

Before the Hearing Panel  
Appointed by the Waimakariri District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a hearing on submissions on the proposed Waimakariri District Plan

Hearing Stream 12: Rezoning

Ravenswood Developments Limited

Submitter number 347

---

**Evidence of Andrew Alan Metherell**

26 March 2024

---

**Submitter's solicitors:**

Sarah Eveleigh | Sarah Schulte  
Anderson Lloyd  
Level 3, 70 Gloucester Street, Christchurch 8013  
PO Box 13831, Armagh, Christchurch 8141  
DX Box WX10009  
p + 64 3 379 0037 | f + 64 3 379 0039  
sarah.eveleigh@al.nz | sarah.schulte@al.nz

**anderson  
lloyd.**

## Introduction

- 1 My name is Andrew Alan Metherell.
- 2 I am a Chartered Professional Engineer, a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand, and am included on the International Professional Engineer Register. I hold a Bachelor of Engineering (Civil) with Honours degree from the University of Canterbury. I am also an Associate Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
- 3 I have more than twenty years' experience, practising as a traffic engineering and transportation planning specialist based in Christchurch. I am currently employed as the Christchurch Traffic Engineering Team Leader at Stantec New Zealand (Stantec), a global multi-disciplinary engineering consultancy. In this role I am responsible for providing transport engineering advice, assessment and design for a wide range of activities.
- 4 I have had extensive experience providing transportation engineering advice and assessment for land development projects in the greater Christchurch area. Relevant to this project I am regularly involved in the planning, assessment and design of the transport networks for residential, commercial and industrial growth areas.
- 5 I have carried out transportation assessment for commercial and industrial developments and integration with adjacent residential developments including examples as follows:
  - (a) zoning and establishment of the Wigram Skies mixed use development;
  - (b) expansion of the Riccarton Mall District Centre;
  - (c) establishment and expansions of the Tower Junction commercial retail park;
  - (d) establishment of Neighbourhood Centres at Wigram, Northwest Belfast; Yaldhurst; and
  - (e) zoning of a major industrial hub at Waterloo Business Park in Hornby.
- 6 I have also provided design advice and assessment for many smaller scale commercial developments and retail developments.
- 7 Locally, I was involved in transport modelling, assessment and transport engineering design for the establishment of Pegasus and various land use developments in the Pegasus and Woodend area. I also provided assessment and advice for Plan Change 29 (Summerset Retirement Village) to the Waimakariri District Plan, and provided transportation engineering evidence for Waimakariri

District Council (as a submitter) for Plan Change 31 (Ohoka residential development).

- 8 I have extensive experience with development and application of traffic models at both large and small scales for the purpose of assessing large scale landuse change associated with Plan Changes, through to assessing localised transport effects of development proposals and integration of development. This has included regional transport models such as the Christchurch Transport Model, localised transport network models, and intersection models.
- 9 I am regularly involved in transport infrastructure design and safety assessment of transport infrastructure. Examples include the Little River (City End) Major Cycleway scheme design, road design particularly in new subdivisions throughout Christchurch and the Selwyn District, and arterial road upgrades and roundabout designs around Wigram to integrate development with the transport network. I have also led various roundabout and signalised intersection designs.
- 10 I was engaged by Ravenswood Developments Limited (**RDL**) to provide an assessment of transportation planning matters for a private plan change request (Plan Change 30, **PC30**) to rezone part of the Ravenswood Commercial Area under the operative Waimakariri District Plan (**OWDP**).
- 11 I was part of the Stantec team that prepared the Integrated Transport Assessment (**ITA**) dated 20 August 2020, and undertook consultation with Waka Kotahi. I provided evidence on transportation planning matters for the PC30 hearing.
- 12 Following release of the Waimakariri District Council's (**WDC**) decision and filing of RDL's appeal, I undertook expert witness caucusing with Council's transport engineer, Mr Shane Binder to review and recommend amendments to a revised set of provisions developed and agreed by RDL and Council.
- 13 I have now been asked to review and advise on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan (**PWDP**) rezoning provisions proposed by RDL.

#### **Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses**

- 14 While this is not a hearing before the Environment Court, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

### **Scope of evidence**

- 15 This evidence provides a summary of:
- (a) The transportation planning assessment undertaken for PC30;
  - (b) The agreement reached between Mr Binder and myself regarding transportation planning matters in the context of PC30; and
  - (c) My assessment of the PWDP proposed by RDL, as relevant to transportation planning matters.

### **Transportation assessment**

- 16 Through the ITA, RFI response process, evidence and JWS for PC30 I carried out detailed transportation assessment for the proposed Ravenswood town centre. The relevant documentation is included on the Council website for Plan Change 30.
- 17 I considered the existing transport environment and anticipated changes to the transport network and traffic patterns in the area, both as a result of general growth, and as a result of the development. My assessments of the road performance focussed on the ability of the adjacent road network, in particular the State Highway 1 / Pegasus Boulevard / Bob Robertson Drive roundabout, to accommodate extra traffic that could be generated.
- 18 I assessed opportunities for access to the Ravenswood centre by other transport modes including by pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport users.
- 19 From a transport perspective, I assessed that the proposed larger commercial offering in the Ravenswood centre will reduce travel distance on the road network associated with many trips already being made. The Ravenswood centre will enable an increase in local employment, retail and commercial offerings that will in turn reduce the extent that people need to travel longer distances. I also consider some movements through the nearby road network that would otherwise occur without the Plan Change, will be removed with the Plan Change. Shorter trips also lend themselves to active travel modes or public transport more than longer trips.
- 20 With the pre-PC30 zoning provisions, which already enable a large residential and commercial development at Ravenswood, the network connections for Ravenswood have been planned for carrying high traffic volumes. That includes SH1 past Ravenswood, as well as the connections in and out of Ravenswood. Allowance has also been made for the Woodend Bypass which requires a new road connection between Woodend and Ravenswood via Garlick Street.

- 21 To understand the potential change in performance of the road network for access to and from Ravenswood, I carried out a traditional assessment of transport related effects associated with the possible additional traffic generation. Following extensive dialogue with Waka Kotahi during PC30 addressing the sensitivity to a range of development and network scenarios, I understand they agreed that the additional traffic generation on the state highway network will be adequately accommodated.
- 22 I have also assessed that the wider road network including the key internal Ravenswood roads will be able to accommodate possible traffic volume increases. Long term, the existing designation for the Woodend Bypass can be implemented to reduce the severance and access issues SH1 currently creates through Woodend. I consider the change of use of land on the western side of Garlick Street from residential to business will complement the proposed through route connection between Woodend and Ravenswood when the Woodend Bypass is operational.
- 23 Access to the Ravenswood centre will be available for pedestrians and cyclists, with a network of off-road footpaths and shared paths already established next to Ravenswood roads and through reserves. Additional connections are feasible, and allowed for in the ODP to further enhance the provision for these modes. I consider that the Ravenswood centre will be accessible for the anticipated walking (primarily Ravenswood) and cycling (Ravenswood, Woodend and Pegasus) catchments.
- 24 It is my opinion that the detailed rules setting out the development plan will ensure that the centre is developed with a high level of consideration for active and public transport modes of travel, suitable internal and external connectivity, and safe and efficient connection of the site with the road network.
- 25 I supported PC30 from a transport perspective as I consider it provides for positive transport outcomes. It consolidates commercial activity in a way that provides a range of transport network benefits, and the transport network can accommodate the change in transport patterns.

#### **Agreement between transport planning witnesses**

- 26 Within the PC30 decision, the Commissioners accepted the expert advice that PC30 would not create unacceptable adverse effects on the wider road network or State Highway 1 roundabout. However, the Commissioners considered that the internal transport issues including provision for public transport were not sufficiently addressed. These issues were the focus of the expert conferencing that occurred in the context of RDL's appeal.

- 27 Mr Binder and I gave detailed consideration to the transport provisions, including the ODP notations and supporting text, and provided advice to RDL and WDC on recommended amendments to address transportation planning issues.
- 28 As recorded in the Joint Witness Statement (**JWS**) for the PC30 appeal, and as set out in the conclusion of the JWS, it was agreed from a transport perspective between Mr Binder and myself that the refined PC30 provisions as they stood at the time of expert witness caucusing:
- (a) would enable an integrated development supportive of travel by a range of travel modes to be achieved,
  - (b) would have acceptable wider area effects on the transportation network, as previously accepted by the PC30 hearing commissioners;
  - (c) could be supported.
- 29 The JWS also set out how the various provisions would achieve these outcomes from a transportation perspective.

**Proposed Waimakariri District Plan provisions**

- 30 I have reviewed the PWDP rezoning provisions proposed by RDL.
- 31 I understand that the provisions have largely been transcribed across to the PWDP as generally set out in **Table 1** below supplied to me by Counsel for RDL, and included in detail within the planning evidence of David Haines for RDL.

**Table 1: Alignment of PC30 and PWDP Provisions**

<b>PC30 provisions</b>	<b>PWDP provisions</b>
Objective 15.1.2 (Role of Key Activity Centres) Policy 18.1.1.12(a) (KAC at North Woodend (Ravenswood))	DEV-NWD-P1 – relating to management of effects on Rangiora and Kaiapoi
Policy 16.1.1.3 (Business 1 Zones) Policy 18.1.1.12(b) – (e) (KAC at North Woodend (Ravenswood)) Policy 11.1.3.5A (Parking areas for sites with principal shopping street frontage)	DEV-NWD-P2 – development within the North Woodend KAC in accordance with the ODP  See also the notified provisions CMUZ-O2; CMUZ-P6; TCZ-O1; TCZ-P2, which incorporate aspects of the PC30 policy framework
Rule 31.25.5 – retail cap	DEV-NWD-R2 Matters of discretion – DEV-NWD-MD1
Trade suppliers are permitted	DEV-NWD-R3 and advice note in TCZ-R24
Rule 31.25.4 - Restricted discretionary consent required for all "development" within B1 zone	DEV-NWD-R4 and advice note to TCZ-R1 Matters of discretion – DEV-NWD-MD2
Rule 31.25.7 – Timing of construction of the town square / reserve	DEV-NWD-R5 Matters of discretion – DEV-NWD-MD3
KAC ODP text and plan	DEV-NWD- APP2

**Comparison of PWDP Proposed Provisions with PC30**

- 32 The PC30 transport JWS set out suitability of the urban environment, business, and subdivision policy provisions for PC30. A transport focus of provisions was on safe access, pedestrian connectivity, public transport integration, and suitable design of parking and loading facilities. A key consideration was that the Ravenswood site as an emerging Business zone would have a different urban form and different car parking characteristics to existing business zones. This included Ravenswood not being able to rely on public car parking resources which are available in other established business zones.
- 33 Most specifically, Policy 18.1.2.12 included detail around transport integration requirements, and Rule 31.25.4 set out restricted discretion assessment matters for new development.
- 34 I have reviewed the relevant PC30 and DEV-NWD provisions side by side and consider they address the transport matters in a comparable way to PC30. I have provided some discussion of matters requiring further explanation from a transport perspective as follows:
- (a) Under PC30, trade suppliers are a permitted activity in the Ravenswood Business 1 zone. However, under the PWDP provisions, trade retail activities are a restricted discretionary activity. RDL seeks that trade

suppliers be permitted in the North Woodend TCZ, consistent with the PC30 outcome. The ITA specifically addressed the wide area effects of development of the zone with inclusion of activity levels comparable to trade suppliers. Those effects of development were considered to be acceptable. I consider the transport rules of the PWDP, together with the DEV-NWD-APP2 will require suitable assessment to address transport integration of a trade supplier site at Ravenswood.

- (b) A further point of difference from a transportation perspective is that Rule 30.8.5 of the OWDP required specific consideration for Ravenswood, and that is not replicated in the PWDP. This is because the transport rules of the PWDP typically result in restricted discretion activity status rather than discretionary activity status that would result under the OWDP as a result of 30.8.5. The provisions within the transport chapter of the PWDP were not submitted on by RDL as a result of this change in activity status. I consider that the transport provisions of the PWDP will enable suitable and comparable assessment of the site in respect to the transport details.
- (c) DEV-NWD includes a suitable level of detail reflecting PC30 provisions. Where any detail has been removed, I understand that is as a result of a change in the wider District Plan framework and rule references, and is sufficiently covered by the proposed provisions together with other provisions of the PWDP that will apply to development, including, as relevant to my evidence, the TRAN provisions. I consider the DEV-NWD provisions and the ODP reflects the intent of PC30 from a transportation perspective.

### **Conclusion**

- 35 I am satisfied that the PWDP provisions as they relate to transport planning matters reflect the PC30 outcome.
- 36 I confirm that my assessment remains unchanged in the context of the PWDP and that for the rezoning of the Ravenswood Commercial Area the proposed suite of provisions sought by RDL are appropriate from a transportation planning perspective.

Dated 26 March 2024

**Andrew Alan Metherell**