

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

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission in respect of the **PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT PLAN** by **MOWBRAY GROUP LIMITED** pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Act Waikato District Plan Review–Hearing 25 Zone Extents.

STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF CAMERON INDER FOR MOWBRAY GROUP LIMITED AND ANDREW MOWBRAY

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Qualifications and experience

- 1.1 My name is Cameron Beswick Inder. I am a transportation engineer and the Transportation Engineering Manager at Bloxam Burnett & Olliver (BBO), a firm of consulting engineers, planners and surveyors based in Hamilton. I have been employed by BBO since 2004.
- 1.2 I am acting for Mowbray Group Limited ('MGL') in support of their submission seeking rezoning of their land on Tauwhare Road, in the village of Matangi.
- 1.3 My qualifications and experience are set out in my Evidence in Chief (EIC) dated 16 February 2021, and I am the author of the Integrated Transportation Assessment for the proposed mixed-use zone, dated 16 February 2021.
- 1.4 I also wrote my Evidence in Chief in respect of this rezoning proposal, dated 16 February 2021.

Purpose and scope of rebuttal evidence

- 1.5 I have read the s42A Report; Hearing 25: Mix Used Zone - Matangi, prepared by Ms Betty Connolly dated 16 April 2021 ('s42A Report').

1.6 I have also read the Technical Specialist Review ('TSR') memorandum prepared by Mr Skip Fourie and dated 15 April 2021 that is relevant to my area of expertise. It is attached as Appendix 6 to the s42A Report.

1.7 I note Mr Fourie raised no issues of concern in relation to the transportation assessment and concluded in Section 6 of the TSR:

"I generally agree with the findings of the TA and the submitter's recommendations. I agree the proposed MMUZ has less potential transport impact than the current PWDP zoning based on the evidence provided in the TA..."

"...From a traffic and transportation perspective, assuming the recommendations in the TA are committed to, there are no additional potential or actual issues that the planner and Hearings Panel need to be aware of in considering the application for live zoning."

1.8 I note the s42A report in Paragraph 82 also does not raise any specific concerns or issues with the transport assessment. However, there are two topics raised within the s42A report commentary that I consider need further input from me. This statement of rebuttal evidence is focused on these, specifically:

(a) Ms Connolly's commentary in paragraph 60 about the proposed rule MUZM-R11 relating to Visitor Accommodation being limited by number of people but not the number of dwellings. I provide comment about that in relation to potential traffic effects.

(b) I review the need for proposed Traffic Rule MUZM-S7 PER 1(a)(i): a maximum of 250 vpd (per activity on site)

2. **Visitor Accommodation – Railway Cottages**

2.1 In paragraph 60 of the s42A report, Ms Connolly states "Rule MMUZ-R11 as drafted only stated the number of guests per building and did not have a maximum number of buildings that could be used for this purpose".

2.2 To help the Hearings Panel in this regard, I wish to clarify that while there are possibly other effects-based reasons to justify limiting the number of dwellings on site for Visitor Accommodation purposes, from a transportation effects perspective proposed rule MUZM S7 PER1(a)(ii) and (iii) provides an all-encompassing site wide cumulative traffic volume control for both total daily and peak hour traffic generation. Provided those two rules are administered there will be no difference in transportation effects of the MUZ-

M regardless of whether there are four activities or forty activities operating on site.

2.3 Therefore, in my view, the Hearings Panel can rule out Transportation effects as a reason to justify adding a limit to the number of dwellings for Visitor Accommodation on site.

3. **Traffic Rule MUZM-S7 PER 1(a)**

3.1 Traffic Rule MUZM-S7 PER 1(a)(i) – (iii) outlines a Permitted activity is:

“Any permitted, controlled, or restricted discretionary activity within the MUZ-M creating:

- (i) *a maximum of 250 vehicle movements (vpd) per day;*
- (ii) *a cumulative maximum of 2200 vpd for all activities within the MUZ-M; and*
- (iii) *a cumulative maximum of 330 vehicle movements per hour (vph) for all activities within the MUZ-M.*

3.2 Having considered the wording of this rule further, I recommend the following amendments in red to strengthen the rule in accordance with its purpose for identifying when an Activity is Restricted Discretionary requiring a resource consent with an ITA.

“Any permitted, controlled, or restricted discretionary activity within the MUZ-M creating:

- (i) *a maximum **individual** volume of 250 vehicle movements (vpd) per day **(typical day)**; and*
- (ii) *a cumulative ~~maximum of typical daily~~ **volume not exceeding 2200 vpd for all activities within the MUZ-M; ~~and~~ or***
- (iii) *a cumulative ~~maximum of typical peak hour~~ **volume not exceeding 330 vehicle movements per hour (vph) for all activities within the MUZ-M.***

3.3 I consider that these proposed amendments remove ambiguity and reduce the potential for misinterpretation. The word “typical” recognises that traffic volumes fluctuate day to day either side of the average. So, a single count cannot be used to justify compliance or non-compliance. In addition, replacement of the word, “and” with “or” in (a)(ii) removes the need for both

(ii) and (iii) to be true, and thus is wider reaching to ensure activities that are Restricted Discretionary are identified.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 I have reviewed the s42A Report by Ms Connolly and the associated TSR memorandum by Mr Fourie. Neither identified any areas of concern with the transportation effects assessment or the content of my EIC.
- 4.2 I consider that the traffic and transportation issues relating to the proposed MUZ-M have been robustly considered and are appropriately addressed in the proposed rules for the zone, subject to the few amendments I recommended in paragraph 3.2.
- 4.3 I consider that the conclusions and recommendations of my Transportation Assessment remain appropriate and, on that basis, the proposed mix-use zone at Matangi with the proposed transportation rules MUZM-S7 (as amended) can be supported from a traffic and transportation effects perspective.

Cameron Inder
3 May 2021