

**Section 32 Report**

**Proposed Plan Change No. 6 to the Queenstown Lakes District Partially Operative District Plan regarding the widths of private access in the residential zones.**

Prepared by CivicCorp in conjunction with Ken Tremaine Consulting, Wasley Knell Consultants and Boffa Miskell.

For the Queenstown Lakes District Council  
Dated 16 February 2005 and 5 October 2005

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Currently the Queenstown Lakes Partially Operative District Plan includes requirements for the widths of access ways at the time of subdivision. It does not contain any provisions determining the widths of private access to sites after subdivision has taken place.

At the time of subdivision the width required for a private access is determined by a combination of the length of the access and the number of units on the site.

However, any time after subdivision has taken place the use of the site may change, i.e. the number of units may be increased. At this time it would be logical for the rules that governed access widths at the time of subdivision to be revisited and reapplied based on the change of land use.

Given these issues, the purpose of this Plan Change is to ensure the width of access ways are appropriately designed for current and future use.

Through an analysis of alternatives for ensuring that adequate width is required for land use it has been recognised that a plan change is needed. The plan change proposed here will partially align the situations at the time of subdivision and at the time of development by enabling the widths of accesses to be reconsidered together with a development proposal.

The new rules will allow potential future development of the sites to be taken into account and they will also ensure the width of private roads accessing more than 5 dwellings is brought in line with the width of public roads. This ensures sufficient road reserve is maintained to allow the road to potentially be vested in the Council at a future stage.

Access ways servicing less than 5 dwellings are less likely to act like public roads, and for these situations it is considered reasonable to consider the efficient use of land as a priority, over and above attempting to maintain a maximum road reserve. Therefore, for these situations the only carriageway width is set. However if the sites being accessed have the potential for more intensive development, then the Council can require a larger road reserve to be established and maintained.

As a result of this Section 32 analysis, it has been found that the most efficient and effective mechanism is to require the following access widths as part of a zone standard for any resource consent application:

<i>The greater of</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>the actual number of existing units serviced or</i></li><li>• <i>the maximum number of units possible as a permitted or controlled activity</i></li></ul>	<i>Minimum street width (m)</i>	<i>Carriage way width (m)</i>
2-4 units Cul de sac	4.5	3
5-20 units Cul de sac	12	6
21-50 units Cul de sac <i>note: The access shall be formed in accordance with Council standards for public streets to vest</i>	18	6
0-50 units Through Road <i>Traffic volume up to 400 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic per day)</i>	18	6

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE WIDTHS OF PRIVATE ACCESS

<i>note: The access shall be formed in accordance with Council standards for public streets to vest</i>		
<i>Any number of residential units Traffic volume 400-900 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic per Day) note: The access shall be formed in accordance with Council standards for public streets to vest</i>	18	6
<i>Any number of residential units Greater than 900 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic per Day) note: The access shall be formed in accordance with Council standards for public streets to vest</i>	20	7

## SECTION 32 REPORT

### CONTENTS

1.0 BACKGROUND .....	5
1.1 Introduction .....	5
1.2 Scope of the Plan Change .....	5
1.3 The issues .....	5
1.4 The purpose of the Plan Change .....	5
1.5 The current situation .....	6
2.0 THE CONTEXT AND NECESSITY OF THE PLAN CHANGE .....	6
2.1 The Resource Management Act (1991) .....	6
2.2 Regional Policy Statement for Otago .....	7
2.3 Other relevant documents .....	8
2.4 NZS4404:1981, NZS4404:2004 and amendments .....	8
2.5 Regional Land Transport Strategy for Otago 2000 – 2005 .....	9
2.6 Partially Operative District Plan (2003) .....	9
3.0 RELEVANT NON-STATUTORY DOCUMENTS .....	12
3.1 Tomorrow's Queenstown: Vision, issues and directions – July 2002.....	12
3.2 Wanaka 2020 report – May 2002.....	12
3.3 Rural Roading Corridors - Corridor Management Guideline .....	12
4.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS .....	13
4.1 Options 2020 Workshops – March/April 2004.....	13
4.2 Panel Display and Public Meetings - 14 & 15 June 2004.....	13
4.3 Statutory Bodies .....	13
4.4 Agendas, reports and minutes .....	13
5.0 ISSUE .....	13
6.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE OPTIONS FOR ADDRESSING THE ISSUE .....	15
6.1 Broad Alternatives.....	15
6.2 Specific Alternative Rules .....	18
7.0 CONCLUSION .....	21
8.0 PLAN CHANGE .....	21

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

### **1.1 Introduction**

The proposed Plan Change has resulted from a number of situations where multi unit developments have taken place on sites where the access width was designed for a single dwelling. The result is a narrow privately owned road, which is insufficient and inappropriate for the purpose of servicing the properties.

### **1.2 Scope of the Plan Change**

This plan change concerns the provisions for private access roads servicing residential properties in the Queenstown Lakes District in the Low and High Density Residential zones. In scope it is limited to considering ways of achieving appropriately dimensioned access for the property or properties to be serviced. Some consideration is also given to the issue of private versus public ownership of access ways to multiple properties.

In researching this Plan Change, it has been established that the widths currently imposed at time of subdivision and contained in the subdivision standard currently utilised are appropriate. The focus has been on the balance between the current requirements for private and public roads and the temporal moments at which the widths of access ways need to be re-considered.

### **1.3 The issues**

#### **1.3.1 Width requirements of private access ways**

Some sites that originally had one or a limited number of dwellings on them are being redeveloped to or over maximum capacity with a number of units on them. The original access would have been adequate for the original purpose, but is often retained and used for accessing a far larger number of units. The access way is then often too narrow for the passing and sometimes parking requirements demanded by an increase in resident numbers.

A related issue, which overlaps the width requirements, is a consideration of ownership of access. On a regular basis the Council receives requests or complaints from residents of dwellings serviced by private access ways concerning issues such as maintenance of the pavement or gravel and collection of rubbish. The explanation to the person contacting the Council that the Council is not responsible is often met with disbelief or dissatisfaction. Although this report does not go into further considerations of maintenance and servicing, it does consider the option of transferring ownership.

### **1.4 The purpose of the Plan Change**

The purpose of the Plan Change can be summarised as follows:

To ensure the width of access ways is appropriately designed for current and future use.
--

## 1.5 The current situation

### 1.5.1 District Plan provisions

Within the District Plan the provisions for determining the appropriate width of an access to residential units are applicable only at the time of subdivision. There are no rules governing the widths at the development or redevelopment stage. In paragraph 2.5 of this report and in appendix A all the objectives, policies and rules relating to access in general have been collated.

The only rule with direct relevance to the widths of private accesses at present is Site Standard 14.2.4.1:

*iv Parking Area and Access Design*

*All vehicular access to fee simple title lots, cross lease, unit title or leased premises shall be in accordance with the standards contained in NZS4404: 1981. Off-street parking spaces shall be separated from footpaths or adjoining roads by a physical barrier.*

NZS4404:1981 was adopted by the Queenstown Lakes District Council with some amendments on 1 June 1994. The issue of access widths is subject to one of these amendments (Part 3) that states as follows for secondary, local, residential streets:

Type of street	Area served	Design speed	Minimum street width	Recommended carriageway width (m)		
				Parking	Traffic	Total
Private way	2-3 du	-		-	3	4
Private way	4-6 du				4	5
Short cul-de-sac	<20 du <100 m	20	12	2 x 2.75		5.5
Long cul-de-sac	>20 du >100 m	20	15	2 x 3		6
Minor access	<100 du	20	15	2 x 3		6

(du = dwelling units)

## 2.0 THE CONTEXT AND NECESSITY OF THE PLAN CHANGE

### 2.1 The Resource Management Act (1991)

Section 32 of the Resource Management Act (the Act) states that an evaluation of the alternatives, benefits and costs of any plan change must be carried out before adopting any plan change. The evaluation should examine the extent to which each option or alternative is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, whether the policies, rules or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives. This chapter of the report sets out provisions in various statutory documents that are achieved through this Plan Change.

32 (4) directs that for the purposes of this examination an evaluation must take into account -

*(a) the benefits and costs of policies, rules or other methods; and*

- (b) *the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules or other methods.*

This plan change has been prepared as a means of achieving the purpose of the Act, which is expressed in Section 5 as follows:

- (1) *The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.*
- (2) *In this Act, “sustainable management” means managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while –*
  - (a) *sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
  - (b) *Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and*
  - (c) *Avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

The change will ensure that people can continue to provide for their wellbeing by accessing their properties in an appropriate way, while ensuring access ways are wide enough to cater for future needs and development. In addition it avoids and mitigates adverse effects on the access way by ensuring sufficient width is provided for parking, passing and pedestrians.

Section 7 lists “other matters” that the Council must have particular regard to. The following sub-sections are of particular relevance to this Plan Change.

- (b) *The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;*
- (c) *The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values;*
- (f) *Maintenance and enhancement of quality of the environment;*
- (g) *Any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources;*

This Plan Change is instrumental in enhancing the amenity values of the residential zones by ensuring suitable access widths, and yet using the available land in the most efficient manner possible by retaining sufficient space for any future requirements.

Section 31 of the Act sets out the functions of territorial authorities. This Plan Change relates specifically to Council's functions under 31 (a), which reads:

- (a) *The establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district;*

Section 74 of the Act requires that the plan change be in accordance with the Council's functions under Section 31, the provisions of Part II, its duty under Section 32 and any regulations or bylaws.

Because of the current problems with inadequate access ways, it has been determined that this Plan Change is necessary for the Council to meet the requirements of the RMA.

## 2.2        **Regional Policy Statement for Otago**

Section 75 specifies that regard must be had to any Regional Policy Statement or Regional Plan. The Regional Policy Statement for Otago (14 September 1998) is of some relevance to this Plan Change and therefore the relevant parts of that document have been included:

**Objective 9.4.1**

*To promote the sustainable management of Otago's built environment in order to:*

- a) *Meet the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of Otago's people and communities; and*
- b) *Provide for amenity values; and*
- c) *Conserve and enhance environmental and landscape quality; and*
- ...

**Policy 9.5.4**

*To minimise the adverse effects of urban development and settlement, including structures on Otago's environment through avoiding, remedying or mitigating:*

- ...
- (d) *Significant irreversible effects on:*
  - (i) *Otago community values*
  - (vi) *Amenity values*

**Policy 9.5.5**

*To maintain and, where practicable, enhance the quality of life for people and communities within Otago's built environment through:*

- a) *Promoting the identification and provision of a level of amenity which is acceptable to the community; and*

**2.3 Other relevant documents**

Section 75 specifies that regard must be had to any management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts; relevant planning documents recognised by an Iwi authority affected by the district plan; any relevant entry in the Historic Places register; and other regulations relating to fisheries resources.

With regards to this proposed Plan Change other relevant documents are:

- NZ Standard 4404 : 1981, 2004 and QLDC amendments and
- Regional Land Transport Strategy for Otago 2000 – 2005 : 9 February 2000

**2.4 NZS4404:1981, NZS4404:2004 and amendments**

On 1 June 1994 Queenstown Lakes District Council adopted NZS4404:1981 together with some district specific amendments. NZS4404:1981 prescribes the engineering standards at time of subdivision. The relevant part is quoted in paragraph 1.5 of this report.

It is noted that this standard has no bearing on any situation other than subdivision. It is also noted that this standard and the amendments thereto are considered to be appropriate and that in researching this plan change, no consideration has been given to amending them.

However, the Council adopted a new version of NZS4404, namely NZS4404:2004 and some new amendments, on 5 October 2005. This changed some of the requirements and it is deemed that this new version of the standard should replace the old version. The relevant part of the standard is contained in tables 3.1 and 3.2 and reads as contained in appendix A.

## 2.5 Regional Land Transport Strategy for Otago 2000 – 2005

This report documents the general transportation situation in Otago in the year 2000 and the predicted changes over the following 5 years. It establishes that car ownership and transportation by private vehicle will increase in Otago.

However, there is no general reference to access widths and none of the issues, objectives or strategies relate to this matter.

## 2.6 Partially Operative District Plan (2003)

Section 14 of the Partially Operative District Plan deals with Transport. Significant attention is paid to the provision of access to sites that is not directly related to the width of the access way.

Directly relating to the issue of appropriate access widths are the following:

In Section 14.1.3 Objectives and Policies, on pages 14-2 through 14-3, a number of objectives, policies and implementation methods are of direct relevance. This Plan Change will particularly ensure Policy 1.10 is met by enabling property access to be considered at the time of development as well as at the time of subdivision.

### *Objective 1 – Efficiency*

*Efficient use of the District's existing and future transportation resource and of fossil fuel.*

### *Policy 1.10*

*To require access to property to be of a size, location and type to ensure safety and efficiency of road functioning.*

### *Implementation Methods*

#### *(i) District Plan*

*(b) Set performance standards for property access, parking and loading.*

Directly regulating the widths of access is Rule 14.2.4.1 as quoted in paragraph 1.5 of this report.

Within section 15 of the Partially Operative District Plan the following are of relevance and will be further achieved through this Plan Change:

### *15.1.3 Objectives and Policies*

#### *Objective 1 – Servicing*

*The provision of necessary services to subdivided lots and developments in anticipation of the likely effects of land use activities on those lots and within the developments.*

### *Policy 1.2*

*To ensure safe and efficient vehicular access is provided to all lots created by subdivision and to all developments.*

### *Policy 1.7*

*To ensure the design and provision of any necessary infrastructure at the time of subdivision takes into account the requirements of future development on land in the vicinity.*

Generally a number of provisions regarding the amenity values of the residential zones should also be considered:

At the time of subdivision the following applies:

#### *15.2.6.1 Controlled Subdivision Activities – Lot Sizes and Dimensions*

*Except where specified as Discretionary or Non-Complying Subdivision Activities in Rules 15.2.3.3 and 15.2.3.4, any subdivision of land in any zone, which complies with all of the Site and Zone Subdivision Standards, is a Controlled Subdivision Activity, with the Council reserving control in respect of the following:*

- i      Lot sizes and dimensions for subdivisions of land in the Town Centre, Corner Shopping Centre, Remarkables Park, Resort and Visitor Zones.*
- ii     Sizes and dimensions of lots for access, utilities, reserves and roads*
- iii    There will be no minimum lot sizes or areas for hydro development activities and subdivision*

#### *15.2.8 Property Access*

##### *15.2.8.1 Controlled Subdivision Activities – Property Access*

*Except where specified as Discretionary or Non-Complying Subdivision Activities in Rules 15.2.3.3 and 15.2.3.4, any subdivision of land in any zone, which complies with all of the Site and Zone Subdivision Standards, is a Controlled Subdivision Activity, with the Council reserving control in respect of the following:*

- The location, alignment, gradients and pattern of roading, service lanes, pedestrian accessways and cycle ways, their safety and efficiency.*
- The number, location, provision and gradients of access from roads to lots for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians, their safety and efficiency.*
- The standards of construction and formation of roads, private access, service lanes, pedestrian access, accessways and cycle ways.*
- The provision and vesting of corner splays or rounding at road intersections.*
- The naming of roads and private access.*
- The provision for and standard of street lighting.*
- Any provisions for tree planting within roads.*
- Any requirements for widening, formation or upgrading of existing roads.*
- Any provisions relating to access for future subdivision on adjoining land.*
- Any requirement for financial contributions in respect of property access.*

##### *15.2.8.2 Site Subdivision Standards - Landscaping and Recreational Access*

- (i) This Rule shall only apply to subdivision of land situated south of State Highway 6 (“Ladies Mile”) and southwest of Lake Hayes which is zoned Low Density Residential or Rural Residential as shown on Planning Map 30.*
- (ii) The landscaping of roads and public places is an important aspect of property access and subdivision design. No subdivision consent shall be granted without*

*consideration of appropriate landscaping of roads and public places shown on the plan of subdivision.*

- (iii) *No separate residential lot shall be created unless provision is made for pedestrian access from that lot to public open spaces and recreation areas within the land subject to the application for subdivision consent and to public open spaces and rural areas adjoining the land subject to the application for subdivision consent.*

#### 15.2.8.3 Assessment Matters for Resource Consents

*In considering whether or not to grant consent or impose conditions in respect to property access, the Council shall have regard to, but not be limited by, the following assessment matters:*

- (i) *The need for and extent of any financial contributions to the provision of property access, as referred to in Rule 15.2.5.*
- (ii) *The safety and efficiency of the roading network and the proposed roading pattern, having regard to the roading hierarchy, standards of design, construction for roads and private access.*
- (iii) *The effect of any new intersections or accesses created by the subdivision on traffic safety and efficiency, including the availability of adequate, unobstructed sight distances from intersections and adequate spacing between intersections.*
- (iv) *The provisions of the Council's Code of Practice for Subdivision in respect of the design and construction of roads and private access.*
- (v) *The account taken of safe, pleasant and efficient pedestrian movement, provision of space for cyclists, amenity values of the street and opportunities for tree planting in the open space of the road way to enhance the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.*
- (vi) *The need to provide pedestrian accessway facilities in circumstances where the roading network does not provide sufficient or direct access or easy walking access to facilities in the vicinity.*
- (vii) *The need to provide cycle ways in circumstances where the roading network does not enable sufficient or direct cycle routes through the locality.*
- (viii) *The need to provide alternative access for car parking and vehicle loading in the Business, Town Centre, Corner Shopping Centre or Industrial Zones by way of vested service lanes at the rear of properties.*
- (ix) *Any impact of roading and access on lakes and rivers, ecosystems, drainage patterns and the amenities of adjoining properties.*
- (x) *The need to provide for appropriate standards of street lighting or private access lighting having regard to the classification of the road or the access.*
- (xi) *The need to provide distinctive names for roads and private vehicular access. The name to be agreed by the Council.*
- (xii) *Any need to make provision for future roads to serve surrounding land or for road links that need to pass through the subdivision.*

### **3.0 RELEVANT NON-STATUTORY DOCUMENTS**

#### **3.1 Tomorrow's Queenstown: Vision, issues and directions – July 2002**

The Tomorrow's Queenstown document was prepared following a public workshop held between 7 and 11 July 2002, with the purpose of providing a community vision, strategic goals and priorities for Queenstown for the next ten to twenty years.

The document does not make any specific reference to the widths of private access ways but does include comments on general amenity values in the built environment. It sets as a Strategic Goal : Creating quality urban environments. The principles of this goal include on page 48:

*3. Intensification of existing urban areas will need to be carefully managed to ensure that new buildings do not negatively impact on important views or on the character/pleasantness of urban areas.*

One of the methods for achieving this is listed on page 50 as:

*3. Review the District Plan controls to ensure that the controls allow for and encourage quality intensive residential developments and prevent or discourage poor design.*

#### **3.2 Wanaka 2020 report – May 2002**

The Wanaka 2020 document was prepared following a public workshop held between 24 and 28 May 2002, with the purpose of providing a community vision, strategic goals and priorities for Wanaka for the next ten to twenty years.

This report does not make any specific statements regarding access ways in the residential areas and does not make any general statements about amenity values in the residential areas that relate to the provision of access widths.

#### **3.3 Rural Roading Corridors - Corridor Management Guideline**

The Council adopted this policy on 19 December 2003. It is intended to provide a holistic approach to the management of rural roading corridors. It contains a number of statements with regards to access widths in the rural context that may be of relevance here:

Where vehicle numbers are low, and the road has historic or aesthetic characteristics a narrower width shall be considered. (pg 40)

##### **9.10 Access lots and rights of way**

*Common access lots and rights of way shall be permitted to service no more than nine lots at any one location. Where access is required to more than 9 lots it shall be by means of a legal public road. Where further development or subdivision is likely the Council may require the applicant to create a legal public road.*

##### *Rural subdivision*

a) *Adequate levels of access, safety and convenience are provided for all road users while ensuring acceptable levels of amenity and protection of the environment from the impact of traffic.*

- c) *Roads are laid out to fit in with the general roading requirements of the District Plan. The roading layout must provide for access to adjoining land where deemed necessary by the Council. The roading layout and design must also consider the potential future development of the land if it is developed to its maximum potential in accordance with the current zoning.*
- d)

## 4.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS

### 4.1 Options 2020 Workshops – March/April 2004

In both Queenstown and Wanaka workshops were held at the end of March and the beginning of April 2004. These aimed in part to inform the public of the work undertaken by the Council as a result of the community consultation in 2002 and to gain feedback from the community regarding the current issues. Feedback was predominantly obtained in the form of ‘post-its’ on various ‘issue boards’. One statement was directly relevant to access ways:

- Aesthetic and other (access, parking, affordable staff accommodation etc) factors – developers should be held to a much higher standard than now.

### 4.2 Panel Display and Public Meetings - 14 & 15 June 2004

The outline of the proposed plan change was printed on a full colour A2 panel and displayed on 14 June in Wanaka and on 15 June in Queenstown from 10 am to 4 pm. During this time members of the consultant team working on this plan change were present to answer questions and gain feedback.

On the same days in the evening public meetings took place, and the proposal was presented to the attendants.

The feedback indicated the public was interested in the big picture, however, there was very little feedback regarding the actual dimensions proposed.

### 4.3 Statutory Bodies

Letters were written to the following informing them of the proposal and asking for comments:

Otago Regional Council  
Otago Regional Council  
Ministry for the Environment  
Department of Conservation  
Kai Tahu Ki Otago  
Ngai Tahu

No comments were received.

### 4.4 Agendas, reports and minutes

All information presented to the Strategy Committee has been in the public domain. The agendas, reports and minutes have been made available through the QLDC website.

## 5.0 ISSUE

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE WIDTHS OF PRIVATE ACCESS

The key issue can be identified as follows:

The Partially Operative District Plan contains no provisions for requiring appropriate access widths at the time of development.

## 6.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE OPTIONS FOR ADDRESSING THE ISSUE

### 6.1 Broad Alternatives

Option	Advantages/ Benefits	Disadvantages/ Costs	The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation
1. Do nothing approach  The do nothing approach would mean removing all existing regulation imposed on access way provisions.			<p>This option is deemed to be ineffective at achieving the efficient and effective transportation and use of land.</p> <p>Access way design would be left to the market. This would most likely result in unsuitable and unusable access ways being developed.</p> <p>The amenity values of the built environment are likely to suffer as a result.</p> <p>It is therefore considered inappropriate and would not achieve the policies in section 14.1.3 of the District Plan.</p>
2.Remove all regulation and rely on non-regulatory mechanisms  As 1. Above, but rather than rely solely on the market, intervene in a non-regulatory manner through the provision of guidelines and or education.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost to Council of non-regulatory function and administering guidelines/education.,</li> </ul>	<p>This option is deemed to be ineffective at achieving the efficient and effective transportation and use of land.</p> <p>Access way design would be left to the market. This would most likely result in unsuitable and unusable access ways being developed.</p> <p>The amenity values of the built environment are likely to suffer as a result.</p> <p>It is therefore considered inappropriate and would not achieve the policies in section 14.1.3 of the District Plan</p>
3.Status Quo – Retain the existing rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires suitable access ways at the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No control over access way design, except</li> </ul>	This option is deemed to be ineffective as it has been shown to result in inappropriate

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE WIDTHS OF PRIVATE ACCESS

Option	Advantages/ Benefits	Disadvantages/ Costs	The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>time of subdivision</li> <li>• Relies on provisions drafted nationally and updated nationally. This means any emergency services requirements or other nation-wide provisions would be covered.</li> <li>• Not having to process a plan change would be a cost saving to the Council and ratepayers.</li> </ul>	<p>vehicle crossings, at time of development.</p>	<p>access ways when redevelopment of sites takes place.</p> <p>As a result amenity values in the built environment are often reduced by redevelopment.</p> <p>Because of the inability to provide for future development this option is not effective in achieving the objectives and policies of section 14.1.3 of the District Plan and the purpose the Act.</p>
4. Require the vestment of access ways in the Council if the development is larger than a certain number of units.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All vested access ways would need to be up to public road standards and widths.</li> <li>• Council would be able to maintain the access ways to an acceptable level</li> <li>• Services such as rubbish collection and road maintenance to community improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance costs would transfer from individual property owners to the Council.</li> <li>• The Council would be required to provide services, this could impose costs on the ratepayers.</li> </ul>	<p>There is no legal mechanism to enable this, and it is therefore not considered a viable option.</p> <p>However it could be considered as a guideline for residential zones. It is noted that the guideline Rural Roading corridors already contains the recommendation that access for more than nine lots in the Rural Zone should be by means of a public legal road.</p> <p>This is considered necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act and the objectives of the Plan to require access ways, serviced to meet the needs of the residents.</p> <p>This is recommended and is further considered in paragraph 6.2.</p>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE WIDTHS OF PRIVATE ACCESS

Option	Advantages/ Benefits	Disadvantages/ Costs	The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation
5. Amend the rules to include requirements for access ways that ensure appropriate widths and standards both at the time of subdivision and at the time of development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amenity value of the residential area would be increased, as the access way would be designed for the development taking place.</li> <li>• Matching the width of the access way with the number of dwellings it services should result in an efficient use of land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would increase development costs for applicants because access ways may need to be redesigned and widened for a new development.</li> <li>• There are costs for Council involved in processing a Plan Change.</li> </ul>	<p>This option could result in appropriate widths of access ways when redevelopment of sites takes place, as well as at time of subdivision.</p> <p>This is considered necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act and the objectives and policies of the Plan to require appropriately dimensioned access ways.</p> <p><b>This option is recommended, and variations of it are considered further in detail in paragraph 6.2</b></p>

◀ Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE WIDTHS OF PRIVATE ACCESS

## 6.2 Specific Alternative Rules

Rule Options	Advantages/ Benefits	Disadvantages/ Costs	The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation															
1. Amend the rules to include standard NZ 4404:2004 and amendments as a standard for access ways at the time of development, as follows:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area served</th><th>Minimum street width (m)</th><th>Carriage way width (m)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2-4 units</td><td>4.5</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>5-20 units</td><td>12</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr> <td>21-50 units</td><td>18</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr> <td>through road &gt;900</td><td>20</td><td>7</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Area served	Minimum street width (m)	Carriage way width (m)	2-4 units	4.5	3	5-20 units	12	6	21-50 units	18	6	through road >900	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standard for private and public roads would be the same, making vesting roads in Council at a later stage easier.</li> <li>There would be considerable incentive to vest roads in Council as maintenance would be met by Council.</li> <li>Sufficient road reserve for safe pedestrian usage and occasional parking.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to more roads being vested in Council, the Council would be faced with higher maintenance costs.</li> <li>The large amount of road reserve required for public roads could mean sites with difficult access would not be economically viable for development.</li> <li>Large amounts of potential residential land would be under utilised, as it would be retained as road reserve.</li> <li>In the case of more intensive development in the future there may be insufficient space to widen the access way.</li> </ul>	<p>Requiring 12 metre wide private access to less than 20 dwellings, where no other traffic is likely to use the access, is deemed to be an inefficient use of land resources.</p> <p>However, a private access for more than 5 dwellings is likely to function in a similar fashion to a public road. It is therefore reasonable that this should comply with the width requirements of a public road.</p> <p>This option is partially recommended and is revisited in option 4. below.</p>
Area served	Minimum street width (m)	Carriage way width (m)																
2-4 units	4.5	3																
5-20 units	12	6																
21-50 units	18	6																
through road >900	20	7																
2. Amend the rules to include widths for private access ways at the time of development, which differ from the requirements for public roads:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area served</th><th>Minimum street width (m)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2-4 units</td><td>4.5</td></tr> <tr> <td>5-20 units</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr> <td>21-50 units</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr> <td>through road &gt;900</td><td>20</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Area served	Minimum street width (m)	2-4 units	4.5	5-20 units	12	21-50 units	18	through road >900	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum access widths would enable maximum development of sites, and avoid under utilisation of valuable residential land.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access ways would be narrow compared to public roads.</li> <li>Vesting of roads in the Council at a later date would not be an option, because the requirements for public roads could not be met.</li> <li>In case of more intense development at a future stage, there is likely to be insufficient space to widen the access.</li> <li>In the case of a large number of dwellings (&gt;20) it is likely the access would be used in a similar fashion to a public road, including pedestrian usage and parking. 6 metres (and 12 for more than 150 dwellings) is too narrow to accommodate all these functions.</li> </ul>	<p>This option provides for an efficient use of land, and enables maximum development of sites. However, it does not provide for appropriate access widths where large numbers of dwellings are serviced.</p> <p>This option is partially revisited in option 4</p>					
Area served	Minimum street width (m)																	
2-4 units	4.5																	
5-20 units	12																	
21-50 units	18																	
through road >900	20																	

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE WIDTHS OF PRIVATE ACCESS

<b>Rule Options</b>	<b>Advantages/ Benefits</b>	<b>Disadvantages/ Costs</b>	<b>The effectiveness and efficiency of the option and the Planner's Recommendation</b>										
3. Amend the rules as in 2. above, but taking into account the potential of the site area being serviced	<p>As for 2. above, but also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Takes into account future development.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>The greater of - the actual number of units serviced or - the maximum number of units possible as a permitted or controlled activity</i></td> <td>Carriage way width (m)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-4 units</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5-20 units</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21-50 units</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>through road &gt;900</td> <td>12</td> </tr> </table>	<i>The greater of - the actual number of units serviced or - the maximum number of units possible as a permitted or controlled activity</i>	Carriage way width (m)	2-4 units	4	5-20 units	6	21-50 units	6	through road >900	12	<p>As for 2. above, but also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires valuable residential land to be set aside for access, which may never be needed.</li> </ul>	<p>This option is efficient insofar as safeguarding the uses of the land for the future. However has the same issues regarding pedestrian usage and parking as 2 above.</p> <p>This option not recommended as it does not give effect to the policies of the Plan.</p>
<i>The greater of - the actual number of units serviced or - the maximum number of units possible as a permitted or controlled activity</i>	Carriage way width (m)												
2-4 units	4												
5-20 units	6												
21-50 units	6												
through road >900	12												

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE WIDTHS OF PRIVATE ACCESS

<p>4. a. Amend the rules to incorporate the positive features of 1 and 3 above as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="177 393 593 789"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>The greater of - the actual number of units serviced or - the maximum number of units possible as a permitted or controlled activity</i></th><th><i>Minimum street width (m)</i></th><th><i>Carriage way width (m)</i></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2-4 units</td><td></td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>5-20 units</td><td>12</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr> <td>21-150 units</td><td>15</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr> <td>150-450 units</td><td>20</td><td>7</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>b. Add the following alternative method, as considered in 4. of paragraph 6.1:  <i>Encourage vestment of accesses to multiple properties in the Council.</i></p> <p>c. Add assessment matters to be considered if accesses cannot meet the requirements, as follows:  <i>The extent to which the limited width of an access is mitigated by sufficient on site manoeuvring and parking space.</i></p> <p><i>The likelihood of further or re- development of sites accessed to a situation where more traffic is generated.</i></p>	<i>The greater of - the actual number of units serviced or - the maximum number of units possible as a permitted or controlled activity</i>	<i>Minimum street width (m)</i>	<i>Carriage way width (m)</i>	2-4 units		4	5-20 units	12	6	21-150 units	15	6	150-450 units	20	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standard for private and public roads would be the same for roads accessing a large number of dwellings (&gt;20), making vesting these roads in Council at a later stage easier.</li> <li>Minimum access widths for small numbers of dwellings would enable maximum development of sites, and avoid under utilisation of valuable residential land.</li> <li>Access roads servicing less than 20 dwellings would still be narrow compared to public roads.</li> <li>In the case of less intensive development, access ways could be up to 2.5 m wider than necessary.</li> <li>May encourage requests/attempts for vestment in the Council of unsuitable accesses</li> </ul>	<p>This option is deemed to be effective at achieving the efficient and effective transportation and use of land, whilst providing for future changes and safety.</p> <p>Overall this option addresses the issues, and is an effective and efficient use of land.</p> <p><b>This option is recommended.</b></p>
<i>The greater of - the actual number of units serviced or - the maximum number of units possible as a permitted or controlled activity</i>	<i>Minimum street width (m)</i>	<i>Carriage way width (m)</i>															
2-4 units		4															
5-20 units	12	6															
21-150 units	15	6															
150-450 units	20	7															

## 7.0 CONCLUSION

This report has analysed the range of options for the requirements for access widths in the residential zones. In assessing each option, relevant statutory and non-statutory documents have been considered, in addition to the results of public consultation undertaken in the first half of 2004.

In this section 32 analysis the costs and benefits of each option have been assessed. The most effective and efficient way of achieving the policies and objectives of the Plan, the purpose of the plan change and the purpose of the Act is to insert a new rule for access requirements. This should ensure that for any new development the width of the vehicular access way is appropriate for the number of properties serviced or potentially serviced and is the same as what is required at the time of subdivision.

As a result of this analysis it has been decided to undertake a plan change as outlined in chapter 8.0.

## 8.0 PLAN CHANGE

(Additions are underlined)

Add the following implementation method to 14.1.3, Objective 1 – Efficiency, under Implementation Methods

*Implementation Methods*

*(ii) Other methods*

*(c) Encourage vestment of accesses to multiple properties in the Council.*

Add the following to rule 14.2.4.1 iv:

*iv Parking area and Access Design:*

*All vehicular access to fee simple title lots, cross lease, unit title or leased premises shall be in accordance with the standards contained in NZS4404: 1981, including amendments adopted by Council and subsequent amendments and updates of this Standard.*

*In addition the minimum requirements for the widths of any vehicular access to residential units will be in accordance with the following:*

<i>The greater of</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>the actual number of existing units serviced or</i></li><li><i>the maximum number of units possible as a permitted or controlled activity</i></li></ul>	<i>Minimum street width (m)</i>	<i>Carriage way width (m)</i>
<i>2-4 units Cul de sac</i>	<i>4.5</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>5-20 units Cul de sac</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>21-50 units Cul de sac</i> <i>note: The access shall be formed in accordance with Council standards for public streets to vest</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>6</i>

SECTION 32 REPORT FOR PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 6 TO QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PARTIALLY OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN REGARDING THE WIDTHS OF PRIVATE ACCESS

<i>0-50 units Through Road Traffic volume up to 400 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic per day) note: The access shall be formed in accordance with Council standards for public streets to vest</i>	18	6
<i>Any number of residential units Traffic volume 400-900 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic per Day) note: The access shall be formed in accordance with Council standards for public streets to vest</i>	18	6
<i>Any number of residential units Greater than 900 vehicles (Annual Average Daily Traffic per Day) note: The access shall be formed in accordance with Council standards for public streets to vest</i>	20	7

*Off-street parking spaces shall be separated from footpaths or adjoining roads by a physical barrier unless aligned with an approved vehicle crossing.*

Add the following Assessment matter to 14.3.2 v

*(m) The extent to which the limited width of an access is mitigated by sufficient on site manoeuvring and parking space.*

*(n) The likelihood of a further site(s) being created and/or the likelihood of the re-development of a site(s), where as a result, the site(s) is accessed to such an extent as to generate increased traffic.*