

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 9: Business and Business Town Centre Zones (Proposed Waikato District Plan) submissions and further submissions

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

DATED 12 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 Business and Business Town Centre Zones on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (PWDP). I was not involved in the preparation of the submissions or further submissions made to the PWDP. I can confirm that I have read the submissions and further submissions by the Transport Agency in relation to the PWDP.

1.2 I have reviewed Waikato District Council's Section 42A Rebuttal Evidence for Hearing 9: Business and Business Town Centre Zones (s42A Rebuttal) and the 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 multi-unit developments and signage setbacks in the Business Zone.

2. **Submission Point 742.135: Business Zone: Rule 17.1.3 RD1(a): Restricted Discretionary Activity- multi-unit development; and Submission Point 742.193: Business Town Centre Zone: Rule 18.1.3 RD1(a): Restricted Discretionary Activity- multi-unit development; and Further Submission point 1202.81 to submission 749.132 by Housing New Zealand: Rule 17.4.1.1 RD1 Subdivision- Multi-unit Development**

2.1 The Transport Agency's submissions in relation to the potential adverse effects on the transport network from a multi-unit development have not been addressed in the s42A Rebuttal. It is noted that the author of the s42A Rebuttal welcomes consideration of matters relating to multi-unit developments by the Hearing Panel (paragraph 84) and as such I request that the Hearing Panel take into account the Transport Agency's submission points and paragraphs 5 and 11 of my evidence in relation to multi-unit developments.

3. **Submission Point 742.138: Business Zone: Rule 17.2.7.1 P2 Signs – General**

3.1 Paragraph 51 of the s42A Rebuttal provides commentary on why in the authors opinion there is no need for a sign to be setback 15m from a State highway (except for State Highway 23 in Raglan). The reason given is that a sign on Business Zoned land near a state highway would not be visible for numerous reasons.

3.2 Taking into account the matters outlined in paragraphs 51 (a) to (e) of the s42A Rebuttal, I have again reviewed the planning maps where there is Business Zoned land in the vicinity of a state highway and for the reason outlined in paragraph 3.3 clauses (a) to (d) below, I consider that there is a need for a rule in the PWDP requiring the 15m setback from state highways as outlined in paragraph 7.1 of my evidence.

- a) Pokeno Town Centre map 7.7: Designation J24/SH1 — while there is some earth bunding and planting adjacent to the state highway (100km/hour) a sign could be erected at the boundary of the sites and be visible from the state highway.

- b) Mercer map 7.8: Designation J24/SH1 — Business zoned land (Mercer Service Centre) is adjacent to the State highway (100km/hour) and a sign could be erected at the boundary of the sites and be visible from the state highway.
- c) Horotiu map 26.1: Designation J20/SH1 — the property at 6277 Kernott Road is zoned Business and it abuts the State highway designation boundary on its southern and western boundaries. While the site is elevated above the State highway and there are mature trees on the boundaries, it is noted that they could be removed at any time or a sign could be erected on the opposite side of the trees facing directly to the State highway.

3.3 The Transport Agency's submission also sought a limit of one additional freestanding sign on a site (Rule 17.2.7.1 P2(a)(v)(A)). This amendment was rejected in the s42A Report as it was not considered necessary. This matter was previously addressed in the s42A Report for Hearing 7: Industrial Zone where at paragraph 421 it states:

The New Zealand Transport Agency [742] requests that P2 in Rule 20.2.7.1 Signs – General, be amended to make it clear that there is a limit of two freestanding signs on a site. The words 'any other' in the notified rule mean that no limit is set. This amendment is considered appropriate and necessary.

3.4 It is my opinion that there should be consistency in the PWDP and as such the amendment proposed to Rule 17.2.7.1 P2(a)(v)(A) by the Transport Agency should be accepted. The amendment is as follows (deletions struckthrough and insertions underlined):

(v) Where the sign is a freestanding sign, it must:

A. Not exceed an area of 3m² for one sign per site, and 1m² for ~~any other~~ one additional freestanding sign on the site;

3.5 In summary, I consider that the effects on the level of visual distraction from signs on vehicle users' needs to be more adequately addressed in the PWDP; particularly in relation to the state highway where a higher speed environment typically exists.

4. Submission Point 742.141: Business Zone: Rule 17.3.4 Building setbacks - Zone boundaries

4.1 The s42A Rebuttal rejects a proposed new rule requiring building setbacks from national routes, regional arterials or the Waikato Expressway for reasons set out in paragraphs 51, 72 and 73 of the s42A Rebuttal. However, I note that paragraphs 72 and 73 appear contradictory. Paragraph 72 states:

This rule recognises the amenity values expected within the Residential Zone. However, such amenity values do not apply within the Business or Business Town Centre Zones. Accordingly, I remain of the opinion that the 15m setback is not required.

Yet paragraph 73 deems that such a setback is required in Raglan adjacent to SH23.

4.2 Further I note that at paragraph 72 it states:

I note that in the Residential Zone, Rule 16.3.9.2 includes a building setback for sensitive land uses in relation to a boundary with a national route, regional arterial or the Waikato Expressway.

I consider it important to note that the proposed change to Rule 17.3.4.1 is not in relation to sensitive land uses. These are controlled by Rules 17.3.5 Horotiu Acoustic Area and 17.3.6 Dwelling, where the Transport Agency submission points 742.182 and 742.244 sought the insertion of a more comprehensive response (which would include acoustic treatment requirements) for the management of sensitive land uses in proximity to the state highway network. I understand that these submission points have been allocated to Hearing 25D Infrastructure 4.

4.3 Accordingly for the reason provided in my evidence at paragraphs 9.1 to 9.8, I consider that a building setback is required from national routes, regional arterials or the Waikato Expressway.

Tanya Running

12 February 2020