

BEFORE WAIPĀ DISTRICT COUNCIL

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA")

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Plan Change 14 to the Waipā District
Plan ("PC14")

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF MARK JOHN APELDOORN
ON BEHALF OF FONTERRA LIMITED**

TRANSPORT

6 MARCH 2025

**Russell
McAugh**

D J Minhinnick / S P Grimberg
P +64 9 367 8000
F +64 9 367 8163
PO Box 8
DX CX10085
Auckland

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is Mark John Apeldoorn.

1.1 My qualifications and experience are set out in my Statement of Evidence dated 17 February 2025 ("EiC"). I repeat the confirmation in my Statement of Evidence that I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses.

1.2 This statement summarises the assessments described in the Integrated Transportation Assessment ("ITA") report and my evidence in chief. It also replies to submissions and evidence of others received following preparation of my evidence in chief.

1.3 I have read the further evidence provided by the submitters to the Independent Hearing Panel that is relevant to my area of expertise. I reply to the following submissions and evidence:

(a) Bryan Hudson for Waipa District Council;

(b) Michael Hall for Kama Trust;

(c) Malcolm Boyd for Kama Trust; and

(d) Katrina Andrews for Waikato Regional Council ("WRC").

1.4 The fact this statement does not respond to every matter raised in the evidence of a submitter within my area of expertise should not be taken as acceptance of the matters raised. I have focused this summary and reply statement on the key points of difference that warrant a response.

2. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

2.1 I prepared the ITA report dated April 2024. This overlapped with my Council Transport advisory role in relation to Plan Change 17 applying to the Hautapu C8 and C9 Growth Cell areas. A consistent approach and application of underlying assumptions has been applied in evaluating the potential additional transportation effects due to Plan Change 14.

2.2 At section 7.1 of the ITA, I describe the industrial trip rate assumptions applied to the assessments as representing a level of demand potentially 30% greater than the long-run practical expectation. This establishes a high degree of

confidence as to the evaluation of transport effects and identification of transport infrastructure. It is also important, however, that setting of Rules applicable to the Plan Change appropriately reflect the assumptions, which apply cumulatively across all the Hautapu Industrial areas, to avoid infrastructure requirements in excess of the actual demands generated as land development in the area nears completion.

2.3 The ITA report has had regard to the trip generation potential associated with all the land area subject to PC14. I have contributed to the determination of the proposed Structure Plan, including the road hierarchy arrangement, integrated connectivity with the road network and future-proofing access for the Henmar Trust site with an indicative Collector Road, consistent with the form of Structure Plan prepared for the Bardowie Industrial Limited ("BIL") land holding.

2.4 The Executive Summary in my EIC summarises the ITA assessment.¹ The salient points can be further summarised as follows:

- (a) the transportation assessments are based on a future year 2041 development scenario including full development of the C8, C9 and subject site; and
- (b) a suite of transport infrastructure works has been identified as necessary to support the incremental additional demand due to PC14 together with those works necessary to support land development in the other Growth Cell areas and with background traffic growth demands, ie those passing through the local Hautapu road network environment. I have recommended these works be included within PC14 and I concur with the form of their inclusion as described in the evidence of Mr Hudson.

3. APELDOORN EVIDENCE IN CHIEF

3.1 My EIC confirms my assessment, that the transport demands from PC14 can be readily accommodated by the transport infrastructure and management measures identified in the provisions.²

3.2 My assessment of the s42A Report concluded it was generally well-aligned with my own conclusions. The s42A Report made further recommendations

¹ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, section 2, Executive Summary.

² Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 2.5.

in relation to the timing and staging for transport infrastructure. I recommended some minor amendment to proposed Rules, including:

- (a) Rule 16.4.2.12A in relation to restricting vehicular access to property with a frontage on Swayne Road;³
- (b) Rule S27.2.20.4 in relation to Fire and Emergency New Zealand's (FENZ's) Swayne Road Minor Accessway submission;⁴ and
- (c) Rule 7.4.2.46 to align the need for infrastructure with the potential timing of generated transport effects.⁵

3.3 My evidence also considers and responds to submissions which included the following transport matters:⁶

- (a) setting of speed limits;⁷
- (b) 12-tonne single unit standard delivery vehicle access on Swayne Road;⁸
- (c) altered location of access on Swayne Road;⁹
- (d) assessment of transportation effects and mitigation;¹⁰
- (e) alignment with the Bardowie Industrial Precinct (BIP) Structure Plan;¹¹
- (f) Collector Road access and master planning to service the Henmar Trust property;¹²
- (g) transport emissions, the Regional Policy Statement, and proposed District Plan provisions;¹³

³ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 6.2.

⁴ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 6.4.

⁵ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 6.5 – 6.7.

⁶ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, section 7.

⁷ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.2.

⁸ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.3.

⁹ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.3.

¹⁰ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.4, 7.8 and 7.16.

¹¹ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.6.

¹² Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.7.

¹³ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.11 and 7.13.

- (h) the Regional Public Transport Plan;¹⁴
- (i) Fire and Emergency New Zealand accessibility;¹⁵ and
- (j) construction activity management.¹⁶

3.4 Having further considered these matters I concluded:

- (a) the ITA has appropriately assessed the future transport environment and identified transport infrastructure as mitigation to the incremental additional transport effects generated;
- (b) the New Zealand Transport Agency confirmed it has no outstanding concerns and has provided written support; and
- (c) PC14, read together with the relevant provisions of the District Plan, appropriately responds to the forecast transport environment demands.

4. EVIDENCE OF MR HUDSON FOR WAIPA DISTRICT COUNCIL

4.1 I have considered the evidence of Mr Hudson, which includes responses to my evidence. I concur with Mr Hudson's further assessments and his conclusions, in particular:

- (a) our alignment on the matter of "vehicular" access restriction on Swayne Road and Zig Zag Road;¹⁷
- (b) his further assessments¹⁸ on the Minor Accessway to Swayne Road. These include:
 - (i) enabling light vehicle movement associated with the Mangaone Precinct;
 - (ii) retention of the Minor Accessway titling as it is established at Rule 7.4.2.46(e); and

¹⁴ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.11, 7.13 and 7.14. This also addresses Mr Hall's evidence for Kama Trust which seeks provisions related to electric vehicle supply equipment.

¹⁵ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.15 and Appendix B.

¹⁶ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.17.

¹⁷ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, para 3.2.

¹⁸ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, paras 3.3 – 3.8.

- (iii) Council's assessment as to the accommodation of public transport on the main routes.
- (c) on transport infrastructure provisions¹⁹ with reference to Rule 7.4.2.46 including:
 - (i) our alignment in relation to linking the timing of transport infrastructure to the effect;
 - (ii) clarification as to the purpose and application of the Rule linking infrastructure considerations to land use activities independent of subdivision applications;²⁰ and
 - (iii) the amended Rule provisions included at his Appendix A.
- (d) His assessments and evaluations in terms of Michael Hall's evidence,²¹ in particular:
 - (i) the need for future transport infrastructure improvement and for these to be timed in relation to the transport effect,²² not front loaded;
 - (ii) the role and purpose of the development and infrastructure works agreement, as is proposed in PC14, to inform and fund the nature and timing of network upgrades;
 - (iii) his assessment of the factors (a to j) that will determine if or when the four laning and roundabout upgrades will be needed;²³ and
 - (iv) his agreement with the ITA report in relation to the Victoria Road / Zig Zag Road / Bruntwood Road roundabout²⁴ and the further reference to "shoulder" of the road.²⁵

4.2 I confirm therefore, there are no matters of disagreement between Mr Hudson's and my evidence, and further I concur with the recommended Rule provisions described at his Appendix A.

¹⁹ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, paras 3.9 – 3.13.

²⁰ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, para 3.12.

²¹ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, section 5.

²² Evidence of Bryan Hudson, para 5.4.

²³ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, para 5.7.

²⁴ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, para, 5.10.

²⁵ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, para 5.12.

5. EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL HALL FOR KAMA TRUST

- 5.1 Mr Hall addresses a number of transport planning matters and considerations. I have read and considered these. Save for the purposes of repetition in this evidence, I note that Mr Hudson has thoroughly considered and responded to these matters raised at section 5 of his evidence. In responding, I note Mr Hudson references the assessments described in the ITA report.²⁶ These confirm the depth of assessment, degrees of confidence, regard for local land development and background growth, identification of incremental and additional transport infrastructure needs and the timing of transport infrastructure with effects and need.
- 5.2 The approach and mechanisms proposed by PC14, ensure Council has the tools and capability to continue to manage and operate the transport network in a way that aligns not only with local but wider integrated and strategic transport policy outcomes, such as those supporting district-wide mode shift and multi-modal transport outcomes for example. Accordingly, I have concluded the matters raised in the evidence of Mr Hall are appropriately provided for in the proposed PC14 Rules.

6. EVIDENCE OF MALCOLM BOYD FOR KAMA TRUST

- 6.1 I have read and considered the evidence of Mr Boyd. The principal focus of this evidence is on transport infrastructure provisions and the provisions for timing of its delivery. It supports the evidence of Mr Hall and his paragraph [15] recommendations for full 4-laning of Victoria Road, together with dual-lane improvements to the Hautapu Road and BIP roundabouts.
- 6.2 The assessments and intersection modelling analyses I have described at section 8 of the ITA report, for example paragraph 8.1.4 Victoria Road / BIP roundabout (with a upgraded LOS A at 2041 with full development of the wider Hautapu C8 and C9 areas, together with the proposed PC14 site) indicates there is substantial residual capacity within the current single lane roundabout to accommodate material land development over time before upgrading is necessary. Subject to the nature of development and the traffic demands it generates, there is a reasonable probability the intersection will continue to function adequately as a single lane roundabout at full development of the Hautapu area, and consequently may not in fact require improvement, or the timing for this may be necessitated some time after 2041. Similarly, endowing

²⁶ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, paras 5.5, 5.7(h), 5.8, and 5.10.

Council with the tools that PC14 proposes (and which similarly apply to the C8 and C9 Growth Cells) enable it to manage the transport network operation, including providing to either bring improvement works forward or delay them subject to emerging transport demands, and achieve the wider transport network and strategy outcomes I describe at my paragraph 5.2.

- 6.3 On these bases, and as Mr Hudson describes²⁷ I continue to conclude that the matters raised in the evidence of Mr Boyd are appropriately provided for in the proposed PC14 Rules.

7. EVIDENCE OF KATRINA ANDREWS FOR WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL

- 7.1 I considered the wider WRC submissions and addressed these in my evidence²⁸. This included a comprehensive evaluation of the relevant Regional Policy Statement and Regional Public Transport Plan provisions²⁹, together with the provisions of the most recently released Government Emissions Reduction Plan 2³⁰.
- 7.2 The s42A report also considers the WRC submissions³¹. I have had regard to the s42A report³² and concurred with its conclusions which reject the further inclusions and undertakings sought. Notwithstanding this, I have undertaken the further assessments³³ requested and concluded the required matters have been appropriately considered and provided for in PC14 when read together with the whole of the District Plan.
- 7.3 Ms Andrews makes a particular recommendation for a specific Rule to be added to PC14 establishing electric vehicle charging equipment as a permitted activity and a second provision establishing guidance in relation to any electric vehicle supply equipment installation.³⁴ She refers to similar provision being included within the Private PC20 – Airport Northern Precinct Extension.³⁵ The form of the provisions she recommends are consistent with that which has been confirmed for the Airport Northern Precinct Extension.

²⁷ Evidence of Bryan Hudson, section 5.

²⁸ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 6.3 and 7.9 – 7.15.

²⁹ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, Appendix B.

³⁰ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, Appendix C.

³¹ S42A Report, paras 4.13.11 – 4.13.15.

³² Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 6.3.

³³ Evidence of Mark Apeldoorn, para 7.9 – 7.15.

³⁴ Evidence of Katrina Andrews, para 15 and 49 to 55.

³⁵ Evidence of Katrina Andrews, para 52 and PC20 Rule 10.4.1.1(ee), and Rule 10.4.2.48

7.4 I have given further consideration to this specific provision, I concur with Mrs Andrews and recommend its inclusion in PC14. The balance between potential unintended downstream consequences such as may arise from changing technology are outweighed in my view by what this enables in the intervening period. Any future changes would be able to be captured in any subsequent and broader plan change initiative where that is advanced by Council. The form of the provisions would therefore be as follows:

(a) Add a new Permitted Activity:

Rule 7.4.1.1z:

Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, electric vehicle supply equipment (including any device or object that supplies energy for the recharging of electric vehicles, e-bikes, e-scooters or electrified micromobility).

(b) Add a new rule to Section 7 – Industrial Zones as follows, as well as corresponding assessment criteria in Section 21:

Rule xx - Electric vehicle supply equipment

Within the Mangaone Precinct Structure Plan Area, any electric vehicle supply equipment shall:

- (a) Be installed in an existing, permitted or consented vehicle parking space, vehicle depot or garage structure; and
- (b) Not exceed a height of 2.1m and an area of 3m².

Activities that fail to comply with this rule will require a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity, with the discretion being restricted over:

- Adverse effects on the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the transport system.
- Adverse effects of non-compliance on the streetscape, pedestrian safety, and the amenity of the area.

8. CONCLUSION

8.1 On the basis of the further considerations I describe here, I continue to conclude, as I have in the ITA and in my evidence, that the proposed PC14, read together with the relevant provisions of the District Plan, appropriately respond to the forecast transport environment demands. I further recommend

inclusion of provisions for electric vehicle charging equipment at paragraph 7.4 in this evidence.

Mark Apeldoorn

6 March 2025