

BEFORE THE TIMARU DISTRICT COUNCIL

RC102.2016.141.1

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991
("the Act")

AND

IN THE MATTER of an application to demolish a building
and establish a mixed use commercial
development.

BETWEEN **BAYHILL DEVELOPMENTS LTD**

Applicant

AND **TIMARU DISTRICT COUNCIL**

EVIDENCE OF STEWART FLETCHER ON BEHALF OF THE NZTA

November 2016

My name is **STEWART FLETCHER** of Christchurch and I operate my own planning consultancy. The services I provide include contracting assistance to the NZ Transport Agency (the Agency). I have been requested by the Agency to assist them in the provision of evidence regarding their submission on the notified resource consent application for Bayhill Developments Ltd.

1 Qualifications

- 1.1 I am a Consultant Planner and have been practicing as a Planner for approximately 17 years. I have a Bachelor of Resource Studies from Lincoln University, am a full member of the NZ Planning Institute and a member of the Resource Management Law Association.
- 1.2 I have worked in a number of planning roles and have been operating my own consultancy for the past 6 years.

2 Expert Witness Practice Note

- 2.1 While not a Court hearing I note I have read, and agree to comply with, the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as required by the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014. In providing my evidence all of the opinions provided are within my expertise and I have considered and I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me which might alter or qualify the opinions I express.

3 Scope of Evidence

- 3.1 A resource consent application has been lodged by Bayhill Developments Ltd to demolish an existing building and construct a mixed use commercial development. Detailed descriptions of the activity have been included in the application, further information, planners report and evidence provided by the applicant. I rely on these descriptions rather than repeat them in my evidence.
- 3.2 The submission of the Agency was in opposition to the proposal due to effects on the local roading network and the need to ensure potential traffic related conflicts are suitably addressed. It was highlighted in the submission that Sefton Street (State Highway 78) is a key access for the port area and consideration should be given to the design, location and loading facilities for the development.
- 3.3 My evidence is based on the most recent version of the proposal and elaborates on the reasons for the submission. The main matters that need to be considered, from the perspective of the Agency, are to ensure any proposal will not affect the freight efficiency and safety of the State Highway. These issues can be minimised by ensuring that the car park building will not be available to the public.

Beyond this I encourage the Commissioner to consider how the various activities will operate on a day to day basis and how this will affect the State Highway.

4 Current Proposal

- 4.1 It is proposed to establish a multi use commercial development on a site which is generally zoned for such purposes. In consideration of the proposal the Agency recognises the implications from the zoning of the site. This is reflected in a general acceptance of the nature of the activity and also allowing vehicular access to be from the State Highway as opposed to a side street, such as The Bay Hill.
- 4.2 It is still important to recognise that Sefton Street is a State Highway and is the primary access to the port area. As such there is a higher proportion of heavy vehicles which utilise Sefton Street. Evidence from traffic engineers has recognised this fact.
- 4.3 The freight efficiency of this section of State Highway is important and any activity should not impede the current efficiencies. Analysis has been undertaken by the traffic engineers, on behalf of the applicant, to ensure this is the case.
- 4.4 While the Agency agrees to the nature of the proposal and the provision of vehicular access from the State Highway/Sefton Street, this does not take away from the need to ensure the access is suitably designed and the activity is well managed/controlled. In this regard the Agency is supportive of the establishment of a flush median strip and the necessary removal of two car parks on the southern side of the street.
- 4.5 In considering the design of the proposal it is recommended consideration be given to the operation of activities on the site and the proposed loading area.

5 Operation of Activities

- 5.1 Consideration needs to be given to the details of the day to day operation of activities and how they will occur, particularly the hotel. From reading information in the application and reviewing plans it appears the primary means of customer access to the building will be via the courtyard area on the eastern frontage (The Bay Hill) of the building. Reliance is placed on public/roadside parking should a person arrive from this frontage.
- 5.2 It is understood a guest of the hotel, who has a vehicle, will then be directed to either the parking area accessed from the north end of The Bay Hill or the car park building. Again it is understood a guest directed to park in the building will

drive their vehicle into the ground floor car park building area and from that point a valet will park their vehicle for them.

- 5.3 No suggestion has been made in any evidence that the car park building entrance will operate as a hotel frontage. The evidence provided also advises that the car park building will not be available to the public. The importance of this is highlighted through the peer review undertaken by Abley Consultants which includes, in its conclusions:

The parking building design is not adequate for general public use, but is acceptable provided its use is limited to residents, employees and valet parking attendants.

- 5.4 It is unclear how the parking and valet arrangement will be managed including whether some of the car parks will be allocated for pick up and drop off within the ground floor area although I note Mr Rossiter anticipates this will be the case.
- 5.5 In considering day to day hotel activities, if an arrangement has been made to have particular vehicles arriving or available at particular times it becomes important to ensure other vehicles/potential guests that have not made the necessary arrangements do not arrive unanticipated. Should this occur, and particularly if no car parks are available, difficulties could arise in the ability for unanticipated vehicles to turn within the building and depart. Reverse manoeuvres utilising the ramps may be required.
- 5.6 It needs to also be remembered that manoeuvring space on the ground floor, even for vehicles to pass one another, is reasonably confined. To have a potential guest pulling in and stopping in areas not identified as car parking could lead to potential conflicts and these conflicts may extend out on to the State Highway.
- 5.7 Importantly, it is not considered appropriate for the car park area to become some form of de facto main entrance to the hotel. The need for valet parking within the building reflects a more confined car parking arrangement and as such it is not considered appropriate for the car parking area to evolve into the main entrance to the hotel.
- 5.8 The Agency is supportive of condition 3 volunteered by the applicant that the car parking building is not available for public parking. The Agency is also supportive that car parking for the development needs to be allocated. That said, it is still suggested that all parties consider how the various activities will operate, particularly the hotel, and the impacts of this for the car parking area.

- 5.9 In doing so it is suggested consideration is given to there being no signage which advertises the hotel or other businesses at the car park entrance. This would be similar to other hotels and commercial buildings whereby access to car parking is more discreet.
- 5.10 In considering the details of the proposal the applicant also needs to ensure that, if gates or a garage door are established at the car park entrance, that vehicles will not be overhanging into the vehicle lane while waiting for a gate to open.

6 Loading Areas

- 6.1 A loading area has been identified within the car park area of the building and as part of this it will be necessary to manoeuvre vehicles within the access way of the parking area. There are some obvious potential conflicts which could arise between vehicles entering or exiting the building and those accessing or departing the loading area.
- 6.2 To address this issue the applicant has volunteered condition 4 which specifies loading shall occur outside of the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday (it is assumed the reference to Stafford Street is a error and reference should instead be Sefton Street).
- 6.3 It is agreed that the volunteered condition will significantly address the Agencies concerns regarding potential conflicts between the car park and loading area.
- 6.4 I would also suggest that the necessity to utilise the loading areas is reinforced. There is the risk that it may become attractive or easier for some users of the loading area to instead park on the edge of Sefton Street. For example rubbish bins may be wheeled out on to the street. To ensure this does not occur it is sought that a condition is imposed which prohibits the loading or unloading of vehicles on Sefton Street.

7 Summary

- 7.1 While this evidence supports the submission of the Agency in opposition to the proposal it is recognised that the proposal has been amended to address some concerns, such as loading, and also the site is zoned for activities of the nature proposed.
- 7.2 I am of the opinion that further consideration needs to be given to the details of how activities will operate, how this will affect car parking and any flow on effects to the State Highway. It needs to be ensured that the main public entrance to the development is from The Bay Hill and the car park entrance is seen as secondary, including the control of signage. The car park building provides a

more confined car parking arrangement and this necessitates a more carefully managed operation.

- 7.3 Provided these matters are addressed, which could include through the provision of a management plan, it is considered the Agencies concerns will have been addressed.

Stewart Fletcher