

# PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT TO DISTRICT PLAN COMMITTEE

**DATE:** DPC Meeting - 28 November 2018

**TOPIC:** District Wide - Transport

**SCOPE DESCRIPTION:** Supplementary Preferred Options for Transport (PW017)

**TOPIC LEAD:** Craig Friedel

**PREPARED BY:** Craig Friedel, Consultant Planner, using the Selwyn District Plan Review – Supplementary Transport Baseline Report prepared by Abley Consultants

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A number of the transport-related rules, design requirements and diagrams require amendment to ensure consistency with best practice transport engineering and to provide clearer direction on the transport design requirements to support safe and efficient transport networks; and</li> <li>2. The road classification schedules require updating to reflect recent upgrade works.</li> </ol>
Preferred Options	<p>In summary, the recommended Preferred Options for further development during the drafting phase of the DPR are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the suggested changes to the objectives, policies, rules and design requirements identified in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report, which apply to the following District Plan provisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rail network objectives, policies and rules;</li> <li>- Vehicle crossing and intersection separation distances;</li> <li>- Accessway design requirements;</li> <li>- Rural transport rules; and</li> <li>- Transport-related design diagrams.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consider retaining the current corner splay policies, rules, assessment matters and design requirements.</li> <li>• Update the District Plan road classification schedules, to illustrate these on a map and to incorporate any further changes that occur between now and when the Proposed Plan is publicly notified.</li> </ul>
Recommendations to DPC	That the Preferred Options for District Wide – Transport outlined in Section 5.0 and listed in Appendix 4 for the remaining Issues are endorsed for further development (including the Section 32 analysis and Drafting Phase).
DPC Decision	<u>That the Preferred Options for District Wide – Transport outlined in Section 5.0 and listed in Appendix 4 for the remaining Issues are endorsed for further development (including the Section 32 analysis and Drafting Phase).</u>



## 1.0 Introduction

Abley Ltd (Abley) were engaged to prepare a report that covers the remaining issues relating to the Transport Topic. This assessment has been undertaken to ensure that all the relevant transport provisions in the Operative Selwyn District Plan (the Plan) have been evaluated before the s32 drafting phase commences.

A link to the report entitled Selwyn District Plan Review – Supplementary Baseline Report (DW024) is contained in **Appendix 1**.

This supplementary assessment adds to the initial Transport Baseline Report prepared by Abley and Jasmax Consultants Limited (JCL) that was finalised in May 2018<sup>1</sup>. This initial assessment was targeted to a number of priority Issues<sup>2</sup> that were identified through a desktop analysis of a range of information sources, facilitated workshops and strategic partner advice was finalised in May 2018.

The recommendations contained in this initial Transport Baseline Report formed the basis of the Update and Preferred Options Report presented to the District Plan Committee (Committee) on the 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2018<sup>3</sup>.

## 1.2 Preferred Options

This report presents the Preferred Options for the remaining Issues (Section 5.0 and **Appendix 4**) that relate to the Transport Topic that have not already been covered.

The only exception continues to be the car parking Issue, where a Draft Parking Strategy has been released for consultation to inform possible changes and to assist in ensuring an integrated approach to land use and transport planning is achieved.

The Issues covered by this supplementary assessment are listed in **Table 1** below:

**Table 1: Supplementary baseline assessment Issues and recommendations**

Theme	Issue
5.1 - Rail provisions	Assessing the rail network objectives, policies and rules
5.3 - Road classification updates	Reviewing the classifications of each road to ensure the Plan schedules are consistent with the function they are currently serving within the network
5.5 - Corner splays	No issues have been identified following the assessment

<sup>1</sup> Transport Baseline Report, 4<sup>th</sup> May 2018 - [https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/...Transport Baseline Report](https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/...Transport%20Baseline%20Report)

<sup>2</sup> The Transport Baseline Report and the Update and Preferred Options Report covered the following Issues: (a) Management of road reserves; (b) Land use and transport integration; (c) Street design; (d) Vehicle crossing widths; (e) Footpaths; (f) Walkable blocks; (g) Cul de sac design; (h) Cycle parking rates; (i) Cycle parking design and location; and (j) Public transport

<sup>3</sup> District Plan Committee Agenda, 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2018; P193 to P232 - [https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/...DPC Agenda](https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/...DPC%20Agenda)

5.7, 5.9, 5.11 & 5.13 - Vehicle crossing and intersection separation distances	Determining where changes may be required to the vehicle crossing and intersection separation design requirements
5.15 - Accessway design	Evaluating whether the design requirements support the operational needs of private accessways
5.17 - Rural transport rules	Determining where changes may be required to the rural-specific design requirements in the Appendices of the Plan
5.19 - Rural and Township design requirements and diagrams	Determining where changes may be required to the Township and Rural -specific design requirements in the Appendices of the Plan

## 2.0 Summary of Issues

### 2.1 Overview

The preparation of the Transport Baseline Reports are a key step in reviewing how effectively and efficiently the transport provisions in the Plan are working.

The methodology for preparing the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report included a targeted evaluation of the transport provisions contained in the Plan against best practice transport engineering and design requirements. A comparison of these provisions against the adjoining Waimakariri District Plan and the Christchurch District Plan to determine consistency was also carried out.

Advice has been sought from District Plan Review (DPR) Topic Leads, Council's Asset Manager - Transportation and representatives from KiwiRail, Environment Canterbury (ECan), Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to identify issues and evaluate options. Further detail on the engagement that has been undertaken to inform the preparation of the Transport Baseline and Preferred Option reports is documented in Section 6.0.

The primary aim of the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report was to answer the questions listed in **Appendix 2**. These relate specifically to the matters listed in [Table 1](#).

The report responds to these questions through recommendations and preferred options that either: (a) Support retaining the current provisions and/or design standards; or (b) Outline where amendments should be considered through the s32 phase of the DPR.

### 2.2 Issues

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report makes recommendations on the Issues listed in [Table 1](#) above.

All of the recommendations will require the Proposed Plan objectives, and more so the policies and methods (rules), to clearly link the outcomes sought to any consenting requirements. These will be developed through the subsequent phases of the DPR, which includes a cost/benefit and risk analysis that incorporates stakeholder and Iwi feedback.

## 3.0 Statement of Operative District Plan approach

Section 3.0 of the initial Update and Preferred Options Report summarised where the transport provisions sit within the Plan and outlined the scope of the Plan Change 12 - Integrated Transport Management (PC12).

The breadth of PC12 enabled the baseline review to be targeted to the priority Issues identified in the initial Transport Baseline Report and Update and Preferred Options Report identified in Section 1.0.

The Issues covered by these supplementary investigations are to ensure that all the transport-related provisions have been assessed during the baseline development phase of the DPR.

## 4.0 Summary of relevant statutory and/or policy context

### ***Statutory Review***

Section 4.0 of the initial Transport Baseline Report and Update and Preferred Options Report reviewed and summarised the relevant planning instruments, strategies and guides that are relevant to this Topic. It also provided an update on progress with the development of the National Planning Standards.

There are no amendments to this list of relevant strategies and planning instruments. A detailed assessment of the relevant statutory and policy directions has not been undertaken as this was sufficiently covered in the initial reports prepared for the Transport Topic. A comparison of the targeted provisions against the district plans of the two adjoining territorial authorities has been undertaken to determine consistency.

No further direction has been provided by the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) on the National Planning Standards since the initial Transport Update and Preferred Options Report was presented to the Committee. DPR Team members are continuing to liaise with the Network Utility Working Group to determine where alignment can be achieved.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report confirms that the Plan gives effect to the higher order planning instruments as they apply to these additional Issues.

## 5.0 Summary of Preferred Options Issues

This section outlines the Issues and recommends a Preferred Option following an evaluation against the status quo for the remaining Issues covered by the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report.

Some of the recommendations are linked to referencing the Engineering Code of Practice (ECoP) and other detailed changes to the wording of existing rules and the supporting diagrams and tables. It is important to note that a review of the ECoP has commenced and is being coordinated with the DPR to determine the level of engineering design details that are appropriate to be included in the Proposed Plan. NZTA are also in the process of reviewing their

2007 Planning Policy Manual (PPM) that includes State Highway accessway design standards and guidelines.

These reviews, coupled with the National Planning Standards, may further consolidate what design standards and diagrams are contained within the Proposed Plan versus other non-statutory documents. This rationalisation exercise will be undertaken as part of s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads, Council's Assets Department and key stakeholders.

## 5.1 Rail provisions - Issues and options

### ***Context and Issues identification***

The Main South Line and Midland Line rail corridors pass through the district as part of the national passenger and freight network administered by KiwiRail. There are 53 level crossings where the rail network has a direct interface with the road network. The I-zone and I-Port industrial parks in Rolleston are critical freight and distribution centers where access to rail sidings is provided to service several key activities, including the two inland container ports and the Westland Dairy Processing Facility.

The objectives and policies for supporting the nationally significant rail network are contained in Part B Physical Resources of the Rural and Township Volumes of the Plan. The objectives and policies require that an integrated approach to land use and transport planning is applied. This is to not only ensure that railway lines are safe and efficient to operate, but to also protect the rail network from adverse reverse sensitivity effects, inappropriate access arrangements and settlement patterns that result in unsafe and inefficient crossing points<sup>4</sup>. An objective requires that the rail network does not generate adverse environmental effects on neighbouring activities<sup>5</sup>. The Plan also requires that future road networks and transport corridors are designed, located and protected to promote transport choice and provide for rail as a sustainable option for moving freight<sup>6</sup>.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Assessment outlines the findings of a best practice review that includes reference to NZTA's Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 9 (TCD Manual) and KiwiRail's advice relating to it. The inclusion of the sight lines defined in the TCD Manual are included in the Christchurch District Plan and Auckland Unitary Plan, which reflect current best practice.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report also evaluates how effectively the rules that determine the sight lines at level crossings apply to the rail and wider transport network<sup>7</sup>. These rules, coupled with the design standards in Appendix E10 - Transport and Appendix E11 – Traffic Site Lines of the Rural Volume, Appendix E13 of the Township Volume, the non-statutory Engineering Code of Practice (ECoP) and KiwiRail design standards, assist in ensuring that

<sup>4</sup> Part B Physical Resources - Objective B2.1.1, Objective B2.1.2, Policy 2.1.18, Policy 2.1.19 and Policy 2.1.20

<sup>5</sup> Part B Physical Resources - Objective B2.1.4

<sup>6</sup> Part B Physical Resources - Objective B2.1.3 and Policy B2.1.17

<sup>7</sup> Township Volume Part C Business – C17 Business Zone Roadway: Rule 17.4 Traffic Sight Lines – Road/Rail Crossings and Part C Living – C5 Living Zone Roads and Transport: Rule 5.4 Traffic Sight Lines - Road/Rail

appropriate levels of service and design requirements are met to support a safe and efficient rail network.

KiwiRail have provided comments that support the retention of existing Rule E13.2.2.3 requiring a 30m vehicle crossing and accessway setback from level crossings with associated restricted discretionary activity status and assessment matters. KiwiRail also confirm the strategic need to retain the objectives and policies that apply to the rail network is also provided, along with a number of suggested drafting changes to the objectives, policies and rules to provide more certainty and to assist in administering the Proposed Plan.

### ***Option analysis***

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report evaluated the objectives and policies that currently apply to the strategic rail network. The conclusion from this assessment is that the current provisions are appropriate in providing a safe integrated transport network which supports the efficient operation of the rail network. KiwiRail recommend a number of drafting changes for consideration as part of the s32 drafting phase of the DPR to improve the safety and operation of the rail and wider transport network.

The Report identifies that the majority of the rules that apply to the sight lines at level crossings are working effectively and that no changes are required. Tables 2.1 to 3.1 on Pages 3 to 6 respectively list where there are issues with some of the rules and recommends what drafting changes should be considered.

These changes reflect the Preferred Option for addressing this Issue and include to:

- Consider KiwiRail's suggested changes to the objectives and policies that apply to the rail network and reference to the need to encourage and facilitate rail to support public transport;
- Retain Rule E13.2.2.3 that requires a 30m accessway setback from level crossings with appropriate restricted discretionary matters of assessment;
- Review the definition of 'building' and 'tree' to ensure it covers all activities that require sightlines to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, including billboards and signs<sup>8</sup>;
- Insert the KiwiRail level crossing sight lines diagram in permitted activity Rule 4.7.1 and Appendix 10 - Diagram E10E to detail the Rural design standards; and
- Insert the KiwiRail level crossing sight lines diagram in permitted activity Rule 5.4 and Appendix 13 - Diagram E13.3 to detail the Townships design standards.

---

<sup>8</sup> Township Volume Part C17 Business – C17 Business Zone Roadway: Rule 17.4 Traffic Sight Lines – Road/Rail Crossings and Rural Volume Part Living – C5 Living Zone Roads and Transport: Rule 5.4 Traffic Sight Lines - Road/Rail

## 5.2 Rail network provisions – Preferred Options

The recommended drafting changes represent the Preferred Option to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Transport provisions as they are applied to the rail network within the district. The amendments will assist in improving the administration of the Proposed Plan and the inclusion of the KiwiRail level crossing sightline design diagrams will ensure the Proposed Plan is consistent with the Christchurch District Plan and Auckland Unitary Plans, which are recognised as current best practice.

### ***Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:***

The Preferred Option to apply the drafting changes recommended in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report will assist in ensuring the Proposed Plan contains best practice rules that are easy to understand and apply, while supporting KiwiRail in providing a safe, efficient and cost effective national rail network.

The alternative is to ignore the recommended changes, which represents a lost opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan, align with the two best practice district plan examples and to support the needs of KiwiRail as the operator of the national rail network.

### ***Risks:***

There is limited risk in considering the recommended changes to the rules that apply to the rail network listed in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

### ***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to consider amending the identified rules that apply to the rail network will incur some limited time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions. However, the provisions are being reviewed in any case and it provides the opportunity to improve the current provisions and to provide greater administrative certainty.

### ***Stakeholder and Community Interests:***

All identified stakeholders.

### ***Other:***

Coordinate the development of the rail provisions with the Subdivision and Utility Topics Leads and Council's ECoP review.

### ***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to consider the suggested changes to the rail network objectives, policies and rules identified in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report during the drafting phase of the DPR.

## 5.3 Road classification updates - Issues and options

### ***Context and Issues identification***

The road classifications in the Plan influence the amenity of streets and their function within the wider network hierarchy. They cover the full range of road types provided across the district, from State Highways through to Local Minor Roads. The classification determines what design requirements are applied to achieve the desired levels of service for each road type, through matters such as legal road and carriageway widths, traffic and parking lanes and provision for cycle and footpaths. The rules that apply to the road classifications are supported by outline development plans and the ECoP and Subdivision Design Guide that sit outside the Plan.

The road classifications are listed in Appendix E7 of the Township Volume and Appendix E9 of the Rural Volume. Some of these classifications are out of date as a result of changes to the road network, which are inevitable in a fast growing district where significant upgrades are occurring to respond to increased population growth, ongoing subdivision development and increase in commercial and industrial activities.

### ***Option analysis***

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report incorporates two schedules provided by Council's Assets Department that reference the roads where the classification needs to be updated to reflect their current status within the network. These schedules have been consolidated into a single list contained in **Appendix 3**.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report also recommends that maps illustrating the network road classification are considered for inclusion in the Proposed Plan to provide greater certainty and ease of administration.

Consideration of alternatives to the plan change process<sup>9</sup> to update the road classification schedules more regularly was also considered. This assessment confirms that the plan change process is the only viable option. This is because the road classifications do not qualify as an 'inconsequential' change as they influence what rules and design requirements are applied to proposed activities.

One option is to reference an intermediary status to reflect the possible future classification referenced on the operative outline development plans, such as 'in construction', to alert plan users to the fact that the classification may be changed in the not too distant future. This approach has been applied in the Christchurch District Plan and should be evaluated further during the s32 evaluation phase of the DPR.

The updated road classifications list and map that incorporate any changes and additions that may occur between now and when the Proposed Plan is notified represent the Preferred Option to address this Issue. This map could also reference the outline development plan road classifications to illustrate the likely future road classification.

---

<sup>9</sup> Prescribed in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991

## 5.4 Road classification updates – Preferred Option

The updates to the Road Classifications listed in **Appendix 3** and the incorporation of the road classification map are required to ensure the current classification of roads within the district are consistent with their operational status within the transport network.

### ***Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:***

The recommended updates to the road classification schedules and inclusion of a map is the only appropriate response to addressing the Issue. A further consideration was the inclusion of an intermediary category on the road classification map to reference the possible future classification referenced on the operative outline development plans, which should be considered through the s32 phase of the DPR.

There are not considered to be any other relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

### ***Risks:***

There is no risk in making the changes to the road classifications listed in **Appendix 3** and for these to be illustrated in a map within the Proposed Plan. This schedule can be added to between now and when the Proposed Plan is publicly notified to ensure it is as up to date as possible before it is subject to public submissions.

### ***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to update the road classification schedule and illustrate these in a map will incur an insignificant amount of time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions.

### ***Stakeholder and Community Interests:***

All identified stakeholders.

### ***Other:***

Coordinate the development of the road classification schedule updates with the Subdivision and Utility Topics Leads.

### ***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to update the Road Classification schedules in accordance with **Appendix 3**, to illustrate these on a map and to incorporate any further changes that occur between now and when the Proposed Plan is publicly notified.

## 5.5 Corner splays - Issues and options

### ***Context and Issues identification***

Adequate corner splays at road intersections ensure footpath alignments support appropriate pedestrian sight lines, while also improving sight distance for road users at road intersections. Corner splays are also a method of securing land for future intersection upgrades. Related policies require sufficient setbacks to maintain good visibility for all road users, allow safe access and egress and promote the efficient movement of vehicles and pedestrians<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Part B Physical Resources - Policy B2.1.9 and Policy B2.1.10

Corner splays need to be provided in subdivision scheme plans and formed to the design standards in the Plan and ECoP before subdivision approvals are given by Council<sup>11</sup>. A 3m radius for Living zones and 6m radius in the Business zones is required and the diagonal design setback from the intersection corner increases based on the road classification<sup>12</sup>. The matters of discretion enable Council to consider the effects of non-conforming corner splays on the efficient functioning of the road, the safety of road users and the amenity of surrounding allotments<sup>13</sup>.

The Supplementary Baseline Report also compares the corner splay rules and design requirements in the Plan against the adjoining Waimakariri District Plan and Christchurch District Plan. The WDP contains a number of detailed corner splay design requirements. In contrast, the Christchurch District Plan does not contain any design standards and has a single assessment matter outside the City Centre requiring corner allotments to have an appropriate corner rounding.

### ***Option analysis***

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report has evaluated the corner splay policies and rules and determined that they continue to represent best practice transport engineering. Staff have not reported any issues with how the current rules are interpreted and the application of the design requirements and assessment matters appear to be delivering the anticipated outcomes.

The best practice review confirms that the Plan provides an appropriate level of control and that the current policies, rules, assessment matters and design requirements should be retained.

## **5.6 Corner splays – Preferred Option**

The current policies, rules, assessment matters and design requirements for corner splays should be retained as they are providing an appropriate level of control to achieve the desired outcomes.

### ***Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:***

The best practice transport engineering review and comparison of the corner splay provisions against the Waimakariri District Plan and Christchurch District Plan have confirmed that the current approach should continue to be applied in the Proposed Plan. There have not been any issues identified with the current corner splay provisions, which appear to have delivered the desired outcomes by supporting a safe and efficient transport network that is future proofed to incorporate planned upgrades. The inclusion of a diagram to illustrate how the distances are measured can be considered as part of the ECoP and Subdivision Design Guide reviews.

There are not considered to be any other relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

### ***Risks:***

There is no risk in considering the appropriateness of retaining the existing corner splay design requirements. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are

<sup>11</sup> Pursuant to s224 (c) of the Resource Management Act 1991

<sup>12</sup> Part C Rural Zone Rules - Subdivision: Rule 10.1.1.7 and 10.12.1.5

<sup>13</sup> Part C Living Zone Rules - Subdivision: Assessment matters 12.1.5.4 and 12.1.5.5

contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to consider retaining the existing corner splay design requirements will incur an insignificant amount of time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions.

***Stakeholder and Community Interests:***

All identified stakeholders.

***Other:***

Coordinate the development of the corner splay design requirements with the Subdivision Topic Lead and Council's ECoP review.

***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to consider retaining the current corner splay policies, rules, assessment matters and design requirements.

## 5.7 Vehicle crossings – Issues and Options

***Context and Issues identification***

The Plan contains separate rules and design requirements for vehicle crossings and access arrangements as well as design diagrams in the Appendices of both volumes of the Plan. These rules seek to meet the balance between ensuring the network continues to be safe and efficient for road users, while acknowledging a degree of flexibility is required to avoid unnecessarily curtailing activities that are carried out in urban and rural areas on a day to day basis.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report reviews these provisions and responds to the targeted questions listed in **Appendix 2**.

NZTA have confirmed that all access to the State Highway network require approvals under the Government Rounding Powers Act 1989. This approval is separate and additional to any land use or subdivision approval required under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). NZTA are also reviewing their Policy and Planning Manual (PPM), which may also rationalise what access and vehicle crossing standards are applied at the interface between the State Highway network and public and private properties. Retention of the current design standards and alignment with the provisions of adjoining territorial authorities is supported by NZTA pending the completion of this review and the formalisation of the National Planning Standards.

***Option analysis***

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report identifies that the majority of the urban and rural vehicle crossing, access arrangements and design diagram requirements are working effectively and that no changes are required.

Confirmation is provided that the vehicle crossing design requirements need a degree of variation between urban and rural environments to respond to varying speed environments, land use activities and vehicle movements. It is not considered appropriate to rationalise the provisions into a single set of vehicle crossing design standards.

Table 7.1 on Pages 15 and 16 of the Report lists where there are issues with some of the rules and recommends what drafting changes should be considered.

These changes reflect the Preferred Option for addressing this Issue and include to:

- Consider inserting a rule or explanatory making reference to the heavy-duty vehicle crossing design requirements contained in the ECoP;
- Replace any references to 'Strategic Road' to State Highway' to ensure consistency with the operative road classifications to be consistent with Rule C4.5; and
- Consider cross referencing the land use matters of discretion (Rural Volume 3.9.2.2 (b) and Township Volume 5.3.5.2) so they are included in the vehicle crossing design requirements and illustrated in the diagrams contained in the Appendices.

## 5.8 Vehicle crossings – Preferred Option

The recommended drafting changes represent the Preferred Option to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the transport design requirements for ensuring the general rules that apply to vehicle crossings remain fit for purpose. The amendments will assist in improving the administration of the Proposed Plan by providing greater certainty around the vehicle crossing design requirements consistent with current best practice.

The inclusion of a reference to NZTA's PPM for determining the correct design standards where vehicle crossings access State Highways will provide certainty and flexibility pending the completion of the PPM review and formalisation of the National Planning Standards.

### ***Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:***

The Preferred Option to apply the drafting changes recommended in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report will provide greater certainty in what vehicle crossing design requirements apply. These changes will assist in ensuring the Proposed Plan contains best practice rules that are easy to understand and apply. The suggested amendments will also ensure consistency with how the vehicle crossing design standards contained in the Plans of adjoining territorial authorities and ensure compliance with NZTA's design requirements as they apply to State Highways.

There are not considered to be any relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

### ***Risks:***

There is limited risk in considering the recommended changes to the vehicle crossing rules listed in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

### ***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to consider making the recommended changes to the vehicle crossing rules will incur some limited time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions.

However, the provisions are being reviewed in any case and it provides the opportunity to improve the current provisions and to provide greater administrative certainty.

The alternative is to ignore the recommended changes, which represents a lost opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan.

***Stakeholder and Community Interests:***

All identified stakeholders.

***Other:***

Coordinate the development of the vehicle crossing design requirements with the Subdivision Topic Lead and Council's ECoP review.

***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to consider the suggested changes to the vehicle crossing rules identified in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report during the drafting phase of the DPR.

## 5.9 Vehicle crossing and intersection distances - Issues and options

***Context and Issues identification***

The Plan includes minimum separation distances between vehicle crossings and intersections in Appendix E13 and Table E13.5 of the Township Volume<sup>14</sup>. A minimum distance between intersections and vehicle crossings serving individual properties are required to support road safety and efficiency outcomes. Appropriate separation distances reduce the risk of conflict associated with vehicles queuing at intersections and road users trying to access properties by ensuring there are sufficient sight lines provided.

The comparison of the Plan against the Waimakariri District Plan and Christchurch District Plan establishes that the primary difference is that Table E10.3 – Minimum Distances of any Vehicle Crossing from Road Intersections in the Plan only has two speed limit environments (>50km/h and ≤50km/h) and doesn't reference the primary 'Frontage Road'. The design diagrams used in the Christchurch District Plan are identified as a best practice method to illustrate the vehicle crossing and intersection distances within a district plan.

As mentioned above, NZTA have confirmed that all access to the State Highway network require approvals under the Government Rounding Powers Act 1989. This approval is separate and additional to any land use or subdivision approval required under the RMA. NZTA are also reviewing their PPM, which may also update the access and vehicle crossing standards that are applied at the interface between the State Highway network and public and private properties. Retention of the current design standards and alignment with the provisions of adjoining territorial authorities is supported by NZTA pending the completion of this review and the formalisation of the National Planning Standards.

<sup>14</sup> Appendix E13 Transport: E13.2.2 Distances of Vehicle Crossings from Intersections and Table E13.5 – Minimum Distances of any Vehicle Crossing from Intersections of the Township Volume

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report evaluates how effectively the design requirements that maintain an appropriate separation distance between vehicle crossings and intersections are working.

### **Options analysis**

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report identifies that the majority of the design requirements to ensure an appropriate distance is maintained between vehicle crossings and intersections provisions are working effectively and that no changes are required. Table 8.1 on Page 17 of the Report lists where there are issues with some of the rules and recommends what drafting changes should be considered.

These changes reflect the Preferred Option for addressing this Issue and include to:

- Consider the inclusion of explanatory text to Tables E10.3 and E13.5 to:
  - (a) Remove the State Highway minimum distances and to make a reference to NZTA requirements (which may change through the review of the PPM); and
  - (b) Replace the words “*Vehicle crossings adjoins to*” with “**Frontage Road**” to improve clarity.
- Recommend that the method for measuring the vehicle crossing and intersection distances for both urban and rural environments is referenced in a new diagram to provide certainty.

## **5.10 Vehicle crossing and intersection distances – Preferred Option**

The recommended drafting changes represent the Preferred Option to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the transport design requirements for ensuring appropriate distances are maintained between vehicle crossings and intersections. The amendments will assist in improving the administration of the Proposed Plan by providing greater certainty around the vehicle crossing and intersection separation design requirements consistent with current best practice.

The inclusion of a reference to NZTA’s PPM for determining the correct design standards where vehicle crossings access State Highways will provide certainty and flexibility pending the completion of the PPM review and formalisation of the National Planning Standards.

### **Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:**

The Preferred Option to apply the drafting changes recommended in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report will provide greater certainty in what vehicle crossing and intersection distance design requirements apply. These changes will assist in ensuring the Proposed Plan contains best practice rules that are easy to understand and apply. The suggested amendments will also ensure consistency with how the vehicle crossing and intersection separation distances are managed in the Plans of adjoining territorial authorities and ensure compliance with NZTA’s design requirements as they apply to State Highways.

There are not considered to be any relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

**Risks:**

There is limited risk in considering the recommended changes to the vehicle crossing and intersection separation distance rules listed in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

**Budget or Time Implications:**

The Preferred Option to consider making the recommended changes to the vehicle crossing and intersection design requirements will incur some limited time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions. However, the provisions are being reviewed in any case and it provides the opportunity to improve the current provisions and to provide greater administrative certainty.

The alternative is to ignore the recommended changes, which represents a lost opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan.

**Stakeholder and Community Interests:**

All identified stakeholders.

**Other:**

Coordinate the development of the vehicle crossing and intersection separation design requirements with the Subdivision Topic Lead and Council's ECoP review.

**Recommendation:**

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to consider the suggested changes to the vehicle crossing and intersection separation design requirements identified in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report during the drafting phase of the DPR.

## 5.11 Vehicle crossing separation distances - Issues and options

**Context and Issues identification**

The Plan includes minimum separation distances between vehicle crossings in Appendix E13 and Table E13.9 of the Township Volume<sup>15</sup>. A minimum distance between vehicle crossings is required to support road safety and efficiency outcomes, while also ensuring that sufficient space is available in the road for on-street parking. There are examples where the minimum vehicle separation distances have not been applied consistently, but this does not appear to be causing any identified issues.

A comparison of the Plan against the Waimakariri District Plan and Christchurch District Plan was undertaken. The primary variance is that these two Plans manage the separation distances based on the speed limit, where no restrictions apply within a speed limit below 70mk/h, including State Highways. The separation distances are also lower, for example 40m compared to 100m for areas subject to a speed limit that is higher than 70km/h. The Auckland Unitary Plan

<sup>15</sup> Appendix E13 Transport: E13.2.1 – Private Vehicle Accessway and Table E13.9 – Minimum Requirements for any Shared Private Vehicular Accessway

requires a minimum distance of 2m between two vehicle crossings to provide sufficient space for pedestrian movement.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report evaluates how effectively the design requirements that maintain an appropriate separation distance between vehicle crossings are working.

### **Options analysis**

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report identifies that the majority of the design requirements to ensure an appropriate separation distance is maintained between vehicle crossings are working effectively and that no changes are required. Table 9.1 on Page 21 of the Report lists where there are issues with some of the rules and recommends what drafting changes should be considered.

These changes reflect the Preferred Option for addressing this Issue and include to:

- Consider the retention of the vehicle crossing separation distance design requirements and consider these in conjunction with the Local Minor and Local Intermediate Road classification design requirements; and
- Amend Rule E13.2.4.8 to incorporate NZTA road speed thresholds as follows:

*“Notwithstanding E13.2.4.5 above, for vehicle crossings onto a State Highway or Arterial Road with a posted speed limit of ~~60~~ 70km/h or greater the distances between crossings shall be taken from Diagram E13.4”.*

## **5.12 Vehicle crossing separation distances – Preferred Option**

The recommended drafting changes represent the Preferred Option to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the transport design requirements for ensuring appropriate distances are maintained between vehicle crossings. The amendments will assist in improving the administration of the Proposed Plan by providing greater certainty around the vehicle crossing separation design requirements consistent with current best practice. It will also enable the separation distances to be considered alongside the design requirements for Local Minor and Local Intermediate Road classifications to ensure the desired outcomes are achieved.

It will also achieve a degree of alignment with the District Plans of Christchurch City and Waimakariri Councils and ensure consistency with NZTA’s updated speed management approach.

### **Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:**

The Preferred Option to apply the drafting changes recommended in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report will provide greater certainty in what vehicle crossing separation distance design requirements apply. These changes will assist in ensuring the Proposed Plan contains best practice rules that are easy to understand and apply. The suggested amendments will also ensure consistency with how the vehicle crossing separation distances are managed in the Plans of adjoining territorial authorities.

There are not considered to be any relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

**Risks:**

There is limited risk in considering the recommended changes to the vehicle crossing separation distance rules listed in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

**Budget or Time Implications:**

The Preferred Option to consider the recommended changes to the vehicle crossing separation design requirements will incur some limited time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions. However, the provisions are being reviewed in any case and it provides the opportunity to improve the current provisions and to provide greater administrative certainty.

The alternative is to ignore the recommended changes, which represents a lost opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan.

**Stakeholder and Community Interests:**

All identified stakeholders.

**Other:**

Coordinate the development of the vehicle crossing separation design requirements with the Subdivision Topic Lead and Council's ECoP review.

**Recommendation:**

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to consider the suggested changes to the vehicle crossing separation design requirements identified in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report during the drafting phase of the DPR.

## 5.13 Intersection separation distances - Issues and options

**Context and Issues identification**

The Plan includes minimum separation distances between intersections in Appendix E13 and Table E13.9 of the Township Volume<sup>16</sup>. The minimum distances between intersections are required to support road safety and efficiency outcomes at the time of subdivision. There have been a number of examples identified where the minimum intersection separation distances have not been enforced, although the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report establishes that to their knowledge this hasn't resulted in any adverse safety or efficiency concerns.

The comparison of the Plan against the Waimakariri District Plan establishes that the latter applies more conservative separation distances for intersection separation distances, with the exception of the 100km/h speed limit. The Christchurch District Plan does not control intersection separation distances.

<sup>16</sup> Appendix E13 Transport: E13.3.2 Road Intersection Spacing's (all roads) and Table E13.9 – Minimum Distance Between Intersections

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report evaluates how effectively the design requirements that maintain an appropriate separation distance between intersections are working.

#### ***Option analysis***

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report identifies that the majority of the design requirements to ensure an appropriate distance is maintained between intersections are working effectively and that no changes are required. Table 10.2 on Page 25 of the Report lists where there are issues with some of the rules and recommends what drafting changes should be considered.

These changes reflect the Preferred Option for addressing this Issue and include to:

- Remove the minimum separation distance requirement for Local Roads that operate at a 50km/h speed limit and include it as a subdivision assessment matter; and
- Consider referencing NZTA's guidance to determine the minimum intersection separation distances and determine whether this is referenced in the ECoP.

### **5.14 Intersection separation distances – Preferred Option**

The recommended drafting changes represent the Preferred Option to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the transport design requirements for ensuring appropriate distances are maintained between intersections. The amendments will assist in improving the administration of the Proposed Plan by providing greater certainty around the vehicle crossing and intersection separation design requirements consistent with current best practice.

#### ***Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:***

The Preferred Option to apply the drafting changes recommended in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report will provide greater certainty on what intersection distance design requirements apply. These changes will assist in ensuring the Proposed Plan contains best practice rules that are easy to understand and apply, including consistency with NZTA minimum intersection separation distances.

There are not considered to be any relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

#### ***Risks:***

There is limited risk in considering the recommended changes to the intersection separation design rules listed in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

#### ***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to consider making the recommended changes to the intersection separation design requirements will incur some limited time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions. However, the provisions are being reviewed in any case and it provides the opportunity to improve the current provisions and to provide greater administrative certainty.

The alternative is to ignore the recommended changes, which represents a lost opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan.

**Stakeholder and Community Interests:**

All identified stakeholders.

**Other:**

Coordinate the development of the intersection separation design requirements with the Subdivision Topic Lead and Council's ECoP review.

**Recommendation:**

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to consider the suggested changes to the intersection separation design requirements identified in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report during the drafting phase of the DPR.

## 5.15 Accessway design - Issues and options

**Context and Issues identification**

The Plan includes the minimum design requirements for accessways and laneways that are applied at the time of subdivision<sup>17</sup>. The requirements are based on the number of allotments the accessway is serving, with a 4.5m minimum legal width and 3m carriageway width required where the accessway serves up to three lots. Additional design requirements apply to accessways serving between four to six lots. The remaining 1.5m of the legal width once the carriageway has been formed provides for landscaping, underground utilities and stormwater management. More detailed design standards and cross-sections are contained in the ECoP, which includes the following statement:

*"As work within private ways, service lanes and accessways will not be taken over by Council upon completion: the Council will be placing the onus for confirming both the suitability of design and construction on the developer".*

This highlights that accessways are private spaces where management falls to private land owners, with legal interests being protected by individual agreements. However, accessways do interface with the road network and are key connection points to private properties for emergency and utility services, so it is important to evaluate how the current Plan rules are working to assist in determining how these may be managed more efficiently and cost effectively in the future.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report evaluates the accessway design requirements and whether they are appropriate from an operational perspective. These include ensuring that the design width supports: (a) the safe and efficient movement of vehicles and people; (b) the management and disposal of onsite stormwater, and; (c) sufficient space to accommodate utility services. The Residential Topic is considering whether the amenity strip width is sufficient to support streetscape amenity. This includes evaluating the need for other development controls

<sup>17</sup> Appendix E13 Transport: E13.2 Vehicle Accessway and Crossing Standards and Table E13.4 – Minimum Requirements for an Shared Private Vehicular Accessway

to manage long lengths of close board fencing, encourage suitable amenity planting and urban design treatments at the interface between accessways and the road and adjoining properties.

A comparison of the Plan has been undertaken against the Christchurch District Plan which applies an alternative approach, where the minimum design requirements are based on activities rather than the zone. The City Plan also aligns the maximum accessway formed width with the maximum vehicle crossing width and a number of notes to clarify how the design standards in the table are applied.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report evaluates how effectively the accessway design requirements are working from an operational perspective.

### ***Option analysis***

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report identifies that the majority of the design requirements that apply to accessways are working effectively and that no changes are required. Table 11.1 on Pages 29 to 31 of the Report lists where there are issues with some of the rules and recommends what drafting changes should be considered.

These changes reflect the Preferred Option for addressing this Issue and include to:

- Amend the Living Zone design requirements to include a single table that includes single access legs serving rear properties and making it clear that this does not apply to sites with direct road frontage (while retaining the 3.5m minimum width for single accessways and 4.5m for accessways serving 2 to 3 lots);
- Retain the minimum formation widths, while noting that the maximum formed width is not required as the maximum vehicle crossing width applies;
- Increase the Business Zone minimum formed accessway width to 5.5m to support two-way traffic flow and consider the inclusion for a path to facilitate pedestrian movements where a certain number of onsite parking is required;
- Consider how passing within private accessways could be facilitated, including whether design requirements are provided in the ECoP and/or Subdivision Design Guide;
- Evaluate the need for a subdivision assessment matter to consider the design of turning areas rather than a rule; and
- Introduce a rule or explanatory note outlining the minimum New Zealand Fire Service design requirements.

## **5.16 Design of accessways – Preferred Option**

The recommended drafting changes represent the Preferred Option to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the accessway design requirements to support a safe and efficient transport network. The amendments will assist in improving the administration of the Proposed Plan by providing greater certainty around the accessway design requirements consistent with current best practice.

Consideration of the width of amenity strips and any associated development controls to ensure private accessways are contributing to the streetscape and the character of commercial areas needs to be coordinated with the Residential and Business Topics. This may result in further changes to the design standards to accommodate wider amenity strips within accessways.

***Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:***

The Preferred Option to apply the drafting changes recommended in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report will provide greater certainty in what accessway design requirements apply. These changes will assist in ensuring the Proposed Plan contains best practice rules that are easy to understand and apply to support a safe and efficient transport network.

There are not considered to be any relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

***Risks:***

There is limited risk in considering the recommended changes to the accessway design rules listed in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to consider making the recommended changes to the accessway design requirements will incur some limited time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions. However, the provisions are being reviewed in any case and it provides the opportunity to improve the current provisions and to provide greater administrative certainty.

The alternative is to ignore the recommended changes, which represents a lost opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan.

***Stakeholder and Community Interests:***

All identified stakeholders.

***Other:***

Coordinate the development of accessway design requirements with the Subdivision, Residential and Business Topics Leads and Council's ECoP review.

***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to consider the suggested changes to the accessway design requirements identified in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report during the drafting phase of the DPR.

## 5.17 Rural transport rules – Issues and options

***Context and Issues identification***

The Rural Volume of the Plan contains the rules that apply to rural roads and how these integrate into the wider transport network<sup>18</sup>. The initial rules are concerned with the forming,

---

<sup>18</sup> Part C Rules and Definitions

maintaining and upgrading of roads and how this relates to Outstanding Landscape Areas, natural hazards and sites of significance to Tāngata Whenua<sup>19</sup>. The appropriateness of these rules and design standards will need to be evaluated by the respective Topic Leads during the s32 phase of the DPR to ensure they remain appropriate.

The balance of the Rural Zone road and engineering standards, coupled with the design standards in Appendix E10 - Transport and Appendix E11 – Traffic Sight Lines of the Rural Volume and the non-statutory ECoP, assist in ensuring that appropriate levels of service and design requirements are met to support a safe and efficient transport network.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report evaluates how effectively the road and engineering standards, vehicle accessways and crossings, vehicle and cycle parking and road and rail crossing traffic sight lines are working<sup>20</sup>.

### ***Option analysis***

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report identifies that the majority of the general rural transport provisions are working effectively and that no changes are required. Table 12.1 through to Table 12.3 on Pages 32 to 37 the Report list where there are issues with some of the rules and recommends what drafting changes should be considered.

These changes reflect the Preferred Option for addressing this Issue and include to:

- Remove references to the horizontal (cross fall) gradient in the permitted and restricted discretionary activity rules for the Road and Engineering Standards;
- Include a matter of discretion to support Rule 4.6.1.3 to avoid any adverse effects relating to parking overspill into the berm of rural roads;
- Amend the land use matter of discretion under Rule 4.6.6.1 to clarify that further consideration of the design for mobility impaired parking is needed only when the demand is lower than the number required in Rule 4.6.3;
- Restructure the Table E10.1 – Minimum Car Park Dimensions of Appendix E10.1 to align the table with the design diagrams, ensure consistency with engineering best practice and provide clarity to improve the administration of the Plan; and
- Delete the reference to Table E10.2 in E10.2.1.2 of Appendix E10.1 as all shared private vehicle accessways require turning areas and to insert wording to reference the ECoP correctly.

<sup>19</sup> Part C Rural Rules - Roads and Transport: Rule C4.1 Roads and Outstanding Landscape Areas; Rule C4.2 Roads and Natural Hazards; and Rule C4.3 – Roads and Sites of Significance to Tāngata Whenua

<sup>20</sup> Part C Rural Rules - Roads and Transport: Rule C4.4 Road and Engineering Standards; Rule C4.5 Vehicle Accessways and Vehicle Crossings; Rule C4.6 Vehicle and Cycle Parking; and 4.7 Traffic Sight Lines – Road/Rail Crossings

## 5.18 Rural transport rules – Preferred option

The recommended drafting changes represent the Preferred Option to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Transport rules as they are applied to the rural areas of the district. The amendments will assist in improving the administration of the Proposed Plan by providing greater certainty around the transport network design requirements as they apply to the rural areas of the district.

### ***Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:***

The Preferred Option to apply the drafting changes recommended in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report will provide greater certainty in what transport and roading rules apply to activities taking place in the rural areas of the district. These changes will assist in ensuring the Proposed Plan contains best practice rules that are easy to understand and apply.

There are not considered to be any relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

### ***Risks:***

There is limited risk in considering the recommended changes to the rural transport rules. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

### ***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to consider amending the identified rural transport rules will incur some limited time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions. However, the provisions are being reviewed in any case and it provides the opportunity to improve the current provisions and to provide greater administrative certainty.

The alternative is to ignore the recommended changes, which represents a lost opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan.

### ***Stakeholder and Community Interests:***

All identified stakeholders.

### ***Other:***

Coordinate the development of the general rural transport provisions with the Subdivision and Rural Topics Leads and Council's ECoP review.

### ***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to consider the suggested changes to the general rural transport rules identified in Supplementary Transport Baseline Report during the drafting phase of the DPR.

## 5.19 Transport design requirements and diagrams - Issues and options

### ***Context and Issues identification***

Appendix E13 of the Township Volume and Appendix E10 of the Rural Volume of the Plan contains a number of design requirements that are supported by diagrams. These seek to

ensure the network continues to be safe and efficient for road users by setting minimum design standards relating to car parking, sight lines and access arrangements.

NZTA have confirmed that all access to the State Highway network require approvals under the Government Roading Powers Act 1989. This approval is separate and additional to any land use or subdivision approval required under the RMA. NZTA are also reviewing their PPM, which may also update the access and vehicle crossing standards that are applied at the interface between the State Highway network and public and private properties. Retention of the current design standards and alignment with the provisions of adjoining territorial authorities is supported by NZTA pending the completion of this review and the formalisation of the National Planning Standards.

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report evaluates how effectively these design requirements and supporting diagrams are working.

### ***Option analysis***

The Supplementary Transport Baseline Report identifies that the majority of the design requirements and diagrams contained in the Township Volume are working effectively and that no changes are required. Table 13.1 and Table 14.1 on Pages 38 to 40 of the Report list where there are issues with some of the design requirements and diagrams and recommends what drafting changes should be considered.

These changes reflect the Preferred Option for addressing this Issue and include to:

- Remove Diagram E10.A1 – Sight Distances Measurements and State Highway/Arterial Sight Distance Values, insert a reference to NZTA’s PPM design requirements and consider preparing a diagram to illustrate the design requirements (Rural Volume);
- Simplify diagram E10.A2 – Access Separation from Intersections to ensure a consistent approach is applied across the rural and urban environments and consider including a footnote stating that the rule only applies to vehicle crossings on the same side of the road as the intersection (Rural Volume);
- Remove diagram E10.B1 – State Highways – Low Use Access Standard (up to 30 ecm/day) in the Rural Volume to accord with NZTA PPM Table App5B/4 – Accessway Types and insert a reference to NZTA’s PPM design requirements (Rural Volume);
- Remove diagram E10.B2 – State Highways – Moderate Use Access Standard (31-100ecm/day) to accord with NZTA PPM and insert a reference to NZTA’s PPM design requirements (Rural Volume);
- Remove the reference to “*Residential*” from diagram E10.C1 – Vehicle Crossing – Residential Access Standard for Local Roads to ensure consistency with the ECoP and ensure that access to other building types or activities is clear (Rural Volume);
- Remove the reference to “*Residential*” from diagram E10.C2 – Vehicle Crossing – Residential Access Standard for Arterial and Collector Roads to ensure consistency with

the ECoP and ensure that access to other building types or activities is clear (Rural Volume);

- Include instructions on how to calculate the measurements under the 'Varies' category in diagram 10.D – Vehicle Crossing – Commercial and Heavy Access Standards for all Roads (Rural Volume);
- Update E10.E – Sight Distance at Railway Lines to incorporate KiwiRail's design requirements (Rural Volume);
- Replace the 5.4m stall depth to 6.1m as it applies to all users in diagram E10.F Car Parking and insert a reference to NZS4121:2001 Design for Access and Mobility in the advice notes (Rural Volume);
- Remove the reference to 'Collector Road' in the heading of Table E10.4 – Minimum Sight Distances as the rules only apply to State Highways and Arterial Roads (Rural Volume);
- Replace the 3.2m stall width to 3.6m as it applies to disabled parking to ensure diagram E13.1 – Car Parking is consistent with Table 13.2 (Township Volume);
- Replace the 5.4m stall depth to 6.1m as it applies to all users in diagram E13.1 Car Parking and insert a reference to NZS4121:2001 Design for Access and Mobility in the advice notes (Township Volume); and
- Simplify diagram E13.5 – Access Separation from Intersections (as per diagram E10A2 above) to ensure a consistent approach is applied across the rural and urban environments and consider including either a rule or diagram explanatory note stating that the requirements only apply to vehicle crossings on the same side of the road as the intersection (Township Volume).

## 5.20 Transport design requirements and diagrams – Preferred Option

The recommended drafting changes represent the Preferred Option to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the transport design requirements as they are applied to the rural areas of the district. The amendments will assist in improving the administration of the Proposed Plan by providing greater certainty around the transport network design requirements.

Retention of the existing design standards and alignment with the provisions of the adjoining territorial authorities where they apply to the State Highway network will also be consistent with NZTA's advice that these requirements should be retained in some form pending the completion of the PPM review and formalisation of the National Planning Standards.

### ***Effectiveness in Addressing Issue:***

The Preferred Option to apply the drafting changes recommended in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report will provide greater certainty in respect to how the transport design requirements and supporting diagrams are applied to activities taking place throughout the

district. These changes will assist in ensuring the Proposed Plan contains best practice rules that are easy to understood and apply.

There are not considered to be any relevant or practical alternative options to consider.

***Risks:***

There is limited risk in considering the recommended changes to the design requirements and diagrams listed in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report. The review of the ECoP could reduce some of the design requirements that are contained in the Preferred Options, which will be determined through the subsequent s32 phase of the DPR in consultation with other Topic Leads and Council's Assets Department.

***Budget or Time Implications:***

The Preferred Option to consider amending the design diagrams will incur some limited time and cost to Council when drafting the transport provisions. However, the provisions are being reviewed in any case and it provides the opportunity to improve the current provisions and to provide greater administrative certainty.

The alternative is to ignore the recommended changes, which represents a lost opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Proposed Plan.

***Stakeholder and Community Interests:***

All identified stakeholders.

***Other:***

Coordinate the development of transport design requirements with the Subdivision Topic Lead and Council's ECoP review.

***Recommendation:***

Proceed with the Preferred Option, which is to include the suggested changes to the design diagrams identified in Supplementary Transport Baseline Report during the drafting phase of the DPR.

## 6.0 Summary of stakeholder engagement

Stakeholder engagement has been undertaken as part of the process to prioritise the Issues, determine the Preferred Options and finalise the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report.

Section 7.0 of the initial Transport Update and Preferred Options Report outlined the engagement steps undertaken to provide advice on the priority Issues. This included facilitated workshops attended by Selwyn District Council staff and representatives from the NZTA and Environment Canterbury. Targeted discussions on the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan took place with Mahaanui Kurataiao advisors, who were also invited to attend the workshops but did not attend. This initial engagement did not identify any specific comments relating to the Issues covered by the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report. The draft Supplementary Baseline Report was forwarded to Mahaanui Kurataiao, but no comments were received.

These stakeholders, in addition to KiwiRail, have also contributed to the content and review of the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report and Preferred Options. Environment Canterbury, KiwiRail and NZTA staff support all the proposed Options in principle.

ECan endorse the high level approach being applied by the Transport Topic to date, including the need to support public transport through integrated transport and land use planning, enabling the provision of appropriate transport facilities, supporting well connected and adaptable bus routes and putting in place safe and convenient connections to encourage the use of public transport services.

NZTA support the retention of the existing design requirements for intersections and vehicle crossing separation distances and that they are aligned as much as possible with the adjoining district plans pending completion of the National Planning Standards and NZTA PPM review.

KiwiRail support the retention of the 30m accessway setback from rail level crossings, minimum sightline requirements and the strategic basis of the rail related objectives and policies. A number of drafting changes are suggested to these objectives and policies to update the wording to assist in the efficient administration of the Proposed Plan.

DPR Team members are continuing to liaise with the Network Utility Working Group and personnel leading the Transport Topic of the Waimakariri District Plan Review to determine where alignment can be achieved.

## 7.0 Conclusion

Overall, there is strong direction provided in the Supplementary Transport Baseline Report to provide confidence to Council that the identified Preferred Options can proceed to the consultation, Section 32 evaluation and drafting phases.

The only exception continues to be the car parking Issue, where recommended Draft Parking Strategy has been released for consultation that will inform changes to the District Plan and ensure an integrated approach to land use and transport planning is achieved.

## 8.0 Preferred Options for further consideration

The Project Team recommends that:

1. The Preferred Options for District Wide - Transport that are outlined in Section 5.0 and listed in Appendix 4 are endorsed for further development.

## APPENDIX 1: Supplementary Transport Baseline Report (DW024)

## APPENDIX 2: Supplementary Baseline Report - Targeted questions

### 1. Rail

- Are the objectives, policies and rules in relation to rail (new lines/sidings, crossings and sight lines) appropriate?

### 2. Road hierarchy

- Do any roads need a different hierarchy (Township Appendix E7 and Rural Appendix E9) (higher or lower) applied to them?
- Are there roads that have been upgraded or constructed to collector or arterial road standards since the hierarchy list was last reviewed and need to be included in the list, so that associated land uses can be appropriately managed?
- Where new collector/arterial-function roads are constructed, what planning process should be used to include them in the roading hierarchy (a deeming provision? Plan change? Something else?), and at what point should this happen?

### 3. Corner splays

- Are the provisions in relation to corner splays (sizes, matters for discretion where not complying) appropriate?

### 4. Vehicle crossings and access

- Are the rural vehicle crossing provisions adequate and appropriate?
- What is the difference between a standard and a heavy-duty crossing (Townships Appendix E13.2.5)? Should this difference be retained?
- Should the vehicle crossing standards be the same or different between townships and rural areas?
- Is Rural Rule 3.9 Buildings and access and parking adequate and appropriate?
- Are the provisions in Townships Appendix E13.2.2 and associated Table E13.5 (distance of vehicle crossings from road intersections) adequate and appropriate?
- Are the provisions in Townships Appendix E13 Table E13.7 (distance between vehicle crossings on same side of the road) adequate and appropriate?
- Are the provisions in Townships Appendix E13 Table E13.9 (minimum distance between intersections for new roads) adequate and appropriate?

### 5. Amenity strips in vehicle accessways

- Should amenity strips within private accessways be better enabled and if so determine how this is best achieved (i.e. increasing the minimum legal width of accessways, limiting the length of accessways)?

### 6. Rural

- In relation to Rural Rule C4 Roads and Transport, Rural Appendix E10 Transport and Rural Appendix E11 Traffic Sight Lines, are the existing provisions adequate and appropriate?

**7. Design Diagrams**

- Are the existing diagrams in Rural Appendices E10 Transport & E11 Traffic Sight Lines adequate and appropriate?
- Are the existing diagrams in Townships Appendix E13 adequate and appropriate?

## APPENDIX 3: Road Classification Schedules

### Road classification updates

Road	From	To	New Classification
<b>New Arterial Road Classifications</b>			
Dunns Crossing Road	Lowes Road	Selwyn Road	Arterial
Selwyn Road	Lincoln Rolleston Road	Dunns Crossing Road	Arterial
<b>New Collector Road Classifications</b>			
Barton Fields Drive	Birchs Road	Faulks Drive	Collector
Beaumont Drive	Levi Road	Kendon Drive	Collector
Berketts Road	Main South Road	Larcombs Road	Collector
Branthwaite Drive	Lincoln Rolleston Road	TBC	Collector
Brinsworth Avenue	Weedons Ross Road	Rotherham Drive	Collector
Broadlands Drive	Springston Rolleston Road	Lowes Road	Collector
Carnaveron Drive	Faulks Drive	TBC	Collector
Carnbrae Drive	Springs Road	Blakes Road	Collector
Central Avenue	Tosswill Road	Stationmasters Way	Collector
Courtenay Road	West Coast Road	150m south of Adelaide Street	Collector
Craig Thompson Drive	Birchs Road	O'Reilly Road	Collector
Curraghs Road	Main South Road	Maddisons Road	Collector
Dynes Road	Springston Rolleston Road	Goulds Road	Collector
East Belt	James Street	Edward Street	Collector
East Maddisons Road	Oak Tree Lane	Selwyn Road	Collector
Eastfield Drive	O'Reilly Road	Edward Street	Collector
Farringdon Boulevard	Dynes Road	Ledbury Drive	Collector
Faulks Drive	Barton Fields Drive	Carnaveron Drive	Collector
Goulds Road	Broadlands Drive	Leeston Road	Collector
Granite Drive	Brookside Road	Dunns Crossing Road	Collector
Greendale Road	Cardale Street	250m south of Snowdon Place	Collector
Iris Taylor Avenue	Preston Avenue	West Coast Road	Collector
Jones Road	Weedon Ross Road	Trents Road	Collector
Kendon Drive	Beaumont Drive	Strauss Drive	Collector
Kidman Street	Tennyson Street	Rolleston Drive	Collector
Kimberley Road	Kowhai Drive	Old West Coast Road	Collector
Larcombs Road	Waterholes Road	Berketts Road	Collector
Link Drive	Hoskyns Road	Izone Drive	Collector

Road	From	To	New Classification
Maddisons Road	Hoskyns Road	Dawsons Road	Collector
Mclaughlins Road	Cressy Place	Stott Drive	Collector
Minchins Road	Old West Coast Road	Waimakariri Gorge Road	Collector
Norman Kirk Drive	Rolleston Drive	Kidman Street	Collector
O'Reilly Road	Eastfield Drive	Craig Thompson Drive	Collector
Preston Avenue	Weedons Ross Road	Iris Taylor Avenue	Collector
Robinsons Road	Main South Road	Waterholes Road	Collector
Russell Lilley Drive	East Maddisons Road	TBC	Collector
Shillingford Boulevard	East Maddisons Road	TBC	Collector
Stationmasters Way	Springs Road	Central Avenue	Collector
Stonebrook Drive	Brookside Road	Granite Drive	Collector
Strauss Drive	Kendon Drive	Levi Road	Collector
Tancreds Road	Ellesmere Road	Springs Road	Collector
Tauhinu Avenue	Vernon Drive	Southfield Drive	Collector
Tiny Hill Drive	Lowes Road	Brookside Road	Collector
Trents Road	Main South Road	Birchs Road	Collector
Trices Road	Ellesmere Road	Birchs Road	Collector
Vernon Drive	Gerald Street	Southfield Drive	Collector
Wards Road	Two Chain Road	Bealey Road	Collector
Waterholes Road	Selwyn Road	Hamptons Road	Collector

### Possible future road classifications

Road	From	To	New Classification
Branthwaite Drive Extension	Branthwaite Drive	TBC	Collector
Broadlands Drive Extension	Springston Rolleston Road	TBC	Collector
Carnaveron Drive Extension	Birchs Road	Faulks Drive	Collector
Iport Drive	Jones Road	Hoskyns Road	Collector
Link Drive	Hoskyns Road	Iport Drive	Collector
Northmoor Boulevard	East Maddisons Road	TBC	Collector
Southfield Drive	Southfield Drive	Springs Road	Collector

## APPENDIX 4: Summary of recommended changes

Issue	Recommendation	Discussion
<b>Rail provisions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider KiwiRail's suggested changes to the objectives and policies that apply to the rail network and reference to the need to encourage and facilitate rail to support public transport.</li> <li>Retain Rule E13.2.2.3 that requires a 30m accessway setback from level crossings with appropriate restricted discretionary matters of assessment.</li> <li>Review the definition of 'building' and 'tree' to ensure it covers all activities that require sightlines to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, including billboards and signs.</li> <li>Insert the KiwiRail level crossing sight lines diagram in permitted activity Rule 4.7.1 and Appendix 10 - Diagram E10E to detail the Rural design standards.</li> <li>Insert the KiwiRail level crossing sight lines diagram in permitted activity Rule 5.4 and Appendix 13 - Diagram E13.3 to detail the Townships design standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suggested changes to the objectives include using the term 'land transport network' to cover road and rail, cycleways, footpath and local roads, referencing KiwiRail Holdings Limited and to better manage incompatible land uses to reduce the risk that they may compromise the efficient and safe operation of the rail network.</li> <li>The suggested changes to the policies seek to encourage multi-modal networks, reference sight line requirements and minor wording changes to improve clarity.</li> <li>The suggested changes to the rules seek to clarify sight lines, assessment matters and the definitions to capture structures that may undermine visibility.</li> </ul>
<b>Road classification updates</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to the updated schedule in <b>Appendix 3</b>.</li> <li>Consider the preparation of a map to illustrate the network road classifications and referencing an intermediary status to reference future anticipated classifications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suggested changes seek to ensure the Proposed Plan includes the most up to date road classifications.</li> <li>The inclusion of a map is consistent with best practice.</li> </ul>
<b>Corner splays</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain the existing corner splay design requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current corner splay design provisions require a 3m radius in Living Zones and a 6m radius in Business Zones, which are working effectively.</li> <li>The subdivision assessment matters relate to the effects on the efficient functioning and safety of the road and amenity.</li> </ul>
<b>Vehicle crossings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider inserting a rule or explanatory note making reference to the heavy-duty vehicle crossing design requirements contained in the ECoP.</li> <li>Replace any references to 'Strategic Road' to 'State Highway' to ensure consistency with the operative road classifications to be consistent with Rule C4.5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suggestion to include a reference to the ECoP design requirements and to consider illustrating these in a diagram reflects best practice.</li> <li>The suggested changes to replace 'Strategic Road' with 'State Highway' is a tidy up from PC12.</li> </ul>

Issue	Recommendation	Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider cross referencing the land use matters of discretion (Rural Volume 3.9.2.2 (b) and Township Volume 5.3.5.2) and illustrating the vehicle crossing design requirements in the diagrams contained in the Appendices.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design and location of the vehicle crossing matters of discretion should be listed in the design requirements and accompanying diagrams.</li> </ul>
<b>Vehicle crossing and intersection distances</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the inclusion of explanatory text in Tables E10.3 and E13.5 to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Remove the State Highway minimum distances and to make a reference to NZTA requirements (which may change through the review of the PPM)</li> <li>(b) Replace the words “<i>Vehicle crossing adjoins to</i>” with “<b>Frontage Road</b>” to improve clarity</li> </ul> </li> <li>Recommend that the method for measuring the vehicle crossing and intersection distances for both urban and rural environments is referenced in a new diagram to provide certainty.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that any direct references to the State Highway minimum requirements are removed and for Plan users to be directed to NZTA to confirm what design standards they require. This also provides flexibility to update the PPM to ensure ongoing consistency between the Proposed Plan and NZTA requirements.</li> <li>The suggestion to illustrate the measurement distances in a diagram similar to Figure 8.1 of the Supplementary Baseline Report reflects best practice and provides greater certainty to Plan users.</li> </ul>
<b>Vehicle crossing separation distances</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the retention of the vehicle crossing separation distance design requirements and consider these in conjunction with the consideration of the Local Minor and Local Intermediate Road classification design requirements.</li> <li>Amend Rule E13.2.4.8 to incorporate the new speed management approach that excludes the use of 70km/hour as follows:  <i>“Notwithstanding E13.2.4.5 above, for vehicle crossings onto a State Highway or Arterial Road with a posted speed limit of <b>60 70km/h</b> or greater the distances between crossings shall be taken from Diagram E13.4”</i> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing vehicle crossing separation distances are 7m to a shared accessway or less than 1m or greater than 7m for Living Zones and less than 1m or greater than 7m for Business Zones. The appropriateness of retaining these design standards need to be evaluated alongside the function of Local Minor and Local Intermediate Roads.</li> <li>The suggested changes to Rule E13.2.4.8 will align the Proposed Plan to NZTA’s updated speed management approach and best practice.</li> </ul>
<b>Intersection separation distances</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the minimum separation distance requirement for Local Roads that operate at a 50km/h speed limit and include it as a subdivision assessment matter.</li> <li>Consider referencing NZTA’s guidance to determine the minimum intersection separation distances on State Highways and establish whether this is referenced in the ECoP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rule E13.3.2.1 requires the intersection spacing to comply with Table E13.9. Replacing this rule with a subdivision assessment matter aligns with best practice, will improve the efficiency of the Proposed Plan and continues to enable road safety to be considered where the minimum intersection separation distance requirement is not met.</li> </ul>

Issue	Recommendation	Discussion
<b>Accessway design</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Living Zone design requirements should include 1 to 3 sites so that the design requirements apply to access legs serving rear single properties and making it clear that this does not apply to sites with direct road frontage.</li> <li>• Retain the minimum formation widths, while noting that the maximum formed width is not required as the maximum vehicle crossing width applies.</li> <li>• Consider how passing within private accessways could be facilitated, including whether design requirements are provided in the ECoP and/or Subdivision Design Guide.</li> <li>• Increase the Business Zone minimum formed accessway width to 5.5m to support two-way traffic flow and consider the inclusion for a path to facilitate pedestrian movements where a certain number of onsite parking spaces are required.</li> <li>• Evaluate the need for a subdivision assessment matter to consider the design of turning areas rather than a rule.</li> <li>• Introduce a rule or explanatory note outlining the minimum Fire and Emergency New Zealand design requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The suggested changes include integrating the single rear accessway design requirements into a single table rather than a standalone rule. It is intended to retain the current 3.5m minimum vehicle crossing widths for these single rear accessways.</li> <li>• Efficiencies are able to be gained by only referencing the minimum accessway widths, with the maximum width being managed covered by the maximum vehicle crossing design widths listed in Table E13.7 – Vehicle Crossing Requirements for Living and Business Zones and Rule E10.2.4 – Vehicle Crossings – Design and Siting for Rural Zones.</li> <li>• Consideration needs to be given to how: (a) Pedestrians using private accessways are catered for; (b) Two-way traffic flows and turning areas are provided for; and (c) Accessway design requirements in Councils ECoP and Design Guides and Fire and Emergency New Zealand minimum design requirements are referenced in the Proposed Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Rural transport rules</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove references to the horizontal (cross fall) gradient in the permitted and restricted discretionary activity rules for the Road and Engineering Standards.</li> <li>• Include a matter of discretion (to Rule 4.6.1.3) to avoid any adverse effects relating to parking overspill into the berm of rural roads.</li> <li>• Amend the land use matter of discretion under Rule 4.6.6.1 to clarify that further consideration of the design for mobility impaired parking is needed only when the demand is lower than the number required in Rule 4.6.3 Parking Requirements.</li> <li>• Restructure the Table E10.1 – Minimum Car Park Dimensions of Appendix E10.1 to align the table with the design diagrams, ensure consistency with engineering best practice and provide clarity to improve the administration of the Plan.</li> <li>• Delete the reference to Table E10.2 in E10.2.1.2 of Appendix E10.1 as all shared private vehicle accessways require turning areas and to insert wording to reference the ECoP correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The suggested changes are recommended to simplify the Proposed Plan, align with current best practice and provide certainty to Plan users.</li> </ul>

Issue	Recommendation	Discussion
<b>Transport design requirements and diagrams</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove Diagram E10.A1 – Sight Distances Measurements and State Highway/Arterial Sight Distance Values, insert a reference to NZTA’s PPM design requirements and consider preparing a diagram to illustrate the design requirements (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Simplify diagram E10.A2 – Access Separation from Intersections to ensure a consistent approach is applied across the rural and urban environments and consider including an explanatory note stating that the rule only applies to vehicle crossings on the same side of the road as the intersection (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Remove diagram E10.B1 – State Highways – Low Use Access Standard (up to 30 ecm/day) in the Rural Volume to accord with NZTA PPM Table App5B/4 – Accessway Types and insert a reference to NZTA’s PPM design requirements (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Remove diagram E10.B2 – State Highways – Moderate Use Access Standard (31-100ecm/day) to accord with NZTA PPM and insert a reference to NZTA’s PPM design requirements (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Remove the reference to “Residential” from diagram E10.C1 – Vehicle Crossing – Residential Access Standard for Local Roads to ensure consistency with the ECoP and ensure that access to other building types or activities is clear (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Remove the reference to “Residential” from diagram E10.C2 – Vehicle Crossing – Residential Access Standard for Arterial and Collector Roads to ensure consistency with the ECoP and ensure that access to other building types or activities is clear (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Include instructions on how to calculate the measurements under the ‘Varies’ category in diagram 10.D – Vehicle Crossing – Commercial and Heavy Access Standards for all Roads (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Update E10.E – Sight Distance at Railway Lines to incorporate KiwiRail’s design requirements (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Replace the 5.4m stall depth to 6.1m as it applies to all users in diagram E10.F Car Parking and insert a reference to NZS4121:2001 Design for Access and Mobility in the advice notes (Rural Volume).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suggested changes are recommended to simplify the Proposed Plan, provide flexibility to update the PPM to ensure ongoing consistency between the Proposed Plan and NZTA requirements, align with current best practice and provide certainty to Plan users.</li> </ul>

Issue	Recommendation	Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the reference to 'Collector Road' in the heading of Table E10.4 – Minimum Sight Distances as the rules only apply to State Highways and Arterial Roads (Rural Volume).</li> <li>Replace the 5.4m stall depth to 6.1m as it applies to all users in diagram E13.1 Car Parking and insert a reference to NZS4121:2001 Design for Access and Mobility in the advice notes (Township Volume).</li> <li>Simplify diagram E13.5 – Access Separation from Intersections (as per diagram E10A2 above) to ensure a consistent approach is applied across the rural and urban environments and consider including either a rule or diagram explanatory note stating that the rule only applies to vehicle crossings on the same side of the road as the intersection (Township Volume).</li> </ul>	