

BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991
(the "Act")

AND of an Application for Resource Consent,
(RMA/2019/1330) to the Christchurch City
Council, 25 Oxford Street and 3, 5, 7 and 9
London Street, Lyttelton.

BETWEEN **COLLETT'S CORNER LIMITED**
Applicant

AND **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**
Territorial Authority

Statement of Evidence

Lisa Marie Williams

1.0 Introduction

1.1 My full name is Lisa Marie Williams. I am a transport engineer and planner employed by Novo Group Limited, a Christchurch based resource management and traffic engineering consulting company.

1.2 I hold a Master of Engineering (Transport) from the University of Canterbury. I have over 10 years experience in transport engineering and resource management planning with local authorities and in private practice, in New Zealand. This specifically includes both the preparation and peer review of integrated transport assessments and traffic impact assessments under the Resource Management Act, for notified and non-notified landuse activities. In addition, I have been actively involved with a variety of parking policy advice for Town Centre Master Planning and District Plan changes. This includes a variety of residential, commercial and mixed-use developments.

1.3 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. I have complied with it in preparing this evidence and I agree to comply with it in presenting evidence at this hearing. The evidence that I give is within my area of expertise except where I state that my evidence is given in reliance on another person's evidence. I have considered all material facts that are known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express in this evidence.

2.0 Scope of Evidence

2.1 I present transport evidence in relation to the resource consent application at 25 Oxford Street and 3, 5, 7 and 9 London Street, Lyttelton on behalf of Collett's Corner Limited ('the applicant'). I prepared the original transport assessment (ITA) which was attached as part of the resource consent application. In preparing this evidence I have also read:

- i The Council planner's notification report, prepared by Ms Jowett;
- ii The Council planner's section 42A report, prepared by Ms Jowett;
- iii The Council Consultants Transport Evidence, prepared by Mr Carr; and
- iv The 169 submissions received.

2.2 From the outset, I note that there is broad agreement between myself and Mr. Carr. With this in mind, I will not be repeating all of the background information that has been canvassed in the consent application and in the Council Planner's reports. In this evidence I will comment on the following:

- Description of site and surrounding area
- The Proposal

- District Plan Compliance
- Assessment of effects on the environment
- Response to recommended conditions of consent
- Submissions
- Objectives and policies of the District Plan
- Conclusion

3.0 The Site and Surrounds

3.1 The site is located at 25 Oxford Street and 3, 5, 7 and 9 London Street, Lyttelton which is commonly referred to as “Collett’s Corner” and is legally described as Lot 1 DP 13544 and Part Section 31 TN OF Lyttelton.

3.2 The site takes vehicle access from Oxford Street along its southern boundary, utilising the same vehicle crossing as the pre-earthquake development. This access previously served two residential car parking spaces and one to two spaces in an un-marked “car court” used by the office activity.

3.3 Oxford Street is classified as a *Major Arterial Road* outside the application site and downgrades to a *local* road immediately north of the intersection with London Street and Sumner Road¹. London Street is classified as a *local* road. Both roads have a 50km/h speed limit and footpaths on both sides.

3.4 A detailed description of the existing on-street parking and loading supply was provided in the ITA (see paragraphs 19-23, and Attachment 3).

3.5 The surrounding transport environment including crash records and public transport routes are also outlined in more detail in the ITA. I am not aware of there being any material changes to the road network since the completion of that ITA.

4.0 The Proposal

4.1 Full details of the proposal are outlined in the application documents. Of particular relevance to transport, the proposal includes:

- 20 units for residential or guest accommodation use;
- 128m² Public Floor Area (PFA) for Food and Beverage;
- 125m² treatment rooms and 87.5m² Pool area for the Day Spa;

¹ The arterial route continues from Oxford Street to Sumner Road.

- 260m² Gross Floor Area (GFA) for the gym (comprising 237m² PFA²);
- 90m² of office or retail;
- Six basement level car parks, accessed via a secure roller door and a 3.6m wide ramp from Oxford Street;
- 26 cycle parking spaces, including 20 secure spaces at basement level for residents and staff; and six visitor cycle parks at first floor level; and
- No on-site loading.

5.0 District Plan Compliance

5.1 I agree with Ms. Jowett's and Mr. Carr's identification of the District Plan's transport non-compliances. This includes the following standards in relation to Rule 7.4.2.3. RD1:

- 7.4.3.1: 63-68 parking spaces are required (depending on the development scenario), whereas only 6 spaces are provided.
- 7.4.3.2: 19-36 cycle parking spaces are required (depending on the development scenario), whereas 26 cycle parks are provided.
- 7.4.3.3: Either 1x99% and 1xHGV loading spaces are required or no loading spaces are required (depending on the development scenario). No on-site loading spaces are proposed.
- 7.4.3.4: An additional reverse manoeuvre is required to enter one of the parking spaces.
- 7.4.3.7: A 4.0m minimum access width is required, whereas a 3.6m width is proposed.
- 7.4.3.8: The vehicle crossing is required to be located 30m from the intersection of Oxford Street with London Street, whereas a 21m separation is provided.
- 7.4.3.10: The site is estimated to generate 69-76 vehicle movements in the peak hour and therefore is a high trip generator and a basic ITA is required.

5.2 I also agree with Ms Jowett that significant weight should be given to the changes to the District Plan parking requirements in Rule 7.4.3.1 that have recently been implemented under section 71 of the *Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016*. Under the amended provisions, if the application was re-lodged, there would be a District Plan parking requirement for 17 car parks

² Public Floor Area

for the 20 units if used as residential and a nil requirement if 18 of those units were used for guest accommodation³ (noting the application seeks approval for both uses).

6.0 Assessment of Effects on the Environment

6.1 There is general agreement between myself and Mr. Carr in respect of the transport related effects. I have summarised the key conclusions below:

- There is ample on-street parking within a walkable distance of the site to meet the anticipated demand. The increase in demand is not such that it precludes the ability of any other (future) developments to also rely upon on-street parking.
- On-street parking is not anticipated to result in any adverse safety effects.
- The on-site car parking layout and manoeuvring is acceptable for the anticipated users.
- The cycle parking provision is acceptable.
- Reliance on existing on-street loading zones is appropriate.
- The proposed access width is not likely to lead to adverse safety or efficiency effects.
- Any queuing related effects are acceptable subject to provision of a high-speed roller-door.
- The location of the vehicle crossing is acceptable, noting the characteristics of the surrounding environment, and proposed low volumes.
- The volume of traffic generated by this site will be disbursed across the surrounding road network and can be accommodated with the existing capacity.

6.2 I can therefore support the application from a transport perspective. This is a view shared by Mr. Carr.

7.0 Proposed Consent Conditions

7.1 Ms. Jowett has recommended six conditions of consent. Conditions #4-6 relate to transport. The applicant accepts these conditions, subject to the following change to condition 4 (Changes

³ As the first two units do not require any car parks and one space per unit is required there-after.

shown **bold and underlined**):

*Condition 4: Parking spaces within the basement shall be allocated to specific units **or managed via a booking system**, to avoid drivers speculatively entering the basement and then having to exit again.*

- 7.2 The amended wording is intended to provide flexibility for use of the parking spaces, particularly under the Guest Accommodation scenario where guests can select their unit and then also book an on-site parking space, if needed. The amended wording is considered to be consistent with the intent of the original condition in ensuring that there are not additional vehicles “speculatively” entering the site when the carpark is full.

8.0 Submissions

- 8.1 A total of 169 submissions were received, with 135 in support, 32 in opposition and 2 neutral to the proposal. Ms. Jowett summarises the submissions in pages 3 and 4 of her S42A report. I generally concur with this summary. The transport related submissions have also been addressed in Ms Jowett’s S42A report and Mr Carr’s evidence.
- 8.2 It is noted that the majority of these submissions related to car parking. In this respect the District Plan changes under s.71 of the *Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016* have provided greater clarity regarding the management of parking resources in Lyttelton. That is, on-site parking is not required for any activity other than residential activities. Accordingly, most parking demand in Lyttelton is anticipated to continue to be met by on-street parking.
- 8.3 Residential parking demand and supply has been addressed in detail in the ITA and in the Council Officers Reports. Compared to that amended District Plan parking rates, there would be an 11 space shortfall⁴ in residential parking supply, this also aligns with the estimated overflow demand from Attachment 2 of the Memo dated 3 February 2020. As outlined by Mr Carr⁵, even if residential demand was higher (one space per unit), there is ample on-street parking available to meet this demand.
- 8.4 The majority of residential parking demand will be for un-restricted parking, by proximity / convenience and availability, most of the residents demand will likely occur on Oxford Street (London – Winchester), and Norwich Quay or Sumner Road. The surveys show there is ample availability in these locations such that demand can be met and as such we anticipate very little displacement of existing parking. There are no residential properties taking access from the

⁴ 20 units, of which units 3-20 generate a requirement for one space each = 18 spaces, less the 3% reduction factor = 17 spaces. 6 spaces are provided on-site.

⁵ In paragraphs 13-23 of Mr Carr’s evidence.

section of Sumner Road surveyed (due to the gradients). Norwich Quay does not adjoin a residential zone. The majority of residential properties along this section of Oxford Street have either on-site parking or a residents parking permit space on-street.

8.5 In respect of the submission by the Lyttelton Port Company we have addressed these concerns directly noting they are related solely to the Port's operation.

9.0 Objectives and Policies

9.1 The transport related objectives and policies are set out in section 7.2 of the District Plan. Of particular relevance is Policy 7.2.1.4a. relating to car parking provision which has been discussed at length in the Section 42A report. In summary, the assessment of effects has outlined that both parking and loading demand can be met without impacting on the functioning of the surrounding transport network and that on-street parking is an existing and anticipated characteristic of Lyttelton. The six on-site parking spaces will be appropriate to meet demand for those occupants needing an on-site car park (i.e., those not willing or able to walk short distances from on-street parking). In respect of 7.2.1.4 a. ii. B. (encouraging public and active travel) the following points are noted:

- there are separate pedestrian entrances;
- the site is located on the main shopping street in Lyttelton;
- appropriate cycle parking is proposed; and
- the site is serviced by two public transport routes.

9.2 Accordingly, the proposal is therefore considered to be consistent with this policy.

9.3 The proposal is appropriately managed as a high traffic generator (Policy 7.2.1.2); has an appropriate car park layout (Policy 7.2.1.5); and provides for access and manoeuvring that will not adversely affect the safety and efficiency of the road (Policy 7.2.1.3). The proposed cycle parking supply is appropriate for the anticipated use and the limited on-site parking supply may also contribute to encouraging use of public transport (Policy 7.2.1.6).

9.4 In summary, Objective 7.2.1 seeks an integrated transport system that is safe and efficient, supports communities travel, reduces car dependency and is managed as one network. Noting the conclusions in respect of effects and the relevant policies above, the proposal is considered to be consistent with this objective.

10.0 Conclusions

- 10.1 The proposal results in several transport related non-compliances. For the reasons outlined above (and detailed further in my original ITA), the site is considered to provide sufficient cycle parking to meet the future needs of staff, visitors, and residents / guests.
- 10.2 The use of on-street loading is considered to be appropriate.
- 10.3 The level of traffic generated by the site will be dispersed across, and can be accommodated by, the surrounding transport network, without adverse safety or efficiency concerns.
- 10.4 There is ample parking supply within the surrounding area to meet the anticipated demand. Use of on-street parking is an existing and anticipated characteristic of Lyttelton and will not adversely affect the safety or efficiency of the road network. The on-site parking spaces will also provide for some future occupiers who have a greater need for on-site parking subject to the proposed Condition 4 wording below:
- Parking spaces within the basement shall be allocated to specific units **or managed via a booking system**, to avoid drivers speculatively entering the basement and then having to exit again.*
- 10.5 The car park layout and access arrangements are considered appropriate subject to the conditions relating to provision of cyclist warning signage and a high-speed roller door (per Conditions 5 and 6 as set out in the s.42A report).
- 10.6 Accordingly, I consider the effects of the proposal to be less than minor and acceptable on the surrounding transport network. This is a view shared by Mr Carr.

Lisa Williams

20 February 2020