

**In the Matter**

of the Resource Management Act 1991

**And**

**In the Matter**

Proposed Plan Change 39 and Hutt City  
District Plan.

---

**Statement of Evidence of  
Harriet Barbara Fraser**

---

Harriet Fraser  
Tel: 04 526 2979  
Mob: 027 668 5872  
Email: [harriet@harrietfraser.co.nz](mailto:harriet@harrietfraser.co.nz)  
PO Box 40170  
Upper Hutt 5140

19 September 2017

## Statement Of Evidence Of Harriet Barbara Fraser BEng(Hons), MSc, MIPENZ, CPEng, IntPE

### INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Harriet Barbara Fraser. I am a Chartered Professional Engineer and a Member of the Institution of Professional Engineers of NZ. I hold a Bachelor of Civil Engineering degree from Imperial College, University of London and a Masters' degree of Science in Transportation Planning and Engineering awarded with distinction by the University of Leeds. My background of experience includes over 20 years consultancy experience in traffic and transportation matters. From August 1998 to August 2012 I worked as a Transportation Planner in the firm of Traffic Design Group Limited practicing as a transportation planning and traffic engineering specialist throughout New Zealand. Since September 2012 I have been working as a sole practitioner in the field of transportation planning and traffic engineering.
2. I am a certified Hearing Commissioner, having completed the MFE Making Good Decisions training and have also been appointed as a Development Contribution Commissioner.
3. I am a local traffic engineer with a significant amount of my workload being in Hutt City. I have assessed the traffic effects of many developments against the provisions of the existing District Plan. At the moment I am engaged by Palmerston North City Council to assist with changes they hope to make to the transportation section of their District Plan. I set out in my submission a number of concerns/ suggestions with regard to the proposed changes to the Transport section of the Hutt City District Plan. Time constraints prevented me from going into a lot of depth and where I have not included a comment on a proposed amendment did not mean that I either agreed or disagreed with the proposed change. I have simply focussed on what in my experience are the main issues.
4. I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2014. While not applicable to Council Hearings, I agree to comply with this Code of Conduct. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on what I have been told by another person. I have

not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

5. I have read the read the Officer's Report dated 6 September 2017 and the evidence that follows addresses matters raised in the report in response to the comments in my submission.

#### **COMMENTS ON OFFICER'S REPORT**

##### **Amendment 22 – Standard 1(b) – Engineering Standards (page 45)**

6. I agree with the suggested approach of setting out the requirements for Service Lanes, Private Ways, Pedestrian Accessways and Walkways in the Transport chapter and referring to it from the Subdivision chapter.

##### **Amendment 24 – Standard 2(b) Separation Distances from Intersections (page 48)**

7. The revised wording usefully makes it clear that spacing to vehicle accesses on the opposite side of the road should also be considered.

##### **Amendment 23 – Standard 2(a) Vehicle Access (excluding separation distance from intersections) (page 49)**

8. I note that my submission regarding the need for a separation distance between vehicle accesses has been accepted and that the 1m separation included in AS/NZS2890.1 for separation between one-way driveways is recommended.
9. There are two matters that I would like to raise. To avoid possible confusion, I consider that it would be useful to specify whether the required separation distance is at the property boundary or at the kerb/ carriageway edge. Also assuming that the separation distance is measured at the property boundary, I consider that the separation distance should be increased to say 2m to allow a comfortable distance for pedestrians to wait. This would allow for someone pushing a pram. The potential flaring of the vehicle crossings towards the kerb will mean that the width of the pedestrian holding area narrows closer to the kerb.

**Amendment 23 – Standard 2 Site Access and Manoeuvring Area****Amendment 25 – Standard 2(c) Manoeuvring Area (page 49)**

10. I note that my suggestion that the provision of pedestrian visibility splays be linked to the receiving traffic environment has been rejected. As set out in my submission, I am supportive of the inclusion of a requirement to provide pedestrian visibility splays and note that applicants will have the opportunity to challenge this requirement through the resource consent process as needed.
11. I note that my submission regarding the exemption from providing on-site turning for single dwellings has been accepted.

**Amendment 23 – Standard 2(c) Manoeuvring Area (page 52)**

12. I note that my submission regarding Standard 2(c) and Standard 5 has been rejected. I accept this assessment and note that the particular servicing requirements of an activity can be addressed through the resource consent process as needed.

**Amendment 28 – Chapter 14A, Standard 4(a) – Car Parking Requirements (page 53)**

13. I note that my submission regarding parking requirements for dwellings has been rejected. There are a number of points I would like to make.
14. With regard to residential parking demands, the 2013 Census data indicated that 44% of Hutt City households had two or more cars. As such the provision of a single on-site parking space is going to result in overspill parking of residents vehicles onto the kerbside in on average around 44% of cases. In addition, with one on-site parking space, it can be assumed that in almost all cases any visitor parking will be accommodated off-site and along the kerbside.
15. In many parts of the city this overspill parking will result in a more efficient use of the existing kerbside parking resource. However, and as stated in my submission, a number of parts of the city have extended areas of heavily occupied kerbside parking such as on the edge of the CBD, near Hutt Hospital, around Weltec, close to

some of the suburban and commercial centres and in the vicinity of some of the train stations.

16. The Officer's Report refers to the High Trip Generator threshold. For residential activities the threshold is triggered when there are more than 60 houses. In my assessment, a residential development with 60 houses could be reasonably be expected to generate a demand for 86 parking spaces for residents (44% of households having two cars) and up to 15 spaces for visitors (one visitor space per four households). As such there would be a total demand for 101 spaces resulting in a potential overspill of 41 vehicles onto nearby sections of kerb. I consider that there are a number of locations in the city where this level of overspill parking could have a more than minor effect on the parking amenity for existing residents and businesses.
17. I recommend that a lower threshold of say 20 houses be used to trigger a particular assessment of parking effects associated with comprehensive residential developments.

**Amendment 28 – Chapter 14A, Standard 4(a) – Car Parking Requirements (page 57)**

18. I note that my submission that the car parking requirements for childcare centres be increased has been accepted. GHD have recommended that the required provision be increased to one space per staff member and 0.2 spaces per number of children the facility is designed to accommodate.
19. While I am happy to see my submission accepted, I consider that the recommended provision has gone too far and would require an unreasonably large number of parking spaces. Over recent years I have observed the following peak parking demands associated with various childcare centres. These peak parking demand rates include off-site parking demands.

Childcare Centre	Number of Children Attending	Observed Peak Parking Demand Rate (staff & drop-off/ pick-up) (vehs/attending child)
Beststart, 244 Naenae Road, Lower Hutt	47	0.19
30 Waikare Avenue, Lower Hutt	47	0.19
Smiley Faces, 1 Fraser Crescent, Upper Hutt	41	0.27
Lots of Hugs, 72 Pitt Street, Palmerston North	43	0.21
Lots of Hugs, 174 Ferguson Street, Palmerston North	40	0.23

20. The NZTA Research Report 453 includes a recommended provision of 0.25 spaces per child the centre is designed to accommodate.
21. I therefore recommend that the proposed parking requirement be revised to a total of 0.25 spaces per child the centre is designed to accommodate. That is for a 40 child centre the requirement would be to provide 10 parking spaces.

**Amendment 32 – Chapter 14A, Standard 4(e) Cycle Parking and End of Trip Facility Requirements (page 59)**

22. I note that my submission recommending reduced provision for cycle parking has been rejected. I remain of the view that the provision of cycle parking facilities for around 4% of staff is reasonable given the 2013 Census data showed 1.8% of Hutt residents cycled to work. The provision of double the Census data proportion reasonably allows for some variation and growth in cyclist activity.

**3.78 Other – Rubbish Collection Points (page 82)**

23. I note that it is recommended that my submission regarding the requirement for rubbish collection points for multi-unit developments be rejected. The Officer's Report does however include recommended wording should the Hearing Panel wish to consider such provisions. I agree with the recommended wording.

24. In my view, if such a provision is not included there is the real risk of adverse effects associated with large amounts of rubbish being placed along the kerbside and possibly obstructing the footpath, along with the risk of a collection vehicle obstructing through traffic given the likely amount of time required to load rubbish associated with say 20 households.

Harriet Fraser

19 September 2017