

*under:* the Resource Management Act 1991

*in the matter of:* an application by Ryman Healthcare Limited for resource consent to construct, operate and maintain a comprehensive care retirement village at 26 Donald Street and 37 Campbell Street, Karori, Wellington

*between:* **Ryman Healthcare Limited**  
*Applicant*

*and:* **Wellington City Council**  
*Consent Authority*

Summary Statement of **Leo Donald Hills** on behalf of Ryman Healthcare Limited

---

Dated: 13 September 2022

---

Reference: Luke Hinchey (luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com)  
Nicola de Wit (nicola.dewit@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com  
T +64 9 357 9000  
F +64 9 357 9099

PO Box 2206  
Auckland 1140  
New Zealand

Auckland  
Wellington  
Christchurch



**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF LEO DONALD HILLS ON BEHALF OF RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED**

- 1 My full name is Leo Donald Hills. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence dated 29 August 2022.
- 2 The Proposed Village satisfies most of the Operative Plan transport permitted activity standards, except for the width of the access point on Donald Street and the total number of access points.
- 3 I consider the number and design of vehicle accesses at the Site to be appropriate. As noted above, the width of the access point on Donald Street does not comply with the Operative Plan (6.0m maximum width). Council's traffic specialist questioned the original width. As such, I have further reviewed the crossing width and consider that it can be reduced to 7.5m based on vehicle tracking by removing the central entry "island". This width is still 1.5m greater than the complying width. However, the additional width is required to ensure service vehicles / fire appliances can negotiate the driveway at the same time as resident cars. I consider this revised access provision to be appropriate.
- 4 Although I understand the standards do not yet have legal effect, I note that the Proposed Village satisfies most of the Proposed Plan transport permitted activity standards, except for provision for electrified vehicles and the use of ramps to connect parking areas. I am comfortable that the ramps to connect parking areas are appropriately designed for the Proposed Village use. I am not qualified to comment on electric vehicle provision.
- 5 In my opinion, the traffic that will be generated by the Proposed Village will have minimal effects on the surrounding road environment. Council's traffic specialist reviewed the information relating to trip generation and distribution, overall intersection modelling and alternatives and agrees with the overall analysis / findings. I also note that the Proposed Village will generate less traffic in the peak periods than both the previous education use and a likely alternate residential development.
- 6 In my opinion, the number of parking spaces proposed on the Site is sufficient for the intended use. The parking provision meets industry standards and Ryman's internal expectations.
- 7 I consider that the construction traffic effects of the Proposed Village can be appropriately managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (*CTMP*), which is a standard management plan for these types of effects on large projects such as here. I understand a condition of consent will require a CTMP to be prepared, certified and implemented (addressed by Mr Richard Turner). The CTMP will specifically address truck movements, truck routes, contractor

parking, pedestrian provisions, construction hours and time restrictions on vehicle movements to and from the Site. A draft CTMP is provided at **Appendix 1** of my statement of evidence to provide an indication of how construction traffic effects will be managed through a CTMP.

- 8 I consider that the majority of submitters' concerns are unfounded or are to be addressed through the proposed conditions of consent. These are summarised as:
- 8.1 Construction traffic effects. The production of a CTMP is the appropriate and industry standard practice method of addressing temporary construction effects for developments such as the Proposed Village.
  - 8.2 Traffic generated by the operation of the Proposed Village. My analysis has shown that the generated traffic can be accommodated in the surrounding road network.
  - 8.3 Parking provision. The proposed parking provision of 229 carparks is in my opinion appropriate and fully complies with industry standards (for a retirement village) and the parking ratio used at other recent Ryman Villages. Conditions relating to a staff travel plan and a parking management strategy plan are to be included.
  - 8.4 Pedestrian safety. The Proposed Village will provide only one vehicle crossing on each frontage thereby minimising conflict points. The driveways are appropriately positioned and will be designed in accordance with Council standards with the exception of width of the access on Donald Street which has been designed to accommodate the vehicles expected. Overall, in my opinion I do not consider the Proposed Village will result in any new safety issues.
  - 8.5 Emergency vehicle access. In my experience from other developments, the details of fire access including fire appliance access is covered in future stages, especially Building Consent sign off. I am often involved at that stage for Ryman to assist with calculating road dimensions, turning circle details and the like. I note that the detailed design phase will further refine the access and parking strategy to address fire safety requirements.
  - 8.6 Traffic Data used. I consider the traffic data used in the analysis is appropriate and reflects the current environment. This data has been verified by Council's current traffic data.
  - 8.7 Use of Campbell Street access. In my opinion Donald Street is the most appropriate main access location given it connects

back to Karori Road at a signalised intersection. I note that residents of Buildings B02-B06 will have direct access to Campbell Street as well as indirect access (through the Site) to Donald Street.

- 9 I note that the owners of 40 Campbell Street (Submission 67) have sought to amend their submission, and now consider, “[t]here will be much more traffic and noise just in front of our house than other residents”. As per **Figure 6** of my statement of evidence (page 17), there will be up to 10 movements per hour in and out of this access at the peak (one vehicle every 6 minutes). Overall, I consider this level of traffic will have little to no impact on safety or efficiency relating to the neighbours driveways (including Number 40).
- 10 I agree with the conclusions of Council’s reporting planner<sup>1</sup> that “subject to [Mr Kong’s] assessment and recommended conditions of consent, the proposal is acceptable from a traffic perspective”. I do however consider a small number of the Council’s proposed conditions are not required or require minor edits. These include:
- 10.1 The CTMP condition should have some allowance for concrete pours to occur through school peaks (with additional provisions such as additional traffic spotters / controllers) as they cannot be stopped until complete;
- 10.2 The condition relating to parking monitoring and surveys (Condition 26) is unnecessary. The parking for the Site is sufficient, and this Condition (together with proposed Condition 27) would effectively remove rights for the Site to use on-street parking. The proposed monitoring would not be able to identify whether any change in parking on adjacent streets was due to the Proposed Village or other development. The purpose of the Condition is also unclear given the on-site parking provision will not be able to be changed once the Proposed Village is operational; and
- 10.3 For similar reasons, Condition 27 should be replaced with a more typical Parking Management Plan condition and in particular should not have any requirement to ensure all parking demand is contained on-site.

**Leo Hills**  
**13 September 2022**

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Officer’s Report – Laura Brownlie, paragraph 444.