

**The Youth Hub Trust: RMA/2020/405 (109 Salisbury Street)**

**Salisbury West Community Preservation Group**

**Response to changes tabled by the applicant 8.10.20, and amended plans received 14.10.20  
16.10.20**

Following careful consideration and consultation with our members please find following our response to the changes tabled by the Youth Hub Trust at the extended hearing 8 October 2020, and subsequently confirmed in amended plans received 15 October 2020.

Our response

The applicant's proposal is for an integrated mix of activities to take place, the majority – 60% at least – of which are non-residential and therefore non-complying.

Amendments to specific elements therefore do not remove or even reduce the negative impact that the applicant's proposal, taken as a whole, will have upon the residential amenity of people living both immediately adjacent to the site and therefore the most affected, and the community as a whole.

For example:

(1) the café

The café has been relocated and replaced by a gallery, to reduce the commercial interface with Salisbury Street. The gallery however still presents a non-residential frontage to Salisbury Street. It is therefore only replacing like-with-like. Both the café and the gallery continue to be non-residential in nature, and are therefore non-complying.

Have the changes made a material difference? **No**

(2) recreational spaces and operational hours

Andrew Just's supplementary evidence tabled 8.10.20 point 7 states:

*'In addition, to assist the Commissioner, we will be providing the following documents: 7.4 examples of what activities might be included in the art and recreation space.'*

The applicant has failed to provide this information. Therefore, this aspect of the applicant's proposal remains vague, and provides neither us or the Commissioner with enough reliable information on which to make an assessment.

Have the changes made a material difference? **No**

(3) landscaping/decks and window treatments

The proposed changes will have only a minor impact upon a few people and go nowhere near to reducing the negative impacts of the applicant's proposal when taken as a whole.

Have the changes made a material difference? **No**

(4) Gracefield Avenue car and cycle parking

The changes proposed by the applicant do not go far enough.

They do not address the congestion and safety issues created by providing access from a part of Gracefield Avenue that is already a bottleneck. There should be no access at all from Gracefield Avenue.

Nor do they take in to account how the applicant's proposal will only further compound the negative traffic effects on Salisbury Street that are beginning to occur because of increased residential development in the area.

Have the changes made a material difference? **No**

(5) travel management plan

Monitoring proposed by the applicant simply seeks to mitigate what the applicant themselves acknowledge as negative impacts of their proposal, rather than to address the underlying root-causes of those impacts.

Have the changes made a material difference? **No**

In summary:

1. The proposed amendments do not remove or even reduce the negative impacts that the applicant's proposal, taken as a whole, will have on the residential amenity of the neighbourhood and community.
2. The proposed amendments will have at best only a minor impact upon a small number of people and fail to address the substantive issues raised in our submissions.
3. Monitoring proposed by the applicant simply seeks to mitigate what the applicant themselves acknowledge as negative impacts of their proposal, rather than to address the underlying root-causes of those impacts.
4. This, combined with the high-level of 'opacity' remaining in applicants proposal (e.g. workshop activities) gives us no confidence in the applicants ability to influence the reduction of these negative impacts.

It is our view that the proposed amendments have given no sound justification for granting resource consent. **Our position remains that the application should be declined in full.**

Michael Prentice  
For the South West Community Preservation Group