

---

# OFFICER'S RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM THE HEARINGS PANEL

---

**DATE:** 27 September, 2021

**HEARING:** Hearing 5 -Transport

**HEARING DATE:** 5 October, 2021

**PREPARED BY:** Jon Trewin – Strategy and Policy Planner

---

## Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a written response to the questions posed by the Hearings Panel on the section 42A report for the Transport Chapter.

## Questions and Answers

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel
7.13 P23 S42a	Posted speed limit' definition: Instead of listing out each of the SDC Speed Limit Review Bylaws dates, and given the potential to have more into the future, would it be better to have a more generic wording for the Council speed limits such as proposed for NZTA's request for the State Highway? Is there scope for such a change or could it be a Clause 16(2) amendment?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>Yes I agree that would futureproof the definition. I have recommended a change through the S42a Addendum Report for the Transport Chapter via a Clause 16(2) amendment.</i>
7.14 P23 S42a	Is the term "vehicle control point" defined in the PDP and if not, should it be to assist Plan users?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>It may be helpful to provide further clarification in the PDP. There is a definition in the Christchurch District Plan that could be utilised - 'means a point on a vehicle access route controlled by a barrier (or similar means) at which a vehicle is required to stop, or a point where conflict with vehicles already on the site may arise (e.g. a point where vehicles on the access route may need to stop to wait for a vehicle reversing from a parking space on the site)'. As 'queuing space' already covers the vehicle conflict element, to avoid repetition a definition of 'vehicle control point' in the PDP could just refer to a barrier. I have recommended a change through the S42a Addendum Report for the Transport Chapter which I believe would be in scope of NZTA submission point DPR-0375:008.</i>
7.18 P29 S42a	The submission from Heritage NZ is very broad. Would it be better to place this statement at the start of the PDP as opposed to each individual chapter to avoid unnecessary repetition?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>As the Transport Chapter is self-contained whereby earthworks in relation to land transport infrastructure is regulated by the TRAN-Chapter and not the Earthworks Chapter (with the exception of earthworks in the DPZ), it makes sense for the sake of clarity to retain this note at the beginning of the rules in this chapter.</i>
7.21 P31 S42a	Is there scope in the submissions to rectify the erroneous roading classification in the PDP? The Council's submission only raises one of them.

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>Broad scope has been provided through Rolleston West Residential Limited [DPR-0358:145], Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited [DPR-0363:144], Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited [DPR-0374:150] and Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited [DPR-0384:152] where they note that there are errors in the roading classification layer of the Proposed District Plan planning maps in relation to APP2 (Appendix 2) Roading Hierarchy and seek amendments to ensure there is consistency between the two.</i>
7.25 P32 S42a	Are you asking us to amend the Notified PDP Maps – Roading Classification Layer (erroneous classification) column labels to those in the Notified PDP - Appendix 2, Roading Hierarchy (correct classification)?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>Yes, the table in Appendix 2 to the S42a (Recommended Amendments) contains both the erroneous roading classifications (that are in the notified PDP maps) and the correct roading classifications which should replace them.</i>
9.6 P56 S42a	In terms of correct grammar should P7 (1) as proposed start with “Avoiding” significant adverse effects and “minimising” ...
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>Yes, this would make more sense given the wording of the ‘lead-in’ sentence. I have recommended a change through the S42a Addendum Report for the Transport Chapter.</i>
10.12 P68 S42a	In terms of grammar in P13(2) should “Encourage” be “Encouraging”?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>Yes, again this would make more sense given the wording of the ‘lead-in’ sentence. I have recommended a change through the S42a Addendum Report for the Transport Chapter.</i>
11.20.2. P80 S42a	Has the note to be included regarding NZTA and access responsibilities been drafted in a similar way to Heritage NZ?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>It appears that a recommended amendment to give effect to this submission point was not included in Appendix 2 of the S42a report. I have therefore recommended a change through the S42a Addendum Report for the Transport Chapter.</i>
11.27 P84 S42a	What is the scope for adding “TRAN-REQ11 Cycle parks and facilities” to TRAN-R6?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>This is in response to Selwyn District Council submission point DPR-0207:012 (page 178 S42a) which sought deletion of the requirement for one space per residential unit without a garage (TRAN-TABLE9) on the basis that there is no rule that links to this standard and the requirement is too onerous in Selwyn. It appears that the recommendation for TRAN-R6 to be retained as notified is erroneous as it did not take into account the recommended change that arose through submission point DPR-0207:012. I have therefore recommended a change through the S42a Addendum Report for the Transport Chapter.</i>
11.28 P100 S42a	How is this recommendation reflected in the rules?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>The application of TRAN-R8 to DPZ is exempted in the left hand column of the rule (P344 Appendix 2 of the S42a).</i>
11.32 P101 S42a	Could the amendment to TRAN-R9(1) (except for the upgrade of an existing utility pole with the same or similar footprint) be read as meaning that the activity in brackets is not a permitted activity and therefore requires consent?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>Yes that would appear to be the case. I have recommended this be worded in a slightly different way in the S42a Addendum Report for the Transport Chapter. I also note Orion’s evidence suggests alternative wording.</i>
12.38.2 P117 S42a	Could the amendment to TRAN-REQ5.5 be read as meaning that a vehicle crossing to a SH remains a permitted activity but does not need to comply with any permitted activity standards?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>A vehicle crossing on a State Highway always requires consent under TRAN-REQ4.1.d. TRAN-REQ5 and the diagrams referred to only apply to local, collector and arterial roads. For vehicle crossing on State Highways, different design standards (used by NZTA or possibly even bespoke) would apply.</i>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel
14.28.2 P167 S42a	<p>Has consideration been made to the use of a different term to “most nearly” to avoid confusion to what this term actually means?</p> <p>Is there a scenario where a “most nearly” access would produce adverse traffic safety effects?</p>
<i>Officer response:</i>	<p><i>The purpose of adding the proposed clause was because every site is entitled to access to a legal road and TRAN-TABLE4 may mean some sites are not wide enough to include an access unless there is some relief given. If there are other mechanisms to ensure every site must be permitted legal access then this clause could be removed. In terms of the actual wording - the proposed statement is a similar clause to that contained within the Christchurch District Plan (Appendix 7.5.11 Standards for the location of vehicle crossings).</i></p> <p><i>There could be a situation where the location of the ‘most nearly’ access could produce adverse traffic effects (e.g. a really narrow site resulting in the access being very close to an intersection). Given the other controls on access design, location and traffic volume thresholds the chance of this occurring is minimised.</i></p>