

27 June 2022

James Witham
Planning Manager
South Wairarapa District Council
MARTINBOROUGH

Attn: James Witham

Kia ora James



P.O. Box 169 Greytown 5712
greytownheritagetrust@gmail.com
www.greytownheritagetrust.co.nz

Re: Proposed New Access and Signage to Fresh Choice Supermarket (134 Main Street, Greytown)

Thank you for giving the Trust the opportunity to comment on this proposal. This is very much appreciated.

About Us

Greytown Heritage Trust is a group of committed volunteers advocating for and preserving the unique history, character and heritage features – the buildings, trees and streetscape – of Greytown in South Wairarapa; New Zealand's first planned inland town.

Greytown Community Heritage Trust (the Trust) was established in 1993 with the Trust Deed was signed on 1 April 1994.

The Trust Deed outlines our aims:

- To encourage and facilitate the preservation of Greytown's contextual, cultural and environmental heritage within the 'Town Centre Precinct'.
- To promote awareness of heritage sites and provide education on heritage issues relating to Greytown.
- To support and promote local historic research.
- To encourage and facilitate the preservation of historic and notable trees, in and around Greytown.
- To be instrumental within the Greytown district in advancing any of these aims.

The Trust worked with South Wairarapa District Council (SWDC) to create the guidelines for the historic precinct in Greytown (Town Precinct), running from the Kuratawhiti/Jellicoe Streets intersection in the north to Wood Street further south.

The Trust was subsequently involved in instigating the Design Guide for the Greytown Residential Extension (North Street to Humphries Street). The Residential Extension received overwhelming community support with several requests to have it extended to other streets in Greytown.

In 2021 we published a well-regarded Style Guide to assist owners of properties within the Heritage Precinct and to provide suggestions for improvements to the environment within the Heritage Precinct.

Since our inception we have provided comment on resource consent applications on Main Street.

Proposed New Access and Signage to Fresh Choice Supermarket (134 Main Street, Greytown)

In 2015 we objected to both the signage and proposed access to the Fresh Choice Supermarket. We understand that these consents were surrendered in 2016. This new proposal is similar to the earlier one with a few changes – a one-way entry from Main Street, retention of the Copper Beech Tree, fewer new carparks and a new enlarged loading area. The earlier proposal caused considerable dissent in the town, a petition which the Trust instigated along with a public meeting (attended by 139 Greytown locals), a court case, considerable coverage in the media and Friends of Historic Greytown was established to oppose the

application. Given the earlier community interest in this, we recommend that this application is publicly notified.

Key issues

While the Trust has an interest in heritage issues, we are fortunate to have a Trustee who is a heritage architect who has identified numerous other issues with the proposal that are found wanting. Due to their nature these issues impact on the wider town heritage.

The Fresh Choice supermarket opened 2 July 2012 and operates successfully and is well supported by the community. The proposed changes would appear to not provide any benefits to the community but rather provide a raft of negative issues.

The issues are:

Consultation

- The Trust is concerned about the lack of consultation on this (and also with the earlier resource consent). This proposal is a critical one which Greytown residents are passionate about as was evidenced by the outcry with the last similar one. If approved, the proposal would fundamentally change the entry to the town centre in Greytown and is at odds with the Town Centre Design Guidelines.

Unsympathetic to the heritage area

- The Trust is concerned that the application totally ignores the town and the context. The proposed entrance from Main St is in the heritage area. Greytown risks losing what is special to it with proposals such as these.
- The proposal is totally unsympathetic to the surrounding streetscape.
- The proposal does not consider the Design Guidelines for the Town Centre or consider the intrinsic Greytown qualities. It appears to ignore the aims of the District Plan.
- No effort has been made to comply with the signage requirements.
- The loading bay area will be visible from Main Street. There has been no consideration of the Town Centre Design Guidelines and we do not support the design in its present form.
- While we can see why an enlarged loading bay area could be needed, we suggest a better overall solution would be to retain existing vehicle movements (refer below), and build an enlarged loading, skip pallet and storage area. This could take up much of the width between the supermarket and boundary. As a suggestion a new building could be built at the front of the site which respects the Town Centre Design Guidelines, for example, a café which opens onto a retained grassed area with a retained tree. This could be particularly lovely in the morning with the sun – and also in the afternoon with the later afternoon sun.

Archaeological Authority

- We note that an Archaeological Authority is required for this site under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. This site is part of one of the original town acres.

Noise

- The Trust is concerned about the additional noise the driveway will create. As with many properties in the Town Centre, the three properties to the north of the proposed driveway all have a residential component to them. This mixed use is part of Greytown's charm. The large b-trains and other vehicles proposed to use this entry will create unnecessary additional noise for these residents. The details of the acoustic fence are not provided and there are no mitigation measures proposed to the north side of the driveway.

Traffic issues and safety

- The proposal as it stands brings trucks unnecessarily into the central area of Greytown creating greater risks for both pedestrians and vehicles in the town and at the nearby crossing.

- We note there is no additional delivery traffic expected, the usual 6 vans, 2 light trucks and 10 b-trains throughout day is expected to remain. While the District Plan 6.5.2(g)(ii) allows one point per frontage we question the need for this additional entry – why is this needed when the two currently in use operate well? The new access point creates negligible benefits to Greytown except for perhaps the 10 b-train movements per day (who will now need to traverse the town centre).
- Main St is a busy street with SH2 traffic. Traffic volumes through Greytown have increased significantly in the past few years. The proposal is to make the Main St entrance one way, traffic from the north (the b-trains from Palmerston North) entering the car park will cause bottlenecks.
- The Commute report notes the b-trains come from the Palmerston North distribution centre and the remaining deliveries are sourced locally. The b-trains will not see the sign when approaching along Main Street from the north and the other delivery vehicles, being local, will know how to access the supermarket. Local drivers (which will include the delivery drivers) know that the quickest way to the supermarket is via West Street. This proposal is effectively diverting this traffic to Main Street and increasing risks and delays.
- More and more the Greytown Town Centre is becoming a pedestrian precinct – the Trust supports this direction. The Trust has lobbied for traffic calming measures on a number of occasions which includes:
 - moving heavy vehicles from Main Street and onto West Street as it was designed (or elsewhere as proposed by others)
 - tree planting to calm traffic
 - providing islands where pedestrians can cross the road more safely
 - raised crossings, additional crossings, cycling and encouraging locals to park off the main street
 - attempting to divert traffic to Main Street is not compatible with a more pedestrian precinct.

Necessity for three entrances and car parking

- The supermarket already has two entrances and even on peak times (such as before public holidays) it is always possible to park in the supermarket.
- In the unlikely event of any parking issues, there is parking across the road in a public carpark, and also on the street.

Vehicle Crossing

- There are 13 vehicle crossings to laneways/driveways on the west side of Main Street, north of the proposed vehicle crossing. These widths vary from 2.883m to 7.350m with a median width of 3.548m and an average width of 3.943m. None of these have splays. The proposed vehicle crossing at 9m is 2.25 times wider than average; and 16m across the splays is over **4x** times wider than average. This is not a greenfield site as in Hamilton, it is in Greytown Country Village.
- The proposed vehicle crossing, and driveway are more akin to a new street. It is not clear why the proposed vehicle crossing at 9m wide and the vehicle crossing with splays scaling at 16m needs to be over DOUBLE the width of Hastwell St at around 7m (when there are cars parked either side). We are not aware of any reported issues or accidents with the use and width of Hastwell Street. West Street was designed the width it is to divert vehicles from Main Street, this diversion needs to be encouraged.
- The Commute data fails to record near misses and unreported crashes in the area. The existing pedestrian crossing is notoriously difficult for anyone with any type of disability due to the steepness of the approach. The proposal will only exacerbate this.

Trucks

- The diagram A1 in the Commute report shows 23m long b-train across the pedestrian crossing (which is approx. 20m away from the site) when coming from the north. This creates further risks for pedestrians. When coming from the south the trucks cross the trees dripline (see later comment regarding the side of the tree). Truck drivers will be focused on reaching the entry and not on the pedestrian crossing.
- We are uncertain as to why a 23m long b-train is shown by Commute on their drawings and the architects show only an 18m truck.

New Driveway

- The Trust is concerned that the new driveway is likely to be used as a shortcut by impatient drivers from the south if the pedestrian crossing is in use – these drivers are likely to drive at speeds through the carpark creating further health and safety concerns. A judder bar is unlikely to do much to slow them down.
- Most locals are likely to retain their existing driving habits and only those approaching from the south from the eastern side of town are likely to use the proposed entry and many of these will keep their habit of using West street rather than the busier Main St.

Footpath

- The proposed 2m wide footpath is unlikely to get much use. Anyone from the east side of town is most likely to be crossing at the pedestrian crossing and then using the shorter distance to the entry via Hastwell Street. The footpath at 2m is wider than the 1.8m path at Hastwell Street. There are no proposals as to lighting to provide safety for users.

Onsite Carparking

We note that the parking numbers differ – the Woodhams Meikle Zhan Architects Existing Site plan shows 69 customer carparks with 3 staff carparks in addition, at total of 72 carparks. The Woodhams Meikle Zhan Architects Drawing RMA-101 Rev A shows 64 carparks as existing with three new ones – a total of 67 and a net loss of 5 carparks. The Forme Planning report refers to a total of 68 carparks proposed.

There are less carparks proposed than existing (refer to *Necessity for three entrances and car parking* (above)).

- A carpark with a concave mirror seems particularly odd, creating an issue where there is none.
- It is not clear who would want to use the three new ones near the Copper Beech – particularly when you need to reverse out onto b-trains entering the site which you can't see! It would be more beneficial to park on the street or in the public car park opposite, than use these carparks.

Loss of street parking

- Taking the splay into consideration it would appear that there would be THREE street carparks removed rather than the two in the application. The splay is part way through the nearest carpark to the crossing. Even if the splay was not there the road code says you need to be at least 6m away from an intersection unless there are marked bays or signage saying you can park closer. Given the new entry is wider than the road this should apply. This would remove the one remaining carpark to the north of the proposed vehicle crossing. The splay is such that there would be only about 3.5m remaining between the splay and the yellow lines (provided for safety at the pedestrian crossing).
- There are six small 'retailers' at this location – Property Brokers, Cuckoo Restaurant, Jet, Hall to the north of the proposed vehicle crossing and Alluminus Beauty Therapy and Tommy' s Real Estate to the south. There are currently five carparks in the vicinity – with this proposal these are reduced to two, with them all being to the south of the proposed crossing. This would severely impact on these businesses. It is not at all clear how Cuckoo, which also operate a takeaway business could continue to operate.
- These retailers currently suffer from being to the south of Hastwell Street from a pedestrian's point of view and this would be a further impediment to their businesses. The view of GHT is that small retailers are the heart of Greytown and any impediment to their business is not acceptable. They are clearly severely impacted by this proposal and should be consulted.

Signage

- We do not understand the need for the proposed sign. Greytown residents already know where the supermarket is having used it for the past decade – there is no need for any additional signage. Non-residents should be easily able to find the supermarket via google etc. The exiting non-complying but consented sign is visible from Main Street, there is street signage to provide direction to the supermarket.

- The signage proposed is a significant departure from the signage allowable under the District Plan. The Trust strongly opposes any further signage for the supermarket, particularly the signage proposed on Main St.
- Regardless of the existing signs on this site, the proposed sign contravenes ALL of the standards for permitted signs in item 1 of 6.5.2 of the District Plan; namely
 - The total face area of all signs exceeds the allowable 5.0m²
 - The supermarket already has a freestanding sign larger than the district plan standards
 - The supermarket already has a “price board”/“services board” per site,
 - The supermarket already has an illuminated sign far greater 2m² allowable. This sign alone (excluding the base) is 9.68 m² or nearly **five** times the allowable size.
- The proposed large, illuminated sign will be visible from residential properties across the road and will detract from their properties. It is not clear from the application the hours the sign will be illuminated.
- In addition, within the application, there has been NO consideration of the requirements set out in Wairarapa Combined District Plan 21.1.3 Historic Heritage Precincts and in Appendix 8 – South Wairarapa Town Centers Design Guidelines 35.1.8 Signage
 - The sign is not at all sympathetic in scale, colour and design with amenities and historical qualities of the area.
 - While the materials may be neat and durable, they are not appropriate to the historical qualities of the area.
 - The sign is illuminated which would seem worse than being painted in fluorescent colours.
 - The sign is internally illuminated rather than illuminated by directional lighting. We note that this type of lighting is not consistent with the Dark Sky lighting requirements.
 - The illuminated sign appears to exceed the 2m² area (all faces) and the 4m² for the site. We presume it will be heavily illuminated (as is the Hastwell Street sign) - the ‘light’ pollution will detract from the ambience of the street and area). This detracts from intrinsic Greytown qualities where signs are not illuminated.
- The sign will dominate the Hall building at 132 Main Street and is only visible from the south.
- Pedestrian Crossing and Hastwell/Main intersection - The proposed sign is approximately 24m from the pedestrian crossing and within 100m of what is a busy intersection for locals using the supermarket. The pedestrian crossing has heavy use before and after school with children and their caregivers walking/cycling/scootering on the footpath along Hastwell Street, to the crossing, across the park and to school. The NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 3, Sec.5.51 clearly states advertising signs should not be located within 100m in urban areas of intersections and pedestrian crossings. NZTA note with regard to these advertising signs that “Hazardous situations can arise as a result of a lack of road user’s (driver, pedestrian and cyclist) concentration or excessive demands on road users at the location”. For the same reason a vehicle entry catering for b-train trucks so close to the crossing should not be allowed.

Alteration to Neighbours’ Verandah

- We are aware that the applicant has not consulted with the neighbours, particularly the neighbour at 132 Main Street. The splay to the northern end of the driveway on the Commute drawing B1 removes a verandah post and presumably the verandah to this property. This is clearly NOT acceptable.

Exterior Lighting

- A crucial issue is that there is no information on exterior lighting of the proposed area for the safety of pedestrians. Subsequently the impact of this on surrounding properties is not clear.
- We would like to see a requirement of complying with the outdoor lighting requirements of the International Dark-Sky associate to support the Wairarapa Dark-Sky reserve proposal. We comment further on this in our Style Guide.
- We are concerned that light pollution will detract from the ambience of the street and will be visible from residential properties. We are also concerned for the safety of pedestrians using the path.

¹ <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/resources/traffic-control-devices-manual/docs/part-3-advertising-signs.pdf>

General Landscaping

- The details of the proposed landscaping are inadequate and should be finalised in detail to ensure their appropriateness.

Fagus sylvatica 'purpurea' (Copper Beech)

- While the Trust is supportive of the retention of the *Fagus sylvatica 'purpurea'* (Copper Beech), we have a number of concerns about this proposal in relation to the tree.
- The Trust, who also have a connection to Friends of the Park, are concerned about the health of the Copper Beech with the proposed new roadway, footpath and load. Henri van de Weyer's report describes the tree as *'a beautiful tree in excellent health with great vigor'* and notes about the roots *"There is consistent root flair around the base of the tree with good placement of the main holding roots... Being situated where it is, with a big lawn space around it, I would imagine the root run to be excellent and there to be plenty of nutrient and water availability"*.
- An earlier report commented about the root plate and roots *"The ground around the tree has been raised by the root plate and this is also consistent around the circumference of the tree. There is some minor damage to exposed roots, caused perhaps by mowers or foot traffic, but it is not significant."* This would indicate that the proposed roadway and footpath would severely damage the tree.
- We are concerned that when the 9m wide roadway and 2m wide footpath are formed across the roots, and the new seal placed with the digging required to create this will cause damage to critical root structures. The subsequent covering the lawn area with the roadway will inhibit the tree's ability to take in both water and oxygen and may result in the tree's death.
- With regard to the spread of the tree we note Henri van de Weyer describes the spread as being 17m. The foliage starts at about 2.8m above ground. This is shown incorrectly on the Woodhams Meikle Zhan Architects Site Plan where the spread scales at 14m. The truck tracking diagram, on the same sheet, shows the trucks impinging on this by 2m. If the tree were shown correctly the trucks would impinge by 3.5m. NZTA notes the maximum allowable height for a b-train is 4.3m². This puts both the tree and pedestrians using the path at risk of injury.
- Signage in relation to the Copper Beech. We do not understand the purpose of the sign – it will be visible only to traffic and pedestrians approaching from the south and will be obscured by the tree. The NW end of the sign is shown aligning with the NW end of the trunk on the Woodhams Meikle Zhan Architects Site Plan. The diameter at breast height³ is described by Henri van de Weyer as being 1.46m. This is 66% of the width of the sign (shown as 2.2m wide). The height of the tree is 19m as opposed to the sign at 5.4m.

In summary, the Trust identifies many issues with this proposal which we object to.

We would like to be further consulted on the items above.

Thank you / Ngā mihi

Carmel Ferguson
Chair
021 925 573

² <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/resources/factsheets/13c/docs/13c-heavy-trailers.pdf>

³ Diameter at breast height, or DBH, is the standard for measuring trees. DBH refers to the tree trunk diameter over the outside bark measured at 4.5 feet/ 1.37 metres above the ground.