



STAFF REPORT

TO: Environment & Planning Subcommittee - Development Contributions Delegated Committee

FROM: Dugald Ley, Development Engineer

REFERENCE: BC091306

SUBJECT: **THE BARN (ABEL TASMAN) LIMITED - REPORT REP10-03-02 -**
Report prepared for hearing of 22 March 2010

1. APPLICATION

Ten Tourist Units (cabins) - The Barn (Abel Tasman District Council) Ltd, 14 Harvey Road, Marahau

2. PURPOSE

This report is to review the roading development contribution of three HUDS (3 x \$5,034 = \$15,102) set out in the attachment.

3. BACKGROUND

This land development goes back to consents granted in 1990 whereby the applicant requested that consent be granted for a backpackers' facility, camping ground and shop for a maximum of 50 people.

In 1998 (RM950425) a variation was sought to change the application to a maximum of 100 people in total for both the backpacker facility and camping and that of the "100 people" there was to be a maximum of 100 for the camping ground (ie, 100 people in the camping ground would mean no people in the backpacker facility).

File records show that the original recommendation from Engineering was a \$4,100 + GST roading contribution toward widening the seal on Harvey Road (for the increased use of the property). Via the consent it would seem that this was reduced to \$1,600 including GST! This amount was subsequently paid on 24 October 1997.

In 2005 consent was granted (RM050208V) which in effect replaced the tent sites with cabins and permitted increased numbers in the backpackers' facility, i.e no tent sites will be available and the total number of people remained unchanged at 100. I can find no record of building consents for the first ten cabins which I understand were constructed prior to 2009. Therefore no request for roading development contributions has been applied to them.

In 2009 a variation (RM050208) was approved where the split of people permitted on site be readjusted and set at:

- 20 maximum in the backpackers facility
- 40 maximum in the 20 cabins
- 40 maximum in tent sites

The present building consent is for the second set of ten cabins whereby under Council's policy development contributions can be requested.

4. ASSESSMENT

It is acknowledged the maximum number of 100 people on site has not changed, however the mix of people in cabins, backpackers and in tents has. One of the ways Council can require development contributions is via building consents and hence the development contribution requested as part of this application.

It is my view that there is a difference in the mode of transport of someone staying at cabin compared to that of someone using a tent site.

Reason - With respect, cabin occupants tend to arrive in a vehicle as they are more affluent and carry more gear (comfort items) knowing that they have a larger area to spread out in and it is secure while they are away for the day. In inclement weather cabins will be used more often and for longer period overall throughout the year.

However, tent sites are more likely to be frequented by trampers, cyclists of lesser means etc and are likely to come on foot or cycle, i.e not have a vehicle. In bad weather tents sites will be used less often and not be used in frosty or very cold conditions.

I contend that the comparison of tent sites to cabins would be 50% more vehicle movements relating to cabins as opposed to tent sites (overall throughout the year). I do not agree with the applicant as they elude that the cabins will always be used by bus companies. The majority of the time the cabins will be available to whoever turns up at the gate.

5. SUMMARY

Development contributions can only be requested via:

- Resource consent
- Building consent
- Service connection

The applicant paid \$1,600 in October 1997 as a roading contribution for a combination of backpacker facility and tent sites. That application was altered to "convert" 20 tent sites to cabins and in my view traffic movements will increase due to this style of accommodation. As mentioned my view is that there is a subsequent 50% increase in traffic movement.

As per the original assessment the development contribution for the ten cabins at three HUDS and with the above view I am prepared to recommend to the committee that this be reduced by 50%.

If we take the original calculation of ten cabins at one park per cabin =

$10 \text{ parks} \div 3 = 3.33 \text{ HUDS}$

$3.33 \div 2 \text{ (50\%)} = 1.66 \text{ HUDS}$

\therefore as per the percentage policy, this equates to two HUDS.

6. RECOMMENDATION

THAT a reduction from three HUDS to two HUDS be approved which reflects the slight increase in traffic movements associated with the comparison of a tent site to a cabin site.

Dugald Ley
Development Engineer