

SUMMARY STATEMENT – TRANSPORT ENGINEERING

- 1.1 My full name is **Michael Christopher Rossiter**. I am a Principal Transportation Engineer at Stantec New Zealand.
- 1.2 I have prepared evidence including, rebuttal evidence, on behalf of the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**) in relation to amendments to the District Plan Transport Chapter to support and improve safety at accesses to sites with the higher density of residential development enabled by Plan Change 14 (**PC14**).
- 1.3 My evidence addressed submissions on the following matters:
- (a) Minimum Requirements for Private Ways and Vehicle Access;
 - (b) High Trip Generators;
 - (c) Accessible Parking;
 - (d) Loading Bays;
 - (e) Garage Dimensions; and,
 - (f) Emergency Vehicle Access.
- 1.4 This summary outlines the key matters that remain in contention and provides further information on some matters.

2. RULE 7.4.3.13.C VEHICLE CROSSINGS/DRIVEWAY SEPARATION

- 2.1 As recorded in the Transport Joint Witness Statement and my rebuttal evidence, I support a reduction in the minimum separation requirement between a shared driveway and any other driveway from 13 metres as proposed in PC14 as notified. From a transport safety perspective, a minimum separation of 3 metres is sufficient to provide space for a pedestrian or cyclist to stop between driveways clear of any vehicle movement.
- 2.2 However, with the increased density of residential development, I would anticipate a higher demand for on-street parking. A 3m separation between driveways does not provide sufficient space to form an on-street parking space. A minimum separation between driveways of 8.1m is required to form a complying parking bay and provide 1m separation from driveways. I consider that reducing the minimum separation requirement between a

shared driveway and adjacent crossings to 8.1m will provide more opportunity to meet the practical parking demands that will arise with increased residential density. From a road safety perspective, it will also reduce the number of potential conflict points along a footpath.

3. APPENDIX 7.5.7 ACCESS DESIGN AND GRADIENT

3.1 Ms Williams on behalf of Carter Group seeks to delete the requirement for passing areas on footpaths proposed in Appendix 7.5.7(c). I have discussed this matter with Council with a view to refining the requirements so that it achieves the urban design outcomes sought by the Council while providing an appropriate level of pedestrian access.

3.2 The notified amendments to Appendix 7.5.7 do not capture the original intent which aimed to ensure that an appropriate level of pedestrian access was provided to all residential development. The amendments also did not capture what was required when a site was developed with no parking or vehicle access. The following table shows my understanding of what type of pedestrian access should be provided for different types of residential development.

Number of Dwellings	No Vehicle Access	With Vehicle Access
< 4	Shared path	Shared Driveway
4 – 15	Shared path	Driveway + 1.5 widening
> 15	Shared path	Separate shared path

3.3 Based on this understanding, I support the wording changes to Appendix 7.5.7(c) as proposed by Ms Piper in her summary statement.

4. ACCESSIBLE PARKING AND LOADING BAYS

4.1 I maintain my position that it is appropriate for the Council to introduce a requirement for accessible parking to be provided within medium density residential developments to ensure that a development does not unduly prevent access for mobility impaired people. This is particularly so given that the Building Code access and mobility requirements are 20 years old.

- 4.2 I am aware that this is addressed in recent guidance issued by the Building Research Association of New Zealand (BRANZ) relating to Universal Design for Access to Homes¹ which states:

1.0.4 The New Zealand Building Code requires that accessible routes be provided for premises providing accommodation, such as groups of pensioner flats, rest homes, boarding houses, hostels and student halls of residence. The Building Code does not currently require accessible routes for private housing, but ensuring dwellings keep people safe and meet their needs throughout their lives makes good economic, social and business sense.

1.0.5 Accessible dwellings have a wider range of possible purchasers and can have a higher resale value. Accessible routes also reduce the chance of accidents. They enable occupants to age in place, be more independent and remain in their own homes and communities for longer, which reduces costs to society.

- 4.3 I also maintain my position that a requirement for a loading space is appropriate at sites having only low numbers of parking spaces to ensure that this can be accommodated.

Date: 21 November 2023

Chris Rossiter

¹ BRANZ BU662 Universal Design for Access into Homes, 2021