

RESPONSE TO S92 REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION



Johnsonville Market Application: SR477991

TO: Sebastian Barrett, Wellington City Council HG PROJECT NO: A2001549.00
FROM: Hannah Payne-Harker, Harrison Grierson DATE: February 26th 2021

This memo provides a response to the s92 Request for Further Information for the Johnsonville Market resource consent application (SR477991), received on Wednesday December 9th 2020.

1. The Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) references parking surveys that were undertaken. Please provide a copy of that data so that the conclusions in the TIA can be peer reviewed. This should include a map marked-up showing the area that has been surveyed and the results in a tabular form with photos.

The updated Traffic Assessment is attached. Table 1 contained in Section 4.1 of the updated Traffic Assessment demonstrates parking observations during typical market operations, which are representative of the initial parking survey. Photos of the parking observations are contained in Section 3 of the report. The map showing the area surveyed is attached in Section 8 of the updated assessment.

2. Please provide additional parking surveys that have been undertaken on a day when other activities, such as soccer lessons and church, have been occurring. Please assess what differences this makes to the effects assessment provided.

An additional parking survey was undertaken in February 2021 by David Wanty (traffic consultant) when football activities were occurring. Additional drive-overs and parking observations were undertaken to support the findings. The results of the additional assessment are included in Table 2, Section 4.1 of the updated Traffic Assessment.

The results of the assessment demonstrate that there are approximately 10-14 additional vehicles associated with the football activity. This combined with the traffic associated with the market increases the level of traffic congestion. We note that there were several observations of unmanaged parking, including parking on yellow lines and double parking in the additional survey. Please refer to Section 4.2-4.7 of the traffic assessment for more details.

In the traffic effects assessment submitted with the original application, it was concluded that traffic effects were less than minor with mitigation measures adopted (refer to Section 7.2.2 of the application report). We believe the additional traffic effects observed while football activities are occurring can be appropriately managed so that adverse effects are less than minor with the additional mitigation measures in the following section.

We also note that a similar level of traffic effects can be observed in the area at busier times, including school opening and closing hours.

3. The Council has received complaints linking the market activities to illegal and inconsiderate parking, particularly on the eastern side of Morgan Street. Please comment on this potential effect and consider how this can be mitigated.

We note that traffic wardens are now in place on Morgan Street while the market is operating. The traffic wardens deter illegal parking and encourage market users to park safely and legally. The

applicant is willing to accept the continued presence of a traffic warden as a condition of the resource consent.

David Wanty (traffic consultant) has recommended that the following additional measures are undertaken to deter illegal parking (please refer to Section 6.2 and 7.2 of the updated Traffic Assessment):

- Mark yellow lines near the school off-street parking area to improve safety (and relieve local temporal congestion)
- In limited cases remove the yellow no parking lines to allow parking or restricted parking
- In the interim place cones in the school staff parking area to prevent parallel parking so that all patrons enter and exit the school parking area in the forwards direction
- Where practical provide engineering measures such as kerb buildouts to physically prevent parking on yellow lines
- Position cones to deter parking in certain on-street places

These measures are recommended alongside the proposed traffic arrangements in the application report (Section 4.2 and 4.3).

The traffic wardens have also advised that traffic effects can be particularly attributed to the carpark between Morgan Street and Ohariu Valley Road and have recommended that closing the park would reduce adverse traffic effects. We request that WCC takes this into consideration.

4. The TIA recommends that the Council reviews the operation of the market in respect of parking and traffic matters by June 2021. Can you please clarify what the purpose of this recommendation.

David Wanty (traffic consultant) has explained that this was a recommendation for monitoring, to appease the concerns of affected residents. June 2021 was chosen to coincide with the end of the current financial year. We request that this comment is disregarded and that standard monitoring conditions apply to the proposal.

5. The proposed signage does not meet the following requirements of standard 5.6.3.1:
 - The sign area for each sign exceeds 0.5m²
 - There is more than one sign
 - The signs advertise an activity that is not a Permitted Activity.

The proposed signage does not meet condition 5.3.11.7 of Rule 5.3.11 because the Ohariu Road sign exceeds 1.5m². Therefore the proposed signage is a Non-Complying Activity under Rule 5.5.

Please include an assessment of the signage effects, as well as a S104 gateway test.

Signage Effects:

There are no proposed changes to the signage from the existing situation. The signage colour and design is fitting with the surrounding area and there are no amenity effects. The signage not located within traffic or pedestrian routes and there are no health and safety effects. Therefore, the effects of the signage are less than minor.

S104 Gateway Test:

There are additional restrictions for non-complying activities under the section 104D(1) of the Act.

In order to approve a non-complying activity, Council must be satisfied that either:

- a) *The adverse effects of the activity on the environment (other than any effect to which section 104(3)(a)(ii) applies) will be minor; or*
- b) *The application is for an activity that will not be contrary to the objectives and policies of -*
 - i) *The relevant plan, if there is a plan but no proposed plan in respect of the activity; or*

- ii) *The relevant proposed plan, if there is a proposed plan but no relevant plan in respect of the activity; or*
- iii) *Both the relevant plan and the relevant proposed plan, if there is both a plan and a proposed plan in respect of an activity.*

When making this determination Council:

- must disregard any effects on a person who has provided their written approval to the application; and
- may disregard any adverse effects of the proposed activity if a rule in a plan or national environmental standard permits an activity with that effect.

The potential adverse effects of this proposal have been assessed in section 7 of the submitted application report, where it was concluded that the potential adverse effects will be less than minor.

Additionally, the objectives and policies of the District Plan have been assessed in relation to this application in this report. This assessment concluded that the proposal is not contrary to the relevant objectives and policies.

This application meets the tests of both section 104D(1)(a) and 104D(1)(b) and is therefore appropriate for the application to be determined under section 104B of the Act.

Conclusion

We believe that this sufficiently addresses the request for further information. Please be in touch if you have any questions or need any clarification.

Yours sincerely



Hannah Payne-Harker
Planner