

**UNDER** the the Resource Mangement Act 1991 ("RMA")  
**IN THE MATTER** of Proposed Waikato District Plan: Hearing 22 –  
Infrastructure and Energy

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PHILIP JOHN STICKNEY ON BEHALF OF  
KĀINGA ORA-HOMES AND COMMUNITIES (749 / FS1269)**

**PLANNING**

**15 October 2020**

---

---

**Instructing Solicitor:**

**C E Kirman  
Special Counsel  
Kāinga Ora-Homes and  
Communities**

**PO Box 14594  
Central Auckland 1061  
E.  
Claire.kirman@kaingaora.govt.nz**

---

**Solicitors Instructed:**

**ELLIS GOULD  
LAWYERS  
AUCKLAND  
REF: Douglas Allan / Alex Devine**

**Level 17 Vero Centre  
48 Shortland Street, Auckland  
Tel: 09 307 2172 / Fax: 09 358 5215  
PO Box 1509, DX CP22003  
AUCKLAND**

## 1. **Summary Statement**

- 1.1 My full name is Philip John Stickney. I am providing planning evidence on behalf of Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities (“**Kāinga Ora**”) in relation to submissions made on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (“**PDP**”) insofar as they relate to this hearing. My qualifications and experience are set out in **Annexure 1** of my Evidence in Chief (“**EIC**”) dated 29 September 2020. This statement summarises my EIC and rebuttal.

## 2. **Summary of EIC**

### ***Vibration and Noise Controls***

- 2.1 The relief sought by KiwiRail and Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (“**the Submitters**”) to include acoustic and vibration controls for a distance of 100 metres each side of the outer boundary of a State Highway or rail designation (“**Controls**”) are an inappropriate and unjustified planning response.
- 2.2 In my view, the evidence provided by the Submitters and the depth of the s.32AA analysis does not signal that there is indeed a significant reverse sensitivity effect that is manifesting itself through the curtailing of road or rail movements, nor that the particular noise environment within the Waikato justifies their introduction. Accordingly, it is not reasonable to arrive at a conclusion that the Controls sought are appropriate and justified. I consider that no detailed assessment options, alternatives and technical analysis has been undertaken, even if it was to be demonstrated that an effect was of a scale that required the imposition of the Controls sought and the rebuttal evidence of the Submitters’ does not change my opinion in that regard.

### ***Carparking Standards and Accessway and Road Corridor Widths***

- 2.3 Kāinga Ora sought changes to Table 14.12.5.7 and Table 14.12.5.14. which regulate minimum parking standards and accessway and road corridor widths. In light of the directions pertaining to parking standards within the NPS-UD2020, I consider that there are opportunities to consider the removal of minimum parking standards. At the very least, and in light of the approach to parking adopted in NPS-UD2020, I consider the full suite of relief sought in respect of Table 14.12.5.7 should be adopted. In relation to accessways, I consider that where more than eight lots are to

be created, Table 14.12.5.14 should be amended to enable a narrower legal width (16m) than the standard of (20m) in the Village and Residential Zones. Alternatively, the trigger point for the number of allotments could be adjusted upwards to enable a greater number to be serviced without a 20m road required.

### **3. Summary of Rebuttal**

3.1 My rebuttal evidence addressed the following matters:

- (a) The proposal by the Submitter to introduce controls related to outdoor noise; and
- (b) The conclusion reached in the report prepared by Acoustic Engineering Services relating to building costs and the use of barriers as an alternative to mitigate against noise.

3.2 My overriding issue with the outdoor noise rule is that for users of the Plan and the community residing within the 100 metres corridors (either side), the combination of rules, options for compliance and technical skills required to assess matters renders the rules onerous and unduly complicated. When the construction costs and practical considerations such as amenity and maintenance are included, I have some concerns as to the appropriateness of the rule (particularly for existing activities), notwithstanding that technically it may well reduce noise levels.

3.3 Regarding the conclusion reached in the report prepared by Acoustic Engineering Services, while the report provides some outcomes in respect of costs per units as a percentage increase, there are a number of factors which are not articulated clearly in the report such as whether the dwellings are single storey or more, the size of the dwellings and/or the build value contained in the Building Consent. It appears that the samples are based on a new-build scenario only and do not consider costs implications of a minor addition to an existing dwelling as a percentage. I am therefore unclear as to the cost implications arising from a minor addition within an established residential area are as a percentage cost to the owner.

3.4 Further, my concerns are raised in the context of the significant geographic extent of the controls sought and the reliance upon this memorandum to inform the s.32 assessment. While at face value the

percentage costs may be relatively low, the issue I have is the extrapolation of those costs over the extent of the areas affected and therefore the cumulative costs to be borne by the community to achieve compliance with the rules sought.

#### **4. Conclusion**

- 4.1 While I have no fundamental disagreement with the benefits that will arise from a health and wellbeing perspective from acoustic attenuation, I remain of the view that the assessments undertaken and the conclusions reached are not of a sufficiently robust nature to conclude that the rules are justified as currently drafted.

**Philip John Stickney**

29 September 2020