

Proposed Plan Change 5 to the Ashburton District Plan

Introduction

The Plan Change covers five discrete Transportation related topics within the Ashburton District Plan, they are:

- A. [Consequential changes resulting from the NPS-UD](#)
- B. [Mobility parking](#)
- C. [Cycle parking](#)
- D. [High trip generating activities](#)
- E. [Update to roading hierarchy](#)

Each of these separate topics listed above are assessed separately in this report, along with an appropriate scale of section 32 analysis and recommendations.

Section 32 of the Resource Management Act requires that the evaluation report for a Plan Change contains a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal. The scale and significance of each part of this Plan Change has been assessed separately to ensure that any differences in the level of impact result in differences in levels of analysis.

The proposed plan change text is included in Appendix 1.

Schedule 1 Consultation

Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with Schedule 1, Clause 3 of the Resource Management Act 1991 prior to notification of this Plan Change with the following stakeholders.

The Ministry for the Environment
The Ministry of Transport
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency
Canterbury Regional Council (ECan)
Selwyn District Council
Timaru District Council
Mackenzie District Council
Westland District Council
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu
Te Runanga o Arowhenua (Aoraki Environmental Agency)
Te Taumutu Runanga (Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited)

A summary of feedback received is attached as Appendix 2.

Summary of Issues

<p><u>Consequential changes as a result of the NPS-UD</u></p>	<p>Why is it an issue:</p> <p>The District Plan currently has standards for the size, layout and formation of “required” car parks. Given that there is now no requirement to provide car parking, technically these design standards are also not required. There is a risk that where developers choose to build car parks, they may not be appropriately designed (i.e. too short, narrow or difficult to manoeuvre into).</p> <p>The requirement for queuing spaces for vehicles at service stations and drive through facilities was also removed in February 2022, as this was previously bundled into the minimum parking standards. Currently, the plan has no requirement for developments to provide queuing spaces. As such, a new fast-food restaurant with drive through facilities could be consented which provides inadequate space for vehicles to queue and may compromise the safety and efficiency of roads.</p> <p>How do we propose to address the issue:</p> <p>It is proposed to delete the word “required” in rule 10.8.4 to give staff the ability to ensure that all parking spaces are designed to appropriate dimensions.</p> <p>It is proposed to add to rule 10.8.12 the queuing length requirements, which were removed as part of the minimum parking standards in February.</p>
<p><u>Mobility parking</u></p>	<p>Why is it an issue:</p> <p>Since the February plan change, no parking is required for any development, so the risk is that a developer could choose for example to develop a large commercial activity, and provide less car parks than would previously have been required, or no car parks at all, and as a result the required mobility parking would be reduced or eliminated.</p> <p>The threshold for mobility parking requirements is too high for most activity types. Any activity that provides fewer than 9 car parks is exempt from providing mobility parking, regardless of the activity type or where it is located. This is inconsistent with the Building Code which requires that any activity providing 1 or more car parks is required to provide at least 1 mobility parking space.</p> <p>How do we propose to address the issue:</p> <p>The proposed change to rule 10.8.3 does two key things.</p> <p>It ensures that larger scale activities (over 2,500m²) which choose to provide no car parking will still be required to provide mobility parking. Basing the mobility parking rate on the floor area is an approach suggested by NPS-UD guidelines as a way of calculating the requirement when no other car parking is provided.</p> <p>It ensures that mobility parking is provided even where 1-9 car parks are provided (except for residential activities or small-scale visitor accommodation such as a B&B). This change is recommended to bring the Plan in line with current best practice and the Building Code.</p>
<p><u>Cycle parking</u></p>	<p>Why is it an issue:</p> <p>Since the February plan change, no parking is required for any development, so the risk is that a developer could choose for example to develop a large commercial activity, and provide less car parks than would previously have been required, or no car parks at all, and as a result the required cycle parking would be reduced or eliminated. In this scenario there may be demand for cycle parking in the absence of car parks.</p>

	<p>The threshold for cycle parking requirements is too high for most activity types. Any activity that provides fewer than 20 car parks is exempt from providing cycle parking, regardless of the activity type or where it is located. If a cycle park is provided it might not be usable because the design or location is poor.</p> <p>How do we propose to address the issue:</p> <p>It is proposed that that the plan is amended so that cycle parking requirements are tied to the nature and scale of the activity taking place. This will ensure that cycle parking provision is not removed or reduced, should car parking provision decrease.</p>
<p><u>High trip generating activities</u></p>	<p>Why is it an issue:</p> <p>There is an opportunity to give effect to the Ashburton District Parking Strategy 2021 (Parking Strategy) through this change. Page 24 of the Parking Strategy sets out a range of methods to achieve Objective A: “Support placemaking, amenity, and good urban design outcomes”. One of the methods is to include provisions in the District Plan for high traffic generating activities. Including provisions in the District Plan is one of the key opportunities give weight to the Ashburton District Parking Strategy and its objectives.</p> <p>By managing the demand for (private motor) vehicle trips, there is an opportunity to alleviate issues of parking supply. Issues of parking supply may become more acute over time as a result of the NPS-UD changes, placing costs on the Council in terms of management of on-street space and/or provision of off-street public parking.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to recognise the benefits of high trip generating developments that provide for accessibility by a range of transport modes, that manage the demand for travel, and/or that integrate well with the existing transport network.</p> <p>There is an issue where high trip generating activities may have substantial negative impacts on the safety and/or efficiency of the transport network through trip generation or site and access design. There is currently insufficient discretion to consider these adverse effects, which risks poor outcomes in terms of level of service for the Council’s roads, and in achieving the transport objectives of the District Plan. In the absence of the proposed rule, Council roads may be vulnerable to congestion or poor safety outcomes.</p> <p>The internal site design may not provide a safe or efficient environment for all transport users (e.g. pedestrians, cyclists, mobility scooters).</p> <p>How do we propose to address the issue:</p> <p>It is proposed is proposed as part of this this Plan Change to include a rule that allows for the assessment of the transport effects of activities which generate significant traffic.</p> <p>New or expanded activities of a certain scale would be classified as ‘high traffic generators’, for example schools with more than 70 students or industrial activities larger than 5,000m² GFA.</p> <p>Activities which trigger the threshold would require a resource consent application including an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA). Developers of high trip generating activities would be encouraged to consider transport effects and opportunities at the design stage of the proposal.</p> <p>The ITA considers the relationship between landuse and transport and may include recommendations to maximise integration between the two. The accessibility of the development by all relevant modes of transport is considered, along with the safety and efficiency of the transport network, and any measures to appropriately manage adverse effects. The level of detail required in the ITA would reflect the scale and complexity of the proposal and its surrounding environment.</p>

	<p>The proposed rule would allow council ensure that transport effects of activities which generate significant traffic are appropriately assessed and managed.</p>
<p>Update to roading hierarchy</p>	<p>Why is it an issue:</p> <p>The Roding Hierarchy is contained within Appendix 10-1 in the Transport Section of the District Plan.</p> <p>Classification of a number of roads in the District has changed since the last update to the classifications in 2018. Updating of the Roding Hierarchy is an ongoing exercise of the Roding Team, as new roads are built, existing roads upgraded and changes in land use along certain roads take place, the Hierarchy which is referred to in the transportation rules is outdated and does not match the current land use and functions of the roads.</p> <p>How do we propose to address the issue:</p> <p>Since the Roding Hierarchy is updated on an ongoing basis as and when required, it is proposed to update the Roding Hierarchy in the District Plan to reflect the current Hierarchy as maintained by Council.</p>

A summary of the relevant documents for this plan change is included in Appendix 3.

A. Consequential changes as a result of the NPS-UD

Problem Definition

There are gaps in some of the existing rules resulting from the removal of minimum parking requirements. Examples include the rule for minimum dimensions of parking spaces. The rule could be interpreted to only apply to parking spaces 'required' by the plan. As only mobility parking is required by the plan, any other parking provided would not be required to meet the minimum dimensions in that rule.

Because the plan does not 'require' standard car parks, the current wording in these rules may cause confusion for plan users and may not be the most efficient or effective means of regulating the subject matter.

The transport effects created from the current gaps in the rules may cause adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the transport network.

SCALE AND SIGNIFICANCE

The ranking has been undertaken on a basis of a -1, 0, 1 ranking system. The following degrees of scale and significance have been allocated to the respective rankings:

-1 – Insignificant

0 – Moderate

1 – Significant

Assessment Matter	Comment	Ranking
Degree of shift from the status quo (status quo defined as the current approach)	This change will be of a limited scale, it is in line with the current policy direction of the Plan and is largely fixing a gap caused by the removal of minimum car parking standards under the NPS-UD.	-1
Who and how many will be affected?	The standards for parking and access design are relevant to a broad range of activities. In practice, most developers will be meeting the standards as they applied before the removal of minimum car parking standards.	0
Degree of impact on, or interest from iwi/Māori	There likely to be limited policy interest from iwi/Māori on the standards for parking and access as they are technical transport standards and do not directly relate to water/soil/air.	-1
When will effects occur?	Ongoing into the future	0
Geographic scale of impacts	Distributed across the transport network	0
Type of effect	The proposal will have a positive and cumulative environmental effect from the design of parking areas and queuing spaces.	-1
Degree of policy risk, implementation risk, or	The proposed Plan Change is seeking to protect areas that are already protected to some extent by the Timaru District Plan. Therefore this proposal is considered nothing more than	-1

uncertainty	aligning Ashburton District Plan with other statutory documents with jurisdiction over the identified area.	
-------------	---	--

CATEGORISATION BASED ON ABOVE:

3 to 6 (High) = Comprehensive / detailed report that thoroughly addresses all aspects of s32. Expert assessments likely to be required.

-2 to 2 (Moderate) = Moderate level of detail focussing on key points.

-3 to -6 (Low) = Basic evaluation without need for much detail.

On the basis of the above assessment in the scale and significance of this Plan Changes has been determined to be **low** (-4)

REASON FOR CHANGE

The proposed change was initiated in response to the removal of minimum car parking requirements in February 2022 under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.

Analysis of Options

The following table summarises the evaluation completed throughout the plan change process in relation to the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the various elements of the proposed plan change, as follows:

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing	OPTION 2: Amend the District Plan to apply the parking design and queuing space requirements to any car park provided.
Costs	<p>There is a cost to users of the transport network from parking design, and queuing space rules not being applied when it would be appropriate for them to do so.</p> <p>There is the potential for confusion for plan users from the retention of reference to 'required' parking, when the District Plan does not require any car parking (other than mobility).</p>	<p>There is a cost to applicants in meeting the requirements for parking design and queuing space. Most of this cost existed prior to the removal of the minimum car parking requirements. There is some additional cost for applicants in needing to meet the design and queuing space requirements for any car park provided, not just those required by the Plan. However, this may have been interpreted by the Plan user in the past to apply to any car park provided in any case.</p>
Benefits	<p>Avoids the cost and time in doing a plan change.</p> <p>Retains the familiarity of the current wording for plan users.</p>	<p>Ensures that any parking provided is subject to requirements for parking design and queuing space. This provides benefit to all users in being enabled to access the road network and land use activities safely and efficiently.</p>
Appropriateness	<p>Given the costs to plan users and users of the transport network, retention of the existing wording is not considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Aligns the requirements with similar rules in Christchurch, Selwyn and Timaru.</p>
Effectiveness and	<p>This is not considered to be an effective or efficient way of achieving the Objectives in</p>	<p>Ensures the existing rules for parking design and queuing space will be effective in achieving</p>

efficiency	<p>the Plan.</p> <p>The existing rules for parking design and queuing space will have almost no effectiveness in achieving the outcomes sought.</p>	<p>the outcomes sought by the Transport Objectives.</p>
-------------------	---	---

SUMMARY OF REASONS

The operative District Plan has objectives and policies seeking the maintenance and enhancement of transport safety and efficiency. In particular, Objective 10.3: Transport Safety and Accessibility seeks “the maintenance and improvement of the safety and ease of pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle movement throughout the District. The design of parking areas and the queuing spaces will contribute to the safety and ease of pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle movement.

In order to ensure that these are achieved, the controls on the design of parking areas and queuing spaces are proposed as necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed to amend the Operative District Plan to ensure appropriate controls over the design of parking areas and queuing spaces are restored.

B. Mobility parking

Problem Definition

Currently, the Ashburton District Plan requires that mobility parking is provided whenever more than nine car parks are provided on a site (Rule 10.8.2). The number of mobility parks required is based on the number of car parks provided for each activity. For example, a retail store with 40 car parks is required to provide 2 mobility parks on the same site.

There are two key issues:

- a) Since the February plan change, no parking is required for any development, so the risk is that a developer could choose for example to develop a large commercial activity, and provide less car parks than would previously have been required, or no car parks at all, and as a result the required mobility parking would be reduced or eliminated.
- b) The threshold for mobility parking requirements is too high for most activity types. Any activity that provides fewer than 9 car parks is exempt from providing mobility parking, regardless of the activity type or where it is located. This is inconsistent with the Building Code which requires that any activity providing 1 or more car parks is required to provide at least 1 mobility parking space.

An entertainment or meeting facility could be constructed with 500 seats and a floor area of 2,600m² (a similar scale to the Ashburton Trust Event Centre). Prior to the NPS-UD, a developer would have to provide 50 carparks plus 2 mobility spaces. Under the current rules that developer could choose to provide no parking spaces on site, and consequently there would be no requirement to provide mobility parking spaces. The draft plan change would require 2 mobility spaces.

A food and beverage outlet may propose a new store and choose to provide 5 on-site car parks. Under the current rules there would be no requirement to provide a mobility parking space. This contradicts with the Building Code which requires 1 mobility space. The draft plan change would require 1 mobility space.

DISTRICT PLAN OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES ON MOBILITY PARKING

The proposed change reflects the importance of mobility parking for those in the community who need an accessible car park near businesses, services and community facilities. They may not be able to walk a longer distance from a public or on-street car park, or to use alternative modes of transport. In preparation of the proposed change discussions were held with mobility stakeholders. The feedback received helped to clarify the issues, and to inform the development of proposed provisions.

The District Plan objectives and policies seek to ensure the transport network is accessible. Policy 10.4B defines this as: *“To ensure adequate car parking for people with disabilities... is made in association with all activities which is sufficient to cater for normal generation demand.* In order to ensure that adequate car parking is provided for people with disabilities, the thresholds for mobility parking need to be set an adequate and appropriate level. This Plan Change seeks to ensure those thresholds are set at the right level to ensure an accessible transport network for the mobility impaired.

Scale and Significance

The ranking has been undertaken on a basis of a -1 to 1 ranking system. The following degrees of scale and significance have been allocated to the respective rankings:

-1 – Insignificant

0 – Moderate

1 – Significant

Assessment Matter	Comment	Ranking
Degree of shift from the status quo (status quo defined as the current approach)	The proposed change is an updating of the mobility parking thresholds. In some situations where no mobility parking was required, there will now be a requirement for mobility parking. The proposed change is consistent with the Building Code, so the level of change for the plan user will be minimised.	0
Who and how many will be affected?	The effects will be District Wide and experienced the greatest by mobility park users, and commercial property owners.	1
Degree of impact on, or interest from iwi/Māori	Iwi are not directly affected, however, as users of mobility parks and commercial property owners, members of Iwi will be affected.	-1
When will effects occur?	Ongoing into the future.	0
Geographic scale of impacts	The rule is applicable to all Zones.	0
Type of effect	Provision of more mobility parks, or the requirement for a resource consent.	0
Degree of policy risk, implementation risk, or uncertainty	By doing nothing, the Council may not meet it's obligations under Human Rights law, or that the transport accessibility objectives will not be met.	-1

Summary of scale and significance.

Categorisation based on above:

3 to 6 (High) = Comprehensive / detailed report that thoroughly addresses all aspects of s32. Expert assessments likely to be required

-2 to 2 (Moderate) = Moderate level of detail focussing on key points

-3 to -6 (Low) = Basic evaluation without need for much detail

On the basis of the above assessment in table 3.1 the scale and significance of this plan changes has been determined to be **moderate** (-1). This requires a moderate level of detail focussing on key points.

Reason for Change

Initiated locally because of plan effectiveness monitoring, feedback from mobility park users, and as a response to the removal of minimum (standard) car parking requirements.

Evaluation of Options

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing	OPTION 2: Update the mobility parking thresholds
Costs	Lack of mobility parking provision, and poor accessibility of the transport network. Mobility parking requirements would continue to be inconsistent with the Building Code.	There is a cost to applicants in meeting the mobility parking requirements. However the proposed change is an update to the existing thresholds and is consistent with the Building Code.
Benefits	No cost if no plan change is carried out.	Ensures adequate mobility parking is provided, ensuring an accessible transport network.
Appropriateness	Not considered appropriate because of the costs to accessibility.	It is considered appropriate to update the mobility parking thresholds.
Effectiveness and efficiency in achieving District Plan Objectives.	Not considered effective and efficient way to achieve the objectives and policies of the District Plan as it undermines the achievement of an accessible transport network.	The proposed change is efficient as it is an update to the existing mobility parking site standard. It is effective because it will apply to all relevant developments, ensuring that all developments are suitably accessible for the mobility impaired driver or passenger.

Summary of Reasons

Through the analysis above, it is concluded that the proposed change will ensure that adequate and appropriate mobility parking is provided for all activities, ensuring an accessible transport network.

Recommendation

It is proposed to update the mobility parking thresholds as set out in Appendix 1.

C. Cycle parking

Problem Definition

Like mobility parking, the Ashburton District Plan requires that cycle parking is provided whenever more than nineteen car parks are provided on a site (Rule 10.8.6). The number of cycle parks required is based on the number of car parks provided for each activity. For example, a retail store with 40 car parks is required to provide 2 cycle parks on the same site.

There are two key issues:

- a) Since the February plan change, no parking is required for any development, so the risk is that a developer could choose for example to develop a large commercial activity, and provide less car parks than would previously have been required, or no car parks at all, and as a result the required cycle parking would be reduced or eliminated. In this scenario there may be demand for cycle parking in the absence of car parks.
- b) The threshold for cycle parking requirements is too high for most activity types. Any activity that provides fewer than 20 car parks is exempt from providing cycle parking, regardless of the activity type or where it is located. If a cycle park is provided it might not be usable because the design or location is poor.

DISTRICT PLAN OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES ON CYCLE PARKING

The District Plan objectives and policies seek to ensure a safe, efficient and sustainable transport network, and that cycling is encouraged. Objective 10.3 seeks “The maintenance and improvement of the safety and ease of pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle movement throughout the District. The cycle standards in the Plan ensure that appropriate cycle parking is provided, and that cycling is encouraged as a sustainable means of transport.

The proposed change would update the thresholds so that cycle parking requirements are tailored to the activity type, and are decoupled from the number of car parks provided. This recognises that cycling may be a substitute for private motor vehicle trips and that it has its own parking and accessibility requirements. In preparation of the proposed change discussions were held with cycling stakeholders. The feedback received helped to clarify the issues, and to inform the development of the proposed changes.

Adequate cycle parking provision is needed to give effect to the Walking and Cycling Strategy and the existing objectives of the District Plan.

Scale and Significance

The ranking has been undertaken on a basis of a -1 to 1 ranking system. The following degrees of scale and significance have been allocated to the respective ranking s:

-1 – Insignificant

0 – Moderate

1 – Significant

Assessment Matter	Comment	Ranking
-------------------	---------	---------

Degree of shift from the status quo (status quo defined as the current approach)	This plan change is generally an update to the existing cycle standards. There is a shift to cycle requirements based on activity type. There is also likely to be an overall increase in the level of cycle parking required/provided.	0
Who and how many will be affected?	Cycle park users and developers of sites where cycle parking is required.	0
Degree of impact on, or interest from iwi/Māori	The potential impact of iwi is minor, this is not an item of specific cultural interest. However, the sustainability of the transport network is of general interest and this plan change will support transport sustainability.	-1
When will effects occur?	Ongoing into the future.	-1
Geographic scale of impacts	This will have a District wide effect to new development that requires cycle parking.	0
Type of effect	Requirements to provide cycle parking in association with land uses, and availability and quality of cycle parking.	0
Degree of policy risk, implementation risk, or uncertainty	Minor, the District Plan currently contains cycle parking standards. The proposed change would update the existing standards by tailoring the cycle parking requirement to the activity type.	-1

Summary of scale and significance.

Categorisation based on above:

3 to 6 (High) = Comprehensive / detailed report that thoroughly addresses all aspects of s32. Expert assessments likely to be required

-2 to 2 (Moderate) = Moderate level of detail focussing on key points

-3 to -6 (Low) = Basic evaluation without need for much detail

On the basis of the above assessment in table 4.1 the scale and significance of this plan changes has been determined to be **Low** (-3). This requires a basic level of evaluation with not much detail.

Reason for Change

Initiated locally because of plan effectiveness monitoring. Council has received feedback from a cycle group, and is also responding the removal of (standard) car parking requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.

Appropriateness of the Plan Change

The proposed Plan Change is in support of the District Plan objectives and policies on transportation by ensuring that an appropriate number and type of cycle parks are provided based on the activity type.

Assessment of Options

The following summarises the evaluation completed throughout the plan change process in relation to the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the various elements of the proposed plan change, as follows:

Option 1: Status Quo – Do Nothing

Option 2: Updating the cycle parking requirements

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing	OPTION 2: Updating the Cycle parking requirements
Costs	Cycling as a means of transport would not be supported. The efficiency and sustainability of the transport network would continue to be compromised.	There are economic costs associated with going through the plan change process. There is a cost to applicants in providing cycle parking.
Benefits	Low cost for Council.	Appropriate cycle parking standards are included in the plan, and cycling is encouraged. The existing District Plan objectives are likely to be achieved.
Appropriateness	Over time the existing provisions for cycle parking look more and more dated relative to best practice. The existing provisions may be a barrier to achievement of the District Plan objectives and the objectives of the Walking and Cycling Strategy.	It is appropriate to update the cycle parking standards so that they are tailored to the activity type.
Effectiveness and efficiency in achieving District Plan Objectives.	The existing cycle standards are not effective in meeting cycle parking needs, or in encouraging the uptake of cycling. They are efficient in that the threshold is simple to apply, but inefficient in that the threshold is not based on activity type which may result in under or over provision.	Updating the cycle standards would be effective in achieving the objectives of the District Plan and the Walking and Cycling Strategy. The proposed change would be efficient because the thresholds for cycle parking provision would be tailored to activity type, and no longer based on the number of car parks provided.

From the above analysis it is concluded that Option 2 is the most favourable.

Summary of Reasons

The proposed update of the cycle provisions is considered appropriate as it will be the most effective and efficient way of achieving the objectives of the District Plan.

Recommendation

It is proposed that updated cycle standards be incorporated into the District Plan.

D. High trip generating activities

Problem Definition

There are currently no provisions in the District Plan for high traffic generating activities, except for some commercial activities which have a vehicle crossing design requirement.

Issues/Opportunities:

- There is an opportunity to give effect to the Ashburton District Parking Strategy 2021 (Parking Strategy) through this change. Page 24 of the Parking Strategy sets out a range of methods to achieve Objective A: “*Support placemaking, amenity, and good urban design outcomes*”. One of the methods is to include provisions in the District Plan for high traffic generating activities. Including provisions in the District Plan is one of the key opportunities to give weight to the Ashburton District Parking Strategy and its objectives.
- By managing the demand for (private motor) vehicle trips, there is an opportunity to alleviate issues of parking supply. Issues of parking supply may become more acute over time as a result of the NPS-UD changes.
- There is an opportunity to recognise the benefits of high trip generating developments that provide for accessibility by a range of transport modes, that manage the demand for travel, and/or that integrate well with the existing transport network.
- There is an opportunity to align the Ashburton District Plan with the proposed Plans of Selwyn, Timaru and the West Coast in providing a consistent approach to the management of high traffic generating activities.
- There is an issue where high trip generating activities may have substantial negative impacts on the safety and/or efficiency of the transport network through trip generation or site and access design. There is currently insufficient discretion to consider these adverse effects (an issue that has been raised by the Transport team). This risks poor outcomes in terms of the safety and efficiency of the road network, and in achieving the transport objectives of the District Plan. In the absence of the proposed rule, roads may be vulnerable to congestion or poor safety outcomes.
- The internal site design may not provide a safe or efficient environment for all transport users (e.g. pedestrians, cyclists, mobility scooters).

DISTRICT PLAN OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES ON HIGH TRIP GENERATING ACTIVITIES

The District Plan existing objectives and policies seek to ensure a safe, efficient and sustainable transport network.

The proposed change would introduce new policies tailored to the management of high trip generating activities. These are focussed on managing adverse effects and promoting and recognising positive effects. The provisions would give effect to the Ashburton District Parking Strategy 2021 and the existing objectives of the District Plan. The proposed change would better give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as discussed in Appendix 2 and would provide consistency with the proposed District Plans of Selwyn and Timaru and the combined district plan for the West Coast.

The proposed plan change would ensure that the transport effects of high trip generating activities are able to be considered in the resource consent process, subject to specific matters of discretion. The matters of discretion allow for recognition of positive effects as well as providing discretion to consider adverse effects.

The assessment process also allows opportunity to integrate land use development with planned infrastructure upgrades, or to ensure that the network can support the proposed activity and the likely transport demands generated from it.

Scale and Significance

The ranking has been undertaken on a basis of a -1, 0, 1 ranking system. The following degrees of scale and significance have been allocated to the respective rankings:

-1 – Insignificant

0 – Moderate

1 – Significant

Assessment Matter	Comment	Ranking
Degree of shift from the status quo (status quo defined as the current approach)	The proposed changes are considered a significant shift from the current situation. The plan currently does not currently have provisions for high trip generating activities, and some new policies would need to be introduced under the existing transport objectives.	1
Who and how many will be affected?	The effects will be felt by all transport users, however they are most likely to be noticed by developers of high trip generating activities and the users of those activities.	0
Degree of impact on, or interest from iwi/Māori	This plan change does not have any specific cultural impacts. However, the proposed change would support the sustainability of the transport network in line with Iwi aspirations.	-1
When will effects occur?	The effects of this plan change will be ongoing as the related development will happen overtime.	0
Geographic scale of impacts	District Wide, focussed on the high trip generating activities and their supporting road and footpath networks.	0
Type of effect	The proposed change will be far reaching in terms of transport safety, accessibility and sustainability.	0
Degree of policy risk, implementation risk, or uncertainty	The degree of policy risk is low as this change is proposed within the adopted Ashburton District Parking Strategy 2021, and would support the achievement of the existing transport objectives. The management of high trip generating activities is being proposed in all neighbouring Council's plans, and is likely to be included in the future regional NBE Plan.	-1

Summary of scale and significance.

Categorisation based on above:

3 to 6 (High) = Comprehensive / detailed report that thoroughly addresses all aspects of s32. Expert assessments likely to be required

-2 to 2 (Moderate) = Moderate level of detail focussing on key points

-3 to -6 (Low) = Basic evaluation without need for much detail

On the basis of the above assessment in table 5.1 the scale and significance of this plan change has been determined to be **Moderate (-1)**. This requires a moderate level of detail focussing on key points.

Reason for Change

The District is anticipated to grow, placing additional pressures on the existing transport network. The management of the effects of high trip generating activities, both positive and negative, will support a safe, efficient, and sustainable transport network.

Evaluation of options

The following table below summarises the evaluation completed throughout the plan change process in relation to the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the various elements of the proposed plan change, as follows:

Option 1: Do Nothing

Option 2: Introduce provisions for high trip generating activities.

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing	OPTION 2: Introduce provisions for high trip generating activities
Costs	No cost to Council if no change is made. However, there would be economic and environmental costs from compromised safety, efficiency and sustainability of the transport network.	There is an economic cost associated with going through the plan change. There is a cost to applicants in meeting the requirements for integrated transport assessments.
Benefits	No cost to Council.	There are benefits for the safety, efficiency, and sustainability of the transport network from the proposed change.
Appropriateness	It is not considered appropriate to rely on the existing planning provisions to manage the effects of high trip generating activities.	It is considered appropriate to introduce provisions to manage the effects of high trip generating activities.
Effectiveness and efficiency in achieving District Plan Objectives.	Doing nothing is not considered effective as there will continue to be a gap in the management of the effects of high trip generating activities, and this will have ongoing adverse effects on the transport network. The potential adverse effects on the transport network, means that the status quo is not likely to be an efficient method of achieving the transport objectives for a safe, efficient and sustainable transport network.	The proposed change is effective because it allows for the management of the effects of high trip generating activities. The management of the effects of high trip generating activities would provide an efficient method of achieving the transport objectives for a safe, efficient and sustainable transport network.

From the above it is considered appropriate to address the issue through the proposed changes and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan. Therefore option 2 is preferred.

Summary of Reasons

The proposed changes would support a safe, efficient, and sustainable transport network.

Recommendation

It is therefore proposed to amend the District Plan to include provisions for high trip generating activities.

E. Update to roading hierarchy

Problem Definition

The key issue is that the current Roading Hierarchy was last updated 5 years ago in Plan Change 2. Over the last 5 years Ashburton District has grown and significant development has taken place over that time which required upgrading of infrastructure including the roading network to accommodate additional vehicles and improved measures.

IMPORTANCE AND OBJECTIVES OF COUNCIL ROADING HIERARCHY

Roading Hierarchy is a classification of roads in the District in accordance with the average daily volume of traffic they carry and other roading functionality in relation to adjacent land use activities. Under the road hierarchy system, roads are classified as arterial, principal, collector and local roads. By maintaining a roading hierarchy in the District, Council manages and directs traffic flows, setting aside certain roads with a priority for through traffic. This increases efficiency by enabling through traffic to travel relatively unimpeded and safely on these roads.

The extent to which vehicle access and vehicle crossings are provided for depends on road design, volume of traffic and speed limit and adjoining land use activities. Adequate visibility distances from vehicular crossings and road intersections are provided for to improve traffic safety. Council has traditionally used the District Plan to control the number, type and location of all vehicle access points and vehicle crossings onto all roads within the District, particularly for activities which generate high numbers of vehicle movements.

The rules specifying width of roads, minimum sight and separation distances of accesses are to ensure that all new roads and accesses are created with the capacity to provide accessibility for residents of the area and link up with the adjoining road transport network safely and efficiently, avoiding congestion, and providing for on-street parking and pedestrian/cycle movement.

Adequate design and construction standards are needed for vehicle crossings depending on the hierarchy of the road in order to ensure that vehicles can enter and leave a site at all times in a safe and convenient manner. Therefore, limitations are required on the number of vehicle crossings to facilitate the intended function of the road hierarchy. The required visibility distances will increase with increasing vehicle speed on the adjoining road and associated increased stopping distances. High speed arterial roads are intended to function primarily as thoroughfares, with minimal property access, whereas local roads are intended to provide direct property access and have the least restriction on the number of access points.

Scale and Significance

The ranking has been undertaken on a basis of a -1 to 1 ranking system. The following degrees of scale and significance have been allocated to the respective ranking s:

-1 – Insignificant

0 – Moderate

1 – Significant

Assessment Matter	Comment	Ranking
Degree of shift from the status quo (status quo defined as the current approach)	This plan change is a minor update to recognise the few new roads and other existing roads that changed status as a result of recent development in the District.	0
Who and how many will be affected?	Residents of identified roads and potential future development along those roads	0
Degree of impact on, or interest from iwi/Māori	The potential impact of iwi is minimal, this is not an item of specific cultural interest	-1
When will effects occur?	Ongoing into the future	-1
Geographic scale of impacts	This will have a District wide effect to new development along the roads.	0
Type of effect	Requirements to vehicular crossing separation in association with local land uses	0
Degree of policy risk, implementation risk, or uncertainty	Minor, the ranking of the road reflects the current volumes of traffic, land use and potential development along the road	-1

Summary of scale and significance.

Categorisation based on above:

3 to 6 (High) = Comprehensive / detailed report that thoroughly addresses all aspects of s32. Expert assessments likely to be required

-2 to 2 (Moderate) = Moderate level of detail focussing on key points

-3 to -6 (Low) = Basic evaluation without need for much detail

On the basis of the above assessment in table 4.1 the scale and significance of this plan changes has been determined to be **Low** (-3). This requires a basic level of evaluation with not much detail.

Reason for Change

Initiated locally because of plan effectiveness monitoring. Council has reviewed and updated its Roding Hierarchy.

Appropriateness of the Plan Change

The proposed Plan Change is in support of the District Plan objectives and policies on transportation by appropriately raking the district roads in accordance with their current and anticipated function in order to manage traffic and development within those roads accordingly.

Assessment of Options

The following summarises the evaluation completed throughout the plan change process in relation to the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the various elements of the proposed plan change, as follows:

Option 1: Status Quo – Do Nothing

Option 2: Maintaining an updated roading hierarchy and incorporate it into the District Plan by reference

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing	OPTION 2: Updating the Roading Hierarchy
Costs	Current roading hierarchy is outdated and does not give Council an opportunity to take into consideration the current status and intensity of use of roads when processing land use proposals.	There are economic cost associated with going through the Plan Review process.
Benefits	Low cost for Council.	Efficiency in allocating land use activities in appropriate locations relative to the roading hierarchy to avoid land use conflicts.
Appropriateness	As the District population increases so does the land use activities and associated traffic movements. Lack of review of the roading hierarchy for a prolonged period is not considered appropriate because it creates mismatch between roading capacity and land use.	It is appropriate to update the roading hierarchy in accordance with the current usage and capacity of roads in order to manage development within those road corridors.
Effectiveness and efficiency in achieving District Plan Objectives.	The current road hierarchy is outdated and its use is not considered efficient and effective way of achieving the transportation of objectives and policies.	The updated roading hierarchy is a result of data gathering on road usage by Council engineers over time. The road hierarchy assist in planning for certain land use activities in appropriate locations taking into consideration the capacity and functionality of those roads.

From the above analysis it is concluded that Option 2 is the most favourable.

Summary of Reasons

The proposed update of the Roading Hierarchy is considered appropriate given that the last one was 5 years ago. The District has grown to the extent that significant land uses have taken place changing traffic volumes on roads in a significant way. Therefore it is appropriate that the road hierarchy be updated to facilitate land use planning matching the road design and capacity to handle the traffic.

Recommendation

It is proposed that a new updated Roading Hierarchy be incorporated into the District Plan.