

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHI

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (the **RMA**)

AND

IN THE MATTER OF of the hearing of submissions on Plan Change 14
(Housing and Business Choice) to the Christchurch
District Plan

**STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF WILLIAM HEMMING FIELD ON
BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**URBAN DESIGN:
TRANSPORT**

Dated: 9 October 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| SCOPE OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE | 1 |
| REMOVAL OF VEHICLE CROSSING CO-LOCATION REQUIREMENTS | 2 |
| REMOVAL OF PEDESTRIAN ACCESS REQUIREMENTS | 3 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. My rebuttal evidence addresses two transport rules that the participants at transport expert conferencing, which I was not part of, propose to amend. For the reasons discussed in my evidence below I continue to support the retention of the following rules:
 - (a) Vehicle crossing co-location requirements – Rule 7.4.3.13c – *"the minimum distance between a shared vehicle crossing and any other shared vehicle crossing shall be 13m"*. However, if this distance is to be reduced, as suggested by Mr Rossiter, I would support a change to 10 metres, allowing for one parking space and tree planting on-street between crossings.
 - (b) Pedestrian access requirements of 3m – Appendix 7.5.7c.

INTRODUCTION

2. My name is **William Hemming Field**. I am employed as a Senior Urban Designer at the Christchurch City Council (**Council**).
3. I prepared a statement of primary evidence on behalf of the Council dated 11 August 2023. My primary evidence addressed: Chapter 6.1A Qualifying matters – City Spine Transport Corridor, Chapter 7 Transport (parts of), Chapter 13.5 Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zones (**SPHZ**), in relation to matters arising from the submissions on Plan Change 14 to the Christchurch District Plan (the **District Plan; PC14**).
4. I have the qualifications and experience set out at paragraphs 27 to 32 of my primary evidence, and I repeat the confirmation given in my primary evidence that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023, and that my evidence has been prepared in compliance with that Code.

SCOPE OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

5. In preparing this rebuttal statement, I have read and considered the transport experts' conferencing statement, and the evidence filed on behalf of submitters as this relates to my primary evidence, including the statement of evidence of Ms Lisa Williams on behalf of Carter Group Limited.
6. In this rebuttal evidence I respond to the following issues:

- (a) Removal of vehicle crossing co-location requirements currently provide for in Rule 7.4.3.13 c. *"the minimum distance between a shared vehicle crossing and any other shared vehicle crossing shall be 13m."*
- (b) Removal of pedestrian access requirements currently provided for in Appendix 7.5.7c. *"For developments of three or more residential units, each unit shall be accessed by either a combined vehicle-pedestrian access or a dedicated pedestrian access that is a minimum of 3 metres 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."*

REMOVAL OF VEHICLE CROSSING CO-LOCATION REQUIREMENTS

- 7. In the transport evidence of Ms Williams and in the Transport expert conferencing statement, Ms Williams has supported the removal of the proposed Rule 7.4.3.13c. Mr Rossiter has agreed in conferencing that the separation distance could be reduced.
- 8. In response to this, I reiterate that I support this rule because it:
 - (a) improves the safety and amenity of the street environment by minimising potential conflicts between pedestrians, cycles other vehicles;
 - (b) provides for more opportunities for creating better street frontages with buildings and garden planting;
 - (c) potentially provides for more on street parking spaces and street tree planting locations; and
 - (d) reduces the potential to create an adverse dominance of hardstand asphalt or concrete areas along street frontages.
- 9. In my opinion, this rule would enable greater management of potential adverse effects of medium and high-density residential development dominating the street frontages and public realm environment with a predominance of vehicle movement and hardstand areas.
- 10. The proposed 13m separation distance would allow for two parallel, on-street parking spaces plus some potential space for build-out street tree planting (while retaining footpath widths). If this distance was to be reduced as

suggested by Mr Rossiter, I would recommend that a distance that allowed for 1 car parking space plus provision for street tree planting (plus any clear zones) could possibly be an alternative. This distance would be in the vicinity of 6.1- 6.5m single parking space length (for high turnover areas)¹ plus a minimum of additional 2m for a street tree² plus provision for clear zones. This would total approximately 10 metres for a lesser proposed separation distance between driveway crossings.

11. I support retaining this rule to encourage development designers to minimise private vehicle crossings onto public streets. The revised Residential design principles included in PC14 have prioritised good site planning as part of residential development design, which includes addressing site access. This rule would signal this issue up front before proposals are lodged and assessed through these matters of discretion.

REMOVAL OF PEDESTRIAN ACCESS REQUIREMENTS

12. In the transport evidence of Ms Williams and in the Transport expert conferencing statement, Ms Williams has supported the removal of the proposed Appendix 7.5.7c. Mr Rossiter has agreed that, from a transport engineering design perspective, this 3m width requirement is not necessary.
13. In response to this, I reiterate and continue to support the reasons in my primary evidence for including the above minimum pedestrian access width dimension, including:
 - (a) The safety and security of people using the pedestrian access and those occupying residential units (in accordance with CPTED) by providing for personal passing space and visibility.
 - (b) Privacy separation distances from paths to windows from internal habitable spaces.
 - (c) Adequate space for people with a disability or with limited mobility.
 - (d) Spaces for some landscape planting along the routes.
 - (e) The ability for cyclists to access cycle storage areas safely and conveniently.

¹ CCC [Part-8-Roading.pdf \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#) IDS 8.10.3 On-street parking (8-20)

² CSS – 2022 – Part 7 Landscape SD708 – ‘Parking Bay Grate Foundation’

- (f) Space to manoeuvre household furniture and other items in a reasonably convenient manner.
 - (g) Access width for the transportation and storage of rubbish and recycling bins, and other servicing.
 - (h) Space for lighting.
14. In my opinion, a holistic approach to the benefits of this rule is required that does not just consider the purely functional metrics of pedestrian accessways. Privacy, CPTED, amenity and provisions for other services such as lighting, and cycle and bin storage should be considered too. Furthermore, in my opinion, accessways used daily by many residents should provide a degree of being welcoming and pleasant environments, and not feel spatially restricted or enclosed, shaded, and cluttered.
15. I note that the Fire and Emergency New Zealand submission requested a wider accessway width requirement of 4.5m to position the ladder and perform operational tasks for emergency services.

William Field

9 October 2023