

BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

THE PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT PLAN (STAGE 1)

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act)

IN THE MATTER OF Hearing 10: Residential Zone (Proposed Waikato District Plan)
submissions and further submissions

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF TANYA RUNNING FOR THE WAKA KOTAHI NZ
TRANSPORT AGENCY (PLANNING)**

DATED 20 FEBRUARY 2020

1. SUMMARY STATEMENT

1.1 The Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (the Transport Agency) lodged submissions and further submission points in relation to the objectives, policies and rules of the Residential Zone on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (PWDP).

1.2 I have reviewed Waikato District Council's Section 42A Rebuttal Evidence for Hearing 10: Residential Zone (s42A Rebuttal) and the two recommendations in relation to the Transport Agency's evidence. This summary statement addresses the matters that in my opinion are not resolved in relation to the effects of signs on traffic, building setbacks from the Waikato Expressway for sensitive land uses, multi-unit developments, retirements villages, and home occupations in the Residential Zone.

2. Submission Point 742.25: Policy 4.4.7 – Managing the adverse effects of signs

2.1 The Transport Agency's submission in relation to the above policy have not been addressed in the s42A Rebuttal. As such I request that the Hearing Panel take into account the Transport Agency's submission point and paragraphs 6.1 to 6.3 of my primary evidence.

3. Submission Point 742.131: Rules 16.3.9.2 P1 and P2 Building setbacks – Sensitive land use

3.1 The s42A Rebuttal requests a more detailed analysis in terms of the relationship between the location of the Residential Zones and the standard Expressway construction, and requests specific information in paragraph 39 clauses (a) to (d). From this request it appears the s42A author is seeking to identify locations to impose a building setback rather than apply a blanket setback approach to capture any future sensitive land use that may be constructed near the Waikato Expressway. The blanket setback approach is the approach sought by the Transport Agency.

3.2 In relation to the questions raised in the s42A Rebuttal, I have sought further comments from Dr Stephen Chiles where necessary as follows:

- Clause (a) states: *Are the residential areas and the dwellings on them been in existence for a long time (such as at Meremere)?*

From a review of both the Operative Waikato District Plan and the PWDP and associated aerial photos it appears all of the areas referred to in Annexure B of my primary evidence have been zoned for residential purposes for some time.

- Clause (b) states: *Is the area greenfield where subdivision will occur prior to residential development and as part of the subdivision application the matter of reverse sensitivity can be considered and addressed?*

The issue of reverse sensitivity can be addressed and considered through the subdivision process. However, if the assessment process considers a 25 metre setback as being the starting point that is problematic because that setback is unlikely to manage the *"most significant adverse effects on new and altered sensitive activities"* as Dr Stephen Chiles has set out in his evidence.

- Clause (c) states: *The Waikato Expressway and SH1 have been treated as if the same volumes and types of traffic are carried across the whole network. Whereas this will not be the situation for example at Taupiri, where the portion of SH1 that will be alongside Residential zoned land will carry significantly less traffic;*

To clarify the Transport Agency submission point seeks to amend Rule 16.3.9.2 P1 which relates solely to the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway, which will in due course be SH1. The submission point does not relate to sections of the existing SH1 which will be revoked and will no longer be state highway.

- Clause (d) states: *No evidence has been provided on how adverse noise effects from sections of the new Expressway on the existing residential zones (such as at Rangiriri and Horotiu) have been mitigated to an extent that the additional setback distance would not be required.*

The Transport Agency undertook extensive noise mitigation (such as barriers and surfacing) for all sections of the Waikato Expressway. A resource consent could always be sought to deviate from the buildings setback of 35 metres if there were particular circumstances to warrant it (e.g. the presence of an existing noise wall).

- 3.3 As part of my primary evidence, the Transport Agency provided evidence from Dr Stephen Chiles (a highly regarded specialist on this matter) that a 35 m distance setback from the edge of the designation would be appropriate to manage the *“most significant adverse effects on new and altered sensitive activities near the Waikato Expressway”*. The Transport Agency’s expectation is that Council would have provided acoustic evidence to justify why a reduction in the setback (as specified in the Operative District Plan) to 25m is appropriate to manage the effects of road noise on sensitive activities.

4. Submission point 742.20: Objective 4.2.16(b) – Housing options

The Transport Agency’s submission in relation to the above objective have not been addressed in the s42A Rebuttal. As such I request that the Hearing Panel take into account the Transport Agency’s submission point and paragraphs 10.1 to 10.3 of my primary evidence.

5. Submission point 742.21: Policy 4.2.18 (a)(iv) – Multi-unit development

The Transport Agency’s submission in relation to the above policy has not been addressed in the s42A Rebuttal and it is noted that the author of the s42A Rebuttal welcomes consideration of matters relating to multi-unit developments by the Hearing Panel and as such I request that the Hearing Panel take into account the Transport Agency’s submission point and paragraphs 11.1 to 11.4 of my primary evidence in relation to multi-unit developments.

6. Submission point 742.120: Rule 16.1.2 P3 Permitted Activities – Retirement villages

The Transport Agency’s submission in relation to the above rule has not been addressed in the s42A Rebuttal. As such I request that the Hearing Panel take into account the Transport Agency’s submission point and paragraphs 12.1 to 12.5 of my primary evidence.

7. Submission point 742.121: Rule 16.1.2 P4 Permitted Activities – Home occupations

The Transport Agency's submission in relation to the above rule has not been addressed in the s42A Rebuttal. As such I request that the Hearing Panel take into account the Transport Agency's submission point and paragraphs 13.1 to 13.3 of my primary evidence.

Tanya Running

20 February 2020