

Memorandum of Murray Guy – submitter Te Urihi Gateway Project

8 November 2022

- 1 The applicant has notified its intention to modify the consent application, by removing the new proposed carpark from the RM210149, “in order to address the concerns raised by submitters”(paragraph 21).
- 2 I congratulate the applicant on taking cognisance of the submitter’s concerns and acting on it. I am also grateful for this removal of the proposed carpark. But I am now deeply concerned by the apparent disconnect between that action and statements in the memorandum by Counsel, and statements arising from Kapiti Coast District Council (KCDC) officers.
- 3 Alison Law (KCDC) project manager, when verbally conveying to me (20/10/2022) this modification, stated “that they would be reviewing parking in 18months once everything is up and running” and in reply to my question, “were not ruling out a carpark in this location”(C6).
- 4 Darren Edwards (KCDC) chief executive has been quoted during the Hearing, in a local press “while the environmental effects of building the carpark would have been relatively small scale and acceptable in terms of the Resource Management Act, removing the proposal reduces the overall adverse effects of the Te Urihi project”. “Extending carparking in the area is provided for in the McLean Park development Plan and this proposal could be re-visited in the future”.
- 5 These statements from senior KCDC officers are clearly controversial and at odds with the expert evidence and submissions presented at the Hearing, which highlighted adverse environmental effects being ‘more than minor’(viz. landscape, visual, coastal hazards). The implication that the carpark issue would/could be reviewed, and in this location (C6), in 18 months is contrary to the statement “addressing the concerns raised by submitters” and is not fair process. It should be called out as “environmental creep” where the applicant is endeavouring to have a second bite at an issue highlighted as having adverse environmental effects more than minor, and therefore altering the scope of the original consent application being heard.
- 6 I reject Counsel’s statement (para 5) that “While the carpark extension could be formed in a way that avoids any material adverse effects on the submitters in terms of coastal hazards” as supposition.

- 7 The applicant has chosen not to provide the further information requested by the Panel relating to the new carpark; namely engineering plans, earthworks plans, landscape plans, and a coastal hazard assessment. This is disappointing given the effort put in by submitters and their legitimate questions raised. The Panel is now unable to test and make a finding on these important issues. And now the possibility of further litigation of this carpark issue in 18 months is disturbing.

- 8 Counsel (para4) states that “Of the concerns raised, the proposed carpark extension emerged as the main focus of the hearing. The submitters directly opposite – understandably concentrated on that aspect of the project”. My personal response to that statement is that it was “a” main focus, but not “the” main focus, as whilst I concentrated largely on the carpark issue, I raised serious issues in my original submission under ‘Building site’ (3rd paragraph) that should be addressed/assessed by the Panel in their findings.