

---

# POST ENGAGEMENT PREFERRED OPTION UPDATE REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

---

**DATE:** DPC meeting – 28 November 2018

**TOPIC NAME:** Transport

**SCOPE DESCRIPTION:** Post Engagement Preferred Option Update Report

**TOPIC LEAD:** Craig Friedel

**PREPARED BY:** Craig Friedel

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*Summary of Preferred Options Endorsed by DPC for Further Engagement:*

### **1. Integrated Transport Assessments**

*Land use and transport integration – Option 6: Require Integrated Transport Assessments based on the scale of activities and for these requirements to be reflected in objectives and policies to achieve integrated land use and transport outcomes.*

### **2. Local Road design**

*Street Design – Option 2: Increase the minimum widths for the Local Minor and Local Intermediate Road categories and develop assessment matters to evaluate applications seeking narrower widths.*

*Cul de sac design – Option 3: Retain the maximum 150m length and no cul de sac at the end of a cul de sac and require a line of sight to the adjoining street (where topographical constraints and existing networks allow).*

### **3. Walking, cycling and public transport**

*Footpaths – Option 2: Require two-sided footpaths on all Local Roads (where provided for within the legal road width) and develop assessment matters to evaluate the appropriateness of single-sided footpaths.*

*Walkable blocks – Option 2: Include subdivision performance standards requiring blocks with an 800m maximum perimeter.*



	<p><i>Cycle parking rates - Option 2: Develop activity-based cycle parking rates using floor area and to cater for both long and short-term needs.</i></p> <p><i>Cycle parking design and location – Option 2: Develop rules to establish the location and design of cycle parking facilities, including the incorporation of some Engineering Code of Practice requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Public transport - Option 2: Include objectives and policies that support public transport outcomes and signal the need for Council to consider specific public transport facilities.</i></p> <p><b>4. Miscellaneous comments related to the Transport Topic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Objectives and policies to support high quality, safe and efficient transport links;</li> <li>b) Rural accessways and vehicle crossings; and</li> <li>c) Car parking.</li> </ul>
Summary of Feedback Received:	<p><i>Integrated Transport Assessments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of respondents confirmed the need to continue to evaluate the appropriateness of requiring Integrated Transport Assessments, while listing a number of matters to consider during the s32 drafting phase.</li> </ul> <p><i>Local Road design</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the Preferred Options is provided, along with comments that will contribute to the wider analysis of the function of Local Roads and their importance to the social and economic well-being of the district.</li> </ul> <p><i>Walking, cycling and public transport</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The respondents confirmed the need to continue to evaluate the appropriateness of reviewing the existing provisions in line with the Preferred Options, while listing a number of options and reference points to consider during the s32 drafting phase.</li> </ul> <p><i>Miscellaneous comments relating to the Transport Topic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The miscellaneous comments fall within one of the Preferred Options endorsed by the Committee and provide useful prompts for further consideration as part of the s32 drafting phase.</li> </ul>
Recommended Option Post Engagement:	<i>That the Preferred Options previously endorsed by DPC progress to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'</i>
DPC Decision:	<i>That the Preferred Options previously endorsed by DPC progress to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'</i>

# 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview of Preferred Option Endorsed by DPC

### ***Integrated Transport Assessments***

#### **Summary of the Integrated Transport Assessment Issue**

An Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) is a method for considering the scope of any mitigation measures, funding arrangements or conditions of consent associated with high traffic generating developments.

#### **Preferred Option**

The Committee endorsed Option 6, which is to require ITAs to supplement consent applications based on the scale of activity and for these requirements to be reflected in objectives and policies.

### ***Local Road design***

#### **Summary of Street Design and Cul de sac Design Issues**

There are examples where Local Minor and Local Intermediate Roads are being vested in Council but are not meeting the intent of the localised 'shared space' environment anticipated by the Plan and the Subdivision Design Guide. The current cul de sac design requirements need be reviewed to avoid the identified poor outcomes and to support walking, cycling and wider connectivity.

#### **Preferred Options**

The Committee endorsed Option 2 for the Street Design Issue, which is to evaluate the appropriateness of increasing the minimum widths of the Local Minor and Local Intermediate Road categories and develop assessment matters to evaluate narrower widths. Option 3 for the Cul De Sac Design Issue was endorsed, which is to evaluate the appropriateness of retaining the existing subdivision rule requiring a maximum 150m length and to require a line of sight to the adjoining street.

### ***Walking, cycling and public transport***

#### **Summary of the walking, cycling and public transport Issues**

The Transport Baseline and Preferred Option Reports covered walking, cycling and public transport through the following interconnected Issues, which included: (a) Footpaths - There are examples where the provision of single-sided footpaths in certain locations within the Local Road network is contributing to poor outcomes; (b) Walkable Blocks – The Plan fails to provide a network that encourages people to use active modes of travel to access destinations to meet their everyday needs; (c) Cycle Parking Design, Local and Rates – There is an identified need for activity-based cycle parking rates and ensuring that cycle parking spaces are appropriately located and suitably designed; and (d) Public Transport - Policies are required to promote access to public transport and to encourage the use of active modes of travel.

#### **Preferred Options**

The Committee endorsed the Preferred Options listed in the Executive Summary of this Report to address these various Issues. These include considering design standards for Local Roads, subdivision assessment matters to promote walkable blocks and evaluate non-complying footpath designs, rules to encourage active modes of travel and objectives and policies to promote public transport and active modes of travel.

## 2.0 Summary of Feedback Received

### 2.1 Statutory Partner Feedback

Environment Canterbury (ECan) emailed comments during the consultation period, which are summarised below:

#### ***Integrated transport Assessments***

ECan support the use of ITAs.

#### ***Local Road design***

ECan support the integration of land use and transport (through appropriate Local Road design requirements).

#### ***Walking, cycling and public transport***

ECan support provisions that will encourage active travel modes.

### 2.2 Stakeholder Feedback

Seven Stakeholders emailed comments during the consultation period relating to the three primary Issues of Integrated Transport Assessments, Local Roads and walking, cycling and public transport. These are summarised in the following section under each Issues heading.

#### ***Integrated Transport Assessments***

Six stakeholders emailed comments on the Integrated Transport Assessment Issue.

##### **Metroport**

Metroport advised that the I-Zone business park has been designed to cater for heavy vehicles and high volume movements. The s32 evaluations need to consider the design and capacity of these existing transport networks before requiring site-specific ITAs for every activity.

##### **Rolleston Industrial Holdings Ltd (RDIHL) and Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd (RIDL)**

RIHL and RIDL oppose the need for ITAs where developments are anticipated by the zoning<sup>1</sup>. This is because the effects should have already been accounted for in the Plan and the Long Term Plan funding for capital works. Their view is that the consenting process should be targeted to on-site access and other related transport arrangements.

##### **Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB)**

The CDHB support the proposed requirement for ITAs and for these to be based on the scale of the development.

##### **Horticulture New Zealand**

Horticulture New Zealand accepts that there are situations where an ITA will be appropriate, but identify that the triggers need to consider the zones where activities are taking place. They believe the

---

<sup>1</sup> Through permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activity status

thresholds for requiring an ITA for activities in rural areas should vary from urban or industrial areas where the intensity of development is different.

### **Oil and Gas Industry**

The Oil and Gas industry support the requirement for ITAs, but seek to ensure these provisions are effects-based and appropriate to the nature of any new traffic generating activity. This includes targeting high trip generating activities to primary destinations, such as primary schools or supermarkets, rather than locations that serve a secondary purpose such as service stations.

### **Spokes Canterbury**

Spokes Canterbury support the requirement for ITAs to encourage alternative transport options, while recommending that an incentives based approach is also considered.

### ***Local Road design***

Two stakeholders emailed comments on the Local Road Issue.

### **CDHB**

The CDHB support the width of roads being based on their function within the network. They also believe that consideration should be given to the 'healthy streets' approach<sup>2</sup> to ensure that the widening of residential roads do not inadvertently give rise to poor health outcomes and that indicators are included in the Engineering Code of Practice.

### **Spokes Canterbury**

Spokes Canterbury oppose the widening of Local Minor and Intermediate Roads, which is seen as a car-centric response to the Issue. They support narrow road formations to reduce speeds and increase safety, which contributes to social cohesion and encourages walking and cycling. They consider that cul de sac connections to adjoining streets are needed to promote connectivity and that roads should prioritise the movement of people rather than storing parked vehicles.

### ***Walking, cycling and public transport***

Four stakeholders' emailed comments on the walking, cycling and public transport Issues.

### **CDHB**

The CDHB support the proposed rules that encourage walking, cycling and better access to public transport, including the provision of footpaths on both sides of the road and cycle parking. A range of information sources are included that outline the benefits of active travel modes for improving health and well-being and support is provided for rules that protect potential future public transport corridors.

### **RIHL and RIDL**

RIHL and RIDL support provisions that encourage walking and cycling and better access to public transport. However, they oppose a regulatory approach that imposes impractical, excessive or overly prescriptive requirements in favour of an incentive-based approach.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://healthystreets.com>

### **Christchurch International Airport**

Christchurch International Airport support the identification of objectives and policies that encourage the use of public transport.

### **Spokes Canterbury**

Spokes Canterbury identify that walking, cycling and the use of public transport outcomes need to be clearly measurable within the Proposed Plan and that it needs to promote a sustainable transport network that contributes towards healthier residents and environments as an alternative to building roads.

### **Miscellaneous**

Six stakeholders emailed comments on the following miscellaneous matters: (a) Objectives and policies to support transport links; (b) Rural accessway and vehicle crossing design; and (c) Car parking.

### **Christchurch International Airport**

Christchurch International Airport support the inclusion of objectives and policies to deliver high quality, safe and efficient transport links between rail, road, port and airport facilities for freight, employees and visitors.

### **CDHB**

The CDHB recommend including an accessway rule to reduce dust nuisance in rural areas, especially at entry and exit points that service significant volumes of vehicle movements.

### **Oil and Gas Industry**

The Oil and Gas Industry agree that the current requirement to have five stacked parking spaces per car wash facility is excessive<sup>3</sup> and support these being reduced where they apply to service stations. They believe that it is inappropriate to apply more than one car parking rate to service stations and that the requirements should be limited to the retail component of the operation.

### **Selwyn District Council, Monitoring and Enforcement Team**

Consideration needs to be given to what vehicle crossing design standards apply to secondary access points<sup>4</sup> onto Arterial Roads as the Plan only includes standards for the principle accessway serving the primary dwelling.

### **Lincoln Community Group Representatives<sup>5</sup>**

Parking overflow has been identified as an issue in Lincoln, where tenants in student flats are parking on the street frontage.

### **Foster Commercial Limited (FCL)**

FCL request that the parking provision in Business/Commercial Zones is reassessed and simplified to include broader categories of use to avoid further consents where uses or tenancies change once a commercial centre is established.

---

<sup>3</sup> Selwyn District Plan: Township Volume – Section D Definitions

<sup>4</sup> For example, to yards, paddocks or other locations within rural properties

<sup>5</sup> These comments were an emailed summary of a meeting that was attended by representatives of the Lincoln Township Committee, concerned residence, Lincoln University and New Zealand Police

## 2.3 Public Feedback

### **Engagement HQ**

During the public consultation period, 105 people visited the Transport web page. Of these visits, 46 visitors either downloaded a document or viewed the FAQ page and 16 visitors completed the survey.

Most respondents (15 out of 16) supported the requirement for major new developments to provide an ITA as part of their application. Of the 16 responses received on the Local Road Issue, 11 agree that the current design standards are not wide enough to support the function of cul de sacs and streets serving more intensive housing areas. Support for the walking, cycling and public transport related Preferred Options was also confirmed through the Engagement HQ portal, with ten responses in support, one in opposition and five not minding either way.

Two members of the public emailed comments during the consultation period. These respondents generally support the preferred options for the ITAs, Local Roads and walking, cycling and public transport, while providing additional comments for consideration that they believe will assist in achieving the desired outcomes.

## 3.0 Analysis of Feedback Received

### 3.1 Integrated Transport Assessments:

A total of 25 respondents provided comments on this Issue. 15 out of 16 of the Engagement HQ portal responses to this Issue supported the Preferred Options. Eight of the emailed responses either supported or confirmed a general acceptance that ITAs are appropriate under certain circumstances. Two stakeholders supported the requirement as a matter of course, with a suggestion that incentive based approaches should be considered. A single respondent opposed the requirement for ITAs on the grounds that consenting should be limited to the consideration of on-site transport arrangements where they are anticipated by the Plan.

### **Analysis**

The Preferred Option relating to this Issue was to require ITAs based on the scale of activity and for these requirements to be reflected in objectives and policies to achieve integrated land use and transport outcomes.

Most of the respondents confirmed the need to continue to evaluate the appropriateness of requiring ITAs under certain circumstances. This endorsement is on the proviso that the drafting phase takes into account the: (a) Existing zoning and levels of service provided within development areas e.g. established industrial parks that already cater for heavy vehicles and high volume movements; (b) Need to establish when ITAs are required in certain zones e.g. rural areas; (c) Need to target high trip generators that are a destination in their own right rather than secondary locations, such as service stations; and (d) Consider incentive-based approaches where wider transport network upgrades are supported by reduced development contributions.

The single response that opposes the need for ITAs if it captures activities that are anticipated by the District Plan. This places an emphasis on ensuring that the supporting objectives are appropriate to promote the purpose of the RMA and the triggers for requiring ITAs do not give rise to onerous, costly or unnecessary consenting processes.

### 3.2 Local Road Design:

The majority of the 21 responses to this Issue through the Engagement HQ portal support the preferred option (11 out of 16 responses). Four respondents emailed comments on this Issue, which included detailed feedback that contributes to the wider consideration of the function of Local Roads and their importance to the social and economic well-being of the district. One response supported the need for the width of roads to be based on their function within the network, while the other opposed the widening of roads as it was seen as a car-centric approach to addressing the identified Issue.

#### **Analysis**

The Preferred Options relating to this Issue was to review the minimum widths of Local Minor and Local Intermediate Roads and the design of cul de sacs.

The responses outline the need to ensure Local Minor and Local Intermediate Roads serve a wider function than the movement of vehicles from one point to the next. This includes through the consideration of the 'healthy streets' and 'quiet streets' concepts and developing approaches that promote social interaction and the use of active modes of travel through appropriate design standards and speed thresholds. These outcomes are consistent with the context around why the widths of Local Minor and Local Intermediate Roads are being reviewed, which is to ensure there is sufficient space for footpaths and through connections to support walking, cycling and accessibility.

A single respondent opposes increasing the widths of these road classifications where it supports on-site parking or streetscape amenity on the basis that it is a car-centric response. These are matters that can be evaluated further as the wider package of provisions are refined.

### 3.3 Walking, cycling and public transport:

A total of 23 respondents provided comments on this Issue. A mix of responses were received on these Issues through the Engagement HQ portal, with ten supporting the Preferred Options, one opposing and five not minding either way. All of the seven emailed responses confirmed a general acceptance that the Preferred Options to promote walking, cycling and access to public transport were appropriate for further consideration. The emailed responses contained detailed comments that contribute to the wider analysis of the importance of active transport modes to the social and economic well-being of the district.

One response related specifically to capital works upgrades within the Lincoln Wetland to facilitate accessibility, which is a matter that sits outside the District Plan and has been forwarded onto the Assets Department for their consideration.

#### **Analysis**

The Preferred Options relating to these Issues extended across a range of response relating to footpath provision, walkable blocks, cycle parking rates, design and location requirements and the inclusion of



objectives and policies that support public transport. The respondents confirmed the need to continue to evaluate the appropriateness of reviewing the existing provisions in line with the Preferred Options.

A number of the responses contain useful reference points and options to consider as part of the s32 drafting, which include: (a) Providing an evidence base to support active modes of travel; (b) Considering provisions to protect potential future public transport corridors; (c) Avoiding regulatory approaches that impose impractical, excessive or overly prescriptive requirements; (d) Promoting incentive-based approaches; (e) Identifying objectives and policies to support public transport; (f) Requiring Travel Demand Management Plans to accompany all development proposals; (g) Developing clear and measurable indicators to track progress towards achieving outcomes; and (h) Investigating alternatives to road building to achieve sustainable outcomes and contribute to healthier residents and environments.

### 3.4 Miscellaneous:

Six respondents emailed comments on the miscellaneous Issues of objectives and policies to support integrated transport links, rural accessways and vehicle crossings and car parking.

#### **Analysis**

The majority of the miscellaneous comments fall within one of the Preferred Options endorsed by the Committee and generally support the approaches being taken to develop the provisions. They provide useful prompts for further consideration as part of the s32 evaluations and drafting.

The three responses relating to car parking overflow in Lincoln and what rates apply to commercial centre's and service station operations are matters being evaluated as part of the Transport Topic (Car Parking Issue), as well as the draft Parking Strategy. The need to consider design requirements for secondary rural vehicle crossings and controls to mitigate dust at rural accessways are being considered as part of the Transport Topic (Vehicle accessway and Vehicle Crossing Design Requirements Issues). The consideration of changes to the existing objectives and policies that support safe, efficient and transport links will be undertaken as part of the wider s32 evaluation.

#### **Conclusion**

Overall, there was sufficient support to proceed with the Preferred Option in the responses received. The feedback provides a useful resource for the s32 drafting phase of the District Plan Review and provides the opportunity for ongoing engagement with Key Stakeholders.

## 4.0 Recommended Option Post Engagement

The Project Team recommends that:

- That the Preferred Options previously endorsed by DPC progress to the 'Drafting and Section 32 Evaluation Phase'.