by Elliot Duke as being an increase in the volume of earthworks, reduction in the potential harvest of fill material, decreased ability for

future improvements, decrease in usable recreational area, and decrease in developable area.

- 15 Other effects of the alternative stormwater design is the reduced connectivity for active transport (pedestrian and cycle ways) links through to State Highway 1 and the less desirable alignment of the sewer main which connects through to State Highway 1.
- 16 The consequential effect of these changes can be quantified through the financial contributions model. The increase costs of having to construct an additional bund (being the raised formation of Lancewood Terrace / Tasman Street), importing additional fill material and reducing the allotment yield results in an increase stormwater financial contribution of approximately \$3,500 per allotment across the entire ODP area.
- 17 There are also intangible costs that are not included in the financial contributions model which include the reduction in useable recreational area and the reduced ability to make future improvements to the capacity and treatment ability of the attention area.

Enabling development and giving effect to Plan Change 21

- 18 In order to enable development within the ODP area Council acknowledges that it has a role to facilitate the delivery of services and provide necessary headworks.
- 19 The facilitation of delivery of services is enabled through the financial contributions policy discussed below and the ongoing administration and management of the model.
- 20 The provision of necessary headworks includes the design and construction of a new connection to the main truck sewer on the eastern side of State Highway 1 and the early acquisition of land / utilisation of existing Council land for stormwater attenuation. Council has already made significant progress in both of these areas.

Functionality of proposed financial contributions model

- 21 Port Bryson Property Ltd and Hilton Trust Ltd seek deletion of Rule 6.3.8(19) (Vesting of Infrastructure) and Rule 6.6.5(2) (Cost Share Agreement). The proposed financial contributions model is an integral part of PC 21 enabling the fair and equitable funding of the network infrastructure necessary to enable coordinated development within the ODP area.
- 22 At a conceptual level, the sewer, stormwater and roading financial contribution models distribute the entire cost of all the necessary infrastructure evenly amongst those parcels / land owners that benefit from the new infrastructure by

way of the ability to subdivide or intensify. Each existing parcel / landowners contribution is adjusted to account for site specific factors such as allotment yield, land lost to stormwater areas and road, proportion of infrastructure to be constructed, etc. This ensures that all contributions account for the potential yield from existing sites as well as the development costs of each site.

- 23 By way of example, this means that a parcel such as 75 Jellicoe St at the far western end of the catchment which contains very little future road or other infrastructure will likely pay a larger financial contribution. Whilst a parcel such as 67 Jellicoe Street will likely receive a financial credit as the allotment yield is significantly reduced due to land being dedicated as road and stormwater reserve.
- 24 In order to facilitate the financial contributions model, the Timaru District Council will act as the intermediary party paying out funds and collecting contributions when due. The net financial effect on Council will be zero as the contributions and payments shall balance.
- 25 Due to the fragmented ownership, varying scale of ownership and cost of infrastructure, many existing parcels within the ODP area would be unprofitable to development in accordance with the underlying zoning, whilst other parcels are restrained in their ability to development due to the inability to connect to infrastructure.
- 26 Therefore the benefit of the financial contributions model is that it enables all parcels to develop in a cost effective manner. The costs are equitably shared across the benefactors with Council carrying responsibility of paying out or receiving funds.

Frazer Munro

5 July 2017