

MINUTES

TITLE: Environment & Planning Subcommittee - Development Contributions Levies
DATE: Wednesday, 23 January 2008
TIME: 9.30 am
VENUE: Council Chamber, 189 Queen Street, Richmond

PRESENT: Cr M J Higgins (Chair) and Cr T E Norriss

IN ATTENDANCE: Manager Resource Consents (J Hodson), Development Engineer (D Ley), Administration Officer (B D Moore)

1. GRACE CHURCH HEADINGLY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT RM050075

The Grace Church Trust had submitted an objection to the development contribution levy for roading of \$120,345.00. This levy had been calculated as 71 household units of demand x \$1,695.00. Mr J Howard, Projects Director of Win Win Project Management representing Grace Church Trust, tabled and read a memorandum of 22 January 2008. He explained how the Headingly Centre would serve as both a church and community centre and would function to enhance the community's health and wellbeing. He explained that the variance experienced in vehicle movements between a shopping mall or mega store as compared to a community facility is very significant. He provided examples of the extent of vehicle parking at Richmond Mall and also Annesbrook Church at similar times of the day to demonstrate that at no time, will the vehicle movement scenario in any way or form replicate that experienced in a commercial situation on the subject Headingly Centre site.

Mr Howard said that it follows that the capital upgrade requirement to roading infrastructure, to support a new commercial situation as opposed to a community situation, will be vastly different. He said that this will be significantly higher in respect of the commercial situation. Mr Howard said that also in respect of the Headingly Centre, much of the vehicle movement scenario will be off peak, resulting in little congestion being imposed on the surrounding road network, therefore there is little requirement for capital upgrade work on roads.

He said that heavy vehicle traffic will be all but non-existent at the Headingly Centre development. He asked the Council to provide a meaningful reduction in development contributions so that the church trust pays a fair share on an equitable basis. He said that the applicant acknowledges the need for formulas to determine costs but that not all formula are valid or produce just outcomes in all situations.

Grace Church trustee, Mr K Polglase, said that the church will have no staff offices in the new facility except for one administrator's office and the church will continue to use the existing office situation and there will be very few vehicle movements between the existing office and this complex.

Mr Howard said that the church is committed to roading improvements of about \$40,000.00 on Queen Street and Headingly Lane and perhaps a figure of \$20,000.00 roading DIL's would be considered reasonable. He said that the church shouldn't be faced with such large costs.

1.1 Staff Report

Development Engineer, Mr D Ley, spoke to his report contained within the agenda. He said he was bound to provide an assessment figure of 71 household units of demand with his calculations being constrained to application of the formula from the Council's Long Term Council Community Plan and the figures provided within the proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan. Mr Ley said that he thought most of the widening work required on Queen Street has already been carried out as a result of the consent obtained for the school in Headingly Lane.

1.2 Right of Reply

Mr Howard said that new roading access work onto the site will still be required. He said that potential vehicle movements to the subject site will be particularly low especially Monday to Friday inclusive and up to 6.00 pm on those days. He said in view of the low vehicle usage that the Grace Church Trust sought a dispensation from the higher level of roading development levy imposed.

Mr Polglase acknowledged that there was potential for the church to attract infrequent one off high attendance situations but that the church only has one large meeting a week. He said that the new complex would be firstly a church and a community facility secondly.

He reminded the hearing panel that the Grace Church did previously exist in Edward Street, Richmond.

The hearing adjourned at 10.45 am.

2. MS FORD - BP RICHMOND CAR WASH

An objection to Council's assessment for the wastewater household unit of demand for the proposed car wash at the BP Service Station, 177 Queen Street, Richmond had been received from Hunt Building Consultants by way of letters dated 3 and 11 July 2007. The projected average discharge volume of water was 2.19 m³ per day (2 huds) instead of 3.25 m³ (3 huds) required by Council for the wastewater building development contribution.

Mr J Gallagher, Project Manager and Mr M Hart of M S Ford, represented the applicant and tabled a letter at the hearing. Mr Gallagher confirmed that the calculations of discharge wastewater were those arrived at following the adduction of 50% recycled water.

2.1 Staff Report

Development Engineer, D Ley, explained the usage and water consumption of other car wash operations including Waimea Motors Limited at 7 Gladstone Road, Richmond and Caltex Bishopdale in Nelson. He described how those operations each use about 7 m³ of water per day and with this proposed operation after deducting 50% for recycling, an estimate of 3 m³ per day (equivalent to 3 huds) is a fair and reasonable assessment.

The hearing adjourned at 11.25 am.

3. DECISION FOR MS FORD – BP RICHMOND CAR WASH

Moved Crs Norriss / Higgins

EP08/01/23

THAT the Tasman District Council upholds the decision of 3 huds for MS Ford – BP Richmond Car Wash.

CARRIED

3.1 Reasons for the Decision

The reasons for the decision are that the Subcommittee agreed with the staff assessment (of 3 HUD equivalents) as the amount of 3.25 cubic metres of wastewater to be discharged was a reasonable prediction and that it was not considered appropriate to assume a reduction in the discharge quantities associated with the existing carwash facility elsewhere in Richmond.

4. THE GRACE CHURCH TRUST HEADINGLY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT

Cr Higgins acknowledged that an adjustment of roading building development contribution appeared necessary in that the Tasman District Council development impact levy policy asks for a fair share on an equitable basis by means of a fair assessment. Cr Higgins acknowledged the intermittent use which occurs for car parking by churches during their community activity.

Cr Higgins noted that a place of assembly requires a higher number of car parks but does not have the same effect on the Council roading infrastructures as a commercial operation such as a shopping mall.

Crs Higgins and Norriss agreed that the figure to use is 35 huds being a 50% reduction to that originally assessed by Council staff. Ms Hodson sought that the Development Contribution Levies Delegated Committee are in agreement that staff use some discretion for low usage places of assembly for example 50%. The Delegated Committee agreed to that discretion by consensus. The Committee instructed Ms Hodson to request that Mr Ley determine how much work is required on both the Queen Street and Headingly Lane roading improvements by the applicant the estimated cost for both projects.

The matter was adjourned pending the receipt of that further information.

Moved Crs Norriss / Higgins

EP08/01/24

THAT the Tasman District reduce the development contribution for roading by a factor of 50%, thus reducing the number of HUD equivalent for roading from 71 to 35.

CARRIED

- 4.1 The reasons for the reduction are that the car parks associated with the Grace Church Headingly Centre will generally be used at a low intensity, and large gatherings where the car park may be full will only occur infrequently. Also, the Church has a requirement to do road upgrading in the vicinity of the site and there is a history of use associated with the Church in Richmond which can be taken into account, as the new use of the old Church property has a lesser parking demand (flats).

Date Confirmed:

Chair: