

SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF TANYA RUNNING FOR THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY (PLANNING)

Hearing 6: Village Zone – Subdivision and Part A Land use (Proposed Waikato District Plan) submissions
and further submissions

1. This summary of my evidence addresses:

- the four submission points where my view departs from the s42A report;
- the section 42A report rebuttal evidence (s42A rebuttal) as it relates to my evidence.

2 Rule 24.1.1 P3 Home Occupations (Submission Point 742.145)

2.1 The s42A rebuttal agrees that the traffic generation of 100 vehicle movements per day, and no more than 15% of these vehicle movements are heavy vehicle movements¹ that would be permitted for a Home Occupation in the Village zone is far beyond that which would typically occur from a home occupation. The s42A rebuttal invites the Transport Agency to provide advice on an appropriate level of traffic for a Home Occupation in the Village Zone.

2.2 I note that this rule also applies to any activity in the Residential, and Country Living Zone and as such, I considered that this is a wider issue to be considered by the Hearings Panel and as such, I accept the s42A rebuttal to reject the Transport Agency's submission point 742.145.

3 Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs (Submission Point 742.25)

3.1 The s42A rebuttal disagrees with the addition of the word 'avoided' to subsection (b) of this policy. I accept this recommendation. As subsection (a) to this policy relates to the adverse effects on signs on traffic I consider that rewording subsection (b) to refer to adverse safety affects on road users would refine the intent of the policy. As such I respectfully request the Hearings Panel to consider the following changes to Policy 4.4.7(b) as follows (insertions underlined):

Discourage signs that generate adverse safety effects from illumination, light spill, flashing, moving or reflection on road users.

4 Rule 24.2.7.2 P1 Signs - effects on traffic (Submission Point 742.149)

4.1 The s42A rebuttal rejects the changes sought to this rule by the Transport Agency's submission and notes that as Rule 24.2.7.1 P2(a)(vii) requires any sign to be set back at least 50m from a state highway and the Waikato Expressway, that the suggested advisory note would not be relevant.

4.2 The Transport Agency's submission seeks to limit the number of words, symbols or graphics on a sign to six. A Traffic and Safety Engineer from the Transport Agency has informed me that by increasing the amount of words on a sign from 6 to 8, (even at a distance of 50m) increases the amount of information on the sign, and as such drivers will take longer to read the sign, which means they will be distracted from the road ahead longer. Essentially the changes sought to this rule relate solely to traffic safety, which in my opinion relates to all roads.

4.3 On advice from the Traffic and Safety Engineer, the preferred amendment to Rule 24.2.7.2 P1(a) (v) is as per paragraph 7.1 of my evidence, which I reiterate below (insertions underlined):

¹ Rule 14.12.1.4 P4 (1)(a)

(v) Contain a no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 words, symbols or graphics;

- 4.4 However, should the Hearings Panel determine that there is no appetite to extend this provision to local roads, an advisory note could be added to the rule stating the following:

Note: in relation to clause (v), where the sign is intended to be viewed from the state highway the following shall apply – Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 words, symbols or graphics.

5 Rule 24.3.6.2 D1 Building setbacks - sensitive land use (Submission Point 742.153)

- 5.1 The s42A rebuttal does not make mention of this submission point, given the important of this matter to the Transport Agency I repeat my evidence² on this matter below.
- 5.2 The PWDP as notified does not specify acoustic treatment requirements for sensitive land uses in proximity to state highways. The relief sought by the Transport Agency under submission point 742.153 assumes that the Transport Agency submission points (742.182 and 742.244) are accepted. For clarity these submission points seek the insertion of a more comprehensive response (which would include acoustic treatment requirements) for the management of sensitive land uses in proximity to the state highway network
- 5.3 I understand that these submission points have been allocated to Hearing 25D Infrastructure 4. If these amendments are accepted through this hearing there would be consequential changes required to this Rule 24.3.6.2 D1.
- 5.4 The s42A report notes the submission points on acoustic treatment and has assumed that this submission point would be dealt with at a later topic. I am of the opinion that if this is the case then the recommendation to reject this part of the submission point can be accepted

Tanya Running
11 December 2019

² Paragraphs 8.2 to 8.5 of my evidence