

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991(RMA)

AND

IN THE MATTER of Plan Change 17 to the Waipā District Plan

JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT (JWS) OF EXPERTS IN RELATION TO:

TRANSPORTATION

10 May 2023

Expert Conferencing Held on: 10 May 2023 at 14:00

Venue: Online (Microsoft Teams)

Facilitator: Neda Bolouri

1 Attendance:

1.1 **The list of participants is included in the schedule at the end of this Statement.**

2 Basis of Attendance and Environment Court Practice Note 2023

2.1 **All participants agree to the following:**

- (a) The Environment Court Practice Note 2023 provides relevant guidance and protocols for the expert conferencing session;
- (b) They will comply with the relevant provisions of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023;
- (c) They will make themselves available to appear before the Panel;
- (d) This statement is to be filed with the Panel and posted on the Council's website.

3 Areas of Agreement

3.1 **Transport Context and Underlying Assumptions**

- (a) *Is the transport context set out at sections 1 to 5 of the transportation assessment included with the S32 Report agreed as a representative summary of the transport environment?*

Michael Hall took the group through the original s32 report that was written for Kama Trust to ensure all agreed to the baseline assumptions. Agreement was confirmed.

- (b) *Are the underlying trip generation rate (20 trips per ha) and the distribution assumptions in TA (100% towards Victoria Road and a sensitivity test involving 80% towards Victoria and 20% on Peake Road) agreed as a reasonable basis for evaluating the potential effects on the transportation network?*

Clarification was made whether this was based on current or future trip generations. The further work done by Stantec covered this off for future distribution. All were in agreement that the 20 trips per ha trip rate is an appropriate approach, and the baseline information is correct.

4 Matters to discuss

It should be noted that all agreements and solutions discussed below, are premised on the possibility of the HLG site being rezoned Deferred Industrial by the Hearings Panel.

4.1 Transport accessibility to the Hautapu Landowners Group (HLG) land and integration in terms of connectivity with Kama Trusts' land

- (a) *Is it appropriate that Road 4 as shown on the structure plan be extended to the northern boundary of Kama Trust land to enable access to HLG land?*

It was shared that should Road 4 be extended, there are no issues for it to go over the stormwater basin from the Three Waters experts (confirmed at Three Waters experts conferencing). A question was raised whether Road 4 should be either constructed to the boundary or land put aside and culverts identified for it, so the road can be easily extended at a normal cost.

Basin 4 could be shown as a reserve space to provide access etc for Council (comment from Tony Coutts). It should be noted that there will be no increase required to increase the sizing of the basin based on Three Waters conferencing and there is a level of comfort in the infiltration rating which is conservative.

It was raised whether Road 4 should be classed as a collector road rather than local road. Road 4 is not more significant than Road 1 or 2 so will stay as a local road. If it was a Collector Road it would be classed under the Development Contributions scheme, which could help with the costs (comment made by Mark Chrisp).

The structure plan could show the road indicatively extending northwards, the question is how far; to the basin, to the boundary or further?. Further than the boundary is not appropriate as no land outside the structure plan is included here.

It was agreed that Road 4 could be extended to the boundary on the Structure Plan through a solid grey line as per the key in the Structure Plan which identifies it as an indicative local road.

Gareth Moran disagrees that Road 4 should be extended to the land boundary at this stage. He stated that it should only go to the basin boundary. Gareth agrees that a grey line should be shown on the structure Plan only when the Hearings Panel accepts the rezoning of the HGL site.

- (b) *Are any further considerations necessary in terms of the structure plan, to provide for an extension of Road 4?*

It was discussed how the basin will be identified i.e. local purpose stormwater reserve, C2 has similar situations with roads over the stormwater. This will be formalised through the subdivision plan through the scheme plan. Again being aware that the basin could reduce in size with detailed design and a culvert may not even be needed.

It was agreed following consideration that no further considerations are needed here.

- (c) *Is the T-intersection described on the structure plan appropriate to accommodate both the Kama Trust and HLG land development areas?*

Everyone agreed that a right turn bay facility is required and the assessment is accepted.

4.2 **Hautapu Road improvements (inclusive of Area 6 Kama Trust and HLG Land)**

- (a) *Is it appropriate that upgrading to Hautapu Road, Hannon Road to Allwill Drive including the Allwill Drive signals, as described on the Structure Plan at bullet point 3, be triggered by either the Allwill Drive connection with Road 1 or development within Area 6, whichever comes first?*

Capacity assessments need to be taken into consideration together with safety measures and safe road crossings. What triggers the signals in the future, who develops it? The signals are a Council funded project and is in the LTP, this may be done at the same time as the roundabout upgrade. Does there need to be an alternative for walking and cycling with the development of Area 6 before the signals are in place? There are increases in through traffic as a result of Area 6 being developed. Council also has plans and funding to upgrade sections of this carriageway. There may be a reasonable basis to seek an earlier trigger, there is phasing established for this work through a procurement strategy. Through a resource consent process, the timing can be sorted if there are delays with revocations etc. There could possibly be no trigger put in the Structure Plan, as plans are already in place for this by Council with funding approved.

Having the trigger gives Council a mechanism to have safety assessments carried out by applicants through subdivision resource consents and to have solutions in place if the signals have not been constructed.

Add words onto the end of the third bullet point “...whichever comes first, unless suitable safety improvements for active mode connectivity to Area 1-5 and 6 can be demonstrated to be provided by alternative means, to the satisfaction of the Transportation Engineering Manager, Waipā DC.

Michael Hall is not in agreement and states that this should not relate back to Area 6, disallowing the development prior to the intersection being signalised. By way of background, it was discussed that an ITA could be prepared which would assess the traffic effects of Area 6 if it was to be developed prior to the signals being completed. Gareth Moran, Planning expert for Kama Trust, does not agree with this statement as the trigger for an ITA has not been definitively established.

- (b) *Is it appropriate that Hautapu Road, Allwill Drive to Peake Road including the Peake Road intersection be upgraded prior to development within Area 6, inclusive of the HLG land?*

This is not currently defined in the LTP for upgrading but may potentially be added. Again, any subdivision resource consents can provide flexibility. A Development Agreement could be entered into, but this cannot be confirmed at this point due to the higher risk profile for the infrastructure on this frontage.

All are in agreement the proposed structure plan trigger is appropriate.

4.3 **Victoria Road / Hautapu Road intersection dual lane roundabout Matters**

- (a) *Is there agreement that a dual lane roundabout may be required at some future point to ensure appropriate management of the structure plan transportation effects?*

Stantec’s assessment showed that a dual laned roundabout could be needed at about 60ha to 70ha of development. Council does not currently have plans to dual lane it. A dual lane roundabout cannot physically fit in the location currently indicated in the concept design plans by Gray Matter but with a slight shift can be accommodated within the land intended to be available. There will be a staged approach with a current IFS and detailed design to address this. This intersection involves a lot of other development areas including Bardowie, Fonterra etc. Council is addressing this and nothing further is required as part of this structure plan. All are in agreement.

- (b) *The Stantec ITA (section 6.4) describes a range of future operational scenarios for single lane, incrementally improved single lane and dual lane roundabout arrangements. Is there agreement that this assessment establishes an adequate basis for staged and incremental assessments (accepting it potentially over-states the forecast demands due to the HLG land) to be made in terms of roundabout performance and capacity?*

There have been a range of assessments that display that the roundabout will need to increase capacity, this can be done incrementally i.e. one lane at a time. Council is responding to Government policy direction by trying to avoid single use vehicles, encouraging public transport and cycling/mobility integration in this area. When the need is proven, Council will include additional capacity provision in the next LTP cycle (three year cycles), depending on the projects implemented adding to the DC pool. This is a matter for Council to address and therefore this does not need to be included in this Structure Plan.

All are in agreement.

- (c) *Is there any further provision the structure plan needs to provide for in terms of the notified “Future Intersection Upgrade” provision at the Hautapu Road / Victoria Road intersection?*

Everyone agrees there are no other provisions needed for this roundabout upgrade for the Structure Plan.

4.4 **Traffic demands and effects management on Peake Road**

- (a) *The Stantec ITA (section 6.1.1 and 6.1.2) together with the Appendix C (80/20 distribution) assessments describe the potential transportation effects to be expected both incrementally as well as for the ultimate case. Is there agreement the assessments provide an adequate basis for considering the potential Traffic effects on Peake Road?*

Everyone is in agreement.

- (b) *Is there agreement that traffic generated by the structure plan land uses will result in some movement demand on Peake Road both north and south of Hautapu Road?*

Everyone is in agreement.

4.5 **Structure Plan Infrastructure Plan Staging Text**

- (a) *Should the Structure Plan “Road & Access” text be refined to enhance readability, refer Mr Hall’s evidence paragraphs 11 to 15, and what form should that take?*

Hypothetically, should subdivision consents be sought prior to the construction of the roundabout, are there sufficient mechanisms in the district plan that would require an ITA from vehicle movements to address transportation effects? There is a situation where some permitted activities can establish which would not require an ITA, however, the construction of the roundabout is relatively progressed and other options would be overly onerous and not considered necessary at this time for the Structure Plan.

Are there accesses from Area 6 onto Hautapu Road not solely through Road 4? The answer is yes. The frontage east of Area 6 along the existing industrial area should be fully upgraded by Council. It should be noted that there is funding for the existing industrial area road urbanisation. A Development Agreement will be made with Council that can stay outside of the Structure Plan.

It should be noted here again that Michael Hall does not agree with the Allwill Drive signal agreement and states that Area 6 should not be a trigger for this rule. Mark Apeldoorn does not agree with Michael's point.

(b) *Structure Plan text as notified (including typographical corrections) is copied as follows to facilitate discussion:*

All are in agreement with the text below except where highlighted:

- HANNON ROAD INTERSECTION TO CLOSE FOLLOWING OPENING OF THE PLANNED VICTORIA ROAD / HAUTAPU ROAD ROUNDABOUT. ~~TO TRAFFIC IN THE 2023-24 FINANCIAL YEAR WHEN 5HA OF NEW DEVELOPMENT HAS OCCURRED.~~
- ~~STAGE 1 ROUNDABOUT ON VICTORIA ROAD TO BE CONSTRUCTED IN THE 2023-24 FINANCIAL YEAR AND IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO HANNON ROAD CLOSURE.~~
- ~~ALLWILL DRIVE INTERSECTION TO BE UPGRADED WITH A LINK INTO THE AREA 2 FURTHER UPGRADE TO SIGNALS WITH AREA 3 DEVELOPMENT.~~
- HAUTAPU ROAD, HANNON ROAD TO ALLWILL DR, INCLUDING ALLWILL DRIVE SIGNALS, TO BE UPGRADED PRIOR TO ALLWILL DRIVE CONNECTION WITH ROAD 1 OR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AREA 6 (WHICHEVER COMES FIRST), UNLESS SUITABLE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS FOR ACTIVE MODE CONNECTIVITY TO AREA 1-5 AND 6 CAN BE DEMONSTRATED TO BE PROVIDED BY ALTERNATIVE MEANS, TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING MANAGER, WAIPĀ DC.
- HAUTAPU ROAD, ALLWILL DRIVE TO PEAKE ROAD, INCLUDING PEAKE ROAD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS, TO BE UPGRADED PRIOR TO DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AREA 6.
- A RIGHT-TURN BAY AND PEDESTRIAN/CYCLE CROSSING TO BE ESTABLISHED AT THE HAUTAPU ROAD / ROAD 4 INTERSECTION PRIOR TO DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AREA 6.
- NO INDIVIDUAL ACCESS TO PEAKE ROAD.
- CYCLE WAY TO BE CONSTRUCTED FROM VICTORIA ROAD THROUGH AREAS 1 AND 3 TO PEAKE ROAD AS SHARED PATH. TREATMENT REQUIRED AT VEHICLE CROSSINGS ALONG ROUTE TO ALERT VEHICLES TO CYCLISTS ON PATH.
- INTERSECTION UPGRADE HAUTAPU ROAD AND SH1B / VICTORIA STREET REFER TO GREY MATTER DESIGNS REF# ECM10796019.

5 Participants to Joint Witness Statement

5.1 The participants to this Joint Witness Statement, as listed below, confirm that:

- (a) They agree that the outcome(s) of the expert conferencing are as recorded in this statement; and

- (b) They have read the Environment Court’s Practice Note 2023 and agree to comply with it; and
- (c) The matters addressed in this statement are within their area of expertise; and
- (d) As this session was held online, in the interests of efficiency, it was agreed that each expert would verbally confirm their position and this is recorded in the schedule below.

Confirmed online: 10 May 2023

Expert’s Name and Expertise	Part	Expert’s Confirmation “Yes”
Tony Coutts – Transportation	All	Yes
Mark Apeldoorn – Transportation	All	Yes
Rhulani Mothelesi – Transportation	All	Yes
Neda Bolouri - Planning	All	Yes
Cameron Inder – Transportation	All	Yes
Mark Chrisp – Planning	All	Yes
Michael Hall – Transportation	All	Yes
Gareth Moran - Planning	All	Yes