

STAFF REPORT

TO: Environment & Planning Subcommittee
Development Contributions Delegated Subcommittee

FROM: Dugald Ley, Development Engineer

REFERENCE: BC081089

SUBJECT: **RICHMOND SOUTH HALLS TRUST - REPORT EP09/06/03 -**
Report prepared for hearing of 5 June 2009

NEW CHURCH HALL, 61 HILL STREET RICHMOND

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to review the calculation of the Rooding Development Contribution of the equivalent of three rooding HUDs (household unit of demand) for the above development.

2. BACKGROUND

Council approved an application on 13 March 2008 (RM070921) for replacement of an existing dwelling with a Church hall and parking to cater for 16 vehicles.

The attached extract from the consent sets out the permitted number of people allowed to gather on the site:

The maximum number of people on the site any one time shall not exceed the following:

- *50 people on Sundays between 5.50 am and 7.10 am;*
- *50 people on Mondays between 6.25 pm and 7.30 pm;*
- *100 people on Sundays on no more than 24 occasions in any 12 month calendar period between 2.50 pm and 4.30 pm; and*
- *100 people on Fridays on no more than 24 occasions in any 12 month calendar period between 7.20 pm to 8.45 pm.*
- *12 people on any day between 4.00 pm and 8.00 pm for the purposes of a meeting of the Richmond South Gospel Hall Trust Board members.*

It was noted at the hearing that many hall user will walk or share rides to the venue.

However the hall can be used for various activities throughout the day which will create extra vehicle movements.

When staff assessed the application it was noted that a credit will be due to the residential use curtailing on the site. Staff were also conscious that the existing hall at 58 William Street could continue to be used for hall purposes with existing use rights.

A similar objection for development levies was heard by Council in 2005 – BC050885, Progressive Enterprises, Takaka supermarket.

In that application the applicant claimed that they were just “relocating” to another area and therefore no or only a small roading HUD should be payable. The committee chose to accept the staff recommendation as this was a new activity and that the existing building (redundant supermarket) could make way for other uses, viz:

In relation to the assessment of the roading HUDS, the Subcommittee notes there is a difference between the staff assessment of 20 and that of 10 by the applicant. At up to 700 vehicle movements per day, the Subcommittee accepts that the residential equivalent of 10 vehicle movements per day would give rise to an unacceptably high contribution given the traffic generating capability of a supermarket. Relocation of the supermarket to this site may have benefits to the locality of the current supermarket site but this is not a relevant matter as that building is able to accommodate new, but unknown tenancies. The proposed supermarket will result in changed traffic flows and in its own right will attract customers by road to this new location. Taking into account the fact that customers will travel to town for reasons other than just visiting the supermarket, seasonal fluxes, and the role of the state highway network, the Subcommittee considered the equivalent of 20 residential HUDs was proportionate and appropriate for such a new development as this.

The panel will be aware that vehicle numbers can be subjective when assessing a new residential activity. The applicant’s submission is that the new hall will create less traffic effects than that of the existing residential dwelling that it replaces, ie no roading HUD payable.

The recognised traffic generation for a residential property is 10 vehicle movements per day, ie 140 vehicle movements per week and the car parking requirement is one HUD = three car park spaces.

It is noted that this church hall is not controlled by a particular religion or belief so Council staff have to accept the hall can be used for any permitted activity which a hall can provide and be guided by the TRMP where the hall space to car park ratio requires the 16 car park spaces.

3. SUMMARY

The normal design capacity of the hall is for 50 persons (but can be up to 100). The TRMP requires one space for four persons, ie $50 \div 4 = 12.5$ (16 provided).

Staff calculate that 12.5 divided by the standard three car park HUD allowance equates to 4.16 HUDS, less the one HUD credit for the existing use (residential dwelling now removed). The result is three roading HUDs as requested by Council.

As mentioned the existing hall in William Street can continue to be used as a hall similar to the Takaka supermarket case and staff have also granted a “credit” for the existing dwelling. Again the hall does not pertain to a particular group of people who use “larger vehicle movers” but to all users who may be one or two occupant vehicles.

It is my view that the calculation of three roading HUDs is realistic and appropriate.

Dugald Ley
Development Engineer