



Living Streets Hamilton  
C/- 29 Claude St  
Hamilton

5 October 2008

**SUBMISSION ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED OR LIMITED NOTIFIED RESOURCE  
CONSENT APPLICATION: From Homes for Living regarding Commercial  
development, including car parking, at 490 Grey St, Hamilton, reapplication, file  
number 2008/075**

**Name of Submitter:** Judith McDonald, on behalf of Living Streets Hamilton

**Living Streets Opposes the entire application**

**The reasons for Living Streets Hamilton's opposition to the application are as follows:**

Most of the reasons we cited in our first objection to the original plan (May 2008, copy attached) still stand.

While minor alterations to building design may help minimise the danger of enclosed courtyards, very little else has changed in this proposed development.

We are highly sceptical of the report on peak parking requirements which seems almost miraculously to suggest that rather than the 186 parking spaces required under the district plan, 149 (the number actually available in this proposal) would suffice.

The proposed usage of the site is also unlikely to occur, since there seems little reason for a large medical/health facility to move in a mere block away from the already existing modern Hamilton East Medical Centre. We believe that once consent is obtained, Hamilton City Council have little or no control over what the buildings are actually used for. Retail outlets involving very high traffic flow, such as fast food restaurants, could conceivably be the actual tenants, and there would be no way to prevent this.

We also disagree with a number of statements in the developers' new proposal. Most are directly connected with traffic safety but some relate to the amenity value of the area:

- Page 36 *"The Salmond Reed report also concluded that the proposed new building would not have adverse effects on local heritage values"*. One could concur, on the basis that the vandalism done by the developers to the mature trees on the site, which were the main heritage value, is beyond recall, and anything else can't do a great deal more harm. However, it does not suggest that the developers will actually give significant thought to local heritage values, based on the approach so far.
- Page 5 of the Design Report: *"Pedestrian and vehicular accesses have sufficient separation to provide a safe pedestrian environment."* This may be

true within the site itself, but as mentioned in our first objection in May, this totally ignores the very large elephant in the room: **pedestrians are obliged to share footpaths with two new double lane (entry and exit lanes in both cases) vehicular crossings into the new site.** This area is already very busy, and most of the footpath users are either schoolchildren or the elderly. Some are likely to be distracted and others may have mobility problems. In either case, they may pose significant delays to traffic trying to enter or leave the site. This will cause impatience amongst drivers and backing up of traffic on both Grey St and Clyde St, both of which are already very congested. It is noteworthy that the traffic report, while covering the 8-9am peak and the 5-6pm peak, omitted the 3-4pm peak caused by school pickups. This is particularly dangerous, with children and vehicles interacting in dangerous ways even now. With additional traffic entering and leaving the new site, conditions can only worsen.

- Traffic issues may extend much further than merely the local Clyde St – Grey St intersection. The provision for only left-turn entry and exit to the site at either entrance is definitely sensible, but it will guarantee that most vehicular users of the site will have to make major detours to leave it. This will involve travelling further down Grey St through the shopping centre or turning left into Clyde St if leaving by the Grey St exit, or continuing down Clyde St if leaving from the Clyde St exit. This is likely to cause increased congestion and accompanying danger to pedestrians and cyclists, and may result in presently reasonably quiet side streets becoming ‘rat runs’ for impatient motorists trying to retrace their path and get back to the direction they really wanted to take. In addition, unnecessary fuel consumption will result from patrons being forced to carry out sizeable detours when they would have normally chosen to turn right out of the centre.

**We seek the following decision from Council:** deny resource consent for this development

**The general nature of resource consent conditions or changes to the application we seek are:** the project should not be permitted, on the grounds of danger to pedestrians and cyclists, increased likelihood of vehicle – vehicle collisions and in general the production of an environment which will not enhance the area.



Living Streets Hamilton  
C/- 29 Claude St  
Hamilton

**23 May 2008: Original submission on first proposal**

**SUBMISSION ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED OR LIMITED NOTIFIED RESOURCE  
CONSENT APPLICATION: From Homes for Living regarding Commercial  
development, including car parking, at 490 Grey St, Hamilton**

**Name of Submitter:** Judith McDonald, on behalf of Living Streets Hamilton

**Living Streets Opposes the entire application**

**Living Streets wishes to submit on the following clauses in the resource  
consent application:** (page numbers refer to those in Form 9, Application for  
consent, as provided by Homes for Living)

Page 15: 4.6.2 – hours of operation and parking/loading/access

District Plan provisions as follows:

Page 19: 4.2.1 Transport network, paragraphs © and (e)

Page 20: 4.2.2 Access, paragraph (b)

Page 26: 6.2.2 Suburban Commercial Development, paragraph (a)

**The reasons for Living Streets Hamilton's opposition to the application are as  
follows:**

The District Plan repeatedly states in the sections we have cited that developments should provide facilities which meet the needs of and do not compromise the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, and which also do not impede vehicular traffic flow.

In the case of this proposed development, we cannot see how this can be achieved. While there is considerable attention given to the separation of pedestrians and vehicles inside the site, which is praiseworthy, there is no apparent attempt to address the sizeable elephant in the room: entry to the site via Grey St and Clyde St cuts directly across footpaths which are already widely used by pedestrians, including the students of both Marian and Sacred Heart schools.

The access is also directly off what are described as minor arterial routes (Grey and Clyde Streets). These streets are very congested already, particularly in the vicinity of the Grey/Clyde intersection, due to the very badly planned Clyde St shopping Centre. Cars are continually in a logjam at the entry to the parking lot, traffic banks up in both directions, and the prospect of adding to that even with something that has better internal traffic flow has to be close to insanity. The nature of the congestion is not adequately revealed by mere traffic counts. The problem is that the traffic barely moves, and that drivers get impatient and take risks. This behaviour is likely to increase when more congestion is provided on the other side of Clyde St.

This area has two schools immediately adjacent to the proposed development. Safety of the students at those schools cannot be enhanced by the provision of more shopping facilities involving more vehicles going in and out onto main roads.

Right turns into either of the entries should be forbidden, if the development goes ahead, because the potential for nasty collisions with oncoming traffic or cyclists would be significant. This means that for anyone using the proposed new centre, they would be forced to enter only from the Grey St entrance and leave either back on to Grey St or onto Clyde St using a left turn only. This should cause some massive detours for some shoppers and contribute significantly to unnecessary carbon emissions.

The optimistic provision of only one loading zone inside the site causes concern. It is common to have multiple small delivery vehicles servicing any small shopping centre, and if these vehicles can't get handy access to their destinations they are likely to park wherever they can, inhibiting traffic flow and quite possibly causing danger to pedestrians by obscuring sight lines or forcing them out into the vehicular traffic stream.

We also have some concerns that the site layout tends to be very inward looking, and that the secluded areas so pleasant in daylight may prove to be rather more sinister at night, being hidden from public view. This again could be hazardous to people walking in the area, and a particular worry for women on their own.

**We seek the following decision from Council:** deny resource consent for this development

**The general nature of resource consent conditions or changes to the application we seek are:** the project should not be permitted, on the grounds of danger to pedestrians and cyclists, increased likelihood of vehicle – vehicle collisions and in general the production of an environment which will not enhance the area.