

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 12: Country Living Zone (Proposed Waikato District Plan)
submissions and further submissions

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

DATED 09 MARCH 2020

1. Introduction

1.1 My name is Tanya Running. I am a Principal Environmental Consultant with WSP where I have been employed since 2004. I hold a degree in Science from Waikato University. I am an Associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have 15 years' planning experience.

1.2 I am authorised to present this evidence on behalf of Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (the Transport Agency), in support of its primary submissions¹ and further submissions² on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (PWDP). I was not involved in the preparation of the submissions or further submissions made to the PWDP.

1.3 I confirm that I am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as set out in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. I have read and agree to comply with the Code. Except where I state that I am relying upon the specified evidence or advice of another person, my evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

2. The Transport Agency's submissions on the Country Living Zone

2.1 The Transport Agency lodged submissions and further submissions to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone and Chapter 5: Rural environment, which are addressed in this hearing.

3. The Section 42A report

3.1 I have reviewed the Hearing 12: Country Living Zone, section 42A report (s42A report) dated 3 March 2020 and its recommendations in relation to the Transport Agency's submissions and further submissions. For clarity, **Annexure A** provides a table of the Transport Agency's submissions and further submissions, and states whether the s42A report's recommendations are agreed or disagreed with.

4. Scope of evidence

4.1 In preparing this evidence, I have had regard to:

- a) The Transport Agency's submissions and further submissions, and the submissions and further submissions made by other parties;
- b) The notified version of Chapter 23: Country Living Zone dated 18 July 2018;
- c) The notified version of Chapter 5: Rural Environment dated 18 July 2018;
- d) The section 42A report entitled Hearing 12: Country Living Zone prepared by Susan Chibnall, dated 3 March 2020;

¹ Submission #742

² Further Submission # 1202

4.2 My evidence addresses the following submissions and a further submission made by the Transport Agency where further comments/clarification are required:

- Submission Point 742.236: Rule 23.2.6.2 P1 – Signs- effects on traffic
- Submission Point 742.238: Rules 23.3.7.1 P1 and P2 Building setbacks – All boundaries
- Submission Point 742.241: Rule 23.3.7.1 RD1 Building setbacks – All boundaries
- Submission point 742.121: Rule 23.1.1 P4 Permitted Activities – Home occupations

5 Submission Point 742.236: Rule 23.2.6.2 P1 – Signs- effects on traffic

5.1 The Transport Agency's submission point supported this rule and sought amendments to clause (v) (insertions underlined):

(v) Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 words, symbols or graphics;

5.2 The s42A Author rightly points out that the proposed amendments sought in this submission “*complicates the situation for a plan reader*” and that:

The rule would then read to include 40 characters, and as well, 6 words, symbols and graphics. The request would be increasing the amount of information on the sign. I do not believe this is the intent of the submission. Further to this, I am unsure about the difference between the terms ‘characters, symbols and graphics’ from an NZTA perspective, and invite NZTA to provide some clarification. I recommend that the panel reject New Zealand Transport Agency [742.236].

5.3 The Transport Agency has requested the same amendment for all zones in the PWDP and this was recently addressed in Hearings 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

5.4 In preparing my summary statement for Hearing 7, I noted that the Transport Agency's original submission to alter the wording of P1(iv) differs to that in the Transport Agency's brochure: *Advertising Signs on State Highways*. The brochure wording is as follows:

Signs should have a maximum of 6 words and/ or symbols, with a maximum of 40 characters

5.5 The PWDP wording as notified is: *Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 symbols*. Given the similarity of the wording in the PWDP and Transport Agency Brochure, I respectfully requested a minor amendment to the rules as follows (insertions underlined):

Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 words and/or symbols;

5.6 However, in light of the s42A Authors' comments I consider for clarity for users of the District Plan that the wording of this rule throughout the PWDP should revert back to the wording in the Transport Agency's brochure: *Advertising Signs on State Highways* as outlined in paragraph 5.4 above.

6. Submission Point 742.238: Rules 23.3.7.1 P1 and P2 Building setbacks – All boundaries

6.1 The Transport Agency does not wish to pursue this submission point; the Transport Agency's concerns relate to building setbacks for habitable buildings (for sensitive land use).

7. Submission Point 742.241: Rule 23.3.7.1 RD1 Building setbacks – All boundaries

7.1 This submission point has not been included in the s42A report. The Transport Agency's submission supported this rule but sought amendments to Rule 23.3.7.1 RD1(b)(ii) as follows (insertions underlined and deletions struckthrough):

(b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters:

(ii) ~~effects on traffic~~ transport network safety and efficiency;

8. Submission point 742.121: Rule 23.1.1 P4 Permitted Activities – Home occupations

8.1 The Transport Agency's submission point considered that the activity of 'Home Occupations' in the Country Living Zone should not involve heavy vehicles and requested a new condition to the permitted activity rule and a new Restricted Discretionary rule should heavy vehicles be involved. The s42A report at paragraph 229 rejected the submission point. My earlier evidence in the Hearing 6: Village Zone³ and Hearing 10: Residential Zone⁴ topic hearings has addressed this matter so it is not repeated here.

Tanya Running 11 March 2020

³ Submission point 742.145

⁴ Submission point 742.121

ANNEXURE A

	Matter	The Transport Agency's Submission or Further Submission Number	S42A report's recommendation	The Transport Agency's Comment
1	Policy 5.6.3 – Subdivision in the Country Living Zone	S742.41	Accept in part	Agree
2	Policy 5.6.14 – Managing the adverse effects of signs	S742.42	Accept in part	Agree
3	Policy 5.6.15 – Artificial outdoor lighting	S742.43	Accept	Agree
4	Policy 5.6.16 – Noise	S742.44	Reject	Agree
5	Rule 23.1.1 P3 – Temporary Event	S742.232	Accept	Agree
6	Rule 23.1.1 P4 – a Home Occupation	S742.233	Reject	Disagree
7	Rule 23.2.2 – Glare and artificial light	S742.234	Accept	Agree
8	Rule 23.2.6.1 Signs – General	S742.235	Accept	Agree
9	Rule 23.2.6.2 P1 Signs – effects on traffic	S742.236	Reject	Disagree
10	Rule 23.2.6.2 D1 Signs – effects on traffic	S742.237	Accept	Agree
11	Rule 23.3.7.1 P1 and P2 Building setbacks– All boundaries	S742.238	Reject	Agree
12	Rule 23.3.7.1 RD1 Building setbacks – All boundaries	S742.241	Missing from s42 A report	
13	Rule 23.3.7.2 P1 Building setback -sensitive land use	S742.240	Accept	Agree
14	Rule 23.3.7.2 D1 Building setback -sensitive land use	S742.241	Accept	Agree
15	Rule 23.4.7 RD1 Subdivision – road frontage	S742.144	Accept in part	Agree