

ORDINARY MEETING

OF

REGULATORY PROCESSES COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Time: 9:30am
Date: Wednesday, 12 August 2020
Venue: Ngake (16.09)
Level 16, Tahiwī
113 The Terrace
Wellington

PRESENT

Councillor Condie (via audio-visual link)
Councillor Free
Councillor Matthews (via audio-visual link)
Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Sparrow (Chair)
Councillor Woolf

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor Pannett (via audio-visual link)
Councillor Foon (via audio-visual link)

TABLE OF CONTENTS
12 AUGUST 2020

| Business | Page No. |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Meeting Conduct | 5 |
| 1.1 Karakia | 5 |
| 1.2 Apologies | 5 |
| 1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations | 5 |
| 1.4 Confirmation of Minutes | 5 |
| 1.5 Items not on the Agenda | 5 |
| 1.6 Public Participation | 5 |
| 2. General Business | 7 |
| 2.1 Postponement of Development Contributions for 15 Alexandra Road (SR359815) | 7 |
| 2.2 Development Contributions Remission for 11 Grenada Drive | 7 |
| 2.3 Traffic Resolutions | 8 |
| 2.4 Proposed Road Closures | 9 |
| 2.5 New Licences for Onslow Cricket Club and Newtown Festival Trust: New Licensees | 11 |
| 2.6 Proposed road stopping - Land adjoining 2 and 4 Rangiora Avenue, Kaiwharawhara, and sale of land under the Local Government (2002) Rating Act. | 12 |

1. Meeting Conduct

1.1 Karakia

The Chairperson declared the meeting open at 9:30 am and invited members to stand and read the following karakia to open the meeting.

**Whakataka te hau ki te uru,
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga.
Kia mākinakina ki uta,
Kia mātaratara ki tai.
E hī ake ana te atākura.
He tio, he huka, he hauhū.
Tihei Mauri Ora!**

Cease oh winds of the west
and of the south
Let the bracing breezes flow,
over the land and the sea.
Let the red-tipped dawn come
with a sharpened edge, a touch of frost,
a promise of a glorious day

1.2 Apologies

Moved Councillor Sparrow, seconded Councillor Woolf

Resolved

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Accept the apologies received from Mayor Foster for early departure.

Carried

Secretarial Note: During the meeting Mayor Foster tendered an apology for absence from the meeting. This apology was accepted.

1.3 Conflict of Interest Declarations

No conflicts of interest were declared.

1.4 Confirmation of Minutes

Moved Councillor Sparrow, seconded Councillor O'Neill

Resolved

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Approves the minutes of the Regulatory Processes Committee Meeting held on 10 June 2020, having been circulated, that they be taken as read and confirmed as an accurate record of that meeting.

Carried

1.5 Items not on the Agenda

There were no items not on the agenda.

1.6 Public Participation

1.6.1 David Greer - Gregarious Properties Limited

David Greer, on behalf of Gregarious Properties Limited, spoke to the meeting regarding Item 2.1 Postponement of Development Contributions for 15 Alexandra Road (SR359815).

1.6.2 Graeme Turley and Matthew Hart - Piringa Development Trust

Graeme Turley and Matthew Hart, on behalf of Piringa Development Trust, spoke to the meeting regarding Item 2.2 Development Contributions Remission for 11 Grenada Drive.

Attachments

- 1 Tabled Document 1
- 2 Tabled Document 2

1.6.3 Raewyn Hailes - CSS Disability Action (Central Region)

Raewyn Hailes, on behalf of CSS Disability Action (Central Region), spoke to the meeting regarding item 2.3 Traffic Resolutions.

1.6.4 Ellen Blake - Living Streets Aotearoa

Ellen Blake, on behalf of Living Streets Aotearoa, spoke to the meeting regarding item 2.3 Traffic Resolutions.

1.6.5 Esther Watt

Esther Watt spoke to the meeting regarding item 2.3 Traffic Resolutions.

Attachments

- 1 Tabled Document

2. General Business

2.1 Postponement of Development Contributions for 15 Alexandra Road (SR359815)

Moved Councillor Sparrow, seconded Councillor Woolf

Resolved

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Agree to postpone development contributions for 12 months, as allowed for in section 2.6 of the 2015-2016 Development Contributions Policy, allowing for the release of the Code of Compliance Certificate for service request number 359815 prior to development contributions being paid.
3. Agrees to this postponement and release of the Code of Compliance Certificate on the understanding that if development contributions are not paid within 12 months, Council Officers will endeavour to secure an encumbrance registered on the relevant title.

Carried

2.2 Development Contributions Remission for 11 Grenada Drive

Moved Councillor Sparrow, seconded Councillor O'Neill

Recommendation/s

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Agree to accept the development contributions remission of \$132,050.66 for water supply on the condition the water connection is reduced to a 50mm connection, a meter and back flow preventer are installed and confirm the development contribution of \$153,767.08 (GST inclusive) is payable by the owner.

Item laid on the table

Moved Councillor Woolf, seconded Councillor Free

Resolved

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Lay on the table the item of business being discussed, and does not discuss the item any further at this meeting, in accordance with standing order 25.2(d).

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 am for morning tea and reconvened at 10:46 am with the following members present: Councillor Condie, Councillor Free, Councillor Matthews, Councillor Pannett, Councillor O'Neill, Councillor Sparrow, Councillor Woolf.

2.3 Traffic Resolutions

Moved Councillor Condie, seconded Councillor Matthews

Resolved

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Approve the following amendments to the Traffic Restrictions, pursuant to the provisions of the Wellington City Council Consolidated Bylaw 2008:
 - a. TR14-20 Guadeloupe Crescent - Give Way and Stop Control
 - b. TR74-20 Highbury Road - No Stopping At All Times
 - c. TR75-20 Landfill Road - No Stopping At All Times
 - d. TR78-20 Cameron Street - No Stopping At All Times
 - e. TR80-20 Tauhinu Road - P120 Parking Restriction & No Stopping Restrictions
 - f. TR81-20 Belfast Street - No Stopping At All Times
 - g. TR82-20 Fernhill Terrace - No Stopping At All Times (Various)
 - h. TR83-20 Raine Street - Extend Loading Zone, Removal of Mobility Park & No Stopping Restriction
 - i. TR85-20 Adelaide Road - Confirmation of P60 Time Restricted Parking; Proposed Emergency Vehicle Stop
 - j. TR86-20 Colway Street - P60 Time Limited Parking Restriction
 - k. TR87-20 Austin & Ellice Street - Bus Stop Time Restrictions
 - l. TR88-20 Kent Terrace - Various Parking Changes
 - m. TR89-20 Park Road - P10 Loading Zone and P120 Parking Restrictions
 - n. TR90-20 Thatcher Crescent - No Stopping At All Times
 - o. TR91-20 Ellice Street - Resident Parking At All Times
 - ~~p. TR106-20 Agra Crescent - Removal of Mobility Park Restriction~~
 - q. TR107-20 Batchelor Street - Time limited and No Stopping At All Times
3. Agree to defer the decision on TR106-20 to a future meeting.
4. Note that officers will submit a traffic resolution for a new time-restricted mobility parking space on the opposite side of Raine Street in the October round of traffic resolutions.
5. Note that changes on Raine St following approval of TR83-20 will only be made once a replacement mobility park has been approved or the following conditions have been agreed by both Countdown and the mall owners:
 - a. A third mobility park is provided
 - b. The mobility parks are closely monitored to ensure they are available for those with mobility permits
 - c. Mobility permit holders are allowed to use these off street parking spaces to access other businesses in the area until a replacement on street mobility parking space can be provided.
6. Note that the operation of TR87-20 and TR88-20 will be monitored and staff will update the portfolio leads and seek feedback from the community after six months.

7. Direct officers to continue to explore possibilities for additional residents parking in the area around Austin & Ellice Street.

Carried

Secretarial Note: The motion moved differed from the recommendations in the officer's report. Changes are highlighted in red.

Secretarial Note: Additional feedback from Ellen Blake, representing Living Streets Aotearoa, on the above traffic resolutions was tabled at the meeting as it was not included in the meeting agenda.

Attachments

- 1 Tabled Document

2.4 Proposed Road Closures

Moved Councillor Sparrow, seconded Councillor Free

Resolved

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Agree to close the following roads and sections of the roads for the events (as listed below) to vehicles and cycles only, subject to the conditions listed in the proposed Road Closure Impact Reports:
 - a. Shelly Bay Sealed Sprint Sunday 4 October 2020 7.00 am to 6.00 pm
 - i. Massey Road (Scorching Bay Reserve to northern entrance to the former Shelly Bay Defence Base) Start line located at Point Gordon.
 - b. Johnsonville Lions Christmas Parade Saturday 5 December 2020 6.00 am to 2.00 pm
 - i. Wanaka Street (6.00 am to 4.00 pm)
 - ii. Dr Taylor Terrace (6.00 am to 1.30 pm)
 - iii. Moorefield Road (between Haumia Street and Johnsonville Road roundabouts – 10.45 am to 12.00 pm)
 - iv. Moorefield Road (between Johnsonville Road and Middleton Road roundabouts – 11.00 am to 12.30 pm)
 - v. Rotoiti Street (closed to through traffic – 11.00 am to 12.30 pm)
 - vi. Broderick Road (Phillip Street to Johnsonville Road – 11.00 am to 12.30 pm)
 - vii. Johnsonville Road (from Fraser Avenue intersection to Moorefield Road roundabout – 11.00 am to 12.30 pm)
 - viii. Frankmoore Avenue (between Earp Street and Moorefield Road – 11.00 am to 12.30 pm)
 - ix. Moorefield Road (western side from Wanaka Street to Frankmoore Avenue). No Parking 6.30 am to 3.00 pm
 - x. No Parking 7.00 am to 1.00 pm - Bannister Avenue, Broderick Road (Bannister Avenue to Phillip Street), Phillip Street, Frankmoore Avenue (Phillip Street to Earp Street), Earp Street.
 - xi. Detour Route - Johnsonville Road, Fraser Avenue, Haumia Street, Bannister Avenue, Broderick Road.
 - xii. Other roads that may be affected - Phillip Street, Earp Street, Ironside Road, Middleton Road and State Highway 1.

- c. Thorndon Fair Sunday 6 December 2020 6.00 am to 6.00 pm
 - i. Tinakori Road (between Bowen Street and Harriett Street)
 - ii. Hill Street (between Tinakori Road and Selwyn Terrace)
- d. Capital City Triathlon Sunday 13 December 2020 7.00 am to 12.00 pm
 - i. Massey Road (Scorching Bay to Shelly Bay Base northern entrance)
- e. Round the Bays Sunday 21 February 2021 6.30 am to 1.00 pm
 - i. Customhouse Quay (southbound lanes, from Whitmore to Jervois Quay) from 6.30 am and 11.00 am.
 - ii. Jervois Quay (southbound lanes from Customhouse Quay to Cable Street) from 6.30 am and 11.00 am.
 - iii. Cable Street (between Jervois Quay and Oriental Parade – with the exception of the right-hand lane which will be open from Chaffers Street to Kent Terrace) from 7.00 am to 11.00 am. The right-hand lane is to remain open allowing traffic from Chaffers New World to turn right into Kent Terrace.
 - iv. Oriental Parade (all of Oriental Parade) from 7.15 am to 11.00 am.
 - v. Oriental Parade and all joining roads (Herd St / Fryberg Pool carpark, Oriental Terrace, Hay Street)
 - vi. Grass Terrace, closed to Carlton Gore Road 7.15 am to 11.00 am.
 - vii. Evans Bay Parade (between Oriental Parade and Cobham Drive) 7.15 am to 12.00 noon.
 - viii. Evans Bay Parade (between Cobham Drive and Kilbirnie Crescent) from 7.15 am to 1.00 pm.
 - ix. Wellington Road (one way east between Crawford Road and Ruahine Street) from 7.15 am to 12.00 pm.
 - x. Shelly Bay Road (all of Shelly Bay Road) 7.30 am to 12.00 noon.
 - xi. Massey Road (between Shelly Bay Road and approximately Point Gordon) from 7.30 am to 12.00 noon.
 - xii. Kilbirnie Crescent / Hamilton Road / Wellington Road intersection to Evans Bay Parade.
 - xiii. Wellington Road intersection, northbound lane closure from 7.15 am to 12.30 pm southbound lane closure 7.15 am to 11.30 pm.
 - xiv. Cobham Drive / Wellington Road intersection. From this intersection to Troy Street roundabout. Full closure from 7.15 am till 11.30 am. This stretch of SH will open as soon as it is safe and practical to do so, with the aim to have it open before the stated time.
 - xv. Hataitai – Taurima St and Goa Street. No entry into Hataitai from 7.15 am to 11.30 am. Traffic can exit from Hataitai.
 - xvi. Wellington Road, east lane closed (making Wellington Road one-way east between Crawford Road roundabout and Ruahine Street), from 7.15 am to 12.00 noon.
 - xvii. Shelly Bay Road, closed between Miramar Avenue and Massey Road – detour in place from 7.30 am to 12.00 noon.
3. Note that recommendations in this report should not be amended without first carrying out further consultation with affected parties and verification from the Council's Traffic Engineer that the amendment is not likely to cause unreasonable impact on traffic.

Carried

2.5 New Licences for Onslow Cricket Club and Newtown Festival Trust: New Licensees

Moved Councillor Sparrow, seconded Councillor O'Neill

Resolved

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Agree to grant one occupation licence for a ten-year term with one renewal term of ten years to Onslow Cricket Club for part of the building known as the Nairnville Recreation Centre on the recreation reserve and legally described as Part Section 4A Harbour District.
3. Note that the licence for the Onslow Cricket Club will include the following Special Provisions:
 - a. The parties acknowledge that the Licensee has contributed to the improvement of the licensed area.
 - b. The Licensee acknowledges that the licence is for non-exclusive use of the space.
 - c. Licensed use will be during the summer season based on the current use by the Club.
 - d. Additional use will be determined annually at the start of each season and will be agreed by both parties.
 - e. A site-specific Health & Safety Plan must be prepared by the Licensee.
4. Agree to grant one garden licence for a five-year term with one right of renewal of five years to Newtown Festival Trust for the land at Carrara Park, Newtown that is legally described as Lot 1 DP 75223.
5. Note that the licence for the Newtown Festival Trust will include the following Special Provisions:
 - a. A site-specific Health & Safety Plan must be prepared by the Licensee.
 - b. The parties acknowledge that there is no water source for the garden at the park, however if one is installed, Council will pay the first \$300 (plus GST, if any) per annum of any water usage costs incurred in relation to the Licensed Use.
 - c. The licensee shall obtain Council approval before putting any new structures on site.
 - d. The parties agree that the licence is not a replacement for any approval or consents needed by the Trust to hold events not related to gardening.
6. Note that approval to grant licences on Reserve Land is conditional on:
 - a. Appropriate iwi consultation
 - b. Public notification as required under sections 119 and 120 of the Reserves Act
 - c. No sustained objections resulting from the above notification
 - d. Legal and advertising costs met by the licensee.

Carried

2.6 Proposed road stopping - Land adjoining 2 and 4 Rangiora Avenue, Kaiwharawhara, and sale of land under the Local Government (2002) Rating Act.

Moved Councillor Sparrow, seconded Councillor Woolf

Resolved

That the Regulatory Processes Committee:

1. Receive the information.
2. Recommend that the Council:
 - a) Declare that approximately 559m² (subject to survey) of unformed legal road land in Rangiora Avenue, Kaiwharawhara, Wellington, shown outlined red on Attachment 2 (the Land), and adjoining 2 and 4 Rangiora Avenue (being Lot 1 DP 484403 held on ROT 686286, and Lot 2 DP 484403 held on ROT 686287) is not required for a public work and is surplus to Council requirements.
 - b) Agree for an application to be made to the Wellington District Court pursuant to sections 77 – 83 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for an order to declare the land at 4D Rangiora Avenue, Kaiwharawhara, Wellington, shown outlined blue on Attachment 3 (Estate land), (being Lot 1 DP 343158 held on ROT 177124) abandoned and authorising Council to sell it.
 - c) Agree to stop and dispose of the Land and dispose the Estate Land referred to above.
 - d) Delegate to the Chief Executive Officer the power to conclude all matters in relation to the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 process and the road stopping and disposal, including all legislative matters, issuing relevant public notices, declaring the road stopped, negotiating the terms of sale or exchange, impose any reasonable covenants, and anything else necessary.
 - e) Note that if objections are received to the road stopping, and the applicant wishes to continue, a further report will be presented to the Regulatory Processes Committee for consideration.
 - f) Note the Estate Land's sale is dependent on the Court's decision.

Carried

The meeting concluded at 11:36 am with the reading of the following karakia:

| | |
|---|--|
| Unuhia, unuhia, unuhia ki te uru tapu nui | Draw on, draw on |
| Kia wātea, kia māmā, te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua | Draw on the supreme sacredness To clear, to free the heart, the body and the spirit of mankind |
| I te ara takatū | |
| Koia rā e Rongo, whakairia ake ki runga | Oh Rongo, above (symbol of peace) |
| Kia wātea, kia wātea | Let this all be done in unity |
| Āe rā, kua wātea! | |

Autheticated: _____

Chair

ORDINARY MEETING

OF

REGULATORY PROCESSES COMMITTEE

MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

Time: 9:30am
Date: Wednesday, 12 August 2020
Venue: Ngake (16.09)
Level 16, Tahiwī
113 The Terrace
Wellington

| Business | Page No. |
|---|-----------------|
| 1.6.2 Graeme Turley and Matthew Hart - Piringa Development Trust | |
| 1. Tabled Document 1 | 2 |
| 2. Tabled Document 2 | 8 |
| 1.6.5 Esther Watt | |
| 1. Tabled Document | 13 |
| 2.3 Traffic Resolutions | |
| 1. Tabled Document | 21 |

Development Contribution Self-Assessment and application for Remission of Levies.

Property

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Address Historical | 11 Grenada Drive, Grenada Village, Wellington 6037 |
| Address Current | 35 Aruba Grove, Grenada Village, Wellington 6037 |
| Legal Description Historic | Lot 2 DP 457689 |
| Legal Description Current | Lot 1 DP 487107 |
| SR Code | 291245 |
| SR Type | Building Consent |
| SR Description | New Church Hall building with car parking and landscaping |
| EHU as Council assessed | 29.13 |

Self-Assessment Overview

Background:

Members of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church (PBCC) are believed to have been living in and practising their faith in Wellington for around 170 years. Written records are not available, but word of mouth carried down through the generations places the arrival of persons associated with or identifying as Brethren in Wellington as being early to mid-1840's. Although public halls and venues have historically been used from time to time – especially for larger gatherings, (and still may be) the PBCC places very high emphasis on owning their own dedicated and purpose built church halls as places of holy worship, prayers for governments and all humanity, preaching of the gospel and Christian teaching. As is typical for the PBCC, the Wellington congregation has a "City Hall" which is central for all members and attended by all members, and a number of "Local Halls" which are distributed in various suburbs where members live. The property in question is the "City Hall" for the PBCC congregation in Wellington and was granted a consent for public use in June 2016.

Project is replacing an existing facility rather than being an additional one for the PBCC in Wellington:

Although the project is indisputably a new development in an area that was historically farmed and more recently part of the WCC Northern Landfill, we believe that in the context of an overview any additional demand placed on the WCC infrastructure in the city of Wellington can be shown to be negligible, as the previous "City Hall" property in Churchill Drive, Crofton Downs, has been disposed of by the PBCC. The congregation numbers in Wellington and the pattern of usage by the congregation has not changed in any material way because of the new venue replacing the previous one. Prior to commencing use of this facility in June 2016, the PBCC used a purpose built facility in Churchill Drive for around 49 years - from 1967 to 2016, and before that in College Street, Te Aro for around 40 years.

Project is not strictly a commercial venture:

Given the obvious reality that the Church Hall is not a residential dwelling it is understandably classified by WCC as a commercial building. The reality is that both the Trust that has developed the property and the Trust that will own and operate it are not-for-profit entities. Although neither Trust is a Registered Charitable Trust as defined by law, both Trusts are approved by IRD to issue receipts for charitable donations and the project has in fact been completed on a non-commercial basis funded by donations and the sale of the previous City Hall property. This means that any Development Levy imposed by WCC will ultimately be funded through donations from persons who already live in Wellington rather than a normal commercial operation. We believe this should be carefully considered by WCC as part of the Self-Assessment/Remission process.

Use of Property is quite unique:

Key to understanding some of the points we will be making further on in our submission is the actual manner in which this property is used by members of the PBCC. Although the Church Hall is in use most days of the week, actual attendance on site is brief and condensed, usually for a period of between 1 hour to 2 hours. Attendees will typically travel to the Hall for the service from a private home and then return immediately after a service is completed. Very little time is spent on site other than for the actual services, which would normally run for around 30 minutes to 60 minutes. Attendees arrive in tidy clothing that is appropriate for a Church service, very often not what they might wear for work or general casual living, and very definitely not what they might wear for sports activities, picnics, or other normal recreational activities. Even where persons may have travelled from outside of the Wellington region to attend a larger gathering, their time spent on site will be constrained and the focus of their visit to Wellington is the church service they are attending.

Scope of Self-Assessment

We wish to seek a review of the development levies as calculated by WCC for Reserves and Roading based on there being no real change or increased demand to the City infrastructure because of the development, our reasoning is expanded below.

We wish to seek a review of the development levies as calculated by WCC for Water Supply and Waste Water based on transparent analysis of actual water usage data, with the maximum expected usage in a 10 year period extrapolated from that data, our data and calculations are presented below.

We do not see any point in reviewing the Storm Water levy as calculated by WCC because it is indisputable that an area of land with natural water run off has been altered by the development and there is now an area of hard seal and roofing from which water run off is collected and piped away for disposal through the City Stormwater system.

Self-Assessment for Contribution to Reserves, City and Zone J

We do not believe this development should carry any burden for the provision of Reserves in the City or in Zone J beyond a nominal contribution of say **1 EHU**

- As outlined above, persons attending a church service are dressed for that purpose and will not have come by way of a reserve or recreational facility or a sports ground nor will they make use of these facilities after the service – they will be going to a private home, usually their own, otherwise to another congregation member’s home for social activities as part of their fellowship with each other.
- An event that might be considered a “maximum in 10 years” will not be materially different in this aspect. The number of attendees will be higher, but people arriving from out of the

Wellington region are most likely to be using coordinated travel arrangements such as chartered coaches and airline flights, and the opportunity to make use of the many recreational facilities in Wellington are unfortunately likely to be minimised at these events rather than increased in any way.

- The normal congregation consists of Wellington residents who will generally be residing in privately owned homes and who may also be commercial property owners/occupants, and therefore already contributing to the many facilities available through their WCC Rates and any developments they may do in their own private or commercial capacity. Asking them to contribute beyond that for Reserves where no nexus can be shown between the development in question and the use of those Reserves is not equitable or justifiable.

Self-Assessment for Contribution to Rooding, City and Zone J

We do not believe this development should carry any burden for the provision of Rooding in the City or in Zone J beyond a nominal contribution of say **1 EHU**

- Regarding the City Rooding infrastructure, the development has not and will not have the effect of increasing demand on the roads in Wellington City.
 - It is in every respect a transfer of a long standing existing use from one established site in Wellington to another site in Wellington.
 - There is no expectation that the development will lead to an increase in the numbers of the Wellington congregation of the PBCC or in the number of locally generated vehicle journeys in Wellington.
 - It will not lead to an increase in visitors to Wellington or in visitor generated vehicle journeys in Wellington.
 - It will not lead to increased wear and tear on Wellington City roads.
 - As noted above, any Development Contribution imposed will ultimately be paid by the members of the congregation and these are longstanding residents of Wellington who will continue going about their daily lives much as they always have done. Asking them to pay an additional levy to support Wellington City rooding infrastructure for the development when they already support the infrastructure through household and commercial rates and it can be shown that the development will not place any increased demand on those roads is not equitable or justifiable.
- Regarding the Zone J Rooding infrastructure, we believe the development will have minimal or negligible effect on roads in that zone.
 - The property is situated immediately adjacent to State Highway 1, on the Western boundary of Zone J
 - The only access to the property is from Aruba Grove, which was built at WCC cost circa 1994 as an un-named private access road to the WCC owned Northern Landfill. The road became known as Aruba Grove circa August 2013 and subsequently became a public road vested with WCC
 - The development uses this long existing roadway as its access and no upgrades or changes have been done in recent years, certainly not since the development commenced. Aruba Grove is a long-standing existing asset long since paid for.
 - No legitimate vehicle movements are possible to the site for any event that do not use Aruba Grove
 - The connection point for Aruba Grove is to what is now known as Grenada Drive, and together these roads connect the development to the SH1 Westchester Interchange.

- In any high usage or maximum usage event it is expected that a *very high* percentage of travel movements to and from the Church Hall will use the short section of Grenada Drive to get between Aruba Grove and the Westchester Interchange.
- Exactly as for Aruba Grove, this short section of Grenada Drive was used as the sole access point for the WCC Northern Landfill which opened in 1994 and closed in 2006, for much of that time it was a dead end street that was blocked off at the landfill access point – there was no public throughway access.
 - We submit that the short section of Grenada Drive that will undeniably be used in any maximum usage event at the Church Hall is a long-standing WCC asset that has long since been paid for.
- We submit that although a maximum usage event will indisputably cause a very short term increase in vehicle movements on these two sections of road in Zone J, they represent such a small part of the overall zone and are not themselves in any sense of the words new or recently developed assets, so that assessing Zone J development contributions for new roads based on the use of those two existing roading sections is not equitable.
- We acknowledge that Zone J in its generality is an area that is undergoing a lot of development – a lot of which is residential – which obviously needs new roading infrastructure, but we submit that this new roading requirement is not caused by or materially affected by the Church Hall development. We also submit that in any maximum event scenario the Church Hall development will not directly benefit to any material degree from new roads in Zone J as the expected transit pathway will be on existing older roads as outlined above.
- As above, we do not believe that asking a *very small* group of private residents in Wellington City to pay additional levies to support new roads in an area simply because their chosen place of worship is just inside the boundary of that area is equitable or justifiable when it can be shown that a maximum usage event will not in fact depend on or make material use of or create the need for those new roads.

Self-Assessment for Contribution to Water Supply in Zone J

We do not believe this development should carry a burden for the provision of Water Supply in Zone J *beyond* what can be shown from available data to be a fair assessment of the actual expected water demand in a maximum event.

- The EHU as assessed is 29.13, which at the WCC mandated rate of 780 litres/day/EHU gives a total expected daily consumption of 22,721 litres.
- As a baseline comparison the actual metered water consumption from 12/02/17 to 04/11/18 inclusive is 135,774 litres.
 - This is a period of 631 days, which gives an average daily consumption of 215 litres which equates to 0.28 EHU
 - This very low average usage is entirely consistent with our expectations based on the way the facility is used as outlined earlier in our submission.
- The self-assessment must be based on the expected maximum daily event in a 10 year period.
 - We do not yet have data available for a maximum event and as these are irregular and not usually forecasted more than say 3-4 weeks ahead, we do not at present know when such data will be available.

- We have therefore based our expected maximum event usage on data from two historical events that were larger than usual although not maximum events.
- Event number 1
 - Date of event was Sunday 12th February 2017
 - Attendees were from Wellington, Hutt, Wairarapa, Horowhenua and Manawatu regions
 - Number of attendees was more or less 1070, which is 0.74 of the design capacity of 1440 attendees.
 - Metered water consumption was 2134 litres in 24 hours, which calculates to 2.74 EHU
 - Allowing for the hall being 0.74 of design capacity, a maximum event could be expected to use 2883 litres, or 3.7 EHU
- Event number 2
 - Date of event was Sunday 4th November 2018
 - Attendees were from Wellington, Hutt and Wairarapa regions
 - Number of attendees was more or less 464, which is 0.32 of design capacity.
 - Metered water consumption was 717 litres, which calculates to 0.92 EHU.
 - Allowing for the hall being 0.32 of design capacity, a maximum event could be expected to use 2240 litres, or 2.9 EHU.
- Considering these two events, it is noteworthy that with more attendees travelling a greater distance for Event 1 the water consumption per attendee is increased, which is exactly what would be expected.
- A maximum event would indisputably have more people travelling a greater distance, so we accept that the water consumption would be higher than the above forecasts. We would also expect to have more people on site than the design capacity, as apart from attendees in the church hall there would also be support personnel on the grounds.
- We submit that if we take the average of the two forecasts above – (3.7 plus 2.9, divided by 2, which equals 3.3) and *doubled* it, we still only have a realistic maximum usage of 6.6 EHU or 5148 litres.
 - Even if WCC was to add a 33% contingency loading to the already doubled figures we still only arrive at a forecasted usage of 6847 litres or 8.78 EHU
- We submit that an EHU contribution for Water Supply in Zone J of say **8 EHU** would be a generous community minded contribution that can be shown to be more than actual forecasted maximum demand.

Self-Assessment for Contribution to Waste Water, City and Zone J

We do not believe this development should carry a burden for the provision of Waste Water for the City or Zone J *beyond* what can be shown from available data to be a fair assessment of the expected maximum demand.

- It is undeniable that the waste water discharged from this development cannot exceed the metered water supply in.
- Referencing the data and calculations above for water supply, we submit that a contribution for Waste Water of 8 EHU would be proper and normal.
- Even if WCC wishes to alter the normal allowance of 390 litres/day/EHU on the basis that most if not all water coming in will also go out as waste, then we submit that the calculation should be based on being no higher than the doubled forecast maximum usage above of 5148 litres / 6.6 EHU which would equate to a Waste Water calculation of 13.2 EHU.

- If we split the difference between 8 EHU and 13.2 EHU we arrive at a figure of 10.6 EHU.
 - We submit that the Waste Water contribution should be set at **8 EHU**, but in the same community minded spirit as above would be happy to accept an assessment of **10.2 EHU**.

We look forward to response from WCC in due course to this application for relief from Development Contribution Levies as originally assessed, based on our calculated self-assessments and our request for remission.

Yours faithfully,

Signed and dated: 29th November 2018



Graeme Turley

Trustee Director

Piringa Development Trust



Royden Power

Trustee Director

Graeme Turley

From: Mark Pattemore <Mark.Pattemore@wcc.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 17 May 2019 3:53 PM
To: Graeme.turley@piringa.co.nz
Cc: Moana Mackey; Julianne Toft
Subject: 11 Grenada Drive - please clarify 4 points

Hi Graeme

Thank you for your previous email with some additional questions. Please, see below the answers for each question you have raised:

1. Regarding the Water and Waste Water levy, comments in your email below include; *"The data and calculations that were provided to us cannot be used in an assessment under the Development Contributions Policy. Discussion about transfer of use does not factor into our assessment, as property previously occupied could be used for another purpose"* and; *"comparing your previous facility (number of attendees) and the amount of metered water it consumed cannot be used to calculate Development Contribution."* Forgive me if I'm reading it wrong, but how I read your comments is that you believe the calculations we made were based on data taken from our old site.

It was clear to us from the dates that the meter reading you provided was taken from the new facility. The statement (*comparing your previous---*) was to advise that data from your previous facility also cannot be used on a pro rata basis to calculate Development Contributions.

- a. For the record, the data we have provided and on which we have based our usage calculations is taken from our current/new site at Aruba Grove and we absolutely stand behind the accuracy and validity of what we have recorded and calculated. The persons attending the site on the two occasions we recorded were completely oblivious to what we were doing – they had no knowledge whatsoever that we were recording water usage and their behaviour and use of water whilst on site was not tainted in any way accordingly.
We are not disputing the water meter reading you provided.
 - b. Our self-assessment for water is based on the widely accepted and understood scientific methodology of actually observing and recording data, then making intelligent and reasonable assumptions or forecasts in a manner that is transparent, testable and repeatable. We could do the same observations time and time again and confidently expect to get the same or very similar results.
The meter readings you provided cannot be used for assessment under the Development Contributions Policy. The Policy requirement is that the development shall be assessed for demand created by the most intensive non-residential uses of the development likely to become established.
 - c. Question number 1 is: Were you aware that our data was taken from our new site or did you believe it was historical data from our old site?
We can confirm, that it was clear to us that the meter reading you provided was taken from the new facility, based on the dates.
2. If WCC incorrectly believed the data was from our old site, are you now prepared to reconsider our application in the light of it actually being relevant to our new/current site?
WCC understands that the data was from the new site.

3. If you were already aware it was from our new site (or now that you are aware of this) and you still believe our data is not relevant, could you please explain why it is not relevant – why a water meter cannot be used to calculate or forecast expected usage of water?

We are not in a position to use the data you provided because it provides the water usage and not the potential water demand created. It is not possible to calculate intensive use of the development from metered water reading. In the context of water supply, intensive use means water demand required for all the water use fixtures in the development to operate without adverse interruption at any time. Furthermore the development is being provided with a 50mm water connection which will provide 3.9l/sec flow rate of water at a velocity of 2m/sec (maximum design velocity is 3m/s). This flow rate is slightly higher the nominal water flow rate 3.5l/sec that we calculated. This means the Council has an obligation to make available 24/7 this flow rate water (3.9l/sec) for the development to draw from its water infrastructure.

4. Brownfield versus greenfield – can you please confirm for us that WCC does not only apply Development Contributions to a greenfield development, but will also normally apply them where there is an actual or perceived increased demand for infrastructure arising from any re-development?

Yes, this is correct, there is no differentiation. However, the fees are different from one area of the city to another.

Please let me know if you wish to discuss or clarify further.

Kind Regards
Mark

Mark Pattemore

Manager City Consenting & Compliance | Wellington City Council
P +64 4 801 3472

E Mark.pattemore@wcc.govt.nz | W Wellington.govt.nz  

The information contained in this email is privileged and confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are asked to respect that confidentiality and not disclose, copy or make use of its contents. If received in error you are asked to destroy this email and contact the sender immediately. Your assistance is appreciated.



From: Mark Pattemore <Mark.Pattemore@wcc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 29 April 2019 11:17 AM
To: Graeme.turley@piringa.co.nz
Cc: Julianne Toft <Julianne.Toft@wcc.govt.nz>; Moana Mackey <Moana.Mackey@wcc.govt.nz>; Kristina Kolpashnikova <Kristina.Kolpashnikova@wcc.govt.nz>
Subject: 11 Grenada Drive

Hi Graeme

Thanks for your time on the phone just now. First of all, our apologies for not acknowledging your self-assessment for remission of levies in a detailed manner at an earlier point.

We appreciate you taking the time to gather all the information and sending it to us.

Below is our feedback for each of the points stated in your remission application.

Background:

We appreciate that you have explained to us the context of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church (PBCC). This provides us with a better understanding of the importance of your work with the community.

The project is replacing an existing facility rather than being an additional one for the PBCC in Wellington:

We understand that the previous church hall in Churchill Drive, Crofton Downs, is longer used by the Church, however, from Council's perspective the building still exists (even though in different form) and is still dependant on the city's infrastructure. Thus, the new development in Grenada Drive additionally impacts on the city's infrastructure.

The project is not strictly a commercial venture:

The Development Contributions Policy does not address whether projects are a 'normal commercial operation', or not. All projects that increase the load on the WCC infrastructure are assessed for Development Contribution without discretion for non-for-profit or charitable status.

Use of Property is quite unique:

The Development Contribution Policy does not take into consideration the length of time people are using the facility and how many people will stay longer after the service as well as where they are coming from and their destination afterwards.

Scope of Self-Assessment:

Reserves

You wish to have the Reserves and Roothing levies in the Development Contribution reviewed as you consider that there will be no real change or increased demand to the WCC infrastructure.

As per s12.1.11 and 12.1.12 of the Development Contribution Policy, Citywide reserves comprise amenities such as Botanic Gardens and open spaces. They are destinations that provide active recreational facilities to the city community. Increased demand can come from anywhere within the city. Growth impacts on these amenities in a number of ways including quality of the amenity, potential overcrowding, changes in activities and usage by residents. Capital works are continually required to upgrade these reserves to enable increased usage and to purchase new land and assets. Works are planned to cater for growth to ensure cost effective use of the Council's resources and assets.

As per 12.2.12 of the Development Contribution Policy, current reserve management policies indicate that other areas are adequately provided with local reserves and open space (except for citywide reserves). As further reserve management plans are developed, new local reserves may be required in established suburbs as a result of infill development growth.

Roothing and traffic levy:

The roading and traffic levy under the Development Contribution Policy treats the transport network as a whole, and therefore provides for expected growth across the network. By adopting the citywide approach it provides a more equitable distribution of the overall costs for developing the transport network to meet the demands of new development. The levy merely covers the additional expenditure Council incurs to maintain the current level of service, taking into account growth.

While the development may only use a small part of the network to access the Church, it is expected that the congregation would use the wider network to make trips to and from the Church from their homes and businesses. While these trips may essentially be similar trips to those made

to the previous premises in this instance, they are considered new trips to a new generator, because the previous site is now being utilised by a new user.

As for the catchment levy for roading and traffic, that represents the same approach to the recovery of the investment in growth. However, this component of the levy is specifically targeted to investment that addressed growth in an identified catchment or area, where the benefits can be directly attributed to users in that area. Area J is a growth node, and considerable investment has been made and will continue to be made in this area by Council to facilitate growth.

While again you suggest that your Church users only use a very small portion of the roading infrastructure, these costs have been aggregated over the full development of the area. Therefore, Development Contributions for your development contribute to its share of that overall cost. Similarly, your short term use of your facilities does not factor into the assessment, because the overriding consideration in this instance is the regular use of the facility that generate the trips on the network.

Considering all factors, the roading and traffic levies applied under the Policy are considered fair and reasonable for your development, and we do not consider there are any grounds for a remission of these levies.

Water and waste water:

You wish to have the Water Supply and Waste Water levies in the Development Contribution reviewed using the data and calculations you provided.

The data and calculations that were provided to us cannot be used in an assessment under the Development Contributions Policy. Discussion about transfer of use does not factor into our assessment, as property previously occupied could be used for another purpose. The new development enables potential growth in the City and is therefore assessed accordingly.

The Policy requirement is for water supply levies to be calculated considering the size of the development (by area) equivalent which in turn is converted to number of Equivalent Household units (EHUs). The levies charged are based on the demand created by the most intensive non-residential uses of the development likely to become established.

This means that in our assessment we have to take into account that the development can be occupied by 1,440 people for 4 to 8 hours. As such, comparing your previous facility (number of attendees) and the amount of metered water it consumed cannot be used to calculate Development Contribution.

Recognising the new development can be occupied by 1,440 people, we have assessed the development on the likely peak loading that could impose on our water and waste water network. This loading is a new impact on our network as a result of this development. We calculated the probable maximum water flow rate required for all the water use fixtures in the development as well as nominal flow rate required for these fixtures to function without adverse interruption. The maximum water flow required is 20 litres per second (20l/sec) and nominal flow rate required is 3.5 litres per second (3.5l/sec). If the development was occupied for 4 hours, the expected nominal flow is 50,400 litres, which is equivalent to 64 EHUs consumption (50,400/780 where 780 is EHU consumption of litres per day). This illustrates that in Council opinion, the development is not overcharged for water or waste water component of the development contribution.

This explanation was provided to us by our professional advisors who use their own guidelines and policies. If you would like to clarify anything further, please advise and we can arrange further conversation with the relevant advisor.

Based on the explanation above, a waiver of fees is not considered necessary.

However, if you wish to take this further, you may request that the matter be discussed further at a Regulations Committee Hearing. At the Hearing, you would have the opportunity to explain to the

Councillors why you think the fees should be waived, may present any documents supporting your case and answer their questions. If you wish to pursue please advise and this can be arranged. Should you have further questions, please, do not hesitate to contact Kristina Kolpashnikova on 021 227 9049 or at Kristina.kolpashnikova@wcc.govt.nz 021 227 9049

Kind Regards
Mark

Mark Pattemore
Manager City Consenting & Compliance | Wellington City Council
P +64 4 801 3472

E Mark.pattemore@wcc.govt.nz | W Wellington.govt.nz |  

The information contained in this email is privileged and confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are asked to respect that confidentiality and not disclose, copy or make use of its contents. If received in error you are asked to destroy this email and contact the sender immediately. Your assistance is appreciated.



24 May 2019

LINDSEY HILL
BY EMAIL: LINDSEY.HILL@WCC.GOV.T.NZ
RE: PROPOSED TRAFFIC RESOLUTION TR 65-19
BUS STOP NEAR 72-86 ELLICE STREET

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission on the proposed extension to the parking restrictions in the bus stop near 72-86 Ellice Street.

We wish to record our objection to the extension of the bus stop times, for the reasons outlined below.

The WCC Parking Policy

The WCC Parking Policy (**Policy**) states that, in inner residential areas "On-street parking is primarily to support residents' parking. However, this needs to be balanced with the needs of local retailers, community, educational institutions and recreational facilities, commuter parking and the need to allow the efficient movement of vehicles at peak times."

The key parts of the Policy that guide the Council's decision regarding the proposed restriction extension in this location are therefore that:

- The primary consideration is supporting residents' parking;
- That is to be balanced against the secondary considerations relevant to this location, being educational institutions, commuter parking, and efficient movement of vehicles at peak times.

The current location and impact of the bus stop

The bus stop currently sits across eight properties on Ellice Street. Some of these are multi-dwelling properties. The bus stop currently operates for 45 minutes at peak time in the morning, from 8 am to 8.45 am and 30 minutes in the mid-afternoon, from 3 pm to 3.30 pm. The bus stop has a significant impact on the residents of these properties. Residents are unable to park outside their houses, or the adjoining properties during these times. The

Residents of 72, 76, 78 and 82A Ellice Street, Wellington 6011

operation of the bus stop prevents both residents and commuters parking cars outside these properties for the duration of a normal work day.

Four of eight of these properties have garages or driveways that require access across the current location of the bus stop. The residents of at least three of these houses include school aged children. Accordingly, in order to transport children to school, the residents of these properties need to move vehicles off and on their properties twice a day, at the very times when the bus stop is currently in operation.

This is inefficient for both the residents and the buses. The buses are required to move from the bus stop to allow these residents to access or leave their properties. In many cases, the buses simply pull out into the middle of the street and wait there. This creates congestion along Ellice Street, making it impossible and/or unsafe for vehicles to pass and pedestrians to cross the road.

Moreover, the operation of the bus stop means that the off-street parks on the affected properties are difficult to use. Accordingly, the vehicles at these properties often need to occupy an on-street park in a high demand area, where those on-street parks could be more efficiently used for other residents or commuters.

It is, of course, accepted that bus stops are necessary to allow Wellington East Girls College (WEGC) students to be dropped off and collected from school. However, the current location of the bus stop fails to balance the considerations under the Policy appropriately.

There are several alternative locations that would more appropriately balance the requirements of the Policy. In particular, these locations would have significantly less negative impact on the primary aim of the policy, being to support residents' parking. They would also better support the secondary aims of efficient and safe movement of vehicles at peak times, and commuter parking. Examples of alternative locations that would better comply include;

- The Austin Street locations where buses wait, but the students of WEGC do not appear to board or disembark the buses. Fewer or none of these properties have right of ways or garages that require access across the bus stop;

- Further down Ellice Street towards the Basin Reserve, where there are significantly fewer properties that would require access across the bus stop. For example, between 58 and 68 Ellice Street. In that location only one property would require access to a right of way or garage. There is no increased risk to the WEGC students, because they would not be required to cross a road to access the buses;
- The North side of Ellice Street, between 53 and 63 Ellice Street, where there are no properties that would require access across the bus stop. The safety of students crossing the road could be addressed by the installation of a pedestrian crossing.
- On Austin Street between Ellice Street and Paterson Street, closer to WEGC. This would better meet the needs of WEGC and its students.

We request that the Council considers these alternative locations for the bus stop in the light of the purposes and considerations of its Policy, and provides us with reasons for its decision.

Current use of the bus stop by the buses

Since 2013, the bus stop restrictions have already extended from 15 minutes in the morning and afternoon to 45 minutes.

Despite this, the buses arrive significantly earlier than the times that the bus stop is now in operation. The buses tend to arrive at 2 pm, an hour before the current restriction begins at 3 pm. The buses park in the bus stop for long periods of time, contrary to the parking designations and the intention of the bus stop. Requests for the drivers to move the buses so that residents can access garages and right of ways are regularly met with negative responses.

Moreover, the bus drivers have informed us that because their shifts begin at 2 pm, they use the bus stop as a layover. This occurs even on days where WEGC students are not in attendance. The Policy does not envisage the use of high demand, inner residential, on-street parking by bus companies as a de facto bus station while drivers wait to begin their routes, whether for significant periods (of say more than 10 minutes), or at all.

In these ways, the bus drivers are already misusing the bus stop. In doing so they:

- prevent residents' access to right of ways and garages;
- unlawfully occupy on-street parks that could be used by residents and commuters for the period during which the bus stop is not in operation;
- create unnecessary demand on on-street parks by preventing residents with off-street parking from accessing those facilities.

The statement that "Net Parking Loss:0" is inaccurate

During the period where the bus stop is not in operation, the area between 72 and 86 Ellice Street operates as Coupon Parking. It provides parking for approximately seven cars. All of those spaces are regularly filled between the bus stop operation times.

Mt Victoria is a high density inner-residential area. Commuters who park on Ellice Street and walk to town also use the limited on-street parking. Demand is high.

The effect of extending the proposed time restrictions will be to further reduce the availability of these Coupon car parks. For the reasons outlined below, the benefits to be gained by the extension, as outlined in the proposal, are in our submission minimal and overstated. The negative impact produced by a significant further reduction in the availability of these parking spaces far outweighs the potential benefit.

The proposed extension of time is disproportionate and unnecessary

The arrival times of the buses shown in the consultation documents show that the proposed extension of time is disproportionate and unjustified.

Morning restrictions

The earliest arrival time for a bus into the bus stop is 8.15 am. That is only one bus: the 734. It is seldom that any cars are parked in the bus stop during the period of the current restriction. It is unlikely that the space required for a single bus to use the bus stop will be unavailable, even if one or two cars are parked in the bus stop contrary to the current restrictions.

The remainder of the buses arrive at or after 8.30 am. The proposed extension of the restriction to 7.30 am is therefore not rationally connected to the space required for the buses.

The reasonableness of the proposed extension must be viewed in light of the fact that a normal work day begins at 8.30 am. The current restriction, beginning at 8 am, already significantly restricts the ability of residents to use the car parks located in the bus stop. Residents are required to ensure that their cars are moved to other on-street parks much earlier than would be necessary for those residents to travel to work. Failure to do so results in a significant fine.

An extension of the limit to begin at 7.30 am would effectively render these parks unavailable for overnight use by residents; many people are not close to leaving their house at 7.30 am, and may not yet be awake. The proposed extension to 7.30 am is disproportionate to the advantages that Parking Services asserts will be gained.

Afternoon extension

For similar reasons, the proposed extension of the restriction in the afternoons is unjustified and disproportionate.

The only day that buses arrive earlier than 3.30 pm is on a Wednesday. There is no rational justification for extending the bus stop operation times on the remaining four days of the week.

The purported benefits of the extension are minimal and overstated

The consultation document states that the reason for the extension is concern from Parking Services related to the time between receiving a complaint and having the vehicle towed. It is submitted that these concerns:

- Do not reflect what is occurring in practice;
- Are overstated;
- Are insufficient to warrant an extension of the restriction, having regard to the Policy.

The reality of what is occurring

Most mornings, 15 minutes before the bus stop restriction begins, at least two Parking Wardens may be observed waiting at the bus stop to issue infringement notices to cars. The concern that there is “only 15 minutes to ticket a vehicle” therefore misrepresents the reality of what is occurring within the current restrictions; infringement notices are being issued immediately when the restriction begins.

The benefit to be gained is overstated

Parking Services' concerns, as outlined in the consultation documents, appear to be overstated. While we do not have the statistics, our observation as residents is that the frequency with which cars are parked in the bus stop during restrictions is low. The bus stop fits four buses end to end. The times at which it is filled to capacity, and the buses cannot work around the odd car, are restricted to a few minutes at each end of the school day.

Having regard to these factors, it is submitted that the negative effect of the proposed extension on residents and the availability of on-street parking significantly outweighs the problem of cars contravening the restrictions.

Moreover, the location of the bus stop is central to the city and its attendant services. Jamieson's Tow Service, which we understand holds the towing contract for the Council, is located on Ohiro Road, a nine minute drive from Ellice Street, according to google maps.

If cars are parked in the bus stop that need to be towed this can be addressed by parking wardens notifying towing services immediately upon the bus stop restrictions coming into operation. Alternatively the towing company may be put on notice slightly before the restriction takes place to ensure a towing service is available to attend within 15 minutes.

In short, the inference to be drawn is that the extension is aimed at increased revenue gathering for Parking Services. This is not a relevant consideration under the WCC Parking Policy.

Summary

For the above reasons, it is submitted that:

- The location of the bus stop should be shifted to align with the purposes of the Parking Policy;
- The statement that the extension will result in no loss of on-street parking is inaccurate; and
- The negative impact of the proposed extension to the restriction on residents and commuters is disproportionate to the potential benefit to be gained.

The Proposed Traffic Resolution should not be passed.

We are happy to address the Council in person on any aspect of this submission, should that be of assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Esther Watt and Roger Shortt
72 Ellice Street
esther.watt@stoutstreet.co.nz

Rebecca Mclean
76 Ellice Street
becmclean23@gmail.com

Cilla and Peter Bennett
78 Ellice Street
cillab1975@gmail.com

Peter O'Kane
82a Ellice street
okanepeter@yahoo.com

Feedback from Ellen Blake of Living Streets Aotearoa:

TR87-20 Austin and Ellice Street and TR88-20 Ken Terrace are supported - no Officers response.

TR 87-20 Austin and Ellice St

Living Streets supports the change to bus stop operation to support school access.

TR 88-20 Kent Terrace

Living Streets supports the change to intermittent bus parking, motorbike parking and loading zone. These areas will need regular enforcement to work. We understand that some business in this area regularly park on the footpath to unload.

TR107-20 Batchelor Street feedback and Officers response:

Living Streets object to this traffic resolution to narrow a footpath and provide mountable kerbs, this does not meet the minimum requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide. There is no information about how many pedestrians use this area although as it is in the Newlands centre, near the community centre, the Kurinchi Kumaran Temple, the pub and the supermarket we expect this to be a busy footpath.

We note there is inadequate pedestrian crossing facilities along this road, with only one kerb drop down near and considerably offset from Stewart Drive.

We note there is ample parking in many nearby places. Increasing traffic speeds by removing the need to slow down for vehicle traffic does not improve safety for pedestrians. Other solutions to reduce parking along this road in this parking-rich area while retaining the current footpath widths should be found.

A solution for a medical centre should support walking and physical activity with adequate footpaths. How do these proposals align with Wellington City Council's Te Atakura Plan and proposed parking policy?

We would like to be heard in support of our submission.

Officers Response:

The footpath is being diverted around the back of the proposed layby parking. The footpath will be constructed to the WCC Code of Practice to a width of 1.5m. There will be a very short section of 1.2m to maintain the footpath completely on the road reserve.

Road safety will be improved:

- The proposed layby parking addresses the current two-way along a one lane operation and the associated road safety concerns on this part of the road network adjacent to the intersection with Bracken Road.
- There is a new multi-unit residential development on Batchelor Street and we need to address the potential road safety issues with the additional traffic flow.