



**TO THE MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS OF THE  
MACKENZIE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE TEKAPO PROPERTY GROUP**

Murray Cox (Chair)  
Claire Barlow (Mayor)  
Russell Armstrong  
Graham Smith  
Stella Sweney  
Richie Smith  
Wayne Barnett (Chief Executive)  
Paul Morris (Manager Finance and Administration)

(Stephen Gubb, RJ Hughes Developments, has been invited to join)

*Notice is given of a meeting of the Tekapo Property Group (a sub-committee of the Finance Committee) to be held on Tuesday, November 11, 2014, at 1pm.*

**VENUE:** Lake Tekapo Community Hall, Tekapo

**BUSINESS:** As per agenda attached

WAYNE BARNETT  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER



## TEKAPO PROPERTY GROUP

Agenda for Tuesday, November 11, 2014

---

### APOLOGIES

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

### CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Confirmation of the minutes of the Tekapo Property Group meeting held on Tuesday, October 7, 2014, including those matters taken under public excluded.

### PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Resolve that the public, be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting namely:

1. Previous minutes, Tekapo Property Group, October 7.
2. Hughes Report to Tekapo Property Group (attached).
3. Land Sale (attached).

<b>General subject of each matter to be considered</b>	<b>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</b>	<b>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</b>
Previous minutes Tekapo Property Group, October 7.	Commercial sensitivity Enable commercial negotiations.	48(1)(a)(i)
Hughes Report to Tekapo Property Group	Commercial sensitivity	48(1)(a)(i)
Land Sale	Enable commercial negotiations	48(1)(a)(i)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a)(i) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows: *Previous minutes of the Tekapo Property Group under sections 7(2)(i) and 7(2)(b)(ii). Hughes Report to Tekapo Property Group under section 7(2)(b)(ii), Land Sale under section 7(2)(i).*

### RESOLUTION TO RESUME OPEN MEETING

## MACKENZIE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE TEKAPO PROPERTY GROUP HELD IN THE LAKE TEKAPO COMMUNITY CENTRE, TEKAPO ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2014, AT 1PM

#### PRESENT:

Cr Murray Cox (Chair)  
Mayor Claire Barlow  
Cr Graham Smith  
Cr Russell Armstrong  
Stella Sweney  
Wayne Barnett (Chief Executive)

#### IN ATTENDANCE:

Stephen Gubb (Hughes Developments)  
Katherine Eveleigh (Aurecon)  
Ari Fon (Aurecon)  
Jane Rennie (Boffa Miskell)  
Keri-Ann Little (Committee Secretary)

#### APOLOGIES:

Apologies were received from Paul Morris (Finance and Administration Manager) and Richie Smith (member).

**Claire Barlow/ Graham Smith**

#### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

There were no declarations of interest.

#### MINUTES:

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Tekapo Property Group held on August 4, 2014, be confirmed and adopted as the correct record of the meeting, including those matters taken under public excluded.

**Claire Barlow/ Stella Sweeney**

#### VISITORS:

Katherine Eveleigh and Ari Fon from Aurecon, and Jane Rennie from Boffa Miskell were present at the meeting to present the Tekapo Landscape and Transport Strategy to property group members.

Ms Rennie an urban designer with Boffa Miskell has been engaged along with Aurecon to undertake a landscape and transport study on the Tekapo development on behalf of the CEO and his team. Ms Rennie said she is progressing a lot of previous work that has already been done to the next level of investigation which she will go into depth shortly. Ms Eveleigh is heading up the team from Aurecon in regards to landscaping and urban

aspects and Ari Fon, Senior Engineer with Aurecon said his input will be parking and the transportation side of the project.

Ms Rennie began the presentation to run through the work that has taken place to date and to give the group an update. Ms Rennie said we are currently three quarters to half way through the process of investigating various technical issues, understanding what has changed in the last couple of years since the previous study had been done, while drilling down to more detail to a point where we would like to talk to numerous stakeholders and gain feedback including the public drop in this afternoon. We are looking forward to hearing what the feedback is, with some aspects of this work going into a bit more detail compared to where things were a couple of years ago.

Ms Rennie distributed an A3 coloured hand-out outlining their findings to date in respect to the Tekapo Landscape and Transport Study.

The CEO said the purpose of this meeting was to gather an idea of the stages the study has gone through and invited the group to stay at the completion of the meeting to view the consultation boards in more depth during the public drop in session.

Ms Rennie said as part of the brief received to us from the Council was to ensure as this development goes forward there is integration from a landscape perspective and obviously from a parking and transportation side of things so there is sufficient land set aside to achieve a good quality design outcome keeping in mind future town development.

Ms Rennie said they are starting to look into more detail regarding how the development will function and whether we have sufficient carparking to meet the growth demands as the town grows and obviously how that all connects in with pedestrian walkways etc.

Cr Smith asked is that the only two areas of parking the east carpark and the west carpark.

Ms Rennie said there will be carpaking around the supermarket area and carparking along the commercial street and options for carparking along the commercial lane and development sites themselves will have sufficient space within their lots to provide carparking for their individual businesses aswell.

Ms Sweeney asked how the scenic resort would be affected noting they attended the last meeting with concerns with parking. Ms Rennie said the Council has recently indicated that the viewing shafts cannot have parking in them, so these view shafts are now landscape high amenity areas. The chairman noted that the scenic resort view shaft was incorrect and is actually carparking. The CEO added that in the case of the scenic resort which is owned by the landowners, council do not have control over what is a view corridor and what is parking in their case.

Cr Smith noted there is no parking in the middle of town. Ms Rennie said over time there will be some transition around areas that now look like storage areas that may be turned into parking.

Mr Ron said as a summary in terms of the development around some of the areas for the next section if that is fully developed and look at the existing development there is enough carparking in the existing layout to provide the plan requirements for the existing and developed case but in saying that while we can be compliant to the district plan however in the peak time there may not be enough carparking spaces. There will be that peak over the summer period where under this current scheme there is not enough carparks and hopefully that is something we can discuss today. Generally you don't provide for one

hundred percent parking all the time, to do that you provide a huge amount of asphalt that isn't used months of the year but there are some areas outside this footprint that could potentially be utilised for overflow parking if required. The most important thing is it will be plan compliant.

Ms Rennie said we have looked at the bus parking situation as well, Mr Fon said we would like to concentrate the buses at the eastern park and like to see buses parking reasonably close to where the new footbridge will go and on the western park the intention is for the buses is to bring them closer to the centre of town around the vicinity of where the mini golf course is, close to information centre and public toilets.

The Mayor added this highlights the need to have another set of toilets at the other end.

Ms Rennie said there is an error on the map and there is another little block which has been indicated, so people coming over the bridge and entering town can use these toilets.

Mr Armstrong noted at the eastern side carpark the buses would have to drive in and back out the same way adding this is a real nuisance to other traffic, is there a way they can drive in and then drive through and out.

Mr Fon said they looked long and hard and welcome any suggestions, stating it is really hard making it all work and even looked at re-rigging the existing state highway 8 entrance. Ideally it would be good to get the buses to circulate through and drive out but because of the amount of room you would need to do this you would lose a lot of carparking down the western side. This is the best fit at the moment but there is some manoeuvring required. Ms Eveleigh added there will be bigger parks for campervans etc and the Mayor stated that there will be a need for good signage to indicate these.

Ms Sweeney said that current buses using the carparking like to back into the parks so they can easily drive out when they have collected their clients.

Ms Eveleigh thank Ms Sweeney for her input and said they will look more closely at that.

Ms Rennie then moved on to the transportation aspects of the project in regards to the internal lane way and parking areas and also the commercial street. With the concept we retain the internal lane through the development which has developed over time as the town centre project has evolved, what we have been looking at is the scenarios as to whether that lane will be one way or two way lane way through the centre of the town. Overall we would want it to be quite informal and there are a lot of crossing across it with view shafts and we want people to feel comfortable in this lane way environment so we have been looking at those options and are interested in your feedback, keeping in mind there are pros and cons in regards to how many carparks can be provided within a one way or two way scenario and how important it is for tourists visiting Tekapo knowing how to get around while trying to keep parking and streets as legible as possible and finally whether a one way or two way assists with that.

Cr Smith asked is it wide enough for a two way.

Ms Rennie said yes but the option of one way would provide parking on both sides of the street opposed to two way providing parking on one side of the street. In some areas it is a wee bit tight.

Mr Fon said with a two way they have provided restrictions with width as you won't want the street to become a highway with a large volume of traffic, keeping in mind safety with pedestrians.

Mr Armstrong said emphasise is getting them out of the cars, agreed by Ms Rennie.

Ms Sweeney added the feedback from the workshops was that the community certainly want the development to be pedestrian friendly and with the lane way being two way I have a vision of two campervans coming in both ways and having ciaos. I would certainly opt for a one way.

Cr Smith asked would the one way be east-west or west-east.

Mr Fon said it would be from the west to east.

Ms Rennie said that is why if it was one way then there would have to be very clearly signposted with a possible internal link to allow for tourists to retreat if they do head up the wrong way.

Cr Smith said most tourists coming into Tekapo come from south or east so they would have to drive through down first and then drive down the one way.

Mr Fon said hopefully they would park at the west or east end and walk.

Mr Gubb added that in reality it may have to start off as a one way to restrict the over spending on the first stage by having to put a one way the whole way through the development. I agree that the development would be ruined if there was too much traffic down there. Ms Rennie said you can design it in a way to make it clear that this is a slow road by using paving with a softer design etc.

The CEO said something that hasn't been allowed for is the amount of parking in the front sites, for the new sites we are selling now we have the ability to under the district plan use a pay in lieu scenario. They can come to council and pay cash in lieu for carparks on their individual site, we are selling the parks so we have the ability to negotiate around that at the moment but the key choice for us is how much do we require parking to be onsite in those businesses which takes away demand on the parks on the end while bring traffic into the area, it will also reduce the value of the area potentially as well, have you worked through that in any detail.

MR Fon said no not for individual sites we have looked at the overall parking assessment in terms of analysis of the existing and in terms of the subdivision and those numbers. With that cash in lieu can you please clarify that does that give Council the ability with payment from the developer for someone not to have any parks onsite with the appropriate cash payment.

The CEO replied and said yes they can have none. We have recently looked at the district plan and if all of these sites get sold and take cash in lieu is only for the land value so the council has to conjure construction but it also has the ability to provide a dumbbell situation with the parking at the two ends of town and nothing in the middle, I am a little bit concerned what that will actually do to the development.

Mr Fon said I certainly would recommend that Council allows that cash in lieu of parking in the new development I think somewhere in the middle but where that maybe we will have to

go into more detail. With the expansion of the development there may be a change with visitors parking and staying longer generally speaking there will be some growth over time.

The Mayor asked if you could put a timeframe on parking and Mr Fon said yes that is an option but must come with reinforcement.

Ms Rennie concluded by summarising today's presentation.

Cr Cox thanked Ms Rennie, Ms Eveleigh and Mr Fon for their time and summary provided.

Mr Gubb said there are some elements we may need you to prioritise, they will need to reflect through into the changes to the application that is with Council now being stage one subdivision because we need those worked into the system quite quickly so we are in a position to let the contract to Fulton Hogan in November otherwise we miss the construction season and I may need to sit with you and work through what those key issues are.

The CEO asked Mr Gubb do you think there are issues around the landscape.

Mr Gubb said not so much landscaping but the street and the tree plant of that and also the parking design will be reasonably key so there will be some elements, relatively minor but I think we just need to pull them to the top so they get worked on immediately.

The CEO enquired if the final report could be presented at the next property group meeting in the next six weeks' time. Cr Cox said going back to the public pre-Christmas would be desired when there are more people in the town but clarifying to the public that this will essentially be the development with minor adjustments if required.

Ms Rennie suggested a signboard available for the public to view to update the public of developments and stages completed etc.

Mr Fon noted for a five week turn around we will require any feedback straight away with emphasis on the one way or two way lane way.

*Katherine Eveleigh, Ari Fon and Jane Rennie left the meeting at 2:14pm*

## **PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

Resolved that the public, be excluded from the following part of the proceedings of this meeting namely:

1. Previous minutes, Tekapo Property Group, August 4.
2. Lakeside Drive Subdivision Project
3. Hughes Report to Tekapo Property Group.
4. RHD Agreement.
5. Possible Land Purchase.

<b>General subject of each matter to be considered</b>	<b>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</b>	<b>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</b>
Previous minutes Tekapo Property Group, August 4.	Commercial sensitivity Maintain legal professional privilege Enable commercial	48(1)(a)(i)

negotiations.

Lakeside Drive Subdivision Project	Commercial sensitivity	48(1)(a)(i)
Hughes Report to Tekapo Property Group	Commercial sensitivity	48(1)(a)(i)
RHD Agreement	Enable commercial negotiations	48(1)(a)(i)
Possible Land Purchase	Enable commercial negotiations	48(1)(a)(i)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a)(i) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows: *Previous minutes of the Tekapo Property Group and Lakeside Drive Subdivision Project under sections 7(2)(i), 7(2)(b)(ii), and 7(2)(g). Hughes Report to Tekapo Property Group under section 7(2)(b)(ii), RHD Agreement and Possible Land Purchase under section 7(2)(i).*

**Claire Barlow/ Graham Smith**

*The Tekapo Property Group continued in open meeting.*

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS  
THE CHAIRMAN DECLARED THE MEETING CLOSED AT 4:30pm**

**CHAIRMAN:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

UNCONFIRMED