

## **Resource Consent Application RM210149**

**Applicant: Kapiti Coast District Council**

**Proposal: Land use consent application to enable the construction and operation of new buildings and associated car parking. The activities within the building are primarily to facilitate visitors to Kapiti Island, with some retail use sought. Earthworks are required to facilitate structures.**

**Legal Description(s): SEC 2 SO 322370**

**Submission by Dr Frederick John Davey, 3 Golf Road, Paraparaumu Beach**

### **Introduction**

My name is Frederick John Davey and, with Brenda Farrell and Alex Fechny, have owned 3 Golf Road for 6 years. We have lived in the Kapiti district since the mid-90s. I am a retired research scientist (doctorate in geophysics).

### **General**

I have been interested in the proposed Gateway project for about 5 years. Since KCDC put a proposal to the PGF just over 3 years ago, I have been trying to find out what was proposed as I would have liked to contribute to it. KCDC staff consistently refused to let me know what options were being considered until after decisions had been made. Other, so-called stakeholders (e.g. Victoria University of Wellington), were consulted. As far as I can find out, no local residents, who will be impacted by the proposal, have been consulted before the Council meeting (25/2/21) that approved the planned Gateway. The present "Note to affected parties" is the second – but very limited - consultation.

I do not support the Gateway project in its present form. The proposed building will not preserve the natural character of the coastal environment. The only requirement, and justification, for another building in Maclean Park is for biosecurity checking for the two tour ferries to Kapiti Island. As noted at the presentations by concerned residents at the Council meeting that decided on a Gateway, this could be carried out far easier, less intrusively, and at less expense using a trailer system (this had apparently been approved by DoC). The building is an inappropriate use and development of the coastal environment. A "Discovery Centre" does not need to be in the park or where biosecurity clearance is carried out, it could be better placed nearer the centre of Paraparaumu Beach and the main activities in the park. The "retail" activities were only needed to support the "business plan" (see PWC report) that was used to justify the large investment by the ratepayers. Any financial

justification has now been totally buried by the latest excessive cost over-run. The cost of servicing the funding will be a millstone around the neck of the ratepayers for a long time. The park should be kept as an open park in tune with the environment and with buildings and decks kept to a minimum.

I note that work on re-lining and modifying the margins of the Tikotu Stream has been progressed under a separate Resource Consent and there appears to be some overlap between that and the present Application. Although not mentioned in the present Application, is another resource consent being considered for modifying the fore dune north of the stream to “improve” beach access for cars and boats? Should they not all have been considered together?

The Application has several errors and flaws in its arguments. These should be corrected. The Application, and the documentation that was made available to us, acknowledge that the application is non-complying in several areas. We think that the rationale presented for ignoring this is not robust. We recommend that the Application should be **declined**.

### **Impact on 3 Golf Road**

Our prime view is to the southwest. The Gateway and possible/probably earthworks on the fore dune associated with ferry access (presumably another resource consent will be needed?) would lie conspicuously in the middle of our view, were the Gateway not partially concealed (west end only) behind the trunks of a row of phoenix palms. From this perspective the “amenity impact” could be considered “minor” to “more than minor”, were the trees to remain. However, KCDC Council staff have cut down several mature trees recently at the north end of Maclean Park – 3 mature pohutukawas and one phoenix palm in the last year and one poisoned pohutukawa about 2 years ago (and many others at the transport hub in Paraparaumu). Another mature pohutukawa by the stream had a major trim only a few weeks ago. I would not be sanguine about the retention of these phoenix palms in the medium term.

A major impact will be the traffic movements and parking in the area. Neither of these have been dealt with adequately in the proposal, its appendices, and later responses by consultants. From the documentation presented there has been no adequate analysis of traffic movements at busy times in summer and holiday periods. Neither has there been any adequate analysis of parking during the ferry boat operations or during “events” in Maclean Park and environs. As an example, at times and with some events the roundabout and local berms are used for parking, creating hazards such as obstructing views of traffic etc. See later section. The proposed buildings and associated planned increases in visitors – not just for the Kapiti ferries but also for general activities (a major intent for the Gateway) - and traffic movements will exacerbate and impact road safety. “Events” are proposed as an activity for the north deck of the biosecurity pod and will project noise and light directly towards us. All these will impact negatively on our situation.

Lighting and Signage at the Gateway could have a major impact on our life. Detailed lighting and signage plans need to be approved within the Resource Consent Application process, not left to later, to ensure that they are to an acceptable standard.

All these issues will lead to a more than minor impact on our property and the application should be **declined**.

### **The Application**

A “clean” copy of the Application with all the revisions included and adequate plans would have been very useful.

“The architectural and landscape plans are indicative” (Applicant response 15/2/22). How much flexibility is possible? else what’s the point?

In the introduction (p8, and 32 and 33) the Governance Group did **not** consult with local affected community. Likewise, in “Applicant’s Response 15/2/22” on “process” as noted above, consultation by Council staff with local residents has been appalling.

On page 9, only one pohutukawa died (2 years ago), five others were poisoned and partially affected, the Council arborist has assured me that pohutukawas are very resilient trees and they should survive. Was the pohutukawa (referred to on page 60) transferred, if so, to where? It’s definitely gone. Was this part of the Resource Consent Application (acceptance still pending)

On page 13 – what is the arrangement for the biosecurity pod? – in one place it is 2 biosecurity rooms in another it is 3 biosecurity rooms.

On page 14 – a possible realignment of the roundabout is noted but the adverse implications are not noted. I would be concerned that if the Application is accepted, Council will assume this realignment option was also accepted.

On page 19 et seq. the buildings will not meet residential building code but will extend into a “residential” area.

Several items contained in the Application have already been done (e.g. earthworks (non-complying) and stormwater pipe rerouting – on what authority? Or is the Application just “pro-forma” for these activities?

Plans – there appears to be an inconsistency as to where the cycle rack will be: east of pod B as in the text or south of pod A (as appears in the plans)?

### **Parking and Transport**

This is an issue on which the Application is very selective in what it considers. Firstly, if you go and look, the ferries do not all load in the boat club car park, one initially does (in the

“wash-down” area), the other loads on the beach. The Application ignores the parking needed for present operations “as it works”, however the Application (Final Traffic Review – 23/2/22) plans for over twice the number of passengers by assuming twice the number of sailing days – unlikely in view of weather. Increasing the number of ferry trips per day will lead to increase in parking needs. At present about 25-30 cars park in the boat club car park, the rest probably in the car park where the Gateway is planned – which will be reduced from 32 to 14. These are long term parking (6 – 7 hours for the trip). The result will be more parking on the adjacent roads and berm - such as occurs outside 3 Marine Parade at present. During some events, parking occurs on the berm outside our house and along Golf Road. People won’t walk the 400+m from the proposed South Carpark, as stated in the Application, if they can park in closer streets.

Appendix 9 has several issues including mistakes and omissions in the text. The “load zones” in Figure 8 are rarely if ever used for loading. Table on p22 should total 2 not 20

Better information is needed. For example, with the crash data, the limited data indicates that the roundabout and end of Golf Road could be a focus. This is discounted by the consultant. However, we are aware of four crashes that have occurred at the end of Golf Road in the past 4 years. From observation, the traffic volumes around the roundabout need to be reassessed. Traffic flow data (7.1) is 4 years out of date.

A better, realistic, analysis and solution is needed.

A major issue is mixing of pedestrians walking from the boat club car park, across the car park and beach boat access track (with cars and boat trailer moving along it) and the bridge to the biosecurity pod. This aspect should be addressed. It is highly likely that the boat club car park will continue to be used for ferry parking. Passengers from cars parked, particularly on the western end of the car park, will take the direct route past the boat club to the bridge and the biosecurity pod. This is potentially hazardous and a safety issue and should be discussed fully.

The Final Traffic Peer Review item 4.6 re traffic increase modelling is questionable. Item 7.2 assumes no new traffic generated; incidentally which park is “the public car park” referred to in the text? A basic tenet of the original Gateway requirement is to attract tourists and others to the beach and particularly to and via the Gateway. Thus, an increase in people at the Gateway. This must imply more people in the area, and given that alternate transport has not been considered, this will probably increase cars and hence parking needs. The Review considers that “the proposal will improve safety by removing conflict between boats and pedestrians in the boat club car park”. As long as ferry passengers park in the boat club car park, we think this is, perhaps, a bit over optimistic.

### **Zoning, Objectives and Policies (appendix 16)**

DO-015: where is the economic justification and viability case?

BA-P2B: is there a light, glare and signage analysis plan?

The documentation notes several Non-complying issues.

### **Effects on Natural Character**

Issues are poorly defined – define what you mean by “high natural character” - and the assessment methodology needs explaining (appendix 8, p 35).

The Final Notification Report notes under “basis for conditions” point 3 “the important screening and softening capabilities offered by the Pohutukawa trees – be acknowledged... and protected” However, as noted earlier, Council have already cut down several pohutukawa trees in the park. Another was severely pruned when Council had to bring in sheet piling to separate the stream to carry out the stream work when their original plan didn’t work. Was the pohutukawa tree by road moved or cut down? This condition does not seem to have been met

under “basis for conditions” point 13 “disturbed of vegetation or land cover along Tikotu stream” – suitable ground cover should be re-established within 5 days. Lowering the southern wall has led to the sea at high tide topping the wall by 10-20cm. The existing cover on the north bank appears to have started eroding.

Another issue is exactly what is planned on the western margin of the Gateway into the beach area? A major impact on the approach from the west (sea), could be where the natural change from beach to coastal dunes into trees and grassed areas will apparently be replaced by sand direct to decking (see images in the Application and go and have a look at what is there at present). The images suggest transfer direct from beach to built-up area (broad decking). However other images suggest that there will be retention of some of the present dune area between the two. What is really planned?

Landscape impact assessments reports – it is not clear how the ratings were derived as they seem to be very subjective, i.e. my opinion could be very different to yours. What were some well-defined quantitative criteria that were used and how were they scored?

The artwork, the 6 m high Ihuwaka, is intended to be visible from all directions - is it 4 to 4.5 m or 6m tall – both heights appear in different places – appendix 8 and Plans. Or some other height? The trees are about 12 m high.

### **Natural Hazard**

Buildings should have a lifetime of at least 50 years. Besides earthquake shaking and ground liquefaction, and retreat due to coastal erosion, the treatment of the effects of and changes in flooding and climate change (storms etc.) is superficial. All need to be dealt with adequately in the Application and not deferred to a later time.

I would like to speak at any Hearing.

Frederick Davey 27/6/2022