

SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF TANYA RUNNING FOR THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY (PLANNING)

1. This summary evidence addresses:

- the three submission points where my view departs from the s42A report;
- the missing submission points: 742.14 to Policy 4.1.10 — Tuakau and 742.15 to Policy 4.1.11 — Pokeno; and
- the rebuttal evidence of Mr Tollemache as it relates to my evidence.

2 Policy 4.15(a) — Density

2.1 My evidence seeks to change of the word “encourage” to “ensure”, the inclusion of “safe, efficient, and effective access” and “without being reliant on private vehicle use” for the following reasons:

- it would provide consistency with other sections of the PWDP that provide a stronger directive.
- in the absence of policy direction and zoning, it could be difficult for Waikato District Council (WDC) to direct higher density housing (in particular) to locations with transport networks, employment, community services and open space.
- ensure consistency with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (2018/2019-2027/2028) which has a focus (amongst other matters) on improving safety for transport users and supporting a mode shift from private vehicles to more efficient low cost modes like walking, cycling and public transport.

3 Policy 4.7.6(a)(i)—Co-ordination between servicing and development and subdivision

3.1 The Transport Agency’s submission sought amendments to this policy to ensure that a development utilising the capacity of infrastructure was consistent with the activities/land use identified by the relevant structure plan.

4 Policy 4.7.7(b) — Achieving sufficient development density to support the provision of infrastructure services

4.1 This submission point notes that it is not just geotechnical or topographical constraints that restrict the potential yield of a development. Urban design outcomes or the requirement for land transport infrastructure can also affect the yield. Therefore, the proposed amendments to this policy would ensure these matters are also considered when designing developments.

5 Policy 4.1.10 — Tuakau

5.1 Given the scale of residential live zoned land proposed in Tuakau, this policy should include reference that the future development in Tuakau needs to be supported by existing or planned infrastructure. Policy 4.1.8 seeks integration and connectivity, therefore, the proposed inclusion of the clause: *iv) that subdivision, use and development in this area is supported by sufficient existing or planned infrastructure* will support this intent.

5.2 Policy 4.1.10 clause (iii) makes reference to the Tuakau Structure Plan. It is noted that the Tuakau Structure Plan and the technical reports supporting it date back to 2014.

5.3 Since this time there have been legislation changes¹, an update to the Future Proof Strategy and changes have occurred in the transport environment with spill-over effects from the significant growth planned in the Auckland southern region. Parts of the Tuakau Structure Plan (e.g. the staging section) are therefore likely to require updating to reflect such changes.

5.4 The Tuakau Structure Plan is only incorporated into the PWDP via a hyperlink in the policy. If Council intend to utilise the current version of the Tuakau Structure, it should be appropriately incorporated into the PWDP.

6 Policy 4.1.11(a) — Pokeno

6.1 It is noted that the policy does not recognise that development in Pokeno needs to be supported by existing or planned infrastructure. This is considered necessary because Pokeno does not currently have a relevant structure plan to guide the staging of land development with infrastructure capacity/availability. Therefore including *is supported by existing or planned infrastructure* to subsection (i) would address this issue.

7 Strategic transport infrastructure networks

7.1 This term is not defined in the PWDP. However the term “regionally significant infrastructure” is defined in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (2016) (RPS) and includes “significant transport corridors” at clause (g) which includes both state highways and railways. Therefore, it is proposed that for consistency with the RPS, the term “strategic transport infrastructure networks” be replaced with “regionally significant infrastructure”. This amendment to the policy will ensure all infrastructure in the Waikato region, that is regionally significant, will be identified.

8 Rebuttal Evidence of Mr Tollemache for Havelock Village Limited

8.1 Section 4.2 and 4.4 of Mr Tollemache’s rebuttal evidence states the he does not support the amendments to Policy 4.1.5(a). For the reasons outlined in section 6 of my evidence, I am of the view that the word should be altered to “Ensure” as it is important that higher density development has access to the required infrastructure. In addition, there are other policies in the PWDP which also use the word “ensure” to provide a stronger directive.

8.2 Mr Tollemache at section 4.3 of his rebuttal evidence considers adding “where they have safe, efficient and effective access” to Policy 4.1.5(a) changes the intent of the policy to a transport focus and this is emphasised by the addition of “without being reliant on private vehicle use”. The proposed change to this policy as outlined in my evidence is to clarify that the higher density of development should have access [emphasis added] to commercial centers, community facilities and open space, rather than just be located near [emphasis added] them. The reference to access that is not reliant on private vehicle use is supporting a mode shift from private vehicles to more efficient low cost modes like walking, cycling and public transport².

¹ National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 and the Resource Management Legislation Amendment Act 2017

² Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (2018/2019-2027/2028)

- 8.3 At section 4.8 of Mr Tollemache's rebuttal evidence he proposes further amendments to Policy 4.7.6(a)(i), I agree with the proposed amendments to have the policy recognise that infrastructure can be provided by other means.
- 8.4 At section 4.8 of his rebuttal evidence Mr Tollemache does not support my proposed amendments to Policy 7.7. In addition to the reasons outlined in my evidence at section 8, I consider that requiring a development to maximise the potential yield based purely on the number of lots may lead to compromises in other areas such as good urban design (as it could be restricted to the absolute minimum rather than what is optimal). This can lead to a loss of amenity.
- 8.5 Mr Tollemache states that it is unclear how transport infrastructure requirements would reduce density within a residential zone. A good example of this is a developer in trying to achieve the maximum lot density of a site could seek to reduce the minimum width requirements for a road, cycle path or a walk way.
- 8.6 Mr Tollemache at section 4.10 of his rebuttal evidence does not consider the proposed changes to the Tuakau and Pokeno policies are necessary as it is repeating requirements. The Transport Agency's intent of the changes to Policies 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 is due to the concerns of live zoning without integrated planning, (as there is no structure plan for Pokeno and the Tuakau Structure Plan is outdated) as outlined in my evidence.

Tanya Running
30 October 2019