

1. SUMMARY STATEMENT - TRANSPORT

- 1.1 My full name is **Clare Joan Piper**. I am a Senior Policy Planner in the City Planning Team of the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**).
- 1.2 I have prepared a section 42A report and rebuttal evidence on behalf of the Council as it relates to the proposed changes to the Transport Chapter of the District Plan (Chapter 7) by way of Plan Change 14 (**PC14**).
- 1.3 This summary statement relates to section 80E (1) (b) (iii) of the RMA – in relation to amending related provisions that support or are consequential on the MDRS or policy 3 of the NPS-UD
- 1.4 This summary statement summarises the recommended changes to the original notified provisions, as per my s.42A report, outlines the remaining outstanding issues and any further recommended changes as result of rebuttal evidence, expert conferencing or pre-hearing mediations with submitters.

2. TRANSPORT CHAPTER - PROVISIONS

- 2.1 A summary of the proposed notified changes for the Transport Chapter, can be found in both the s.32¹, and s.42A² reports, and will not be repeated here.
- 2.2 In summary however, the proposed changes to the Transport Chapter are consequential and address the transport related effects of increased height and density proposed under PC14. In particular, the proposed amendments respond to:
 - (a) Increased reliance on pedestrian access to residential units;
 - (b) Emergency vehicle access to residential units in higher risk situations;
 - (c) Increased number of vehicle crossings;
 - (d) Additional loading requirements; and,
 - (e) The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

¹ ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Plans-Strategies-Policies-Bylaws/Plans/district-plan/Proposed-changes/2023/PC14/Section-32/0023231-v2.PDF – pages 16-17: paragraphs 3.3.3 – 3.3.6.

² 10A-Clare-Piper-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF (ihp.govt.nz) Page14: paragraph 6.1.2

2.3 As per the changes proposed within the s.42A report for the Transport chapter³, these seek to:

- (a) Provide minor clarification wording changes to:
 - (i) Policy 7.2.1.2.
 - (ii) Matters of discretion 7.4.4.3, 7.4.4.1;8 and 7.4.4.27.
 - (iii) Zone naming throughout provisions.
- (b) Amend the appendices relating to:
 - (i) Minimum number of mobility parking spaces for residential activities - Table 7.5.1.1 – inserting new provisions.
 - (ii) Cycle parking facilities – 7.5.2 – inserting advice note for power points in cycle facility facilities.
 - (iii) Access for firefighting purposes - 7.5.7 – inserting wording to assist with dimensions needed for access.
 - (iv) Minimum legal width of accesses – Table 7.5.7.1 – increasing width.

2.4 I acknowledge the Council submission that has been addressed by Mr. Langman in his Statement of Evidence⁴, and accept the recommendation for those amendments to provisions relating primarily to cycle parking (Appendix 7.5.2) and access for emergency vehicles (Appendix 7.5.7), as per Attachment 47 to the Council's submission⁵.

2.5 Further to the above, following consideration of the rebuttal evidence provided by Ms. Heins⁶, Mr. Field⁷ and Mr. Rossiter⁸ for Council, alongside the Joint Witness Statement⁹, and in responding to further points raised by both Carter Group and ChristchurchNZ, I have further recommendations that I discuss below.

³ [PC14-for-s42A-Chapter-7-Transport-Rules.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

⁴ [Christchurch-City-Council-751-Evidence-Marcus-Langman.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) – pages 22-23: paragraph 71-75

⁵ [PC14-751-lke-Kleynbos-for-Christchurch-City-Council-proposed-Attachment-47.pdf \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

⁶ [29-Anne-Heins-Statement-of-evidence-final.PDF \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

⁷ [20.-Rebuttal-Evidence-William-Field.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

⁸ [51.-Rebuttal-Evidence-Chris-Rossiter.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

⁹ [Joint-Expert-Witness-Statement-of-Transport-Experts-Transport-26-September-2023.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

3. CYCLE PARKING - COMPREHENSIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MIXED USE ZONE

- 3.1 I support transport provisions for the Comprehensive Residential Developments¹⁰ in the Mixed Use Zone being located within that zone's provisions as opposed to in the Transport chapter, with appropriate cross references in both that zone and the Transport chapter.

4. CYCLE PARKING - CHARGING POINTS

- 4.1 Power points should be located within communal cycle facilities to support increased uptake of cycling as a transport mode. The options identified for supporting and providing for power points included either amending the power point advice note (as per my section 42A report) on ratios to encourage power points to be provided, or a new provision to require power points.
- 4.2 There may be merit in requiring 1 power point per cycle parking space to be provided within communal cycle parking facilities to assist with the greater demand for micromobility devices as a consequence of intensification of residential activities, and I would support this option if the Panel thinks this option should be further explored. However, I am of the opinion that for now an amendment to the advice note within Appendix 7.5.2 is appropriate, as follows:

2. The installation of standard 240V electrical power points in cycle parking facilities is strongly encouraged to enable the charging of e-bikes, e-scooters and other micro mobility devices. A ratio of 1 power point to 5-1 cycle parking spaces is recommended to accommodate future growth.

5. CO-LOCATION OF VEHICLE CROSSINGS

- 5.1 Rewording 7.4.3.13 - Co-location of Vehicle Crossings - to refer to 'accesses' rather than 'sites', and reduction of minimum distance between shared crossings from 13m to 8.1m.
- 5.2 Mr. Rossiter has agreed in the JWS that the 3m distance is supported from a transport safety rationale. Mr. Fields has further reviewed his position

¹⁰ Comprehensive Residential Developments is defined as "in relation to the Future Urban Zone, means a development of three or more residential units which have been, or will be, designed, consented and constructed in an integrated manner (staged development is not precluded). It may include a concurrent or subsequent subdivision component."

from an urban design perspective and now supports 8.1m as opposed to 10m (as per his rebuttal evidence). On balance, in light of the change in positions on the minimum distance, I consider the minimum should be 8.1m because this would allow for review of safety and streetscape amenity if this is reduced. I recommend that the diagram 7.5.11.4 requires to be amended to reflect this, and that 7.4.3.13 should now read as:

	<u>Applicable to</u>	<u>Standard</u>	<u>The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters:</u>
a.	<u>Any new vehicle crossing within the MRZ and HRZ zone an urban area</u>	a. <u>no more than two adjacent sites accesses shall share a single vehicle crossing;</u> b. <u>the total width of a vehicle crossing shared between two adjacent sites accesses shall not exceed 7m; and</u> c. <u>the minimum distance between a shared vehicle crossing and any other vehicle crossing shall be 13m 8.1m.</u> <u>See 7.5.11.4 for a diagram illustrating the prescribed distances specified in clauses (b) and (c) of this rule.</u>	<u>Rule 7.4.4.28 - Vehicle Crossing Co-Location Layout</u>

6. HIGH TRIP GENERATOR ASSESSMENTS

6.1 Having considered the wording proposed in the JWS concerning high trip generator assessments I agree to the following amendments to the matters of discretion (7.4.4.18 vi), to now read as:

vi. Strategic framework: Whether the proposal is consistent with the local and regional transport policy framework **including that it supports a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and adverse climate change effects.**

~~vii. Greenhouse gas emissions: Whether measures are proposed to be implemented to promote opportunities for safe efficient travel other than by conventional provide vehicles, to seek to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle use associated with the activity, and the ability for the measures to be implemented and maintained over the lifetime of the activity.~~

7. PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

7.1 Submitters sought the deletion of the minimum requirements for private ways and vehicle access. At conferencing Mr Rossiter agreed that from a transport engineering design perspective, the 3m width requirement in rule 7.5.7(c) is not necessary, supporting instead 1.5m. As per my rebuttal evidence I recommended that this rule is retained but consider flexibility for smaller developments is required.

7.2 The changes necessary to give effect to my recommendations are set out below:

(a) Amending Policy 7.2.1.9 Pedestrian Access, to now read as:

a. Pedestrian access is designed to;

- i. ~~be of a sufficient width and grade that the pedestrian access meets the access requirements of residents and their visitors all users, including persons with a disability or with limited mobility;~~
- ii. ~~have a surface treatment that provides for all weather access; and where required for consistency with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), have sufficient illumination to provide for the safety of users after dark.~~

(b) Amending Appendix 7.5.7 c. and d. to now read as:

~~c. Where a vehicle access serves nine or more parking spaces or residential units and there is no other pedestrian and/or cycle access available to the site then a minimum 1.5 metres wide space for pedestrians and/or cycle shall be provided and the legal width of the access shall be increased by 1.5 metres.~~

c. For developments of three four or more residential units where one or more units has no direct, each unit shall be accessed to a road and where no vehicle access is provided, by either a combined vehicle pedestrian access or a dedicated communal pedestrian access shall be provided that has is a minimum unobstructed width of 3metres in width with a formed pathway of at least 1.5m; and each access shall be from the street to the front door of the unit and any garage or parking space for that unit.

d. Where a vehicle access serves four to 15 parking spaces or residential units and there is no other pedestrian and/or cycle access available to the site,

then a minimum 1.5m wide space for pedestrians and/or cyclists shall be provided adjacent to the vehicle access.

e. Where a vehicle access serves 16 or more parking spaces or residential units, then a separate pedestrian access shall be provided that has a minimum unobstructed width of 3m with a formed pathway of 1.5m.

~~d. Any pedestrian access longer than 50m with a formed width of less than 1.8m shall provide passing opportunities with a minimum length of 2m and a minimum width of 1.8m at least every 50m~~

7.3 Supporting minor changes, as per JWS, to the matters of discretion 7.4.4.27 to include surfacing, lighting, CPTED and gradient considerations.

8. OUTSTANDING ISSUES AND FURTHER RECOMMENDED CHANGES

8.1 I note that in the FENZ submission an amendment to height clearance was sought in Table 7.5.7.1 a., from 3.5m to 4m that was not addressed in the s.42A report. I support this and recommend this relief is accepted.

8.2 Further changes are sought to the cycle parking facilities (Appendix 7.5.2). Having considered the Transport JWS and Ms. Heins amended position, I make the following recommendations:

(a) Cycle parking stands: Advice note be inserted into Appendix 7.5.2 after e.iv.B, to read:

Advice note: To achieve the provisions 7.5.2.e iv, 7.5.2.e.iv.A and 7.5.2.e.iv.B, and in order to accommodate a wide range of cycle types and micromobility devices (e-bikes, step-through cycles, cargo bikes, recumbent cycles, adult tricycles, and standard and seated e-scooters) it is recommended that Sheffield cycle stands are selected as the stand type. A Sheffield stand with recommended dimensions is shown in Figure 4.

(b) Cycle dimensions to be updated for 90th percentile:

(i) Insert provision in Appendix 7.5.2, after e. ii to read:

The resident's cycle parking shall accommodate a cycle of the 90th percentile dimensions shown in Figure 4.

- (ii) Proposed new Figure 4 in Appendix 7.5.2 to be: 60mm tyre width, and 1.85m length,

8.3 As such, to ensure all these above recommended amendments to the s.42A provisions work together, and can be operationalised for plan administration, I consider there may need to be further minor consequential amendments and look forward to providing the Panel this full set of track changes in due course.

8.4 Submitters also sought the insertion of new provisions for accessible mobility parking. At conferencing Mr Rossiter agreed that accessible parking should be provided via the District Plan. For clarity, I confirm that as per my rebuttal evidence I recommend the inclusion of a requirement for accessible parking within medium density residential developments.

9. SUMMARY

9.1 Overall, I consider the proposed changes as recommended to the Transport chapter respond to the transport related effects of increase density for residential activities.

Date: 21 November 2023

Clare Joan Piper