

26 July 2021

Kāpiti Coast District Council
C/- Cuttriss Consultants Ltd
PO Box 386
Paraparaumu 5254

Attn: Emma McLean

By Email to: emma.mclean@cuttriss.co.nz

Dear Emma

Further Information Request – Resource Consent Application

Application number(s):	210149
Applicant:	Kapiti Coast District Council
Location:	Marine Parade, Paraparaumu
Proposed activity(s):	Construction and operation of Te Uruhi as a commercial activity and exceeding the permitted activity standards for earthworks within proximity of a stream

I have now reviewed your application, inspected the site and received comments from Council advisors.

The following further information is needed to better understand your proposal, including its effect on the environment and the ways any adverse effects might be mitigated.

Requested information

Planning

1. What was the “official public consultation process” that the Maclean Park Reserve Management Plan went through (as referenced in Section 3.2 of the application documentation)? Did the consultation hold any statutory weight (RMA or otherwise)?
2. At Section 3.3 of the consent application, it is stated that the proposal will have more than minor adverse effects on 3 and 5 Marine Parade (aligning with the conclusions reached in the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment, which concludes there being moderate to high adverse visual effects on these properties). It is then stated in the consent application that *under Section 95B, it is therefore considered that limited notification is not required for this application*. Is this statement relying on the permitted baseline that is

outlined in the application, therefore allowing the adverse effects on 3 and 5 Marine Parade to be disregarded?

It is noted that a permitted baseline is also relied upon for the effects conclusions at Section 3.3 for other nearby properties, including 1 Manly Street and 1, 6 and 7 Marine Parade.

Can you please provide plans of such a Permitted Baseline building enabling a comparison to be made between what can be constructed on the site without resource consent and what is proposed? Please provide comment from the author of the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment as to whether such plans impact on the conclusions they reached in their assessment.

3. At Section 4.2.2 (Amenity Effects – Visual) of the application, visual amenity effects are assessed as being *less than minor*. How does this interact with the more than minor visual effects assessments made on 3 and 5 Marine Parade in Section 3.3 of the application, and the moderate to high adverse visual effects on these properties assessed in the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment?
4. The Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment references a component of the application as being Container Pods. This is not referenced elsewhere in the application. Do they form part of the application? If so, please update plans accordingly to show their location.

Transportation

The transportation aspects of the application have been assessed by Council's appointed transport consultant, Tonkin and Taylor. As a result of their assessment, the following information is sought:

5. Objective DO-O14 of the District Plan seeks to improve the efficiency of travel and maximise mode. The Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) included as Appendix 9 to the resource consent application has identified public transport services and stops in close proximity to the visitor centre, and concludes that public transport accessibility to the site is good. However the TIA has assumed that all travel to the site will be via private vehicle and not identified the likely proportion of visitors that may choose public transport access to the visitor centre, how that may be increased, and the likely resulting effect on parking demand that will result. Has any consideration been given to the proportion of people who may take public transport to the site, and how this may affect conclusions reached in the TIA?
6. Please provide comment on the potential linkages or impacts of the proposal on the cycling routes/facilities identified in the Council's Cycleways, Walkways and Bridleways Strategy and on the Wellington Regional Trails site (<https://www.wellingtonregionaltrails.com/>).
7. Crash data is reported in Section 3.2 of the TIA up to 2019 only. Have any further crashes been reported during 2020 and 2021 and do these change the assessment? Also, please provide comment on the crash history adjacent to the proposed Golf Course and Maclean Street carpark entrances.
8. The application notes that the existing golf club access is only 5.5m wide. Please provide additional information that shows provision for pedestrian access, two way vehicle traffic and shy line offset from the adjacent wall within the 5.5m wide access.
9. What is the design speed for the parking areas, and how will this be reinforced through design elements?

10. Figure 4.1 in the TIA shows the existing pedestrian refuge island on Marine Parade is relocated, however Drawing RC-L1.01 in Appendix 8 of the AEE shows the pedestrian refuge as new. Please confirm what is planned for the existing pedestrian refuge.
11. Section 6.1.1 of the TIA suggests safety improvements for the Golf Course parking area entry/exit, specifically removing an on-street parking space and providing a small speed hump. It is unclear as to whether these suggestions form part of the proposal. Specifically;
 - i The provision of compliant sight distance from the golf club car park accesses rely on the removal of on-street car park spaces. This would require approval of a resolution through Council. Is this process underway?
 - ii Is a speed hump to be provided at the driveway access? If so where is it proposed to be located and how does it interact with the existing speed hump?
 - iii How will pedestrians be provided for through the carparks in the golf course parking?
 - iv Is signage proposed within the car park?
12. The parking assessment provided in the TIA does not provide actual parking demand during peak summer periods. Please provide further information to demonstrate what the peak parking demand is during peak summer periods.
13. Section 2.2 of the consent application describes that there are 31 spaces in the Marine Parade car park. Appendix C in the TIA shows 32 parking spaces. Tonkin and Taylor have also undertaken an assessment and determined that there are 33 spaces (31 plus two accessible). Please confirm the actual number of carparks currently available.
14. The parking demand assessment has arrived at a number of 47 additional parking spaces in the peak season, derived from the Feb 2019 visitor numbers (average of 94 visitors per day). This is below the maximum concession limit of 160 per day. Please assess the effects of parking for the maximum visitor numbers that could be permitted by existing concessions.
15. Cycle parking racks are proposed east of Pod B is along the edge of the path. Please confirm what the available path width will be when bicycles are parked in these racks. Further, will the cycle rack spacing allow for parking of a bicycle on each side of the each rack?
16. Will rain gardens in the Marine Parade car park be traversable? If not then adjacent parking spaces would require an additional 300mm width to be compliant with ASNZS2890.1.
17. Section 4.2.3 of the consent application suggests time restricted parking in public off-road carparks in Maclean Park. Please confirm whether or not this is included in the proposal and the details proposed.
18. Section 4.2.3 in the consent application states that the spaces associated with the golf course will be charged for and available for visitors to the island only. Given the availability of free, unrestricted parking on surrounding streets, what measures will be in place to encourage customers to park in the paid parking spaces?
19. There is no off-road connection between the proposed northern and southern car parks at the golf course. This may result in vehicles using the road to move between the two car parks. This presents safety concerns when compounded with the non-compliant access width and sight visibility issues identified above in Matters 8 and 12 above. Please advise as to how this arrangement might work.
20. Please provide swept paths to demonstrate that the proposed shuttle bus can manoeuvre within the Golf Course carpark to exit in a forward direction.

21. The Golf Course carpark extension shown in Appendix 6 of the consent application is a blind aisle 17 parking spaces long with no turn around area. Please provide further detail on how this is considered to comply with ASNZS2890.1 Section 2.4.2 (c).
22. Please confirm how the spaces associated with this activity can be demarcated from the golf course and administered so that they are available solely for the use specified in the resource consent application.
23. Drawing 1 in Appendix 6 of the consent application shows the proposed carpark layout at the corner of Maclean Street and Kapiti Road. This is different to that shown in Figure 5.2 of the TIA. Please confirm the layout proposed.
24. Section 4.2.3 of the consent application states that “if the activity that the building represents was to be built on a green field site with no existing activities it would be required to provide 3 parking spaces, based on the GFA”. However the TIA appears to only assess for 2 additional parking spaces and associated trips. Does this difference result in any change to the conclusions with regard to parking provision and intersection modelling?
25. The golf course carpark extension will mean that this carpark entrance services 44 parking spaces. Please provide an assessment of the operation of this access on Kapiti Road.
26. For completeness, please provide the SIDRA analysis outputs referenced in the TIA.
27. Please advise the expected traffic related effects from construction and how these will be managed.
28. Please provide tracking curves of the shuttle bus entering and exiting the designated parking space and confirm that a suitable aisle width is maintained for access past the shuttle and into adjacent carparks while the shuttle is parked.
29. Please confirm how the visitor centre will be serviced (such as delivery of merchandise and removal of refuse).
30. Page 16 in the TIA notes a space is provided in the visitor centre carpark to accommodate drop off/pick up vehicles including taxis and ubers etc. This is not currently shown on the plans, please confirm where this is.
31. Please confirm the proposed width of the path around the western edge of the carpark and how this route will be promoted to path users (including cyclists) to ensure that they use the route rather than proceeding into the carpark to access Marine Parade.
32. The consent application describes a moveable post and rope barrier at the beach entrance to separate pedestrian and boat launches. Please provide further detail on how vehicles and pedestrians will be made aware of their responsibilities and how members of the public are not discouraged from travelling along the path and over the bridge.

Development Engineering

Council's development engineer has reviewed the proposal and seeks further information as follows:

33. The proposed earthworks plan for the golf course car park shows that the lowest point on the site would be at the entrance of the car park. The proposed sump appears to be at a proposed ground level of 3.5m. Please either relocate the sump to the lowest point of the site, or advise how stormwater will be collected from the lowest point of the site and directed to the sump.

34. Please provide the ground water level at golf course car park site.
35. Is the proposed cut from the golf course car park being used on the site for fill or transported elsewhere?
36. As an additional paved area is proposed to be added to the existing car park at 343 Kapiti Road, please provide details as to how stormwater will be managed on site at this location.

Landscape and Visual Matters

The landscape and visual aspects of the application have been assessed by Council's appointed landscape consultant, Drakeford Williams. As a result of their assessment, the following information is sought:

37. It would be useful if Section 1.1 of the LVEA (Report Methodology) could make explicit reference to Appendices C and D, which provide the details of the assessment methodology.
38. The LVEA submitted with the application was issued 24 June 2021. KCDC's PDP was made operative 30 June. It would be desirable to update the report accordingly.
39. The Maclean Park Management Plan references within the LVEA are outdated. The relevant objectives are 8.4.1, 8.5.1 and 8.6.1 in the 2017 plan, not 1.4, 1.5.1 and 1.6.1 as stated in the LVEA. Please ensure the relevant objectives are reviewed, and the LVEA updated as necessary.

Providing the information

Please provide this information in writing within 15 working days¹ date. If you will not be able to provide the information by that date, please contact me before then to arrange an alternative timeframe. We will not work on your application any further until either you provide this information, or you state that you refuse to provide it.

Refusing to provide the information

If you refuse to provide the information, or if you do not submit the information to us within 15 days (or by another other agreed timeframe), the RMA requires that we publicly notify your application.²

If this happens, you will be required to pay the notification fee of \$4,890 in full before we proceed with the notification of your application.³

Next steps

Once you have provided the requested information, I will review what you have provided to make sure it adequately addresses all of the points of this request.

In my previous letter I described the statutory timeframe for our decision on your application, which counts (and sets limits) on the number of days we can work on consent applications.

The time for you to respond to this letter will be excluded from the timeframe, and the original forecast date for our decision will now be later than I previously advised.

¹ Section 92A(1) of the RMA

² Section 95C of the RMA

³ Section 36(7) of the RMA

⁴ Section 88C(2) of the RMA

I will be able to give you an updated forecast on a date for this once you have provided the information requested above, or we have discussed the application again.

If you are not sure how to respond or have any questions, please contact me on 027 231 0246 or email me at tom@incite.co.nz.

Attachments

Finally, we have also received comments from Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust. These comments are attached to this letter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Tom Anderson', written in a cursive style.

Tom Anderson
Resource Consents Contractor

tom@incite.co.nz

04 801 6862 or 027 231 0246

Attachment 1 - Comments from Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust

Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust – Response to RM210149: 2 Marine Parade, Paraparaumu

This report provides Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust's (the **Trust**) response to an application (the **Application**) by Kāpiti Coast District Council (the **Applicant**) for a land use consent for the construction and operation of Te Uruhi and the associated earthworks within proximity to the Tikotu Stream (the **Proposed Works**) at 2 Marine Parade, Paraparaumu (the **Site**).

The Proposed Works have the possibility of negatively impacting multiple sites of significance to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (**Ātiawa**) including the Coastal Marine Area (**CMA**) and the Tikotu Stream. The Trust has been involved in previous consultation regarding the Proposed Works and it was made clear that our support for the Gateway Building is conditional on establishing a formal forum for Ātiawa iwi and hapū to input into the development and use of the building. The Trust is aware of conversations to discuss planning and layout issues with the building, however to fulfil Council's Section 6(e) responsibilities under the RMA the Trust requires that we have a formal forum that will ensure that that our iwi and hapū relationships to the land, water and taonga connected to the Gateway is recognised and provided for. The Trust requests that this response is forwarded back to the Applicant so they can contact us regarding the establishment of this forum.

Section 7(1) of the RMA requires decision makers when making decision under the RMA to have particular regard to kaitiakitanga. As part of their kaitiaki role and responsibility, the Trust makes the above comments, recommendations and requests.

Prepared by Madie Davy