

**Before the Independent Hearings Panel
At Wellington City Council**

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of Hearing submissions and further submissions on the
Proposed Wellington City District Plan

**Right of reply of Andrew Wharton on the Transport Chapter and transport
topics on behalf of Wellington City Council**

Date: 19 July 2024

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Andrew Wharton. I am employed as a Team Leader in the District Plan Team at Wellington City Council (the Council).
- 2 The Section 42A Transport Report section 1.3 sets out my qualifications and experience as an expert in planning.
- 3 I confirm that I am continuing to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023, as applicable to this Independent Panel hearing.

SCOPE OF REPLY

- 4 This reply follows Hearing Stream 9 held between 10 and 14 June 2024. It responds to the Panel's request for comments/information from the Transport Chapter reporting officer in Minute 51: Stream 9 Hearing Follow Up (4)(c)(i)-(vi).
- 5 This reply also addresses other questions and points raised by the Panel and from submitter presentations at Hearing Stream 9, and recommends a few minor corrections.
- 6 I show my Right of Reply recommended changes in **orange text**, and further minor alterations/correcting minor errors in **purple text**.

MINUTE 51 TRANSPORT QUESTIONS

(i) As regards TR-R2:

- *Query the merits of identifying what the reference in R2.2(a) to 'the activity' is referring to and whether more specific reference to vehicle trip generation created by upgrades to service stations and drivethrough retail operations is required;*

- *In relation to the suggested information requirement, what is Mr Wharton’s view as to the merits of stating specifically that the detail and scope of an integrated traffic assessment needs to be proportionate to the complexity of the proposal and its traffic context;*

7 As discussed at Hearing Stream 9 and from Ms McPherson’s evidence, “the activity” is intended to be within the context of the TR-R2 title: **Vehicle trip generation**. This is explained in my [supplementary evidence](#) in para 24 as “changes to service stations that do not affect vehicle trip generation to the transport network would have existing use rights under RMA Section 10 if the effects of the use (in this case, vehicle trip generation) are the same or similar in character, intensity and scale. Such changes would not require resource consent under TR-R2.”

8 I agree that more specific phrasing would clarify that a resource consent for vehicle trip generation should only be required when the vehicle trip generation from a service station or a drive-through activity is increased. This would address part of the Fuel Companies’ concern. I therefore recommend the following changes:

TR-R2	<u>Vehicle Trip</u> generation	
	Airport Zone’s Terminal Precinct , or East Side Precinct or South Coast Precinct	<u>1.</u> Activity status: Permitted
	All Zones except Airport Zone’s Terminal Precinct, East Side Precinct or South Coast Precinct	<u>2.</u> Activity status: Permitted Where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Compliance with TR-S1 is achieved; and e. The <u>activity any increase in vehicle trip generation</u> is not <u>from</u>: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. a service station; or ii. a drive-through activity.

9 My position on the merits of stating specifically in the TR-R2.3 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirement that it be proportionate to the complexity of the proposal and its traffic context is set out below. Firstly, I note that proportionality is already part of:

- [RMA Schedule 4\(2\)\(3\)\(c\)](#) Information required in an application for resource consent. This states the application must include an assessment “that includes such detail as corresponds with the scale and significance of the effects that the activity may have on the environment”;
- [Research Report 422: Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines](#) section 5.1 which states: “The level of detail covered by a transport assessment and the nature of the assessment needed for a particular issue will depend on the particular circumstances of each site to a significant degree.” It then explains how this level of detail may vary for different situations and circumstances;
- My Section 42A Transport Rec20 change to TR-P1.2 that high vehicle trip generating activities can provide for non-vehicle modes “at an appropriate scale to the nature of the high vehicle trip generating activity”; and
- The everyday practice of the Wellington City Council team assessing vehicle trip generation, as explained by Ms Wood in Hearing Stream 9.

10 With this proportionality explicit in the legislative and technical documents, and evident through current practice, I do not therefore consider it is necessary for the TR-R2.3 information requirement to specify that it must be proportionate to the activity’s complexity. Conversely, this addition would not be a problem for the information requirement either. If the Panel supported an addition, the following text in italics and underlined may be useful as an option. I have not included the new text in Appendix A to this Right of Reply as it is not my recommendation.

Section 88 information requirements for applications:
--

Applications under Rule TR-R~~1.2.a~~2.3 must provide an Integrated Transport Assessment by a suitably qualified transport engineer or transport planner. The Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency guidelines “Research Report 422: Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines, November 2010” should be used to inform any Integrated Transport Assessment. *The detail and scope of the Assessment needs to be proportionate to the complexity of the vehicle trip generation from the site in context with the surrounding transport network.*

(ii) Can Mr Wharton please consider both the readability and clarity of the tables of the Transport Chapter (in the case of Table 7 for example, that might include clarification as to the zones within which the notified standards apply) and whether he considers there is merit and scope to amend them to address those issues;

11 Hearing Stream 9 identified that Table 7 in particular was confusing about which standards applied in which zones. I also acknowledge and apologise that the overall readability of many of the tables in my Section 42A Transport Appendix A was hindered by converting the wide, readable landscape tables in the Proposed District Plan (PDP) [ePlan Transport Chapter](#) into the narrow portrait of a PDF document, especially for Table 9.

12 I consider Table 7 could be clarified as shown in Appendix A, and separately in Appendix B in landscape view, by moving the first row content about short-stay parking in commercial and mixed use zones to the top of the Table. In Appendix A, I have moved Table 7 and Table 9 into landscape-orientation to improve their readability.

13 I also recommend a small change at the top of Table 7 (as shown separately in Appendix B) as follows:

- short-stay cycle/micromobility parking in these commercial and mixed use zones is not required if the only short-stay parking on-site is mobility parking or loading bays; and

- the minimum short-stay cycle parking is the *lesser* of the TR-7 standards *or* the number of car parks provided (excluding mobility parks and loading bays).

14 These changes add a nuance to my recommendation¹ on Living Streets Aotearoa and Waka Kotahi’s request for there to be at least as many cycle/micromobility parks as car parks on a site. It also accounts for the concern raised in Hearing Stream 9 that if a site provides only one or two short-stay car parking spaces, the *entire* PDP short-stay cycle parking standard applies even if there is no space for this.

(iii) In relation to TR-01.3, query whether this sub-objective needs to be reframed to make it clear that it depends on whether onsite parking is required rather than as at present, implying that on-site parking is required, contrary to NPSUD Policy 11;

15 I understand this query applies to TR-01.5. I agree with the Panel’s suggestion that this objective implies that on-site car parking should be provided. I recommend the following re-phrasing to remove the implication.

TR-01 Purpose

Land use and development is managed to ensure that:

1. High trip generating activities do not compromise the safety and effectiveness of the transport network;
2. A range of transport modes are provided for;
3. Reliance on private vehicles is reduced;
4. New development provides appropriate on-site facilities for cycling and micromobility users; and
5. ~~Safe and effective functional on-site parking, loading, access and manoeuvring is provided.~~ Any parking, loading, access and manoeuvring areas provided on-site are safe and functional.

¹ Refer to paras 232 and 233 in my [Section 42A Report](#) for Hearing Stream 9 – Transport.

(iv) Can Mr Wharton please clarify the apparent inconsistency between his Section 42A Report at paragraph 180 and the suggested amendments to the Transport Chapter in Appendix A?

20 The Panel is correct – my Section 42A Transport report Appendix A shows an amendment in TR-P3.1 when I do not recommend this in paras 180 and 184 of my report. TR-P3.1 should remain as notified with its original text.

TR-P3 Managed activities

Only allow on-site transport facilities and driveways that do not meet standards where:

1. The transport facilities and driveways are **effective** in meeting the operational needs and functional needs of the activity on the site.

(v) Query whether the suggested amendment to TR-P2.4 requires clarification to better express the intended meaning;

21 I agree that the new TR-P2.4 can be clarified. I recommend connecting it with TR-P2.3 as shown below. At Hearing Stream 9, the Panel queried the meaning of the term “substantial buildings” so I suggest amending this to be more specific to the >10 additional parks in Table TR-7A.

TR-P2 Enabled activities

Enable on-site transport facilities and driveways that:

1. Provide for the safe and **effective functional** use of the site and functioning of the transport network;
2. Meet the reasonable demands of site users; and
3. Promote the uptake and use of pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport modes; **and including by providing:**

a. sheltered, convenient and secure parking for cycles and micromobility devices; and

b. showers and lockers where commercial, tertiary education and healthcare developments require more than ten additional long-stay cycle/micromobility device parks.

4. Provide parking for cycles and micromobility devices that is sheltered, convenient and secure, and end-of-journey showers and lockers for staff in new substantial buildings for commercial, tertiary education and healthcare activities.

(vi) Can Mr Wharton please advise the Council's view on the merits of the Plan providing direction about giving priority to use of native species as street trees, either generally, or with specific reference to the list of species provided by Mr Horne;

22 Mr Anderson's [Section 42A Infrastructure report](#) para 384 stated: "The street trees list in Table 3 – Inf have been reviewed by Council parks and reserves offices, include a number of indigenous species, but also needs to provide for a range of species as different species will be more appropriate in different locations. I am informed that while it would be desirable to have solely indigenous species, this is not always possible."

23 The Council has biodiversity policy actions² to support use of native tree species on streets where they are suitable and practicable, and if they encourage native birds to move between ecosystems.

24 I have discussed with Council staff in the transport, parks and resource consenting teams about their processes for selecting street trees in new roads. They concur with Mr Anderson's findings that Council can use native trees where suitable, but many species of native trees are not suitable as street trees. They want the ability for Council to be able to decline a particular tree in a particular location if the canopy size, the maintenance, the root structure or the supporting ecosystem are not a good fit and could cause subsequent problems for the Council as the tree owner in the future. For example, if the tree canopies would strike passing buses, if roots could invade nearby water pipes, if the trees need

² [Our Natural Capital – Wellington's biodiversity strategy and action plan 2015](#) – refer in particular to actions 2.1.3.g, 2.4.1.c, 4.2.4.c, 11.2.4 guideline 14, 11.4.5.

wind shelter from other plants, or if they would cause problems with street maintenance. Alternatively the Council may approve a native street tree but with conditions such as an effective root box or a road setback.

25 Living Streets Aotearoa's supplementary evidence on native trees and shrubs to add into INF-Table 3 says the list is subject to advice from people with experience in planting trees in urban areas, and with detailed knowledge of the underground infrastructure. When I talked with Council street tree expert Oliver Pease, in his opinion only a few of the trees on this list would actually be suitable for a street environment. Many grow slowly, and when they get to full size they may be too large or the road environment may have changed. The trees on Living Streets Aotearoa's list may be suitable in other urban environments such as in local parks or hillside plantings.

26 The Council has a large database of native and exotic trees for public spaces, and where and how they are best planted in different urban environments: linear streets, large parks, narrow spaces, low light, high wind, etc. When deciding on trees for a new street the local conditions and nearby vegetation are very important to select the right tree for the right location.

27 As an aside, the PDP's Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter is focused on protecting identified significant natural areas, and encouraging protection and restoration of native biodiversity areas. It does not cover street trees. SRCC-01 "supports healthy functioning of native ecosystems and natural processes", but urban street trees are generally not part of this.

28 In conclusion, I do not support adding the native species from Living Streets Aotearoa's list into INF-Table 3 Street Tree Species List. Instead, I recommend removing INF-Table 3 entirely, and specifying tree species and conditions on tree planting as matters of discretion for new roads. This will give the Council the scope to advise on planting native trees

along new roads where it is appropriate. This change fits in the current rule framework because unlike other standards, INF-S13 does not determine an activity status. Instead, INF-S13 is already only a matter of discretion to align with for INF-R25.1 New Roads.

29 For the Panel's reference, I do not recommend removing INF-Table 2. Table 2 sets the baseline requirements for the numbers and sizes of street trees on new roads. Living Streets Aotearoa is only asking for more native tree species instead of exotic tree species along roads. My recommendations facilitate this by giving Council control over species that are appropriate and over effects on infrastructure.

30 I therefore recommend the following changes to INF-S13, INF-Table 2 and INF-Table 3:

INF-R~~2325~~ New roads

1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

a. Compliance is achieved with the following standards:

i. INF-S3;

ii. INF-S~~1618~~; and

iii. Compliance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS6806:2010 Acoustics — Road Traffic Noise — New and Altered Roads.

Clause iii shall apply only to new roads predicted to carry at least 2,000 annual average daily traffic (AADT) at the design year. In circumstances where NZS6806:2010 Acoustics — Road Traffic Noise — New and Altered Roads does not apply, as listed in paragraph 1.3.1 of NZS6806:2010 Acoustics — Road Traffic Noise — New and Altered Roads.

Matters of discretion are:

1. The classification of the proposed road and how the proposed [road](#) aligns with INF-S~~1213~~; and
2. Design of the road; and

3. Number, species and location of street trees, and any other planting conditions.

INF-S123 Design of roads

6. Street trees must be provided in accordance with:
- c. When street trees are required in accordance with Table 1 — INF: Design of Roads — One Network Framework, they must be provided in accordance with the number of trees per Size Class at Maturity set out in Table 2 — INF: Street Trees and species in accordance with Table 3 — INF: Street Tree Species List;

Table 2 – INF: Street Trees
Size class at maturity (Stem diameter at 1.5m above ground)
<300mm <u>Tree species must be selected from the list in Table 3 — INF: Street Tree Species List</u>
300 - 600mm <u>Tree species must be selected from the list in Table 3 — INF: Street Tree Species List</u>

~~**Table 3 — INF: Street Tree Species List** [delete whole table]~~

OTHER POINTS RAISED DURING HEARING STREAM 9

South Coast Precinct reference for TR-P1

31 My supplementary evidence supported Ms O’Sullivan’s evidence that the Airport Zone’s South Coast Precinct should be excluded from TR-S1 thresholds. Commissioner Black pointed out that my Section 42A Transport report HS9-TR-Rec20 recommends adding provisions to enable high vehicle trip generation in the Airport Zone’s Terminal Precinct and East Side Precinct. If the South Coast Precinct is added in TR-S1, TR-P1 should have this reference as well. I agree this

consequential change should be made following Ms O’Sullivan’s request for Wellington International Airport.

TR-P1 High vehicle trip generation ~~ong-use-and-development~~

Provide for high vehicle trip generating activities where they:

1. Safely and effectively integrate with the transport network, including planned network upgrades and service improvements; and
2. Provide for pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport modes at an appropriate scale to the nature of the high vehicle trip

generating activity;

Or

3. Are in the Airport Zone’s Terminal Precinct, ~~or~~ East Side Precinct or South Coast Precinct.

Explanation on ramp gradient limit

32 The Panel found para 198 of my Section 42A Transport report confusing. Para 198 assesses Paihikara Ki Pōneke’s [302.29] request for TR-S4.1 to add that wheeling ramps do not exceed a gradient of 50%.

33 Put more simply, people have to be able to push their bicycle up/down from the street to the dwelling. A new ramp will usually need to follow existing steps/paths, and legal available accessways. People installing a bike ramp will usually be choosing the most practical and accessible option. In my view, a 50% maximum gradient standard for wheeling ramps adds complexity and uncertainty for little practical purpose.

Problems with projected demand for cycling and micromobility parking

34 Mr Lewandowski raised the issue that TR-P3.4 allows for transport facilities that do not meet standards when the projected demand for cycling and micromobility parking will be lower than required in the standards. He pointed out that calculating projected demand is problematic, and the purpose of PDP provisions is to enable micromobility options.

- 35 I agree this part of TR-P3.4 is problematic. The PDP gives no guidance on how projected demand should be calculated: on current demand, on demand based on ongoing increases in cycling, or based on Regional Land Transport Plan mode shift goals? The policy may also be inconsistent with TR-P2: “Enable on-site transport facilities and driveways that promote the uptake and use of pedestrian, cycling, micromobility and public transport modes.
- 36 Mr Lewandowski tabled amendments to TR-P3 on behalf of Stratum Management Ltd (Stratum) at Hearing Stream 9. Stratum has scope to propose these changes under their submission to amend TR-O1 and TR-P3, and “any other such relief and/or consequential amendment are made that achieve an equivalent outcome.”
- 37 In the table below, my amendments in previous Hearing Stream 9 evidence are in red, Stratum amendments are in green, and my comments and recommendation on the Stratum amendments are in the right hand column.

Stratum amendments	My comments and recommendation
<p>TR-P3 Managed activities</p> <p>Only aAllow on-site transport facilities that do not meet standards where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The transport facilities and driveways are effective in meeting the operational needs and functional needs of the activity on the site; 2. The safety and efficiency of the transport network is not compromised; 3. Public health and safety, including the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and 	<p>I do not support the change from “Only allow” to “allow”, to be consistent with Mr McCutcheon’s evidence on the PDP policy drafting language³ where “allow” is used for permitted activities, not activities needing resource consent.</p> <p>I agree with deleting cycling and micromobility parking from (4), because projected demand is unclear, and may be inconsistent with the PDP’s policy direction to enable cycling.</p>

³ Refer to the [Section 42A report – ISPP Wrap Up Hearing – Part 1 – Definitions, Nesting Tables, General, and Omitted Submissions](#), page 44

<p>micromobility users travelling through any parking areas, is not compromised;</p> <p>4. The projected demand for loading spaces or cycling and micromobility parking will be lower than that required in the standards or can be accommodated by public, shared or reciprocal arrangements;</p> <p><u>5. Cycling and micromobility parking is provided for in a manner that is adequate for the location and nature of the proposed activity, and does not impact on its economic viability;</u></p> <p>6. Safe and effective access for firefighting purposes is provided with reference to NZS 4404.2010 and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008; and</p> <p>7. There are site and topographical constraints that make compliance unreasonable.</p>	<p>I agree with part of the new (5) that brings in consideration of the location and nature of the activity. For example an apartment for people with disabilities, or a community facility next to a large Council cycle park may justify fewer cycle/micromobility parks.</p> <p>I disagree that “economic viability” should be a factor. Economic costs and overall benefits should be considered in plan hearings and plan changes through a Section 32 evaluation (and 32AA evaluation as required, but for individual resource consent applications economic viability for a particular development is not typically categorised as an adverse environmental effect.</p> <p>At Hearing Stream 9, the Panel asked whether adequate cycle/micromobility parking provision needs to consider policy direction to encourage cycling and micromobility. WCC Environmental Reference Group at Hearing Stream 9 noted that “projected demand” ignores that the cycle/micromobility parking is intended to enable the demand that will come. I agree with this, and recommend that the new (5) should be balanced with the addition of <u>“that enables the uptake of cycling and micromobility”</u>.</p>
---	---

My recommendations above therefore amend TR-P3.4 as follows:

4. The projected demand for loading spaces ~~or cycling and micromobility parking~~ will be lower than that required in the standards or can be accommodated by public, shared or reciprocal arrangements;

5. Cycling and micromobility parking is provided for in a manner that is adequate for the location and nature of the proposed activity, and that enables the uptake of cycling and micromobility;

COMMENTS ON OTHER POINTS RAISED AT HEARING STREAM 9

Stratum evidence on costs per apartment for cycle parking

- 38 On Day 4 of Hearing Stream 9, Stratum’s experts and representative answered Panel questions about the costs of cycle parking per apartment, among other questions. The cost estimates calculated on the spot during Hearing Stream 9 seemed too high to me when compared to market prices for car parks and storage lockers in Wellington’s multi-storey city centre buildings. For reference, I include time references below for Stratum’s evidence in the [video for Hearing Stream 9 – Week 1, Day 4](#).
- 39 [Minute 33:40] The Stratum experts calculate that the additional cost of providing one cycle park for each apartment, based on the apartment development example provided in their supplementary evidence, was \$61,300 per cycle park if one floor (11 apartments) was taken by cycle parking, and \$63,300 if one and a third floors (15 apartments) were taken by cycle parking.
- 40 For comparison, Prime Property⁴ currently has four advertisements for car parks within multi-storey buildings in Wellington’s City Centre Zone: \$60,000 + GST (8 Church Street, multiple available), \$70,000 + GST (9 Gilmer Terrace), \$80,000 + GST (16 Mowbray Street, multiple available), \$110,000 + GST tandem carpark (9 Gilmer Terrace). Around 10 cycles can

⁴ <https://www.primeproperty.co.nz/properties/parking-bays-for-sale/>, sourced on 1 July 2024.

fit in a single carpark⁵, though this will depend on the carpark depth and its share of the vehicle manoeuvring space.

41 [Minute 35:43] Mr Stewart noted that until recently, Stratum developments did not provide cycle parking, but in most buildings they had 15-20 storage lockers available for purchase at \$10,000–\$15,000, which could be used for bike storage. Various Stratum buildings still have some storage lockers for sale. [Minute 48:23] Mr Stewart said these storage lockers are typically 2 – 3 m long by 1.5 m wide. If storage lockers of this size were replaced by group cycle parking⁶, three regular cycles could fit in the space of one storage locker.

42 Using these comparisons with market prices of car parks and storage lockers, a typical price per cycle park per apartment would more likely be in the range of \$3,000–\$8,000.

43 The difference in this comparative estimate and Stratum’s estimate of \$61,300–\$63,300 may be partly because Stratum’s method at their Hearing Stream 9 presentation divided the example development’s market value as a whole by a floor (or more) of full-price apartments being removed. However, [Minute 35:46] Mr Stewart confirmed that cycle parking in multi-storey buildings is typically provided in basement levels, in enclosed rooms, and where it can be fitted in. These spaces have much lower value compared to the value of apartments on floors above ground level, and do not have the costs and value of apartment linings, appliances and services etc. A better method to calculate the cost of cycle parking in these buildings may therefore have been the additional cost of building more ground floor service space, with the building slightly higher or designed differently to adjust for it.

⁵ Refer to [Mr Lieswyn’s evidence](#) to Hearing 9, page 3.

⁶ Using the dimensions in the recommended Figure 1 – TR: Cycle and micromobility parking as sourced from [NZTA guidance](#).

44 My 4 June [supplementary planning evidence](#) and the spokesperson for WCC Environmental Reference Group at Hearing Stream 9 identified options to reduce cost by using space more efficiently, such as: hanging racks, vertical stands, and double-decking the parking. [Minute 36.45] Mr Stewart also noted that where car parks are provided, cycle parking can be placed at the end of those.

Vehicle movements for smaller dwellings

45 At Hearing Stream 9, Kāinga Ora representatives asked whether in TR-S1 the number of vehicle movements for 1–2 bedroom dwellings can be considered to generate 6–8 vehicle movements per day (vpd) instead of 10 vpd, with reference to the [NZTA Planning Policy Manual Appendix B – Accessway standards and guidelines](#). In this technical document, NZTA has a Table App5B/5 that measures typical New Zealand trip generation rates from a 2001 research report. “Dwelling houses” has 10.4 vpd, and “Medium density residential flat building” has 6.8 vpd. In light of this new data and after consulting Ms Wood⁷, I support Kainga Ora’s proposal to add this variation to TR-S1. Scope for this change is within Rimu Architects' submission to reduce light vehicle movements generated by a car park from 10 to 6 per day.

46 I therefore recommend the following changes to TR-S1:

⁷ [Ms Patricia Wood provided written evidence](#) and verbal evidence on behalf of the Council at Hearing 9.

TR-S1 Vehicle trip generation

1. Activities must not exceed the following maximum vehicle movement thresholds:

Type of vehicle	Maximum number of vehicle movements
Light	200 per day to/from a local road <u>except the state highway</u>
	<u>100 per day to/from the state highway</u>
Heavy	8 per week

2. For the purpose of the above assessments:

~~a. An on-site carpark associated with a residential activity is considered to generate 10 light vehicle movements per day~~

~~a. A residential unit or minor residential unit with one or more associated on-site car parks is considered to generate the following light vehicle movements:~~

~~i. 2 or fewer bedrooms: 7 per day~~

~~ii. 3 or more bedrooms: 10 per day;~~

b. Vehicle movements per day must be assessed as average vehicle movements per day, averaged over a full seven-day week; and

c. Vehicle movements per week must be assessed as average vehicle movements per week, averaged over a full 52-week year

MINOR CORRECTIONS

48 My Section 42A Transport report recommended the amendment below Table TR-7 should be clarified, as the Panel suggests in Minute 51:

Where the calculation of required parking spaces results in a fractional space, the fraction must be rounded up or down to the nearest full-whole space.

49 Living Streets pointed out at Hearing Stream 9 that in Section 42A Transport Appendix A track changes, TR-S7.3.d has a mistake where it duplicates 3.c with extra garbled text. This will be deleted.

~~TR-S7.3.d Have a minimum height clearance of its vehicle access and any associaedCommercial/industrial 2.3~~

Andrew Wharton

Team Leader District Planning

Wellington City Council

19 July 2024

Appendix A: Right of Reply Recommended Amendments to Transport Provisions

Appendix B: Recommended format changes to Table TR-7

Table 7 – TR: Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces

<p>1. <u>These Table TR-7 short stay and long stay requirements apply in all zones, except that in the City Centre, Metropolitan Centre, Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed Use Zones:</u></p> <p>a) <u>The short stay (visitors) minimum parking requirements only apply if one or more short-stay visitor car parks are on site.</u></p> <p>b) <u>When 1(a) applies, the minimum number of short-stay visitor cycling and micromobility device parking spaces required is the lesser of:</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. <u>the number of short-stay visitor car parks (not including mobility parks or loading bays) on site; or</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. <u>the number in the short stay (visitors) column in this Table 7.</u></p> <p>c) <u>Otherwise, the short stay (visitors) requirements below do not apply.</u></p>		
<p>2. <u>Where the calculation of required parking spaces results in a fractional space, the fraction must be rounded up or down to the nearest full-whole space.</u></p>		
Activity	Minimum number of on-site cycling and micromobility device parking spaces Both short stay and long stay must be provided	
	Short stay (visitors)	Long stay (staff*, residents, students)
<p>Any activity in the following zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Centre • Metropolitan • Local Centre • Neighbourhood 	Nil	In accordance with the rest of this table

← Mixed Use			
3. Commercial activity	<u>a. All, except as per specific activity below</u>	Minimum 2, 0.05 per 100m ² GFA <u>or as per specific activity below</u>	Minimum 1, 0.1 per 100m ² GFA <u>or as per specific activity below</u>
	<u>b. Entertainment and Hospitality Activity</u>	0.1 per person that the <u>site</u> is designed to accommodate; <u>or as per specific activity below</u>	Minimum 1, 0.1 per staff member* <u>or as per specific activity below</u>
4. Community facility		0.1 per person that the <u>site</u> is designed to accommodate	Minimum 1, 0.1 per staff member*
5. Educational facility		<u>As per specific activities below</u>	
	<u>a. Childcare services</u>	Minimum 2	Minimum 1, 0.1 per staff member*
	<u>b. Tertiary education facility</u>	Minimum 2	Minimum 1, 0.1 per student and 0.1 per staff member*
6. Emergency service facilities		Minimum 2	Minimum 1, 0.1 per staff member*
7. Healthcare activity		Minimum 2, 1 per 100m ² GFA	Minimum 1, 0.1 per staff member*
8. Industrial activity		Minimum 2	Minimum 1, 0.1 per 100m ² GFA
9. Residential	<u>a. All, (except as provided per specific below)</u>	1 per 10 <u>residential units</u>	Minimum 1 per <u>residential unit</u> **
	<u>b. In the City Centre Zone</u>	<u>1 per 10 residential units</u>	<u>Minimum 0.5 per residential unit**</u>
	<u>c. Hostels</u>	1 per 10 beds	Minimum 1, 1 per 3 beds

	<u>d. Retirement villages</u>	<u>Minimum 1, plus 0.1 per residential unit</u>	<u>Minimum 1, plus Minimum 0.1 per residential unit** and 0.1 per staff member*</u>
<p>* The number of staff members is the maximum number of full or part time staff members on the site at any one time.</p> <p>** <u>The cycle and micromobility device parking space cannot be located within the residential unit itself.</u> A lockable, residential unit-specific storage facility such as a garage or storage locker is an acceptable solution, <u>provided it can fit the cycle space dimensions in Figure 1 – TR: Cycle and micromobility parking.</u> This may be a communal facility.</p>			