

Michael Wilson and Clare Holden

55 Marine Parade Paraparaumu Beach

**Memorandum of Michael Wilson and Clare Holden – submitters Te Urihi Gateway Project
RM210149**

In response to memorandum of council on behalf of applicant. As per paragraph noted.

7 November 2022

Paragraph 3.

Totally disagree with Paragraph 3

The applicant stated that there was relatively little objection to the fundamental proposal for Te Urihi to be a high quality “Gateway” development”

We believe that the bio security is the main requirement, and this does not require the high quality level.

There is a huge ground swell of opposition to the gateway in its entirety. The initial “stop the Kapiti gateway petition” saw 3000 signatures’ opposing the gateway. The 80 separate letters submitted opposing the project from the immediate surrounding property owners / residents oppose the proposed gateway. The applicant has NOT included this information within their application – why not?

Due to public pressure KCDC commissioned a report. - The Jenkins report identified shortcomings in the entire consultative process, why has the applicant made no mention of that?

Paragraph 4.

In our submissions (Which we were not required to read in full at the hearing) we objected to the whole Gateway project, this included the car park, and the reasons for opposing the Gateway project in full.

Paragraph 5.

Totally disagree that the carpark could be formed in any way that avoids any mutual effects

I would suggest that the carpark design could not meet the most basic of the car parking design and mitigation requirements, turning areas, garden depths, and vehicle clearance & landscaping mitigation requirements without major earthworks and dune deformation.

I also support the mention by Murray Guy in paragraph 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 of the submitters in terms of costal hazards’ as supposition.

The disruption to the fore dune is an inevitable negative consequence in achieving compliance for the proposed car parking

It is not a matter of “hearing the concerns of the submitters” to withdraw the carpark but a more cynical need to remove the carpark because it is not workable.

While the UPS (urban policy statement) may be seen to assist the diminished need for car parking for the Te Uruhi building & commercial activity, the demolition of 18 community owned carparks has not been justified or proven to be nothing but a negative blow to the sustainability and amenity that the wider community currently enjoys...

No Land use consent or Resource Consent was sort when the visitor numbers to Kapiti Island were increased from 50 to 160 by DOC around 2010. While there is a huge amount of email dialogue between DOC and KCDC no application was lodged to seek approval for the massive increase in activity within Maclean Park. KCDC failed in their regulatory duty to inforce the RMA in this matter. No measure of demand has ever been identified as a baseline, yet KCDC now seem to be all knowing when it suits its own agenda and completely contradictory when the Management plan is considered.

The so called traffic experts have used two very basic traffic monitoring sessions and a google earth image (outside of peak season), to put forward a whole raft of conclusions. How can they justify the removal 18 carparks when they have **not** demonstrated the true year round car parking demand?

This parking contradiction is further compounded by the ED Managers hearing submission providing a glowing testimonial of the huge growth and business activity the gateway project will bring.

The applicants concerns surrounding the parking are clearly noted / identified in the Maclean Park Management Plan 2017 see below:

Maclean Park Management Plan 2017 identifies that there was / is insufficient parking areas to cope with demand for parking at the reserve. Yet miraculously in 2022 (this Resource Consent) the applicant doesn't see diminished car parking spaces as an issue.

Removing 18 carparks is completely contrary to the Maclean Park Management Plan

Maclean Park Management Plan stating on page 19 - 6.0 Issues

Item 6.4. Parking “The current parking areas are insufficient to cope with the demand for parking at the reserve and motorists have difficulty negotiating the existing middle carpark.”

Maclean Park Management Plan stating page 41 - Project Area A: The Gateway

Item 3. Potential Drivers and issues

“In terms of the overall park and village, the development of a significant visitor facility on this site has the potential to compound emerging issues with parking and access for large vehicles.

Parking and servicing for this facility needs to be provided and contained within the northern area of the site so as not to adversely affect the recreational values in other parks of the reserve.”

Maclean Park Management Plan stating page 38 – Maclean Park vision

Item 9. Manage the negative impact of parking on the park and foreshore

Maclean Park Management Plan – Page 20/21

Item 6.8 Tours to Kapiti Island the last line – “Under the current arrangement this area of the park is currently at capacity.”

How can the applicant and its experts say a reduction of 18 carparks will NOT adversely affect the parking requirements of the park users when it has already been identified in the 2017 management plan?

The council seem to pick and choose the language and passages of their own policy's and plans to suit their own agenda!

This Resource Consent does NOT mitigate the adverse effects of insufficient parking.

If the applicant is successful in this application will this set a precedence and create grounds for a future challenge?

The Proposed Plan Change 1L – has NOT been approved. At present over 12 submissions, all opposing every aspect of the Plan change for Maclean Park to change from Natural Open Space to Open Space (Recreational Reserve). The applicant has included Plan Change 1L as supporting documentation for this Gateway application, however this plan change 1L is highly contestable due to the upcoming hearing process and needing full council sign off. This plan change will be vehemently opposed by the community going forward. The commissioners can NOT rely on plan change 1L being approved.

I believe KCDC staff were disingenuous when trying to put this plan change out to the community. As can be witnessed by the recorded council meeting back in July ,the councillors were not presented the documents or a concise description of the plan change repercussions. The new councillors however are well informed of the contentious plan change issues and I suggest they will not support this plan change for Maclean Park.

Which document are the commissioners expected to consider as a true representation when the traffic report process is so poorly executed and conclusions so poorly considered and conflicted?

Photo Montages

While the photo contractor has identified the type of equipment use,

Distortion/barrel affect has been acknowledged as part of the image process.

The perspective and the depth of field does not match the reality when viewing the proposed site from 5 Marine Parade.

Paragraph 21/Minute 4.

We believe that removing one aspect (i.e. Removing the car park) from the Resource Consent Application while it is still in the “consent process” is grounds for an appeal.

Photo view point 9 Paragraph 25 to 27

A large tree had been added to the photo montage 9 whereby positioning a tree to obscure and diminish the bulk and location of the gateway building.

At the hearing it was stated that this tree would take 8 years to mature to this size. This tree is not identified on the amended landscape plan submitted by the applicant on Oct 20. What species will it be? How tall will it be when planted? What will the image look like without the tree obscuring the building?

As the owner of 5 Marine parade, it is without question the entire view across the Maclean park natural landscape to the beach and Kapiti view will be completely replaced by a view of the Gateway structure. This negative adverse effect is supported by the Landscape Architects expert assessment of a moderate High calibration. The build edifice of the gateway structure will consume the immediate natural view and block the distant vista to the beach and Island.

The adding of a mature tree to soften the bulk and location of the 6 metre high structure is disingenuous and photo 9 should be shown without this tree to provide a true representation of what we will see from 5 Marine Parade. No true assessment can be considered when KCDC have applied artistic license to a presentation image purely to seemingly diminish a hugely negative aspect of the proposal. The removal of the tree will expose the entire gateway façade, further emphasising the truly detrimental impact this proposal will have on my quality of life.

One final item I would like it to be noted that I agree with the “Memorandum of Murray Guy 8 November 2022” and I support that and agree with that in its entirety.

I would like the commissioners to **decline** the application. I believe the many non complying activities are still in place and collectively the effects are more than minor and this application should not be approved.

Michael Wilson

Clare Holden