

## Mike Smith for QLDC – Hearing Stream 15 – Transport

My evidence relates to specific relief sought by submitters in relation to Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) Chapter 29 Transport.

Chapter 29 Transport seeks to achieve an integrated, safe, and efficient transport network that provides for all transport modes, reduces dependency on private motor vehicles, and promotes the use of shared, public, and active transport.

My evidence considers the following key matters:

1. Rule 29.5.22 Minimum Distance of Vehicle Crossings from Intersections, in relation to which I consider that the nature and scale of a proposed development may have a significant effect on the safe operation of the road. I consider that the assessment criteria for this rule should be easy to understand from a lay person's perspective, and therefore consider that the posted legal speed limit for a road should be used, not the operating speed, as it is the clearest method for determination of a breach of the rule.
2. Table 29.8 Car Parking Sizes and Layouts, where I am cautious about adopting AS/NZS 2890.1: 2004 as the standard for aisle dimensions. AS/NZS 2890.1: 2004 was last reviewed in 2004, and was based on an evaluation of the Australian vehicle fleet that was registered in 2000. I consider that this standard should provide the absolute minimum dimensions acceptable only, when undertaking an assessment of adequate parking dimensions.
3. Table 29.2 Heavy Vehicle Parking Layout standards, in relation to which I note that there is a mechanism in the proposed Rule 29.5.2, 29.5.7 and 29.5.10 that allows the consideration of a pass / fail test for the application, along with a mechanism for the demonstration of a suitable layout utilising tracking of vehicles should it fail the initial test. In my view, reliance on tracking curves only should not be determinative of compliance for an application.
4. Parking Rates, where I recognise and support the Council's aims to facilitate a modal shift, and reduce the traffic impact on the road network. In my rebuttal evidence I indicate that I am cautious about adopting a 1:5 blanket MPR ratio for hotel style accommodation due to an absence of published data to clarify what the appropriate parking requirements are for that type of activity. However, a stepped approach to reduction in parking rates would be appropriate depending on the threshold level.