

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY THE
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER OF

The Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA** or
the Act)

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Hearing of Submissions and Further
Submissions on the Proposed Waimakariri
District Plan (**PWDP** or **the Proposed Plan**)

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Hearing of Submissions and Further
Submissions on Variations 1 and 2 to the
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

Submissions and Further Submissions on the
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan by
Momentum Land Limited

**EVIDENCE OF ANDY CARR
ON BEHALF OF MOMENTUM LAND LIMITED REGARDING STREAM 12
REZONING OF LAND**

DATED: 5 March 2024

Presented for filing by:
Chris Fowler
PO Box 18, Christchurch
T 021 311 784 / 027 227 2026
chris.fowler@saunders.co.nz

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Andrew ("Andy") David Carr.
- 2 I am a Chartered Professional Engineer and an International Professional Engineer (New Zealand section of the register). I hold a Masters degree in Transport Engineering and Operations and also a Masters degree in Business Administration.
- 3 I served on the national committee of the Resource Management Law Association between 2013-14 and 2015-17, and I am a past Chair of the Canterbury branch of the organisation. I am also a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand (formerly the Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand), and an Associate Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
- 4 I have more than 34 years' experience in traffic engineering, over which time I have been responsible for investigating and evaluating the traffic and transportation impacts of a wide range of land use developments, both in New Zealand and the United Kingdom.
- 5 I am presently a director of Carriageway Consulting Limited, a specialist traffic engineering and transport planning consultancy which I founded more than ten years ago. My role primarily involves undertaking and reviewing traffic analyses for both resource consent applications and proposed plan changes for a variety of different development types, for both local authorities and private organisations. I have previously been a Hearings Commissioner and acted in that role for Waimakariri District Council, Christchurch City Council, Ashburton District Council and Greater Wellington Regional Council.
- 6 Prior to forming Carriageway Consulting Limited I was employed by traffic engineering consultancies where I had senior roles in developing the business, undertaking technical work and supervising project teams primarily within the South Island.
- 7 My experience includes providing transportation assessments for proposed residential subdivisions and private plan change requests. Relevant experience includes providing technical inputs to, and presenting evidence for, the following plan changes, which range from 50 to 2,000 residential lots:

- (a) Within Waimakariri District: Transportation Assessments and advice for Plan Changes 11&12 (Ruby Views), 17 (Ohoka), 22 (McHughs Road), and 23 (Fernside)
- (b) Within Selwyn District: Transportation Assessments and advice for Plan Changes 24 (Silverstream), 34 (Southbridge), 36 (Conifer Grove), 41 (Shands and Trents Road), 60 (Kirwee), 61 (Darfield), 62 (Leeston), 64 and 70 (Faringdon) and 77 (West Melton).
- (c) Within Christchurch City: Plan Changes 30 (Prestons) and 68 (Halswell)
- (d) Within Queenstown Lakes District: Transportation Assessments and advice for Plan Changes 4 (North Three Parks), 18 (Mount Cardrona), 25 (Kingston), 39 (Arrowtown South), 41 (Shotover Country), 45 (Northlake), and 53 (Northlake).
- (e) Central Otago: Plan Changes 12 (Wooing Tree), 13 (River Terrace), and 14 (Ripponvale)

8 I have also provided Transportation Assessments for numerous large and small scale residential subdivision applications, as well as for submitters seeking residential land rezonings through the review processes of the Waimakariri, Selwyn, Queenstown Lakes and Central Otago District Plans.,

9 As a result of my experience I consider that I am fully familiar with the transportation characteristics of the type of activities that could establish if the submission is accepted and the site is rezoned as sought.

10 I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct and agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. The matters addressed in my evidence are within my area of expertise, however where I make statements on issues that are not in my area of expertise, I will state whose evidence I have relied upon. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in my evidence.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

11 In my evidence I address the capacity of the transportation networks in the immediate vicinity of the two blocks of the Submitter's land where rezoning is sought, being:

- (a) The **North Block**, at 142-151 Ferry Road and located to the north of the existing Beach Grove subdivision; and
- (b) The **South Block**, at 310 Beach Road and located to the west of the existing Beach Grove subdivision.

SUMMARY

12 I have carried out an assessment of the transportation-related effects of the requested rezoning, and this is set out in a Transportation Assessment attached as **Appendix A** to my Statement of Evidence.

13 Having reviewed the development that could occur if the sites were to be rezoned, I am able to support the request made by Momentum Land Limited for the sites to be rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.

CONTEXT

14 I have been asked by the Submitter, **Momentum Land Limited**, to evaluate the anticipated transportation effects of its submission to rezone the North and South Blocks to Medium Density Residential Zone.

15 To ensure all relevant matters have been considered, I have produced a Transportation Assessment for the sites (Appendix A). I adopt the Transportation Assessment for the purposes of this evidence, subject to any points of difference, clarification or addition detailed below.

16 I am also aware that the Council has provided some initial comments on transportation matters, and I address these below.

KEY ISSUES AND SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

17 I have been advised that the North Block would be able to accommodate up to 1,055 residences in theory, but that this is unlikely to be achieved in practice, with a maximum yield of 900 residences being more likely. Similarly, I have been advised that the South Block would be able to accommodate up to 168 residences in theory, but that this is unlikely to be achieved practice,

with a maximum yield of 144 residences being more likely. My analysis includes both the minimum and the maximum practical yields.

- 18 As the matter is one of rezoning the land, rather than promoting any particular subdivision layout, my assessment has been based on whether there are any critical impediments to the rezoning rather than assessing any specific scheme. This means that although my assessment considers the Outline Development Plans (**ODPs**), I have not assessed whether (for example) a particular carriageway should be widened or not. Rather, I have assessed whether it would be possible to widen the carriageway if required in future, or if there is a reason why this could not be accomplished.
- 19 For clarity, I am aware that indicative masterplans have been produced by the submitter. I understand that these are for the purposes of understanding how the site might be developed, and that they may change in future. Since they are not required as part of the submission, I have not considered them further. Rather, the appropriate time for consideration of transportation-related matters of this level of detail is when land use and/or subdivision consents are sought.
- 20 I am aware that the Council has also sought details of the "specific actions" required in respect of the partially-formed legal road that lies to the east of the South Block. I am of the view that this is again a matter that is appropriately dealt with when land use / subdivision consents are sought. However, I have been advised that the desire is to retain the northern part of this for walking and cycling only, but that the southernmost part (a distance of around 130m) is intended to be available for all road users, including motorised vehicles. As set out in Photograph 5 and paragraph 3.1.6 on my Transportation Assessment, this road is presently formed over a distance of around 80m.
- 21 Within my Transportation Assessment I allowed for current traffic patterns, plus the completion of the Beach Grove subdivision. Based on these expected traffic flows, I then added the traffic indicated to be generated through rezoning of the sites, and tested the resultant volumes using appropriate computer modelling software.

- 22 My analysis showed that the roads around the sites have a 20m legal width, which is ample for any upgrading necessary to allow for an increased number of vehicles.
- 23 An improvement scheme will be required at the Williams Street / Beach Road / Smith Street roundabout. While detailed designs are beyond the scope of the submission, I carried out an assessment on an indicative layout, and found that a minor change to the roundabout geometry can accommodate the demand associated with the lower yield of the sites. At the practical maximum yield of the sites, the intersection will need to be signalised. However an appropriate form of traffic signals can be accommodated within the legal widths available.
- 24 No improvement is needed at the Williams Street / Magnolia Boulevard intersection, but a minor scheme may also be required at the Beach Road / Tuho Drive intersection. The latter depends on whether the full expected yield of the North Block is achieved, but again, the legal road width of 20m means that an appropriate scheme can be devised.
- 25 The crash history in the vicinity of the sites does not indicate that there would be any adverse safety effects from the proposal.
- 26 Appropriate provision can be made for non-car modes of travel within the site, and there is already a high level of provision for such modes on the frontage roads (although I highlight that there is an existing deficiency on Williams Street, in that cycle lanes should be provided but are not). The school, preschool and mixed-use area are within a 1km walking distance of the sites, with Kaiapoi town centre located within a viable cycle ride of less than 3km.
- 27 I reviewed the ODP and identified that there will be a high degree of compliance with the transportation requirements of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**). The only non-compliance is in respect of the intersection separation in two locations, but a first principles assessment shows that an appropriate separation distance is provided.
- 28 I also note that the PDP sets out that any development proposal generating more than 200 vehicle movements per day (which equates to 25 residences) is

a Restricted Discretionary Activity (Rule TRAN-R20), and that a Transportation Assessment is required to be produced for this. I consider that this provision provides certainty that transportation matters such as road and intersection upgrades, will be considered and assessed once development of the sites occurs.

STATUTORY ASSESSMENT

29 Michelle Ruske-Anderson (Aurecon) suggests that the following objectives and policies are relevant to the proposal.

30 National Policy Statement on Urban Development:

- (a) Objective 1
- (b) Objective 3
- (c) Objective 6
- (d) Policy 1

31 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement:

- (a) Objective 5.2.1
- (b) Policy 5.3.7
- (c) Objective 6.2.4
- (d) Objective 6.3.3
- (e) Policy 6.3.4
- (f) Policy 6.3.5(2), (3) and (5)
- (g) Policy 6.3.11(5)(a) and (h)

32 I have been asked to assess the requested rezoning against each of these with regard to transportation matters. For ease of reference, I set out the specific objective or policy before responding.

National Policy Statement on Urban Development

Objective 1: New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.

33 From a transportation perspective, the key provision in this Objective is that of health and safety, as this relates to road safety matters. I have reviewed the prevailing road safety records and as set out in the Transportation Assessment

(section 7.3) I do not expect that the development facilitated by the rezoning would lead to adverse road safety outcomes.

34 I therefore consider that the rezoning request therefore achieves the transportation part of the Objective.

Objective 3: Regional policy statements and district plans enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, areas of an urban environment in which one or more of the following apply:

- (a) the area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities
- (b) the area is well-serviced by existing or planned public transport
- (c) there is high demand for housing or for business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment.

35 The sites are not within a 'centre zone' (as defined in NPS-UD), although I note that the ODP indicates a neighbourhood centre within the North Block. A 'neighbourhood centre zone' is classified as a 'centre zone' in NPS-UD.

36 The term 'near' is not defined in NPS-UD, nor is how to measure it. However the Cabinet Paper which accompanied NPS-UD¹ noted that the outcome of 'near' is expected to be reduced emissions from transport. The Evaluation Report² simply states that the purpose of part (a) is to drive intensification of urban areas where the benefits of intensification are best realised. One example given of this is that of intensifying urban areas that have high employment opportunities.

37 On this basis I consider that from a transportation perspective, 'near' has two meanings. One meaning is that people are more able to travel by active modes of transport, and as such, the site needs to be within 1km of a centre zone for walking and 3km of a centre zone for cycling. The second is that if there is travel by private motor vehicle, then the journey length is minimised and only occurs within the same urban area as the centre zone.

38 The closest edge of the nearest centre zone (the Town Centre Zone) lies at the Williams Street / Sewell Street intersection. This is located 0.6km from the closest part of the South Block but 1.2km from the closest part of the North Block. The South Block therefore would be 'near'. The North Block is not 'near' for walking as it is more than 1km away, but is 'near' for cycling. It is

¹ <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/Cabinet-papers-briefings-and-minutes/cabinet-paper-national-policy-statement-urban-development.pdf>

² https://environment.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Files/NPS_UD_s32_evaluation_report.pdf

however within the same urban area as the centre zone, meaning the length of any vehicle journey will be limited.

- 39 Looking at Part (b) of this objective, as set out in the Transportation Assessment, the South Block is within a viable walking distance of an existing public transport service. The North Block is not within a viable walking distance of existing public transport, and there is no planned future public transport in the immediate area in future.
- 40 I consider that the rezoning request therefore partially achieves the transportation-related parts of the Objective.

Objective 6: Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are:

- (a) integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions; and
- (b) strategic over the medium term and long term; and
- (c) responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity.

- 41 There are no relevant proposals from the local authority for infrastructure planning and funding. However as set out in the Transportation Assessment section 7.1, there would be a need for infrastructure (roading) improvements if the sites were to be rezoned. I would expect that the costs of necessary improvements would be borne by the developer of the sites.
- 42 I therefore consider that there is integration between the potential development and infrastructure planning and funding, and accordingly, that the rezoning request achieves this part of the Objective.

Policy 1: Planning decisions contribute to well-functioning urban environments, which are urban environments that, as a minimum:

- (a) have or enable a variety of homes that:
 - (i) meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households; and
 - (ii) enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms; and
- (b) have or enable a variety of sites that are suitable for different business sectors in terms of location and site size; and
- (c) have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport; and
- (d) support, and limit as much as possible adverse impacts on, the competitive operation of land and development markets; and
- (e) support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and
- (f) are resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change.

- 43 In my view, only part (c) of this relates to transportation matters.
- 44 The South Block has good public transport connections, but these are not present for the North Block. However both blocks are within a viable cycling distance of Kaiapoi town centre (and hence jobs and community services), as set out in section 7.2 of the Transportation Assessment. The masterplan also makes allowance for a small amount of commercial development within the North Block.
- 45 I therefore consider that the rezoning request achieves the transportation part of the Policy.

Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

5.2.1 Location, Design and Function of Development (Entire Region)

Development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that:

1. achieves consolidated, well designed and sustainable growth in and around existing urban areas as the primary focus for accommodating the region's growth; and
2. enables people and communities, including future generations, to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety; and which:
 - a. maintains, and where appropriate, enhances the overall quality of the natural environment of the Canterbury region, including its coastal environment, outstanding natural features and landscapes, and natural values;
 - b. provides sufficient housing choice to meet the region's housing needs;
 - c. encourages sustainable economic development by enabling business activities in appropriate locations;
 - d. minimises energy use and/or improves energy efficiency;
 - e. enables rural activities that support the rural environment including primary production;
 - f. is compatible with, and will result in the continued safe, efficient and effective use of regionally significant infrastructure;
 - g. avoids adverse effects on significant natural and physical resources including regionally significant infrastructure, and where avoidance is impracticable, remedies or mitigates those effects on those resources and infrastructure;
 - h. facilitates the establishment of papakāinga and marae; and
 - i. avoids conflicts between incompatible activities.

- 46 Part 1 of the Objective refers to health and safety, which I address above.
- 47 I consider that only Parts 2(f) and (g) relate to transportation matters. 'Regionally significant infrastructure' is defined in the Regional Policy Statement as the strategic land transport network and arterial roads, and transport hubs. In this case, the closest state highway lies 1.3km to the west with the closest arterial roads being Williams Street and Smith Street, onto which traffic associated with the two sites will be loaded.
- 48 In the Transportation Assessment (section 7.1), I have considered the effects on Williams Street and the Williams Street / Beach Road / Smith Street and Williams Street / Magnolia Boulevard intersections. I found that the roading infrastructure would need improvement in order to accommodate the

additional traffic generated by development of the sites, but also that viable schemes were available for such improvements.

- 49 In that regard, I do not consider that it is possible to “avoid” effects arising on strategic infrastructure, but it is possible to remedy/mitigate those effects. I therefore consider that the rezoning request achieves the transportation parts of the Objective.

5.3.7 Strategic land transport network and arterial roads (Entire Region)

In relation to strategic land transport network and arterial roads, the avoidance of development which:

1. adversely affects the safe efficient and effective functioning of this network and these roads, including the ability of this infrastructure to support freight and passenger transport services; and
2. in relation to the strategic land transport network and arterial roads, to avoid development which forecloses the opportunity for the development of this network and these roads to meet future strategic transport requirements.

- 50 Provided that improvements are carried out to the roading networks as identified in the Transportation Assessment, I consider that significant adverse effects on the network will be avoided. This includes effects on freight and public transport.

- 51 In respect of the second part of this Policy, the legal widths of the roads in the vicinity of both sites is 20m and this is ample for the improvement schemes which I have identified. To my knowledge there are no potential future improvements of this network currently planned (that is, unrelated to the rezoning request). Generally though, a 20m legal width is sufficient to accommodate a range of measures. Consequently I do not consider that the schemes which I have identified foreclose the opportunities for further roading schemes in future.

- 52 I therefore consider that the rezoning request achieves the transportation parts of this Policy.

6.2.4 Integration of transport infrastructure and land use

Prioritise the planning of transport infrastructure so that it maximises integration with the priority areas and new settlement patterns and facilitates the movement of people and goods and provision of services in Greater Christchurch, while:

1. managing network congestion;
2. reducing dependency on private motor vehicles;
3. reducing emission of contaminants to air and energy use;
4. promoting the use of active and public transport modes;
5. optimising use of existing capacity within the network; and
6. enhancing transport safety.

- 53 I have carried out an assessment of the intersections closest to the sites (section 7.1 of the Transportation Assessment), and identified that unless the existing Williams Street / Beach Road / Smith Street roundabout was to be

improved, there would be an increase in congestion. With the roundabout improved though, queues and delays would be appropriate, and congestion would be mitigated. In my view this addresses parts (1) and (5).

54 The North Block and South Block are both within a viable cycle distance of Kaiapoi town centre, with the South Block also being within a viable walking distance of public transport (section 7.2 of the Transportation Assessment). These offer alternatives to using a private motor vehicle. Within the sites themselves, there are appropriate opportunities for non-car travel, including walking and cycling routes, and also ensuring that core routes through the sites are suitable for a future public transport service (if one was to operate). In my view this address's part (4).

55 I have considered road safety matters (section 7.3 of the Transportation Assessment) and consider that adverse road safety effects are not likely to arise due to development of the sites. However, the generation of new traffic does not by definition "enhance" safety, because it means that conflicts might arise where presently there are no such conflicts. This is not unique to these specific sites however, rather, it applies to all development.

56 I therefore consider that the rezoning request partially achieves the transportation parts of this Objective.

6.3.3 Development in accordance with outline development plans

Development in greenfield priority areas or Future Development Areas and rural residential development is to occur in accordance with the provisions set out in an outline development plan or other rules for the area. Subdivision must not proceed ahead of the incorporation of an outline development plan in a district plan. Outline development plans and associated rules will:

1. Be prepared as:
 - a. a single plan for the whole of the priority area or Future Development Area; or
 - b. where an integrated plan adopted by the territorial authority exists for the whole of the priority area or Future Development Area and the outline development plan is consistent with the integrated plan, part of that integrated plan; or
 - c. a single plan for the whole of a rural residential area; and
2. Be prepared in accordance with the matters set out in Policy 6.3.2;
3. To the extent relevant show proposed land uses including:
 - a. Principal through roads, connections with surrounding road networks, relevant infrastructure services and areas for possible future development;
 - b. Land required for community facilities or schools;
 - c. Parks and other land for recreation;
 - d. Land to be used for business activities;
 - e. The distribution of different residential densities, in accordance with Policy 6.3.7;
 - f. Land required for stormwater treatment, retention and drainage paths;
 - g. Land reserved or otherwise set aside from development for environmental, historic heritage, or landscape protection or enhancement;
 - h. Land reserved or otherwise set aside from development for any other reason, and the reasons for its protection from development;
 - i. Pedestrian walkways, cycleways and public transport routes both within and adjoining the area to be developed;
4. Demonstrate how Policy 6.3.7 will be achieved for residential areas within the area that is the subject of the outline development plan, including any staging;
5. Identify significant cultural, natural or historic heritage features and values, and show how they are to be protected and/or enhanced;
6. Document the infrastructure required, when it will be required and how it will be funded;
7. Set out the staging and co-ordination of subdivision and development between landowners;
8. Demonstrate how effective provision is made for a range of transport options including public transport options and integration between transport modes, including pedestrian, cycling, public transport, freight, and private motor vehicles;
9. Show how other potential adverse effects on and/or from nearby existing or designated strategic infrastructure (including requirements for designations, or planned infrastructure) will be avoided, remedied or appropriately mitigated;
10. Show how other potential adverse effects on the environment, including the protection and enhancement of surface and groundwater quality, are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated;
11. Show how the adverse effects associated with natural hazards are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated as appropriate and in accordance with Chapter 11 and any relevant guidelines; and
12. Include any other information that is relevant to an understanding of the development and its proposed zoning.

- 57 Transportation matters are only relevant to parts 3(a), 3(i), 8 and 9 of this Objective.
- 58 The ODPs show the key roads within the sites and their connections to the external roading network, as well as walking and cycling routes. Specific routes for public transport are not shown, although there is no current proposal for the operation of any services.
- 59 I consider that the ODP shows suitable provision for different transport modes, but in a practical sense it is difficult to specifically show integration between different modes at a high level, rather, in my experience this arises through detailed design (part (8)). It is similarly impractical to demonstrate how effects on strategic infrastructure will be mitigated within the confines of an ODP (part (9)). That said, my analysis set out in the Transportation Assessment addresses these matters.

60 I therefore consider that the rezoning request partially achieves the transportation parts of this Objective.

6.3.4 Transport effectiveness

Ensure that an efficient and effective transport network that supports business and residential recovery is restored, protected and enhanced so that it maintains and improves movement of people and goods around Greater Christchurch by:

1. avoiding development that will overload strategic freight routes;
2. providing patterns of development that optimise use of existing network capacity and ensuring that, where possible, new building projects support increased uptake of active and public transport, and provide opportunities for modal choice;
3. providing opportunities for travel demand management;
4. requiring integrated transport assessment for substantial developments; and
5. improving road user safety.

61 The closest strategic freight route to the site is State Highway 1. Given the relatively modest increase in traffic associated with the development of the sites compared to the existing volumes on the highway, this would not be overloaded by the requested rezoning (part (1)).

62 Development of the sites would need to result in transportation infrastructure changes, but these can be designed to support travel by all modes (part (2)).

63 The nature of residential subdivision is that travel demand management measures (part (3)) are very difficult to impose on residents, and rather the approach typically taken is to provide for the ability for those residents to make transport choices. I consider that the rezoning request makes such allowance.

64 My Transportation Assessment has been provided to address part (4) of the Policy.

65 As noted above, new development does not improve road safety (part (e)) because by definition it introduces the potential for conflict where previously there was a lower chance of conflict. However as set out in section 7.3 of the Transportation Assessment, I do not consider that adverse road safety effects would arise from the rezoning.

66 I therefore consider that the rezoning request partially achieves the transportation parts of this Policy.

6.3.5 Integration of land use and infrastructure

Recovery of Greater Christchurch is to be assisted by the integration of land use development with infrastructure by:

2. Ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with the development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure in order to:
 - a. optimise the efficient and affordable provision of both the development and the infrastructure;
 - b. maintain or enhance the operational effectiveness, viability and safety of existing and planned infrastructure;
 - c. protect investment in existing and planned infrastructure;
 - d. ensure that new commercial film or video production facilities are connected to reticulated water and wastewater systems; and
 - e. ensure new development does not occur until provision for appropriate infrastructure is in place;
3. Providing that the efficient and effective functioning of infrastructure, including transport corridors, is maintained, and the ability to maintain and upgrade that infrastructure is retained;
5. Managing the effects of land use activities on infrastructure, including avoiding activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective, provision, operation, maintenance or upgrade of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs.

67 In respect of part (2) of this Policy, the High Traffic Generator Rule of the PDP (TRAN-R20) means that the infrastructure needed to accommodate the traffic generated by the sites will keep pace with the development, and be implemented in good time to avoid adverse outcomes (parts 2(b), 2(e) and 5).

68 As set out previously, the roading schemes needed are unlikely to preclude any other future improvements (part (3))

69 I therefore consider that the rezoning request partially achieves the transportation parts of this Policy.

6.3.11 Monitoring and Review

In relation to development in Greater Christchurch:

5. Any change resulting from a review of the extent, and location of land for development, any alteration to the Greenfield Priority Areas, Future Development Areas, or provision of new greenfield priority areas, shall commence only under the following circumstances:
 - a. infrastructure is either in place or able to be economically and efficiently provided to support the urban activity;
 - h. the operational capacity of strategic infrastructure is not compromised.

70 As set out above, my analysis does not indicate that the strategic infrastructure would be compromised by the requested rezoning. The changes to infrastructure required are required to be assessed when land use / subdivision consents are sought due to the provision of a High Traffic Generator Rule in the Proposed District Plan (TRAN-R20).

71 I therefore consider that the rezoning request achieves the transportation parts of this Policy.

MATTERS RAISED BY SUBMITTERS

72 I understand that submissions were received on Stream 10A to the PDP with regard to the Kaiapoi Development Area, within which the North Block and South Block are located. I have been asked to address these submissions.

Submitter Concern: Traffic safety at the Williams Street / Pineacres turn off, due to the current intersection being dangerous and difficult with traffic not adhering to speed limit

73 In my view it is reasonable to expect that the traffic generated by the North and South Blocks (if rezoned) that passes through this intersection will be comparable to the proportions seen at existing residential development in the immediate area. In this regard, Figure 4 of the Transportation Assessment shows the existing travel patterns at Magnolia Boulevard, where around 95% of traffic travels to and from the south.

74 Figures 12 to 15 of the Transportation Assessment show that even allowing for the maximum practical yield of the sites, the increase in the peak hours would be around 75 vehicles (two-way), or an average of 1 vehicle movement every 48 seconds. In my view this is not sufficient to materially affect road safety at the intersection.

75 Waka Kotahi installed a flashing speed limit sign at this intersection in September 2014, with a view to improving road safety. In the five years prior to this, there were 17 reported crashes at the intersection with 6 resulting in injury. In the period 2015 to 2019 (that is, prior to reductions in travel due to Covid-19 restrictions), 13 crashes were reported with 3 resulting in injury. This represents a 24% reduction in all crashes and a 50% reduction in injury crashes after the sign was installed.

76 I also note that if the Woodend Bypass scheme is progressed, as set out in my Transportation Assessment section 3.3, this layout of this intersection is likely to be modified.

77 Overall,, for the reasons above, I do not consider that rezoning the North and South Blocks will have adverse road safety effects at the Pineacres intersection.

Submitter Concern: More vehicles will put pressure on already overloaded roads from Pegasus to the Waimakariri River due to increased subdivisions.

- 78 The analysis that I have undertaken focusses on the transportation networks close to the sites, as these are the locations where any effects on congestion will be the most pronounced. While there will be increases in traffic further afield, these will be less pronounced due to drivers travelling to different destinations and/or opting to use different routes.
- 79 By way of example, Figures 12 to 15 of the Transportation Assessment shows that around 94% of the traffic generated by development of the two blocks will use either Smith Street or Williams Street (south). Some of these vehicles will then move onto the highway, others will travel northwest in the direction of Rangiora, others will end their journey in Kaiapoi town centre, and others may cross the Waimakariri River via Main North Road instead of State Highway 1. In other words, as distance from a site increases, the increase in traffic on any given route diminishes.
- 80 Waka Kotahi has a traffic counter on the Waimakariri Bridge. This shows that in 2023, in the weekday morning peak hour (7am and 8am), on average nearly 4,300 vehicles travelled south across the river using State Highway 1. The highest volume observed was nearly 4,900 southbound vehicles. Against this background, the likely increase in traffic that arises solely due to this proposal is small.

CONCLUSION

- 81 Having assessed the anticipated transportation effects of the zoning sought, in my view the submission can be supported. I am therefore able to support the request for the sites to be rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.

Andy Carr
5 March 2024