

## STAFF REPORT

**TO:** Environment & Planning Subcommittee  
Development Contributions Delegated Subcommittee

**FROM:** Dugald Ley, Development Engineer

**REFERENCE:** RM080902

**SUBJECT:** **MACHOPS LTD - REPORT EP09/06/04** - Report prepared for hearing of 5 June 2009

---

### **EXTENSION OF HOP DRYING KILN AND TRACTOR SHED (first stage) - \$200,000 – 97 PARKER STREET**

#### **1. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to review the calculation of the Rooding HUD (household unit of demand) being two rooding HUDs, ie  $2 \times \$1781.00 = \$3562.00$ . (Note – Three HUDs = \$5343.00 billed out in error)

#### **2. BACKGROUND**

This application is to expand the existing facility to cope with increased hop production in the local neighbouring property.

New buildings proposed are a  $756\text{m}^2$  building and relocated tractor shed as stage 1 and a  $504\text{m}^2$  building and relocation of workers' accommodation as stage 2. The first stage project value is \$200,000. The new building of  $677\text{m}^2$  will replace the existing sheds of  $330\text{m}^2$ , ie increase of  $346\text{m}^2$ .

The attached plans outline the works and stages proposed. On considering the plan staff chose to give a benefit by only applying a requirement to assess the  $346\text{m}^2$  "additional area for hop production" rather than include the new tractor sheds, ie additional  $108\text{m}^2$ . The  $346\text{m}^2$  equates to the provision via the TRMP to supply seven car parks, ie one car park per  $50\text{m}^2$  of floor area. As per the LTCCP, household unit of demand calculation –  $7 \text{ car parks} \div 3 \text{ HUDs} = 2.3 \text{ HUDs}$  and reduced down to 2 HUDs.

In their application the applicants advised that rather than build or "replicating harvest facilities" on the adjoining land, there was economy of scale to expand the existing facility.

It is clear that increased production will eventuate from this new building development and will affect the adjoining rooding network with increased vehicle movements into and out of the complex.

Staff have been generous in applying the rule requiring car parks for the increased building area and subsequent car parking calculations.

It is my view that the imposition of only two roading HUDs (development contribution) to the value of \$3562.00 is fair and reasonable.

Note – this is reduced from the original three HUDs which was advised in error to the applicant and amended on 11 May 2009.

Dugald Ley  
**Development Engineer**