

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

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of a submission pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Act in respect of the **PROPOSED WAIKATO DISTRICT PLAN**

**STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF WESLEY JOHN EDWARDS ON BEHALF OF POKENO VILLAGE HOLDINGS LIMITED**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My name is Wesley John Edwards. I am the Director of Arrive Limited.
- 1.2 I have outlined my qualifications, experience, and commitment to comply with the Environment Court Expert Witness Code of Conduct in my evidence in chief ("EIC").
- 1.3 I have read the Section 42A Report for Hearing 25: Zone Extents, Pokeno in relation to transport and transport infrastructure in Pokeno.

**Purpose and scope of rebuttal evidence**

- 1.4 The purpose of this statement of rebuttal evidence is to address matters raised in the s42A report, particularly with respect to structure planning and the provision of transport infrastructure. I also address some matters raised in the evidence of Don McKenzie for Yashili (FS1306) with respect to the Havelock Village proposal.
- 1.5 Specifically, I address the following:
  - (a) Structure Planning (Section 2);
  - (b) Transport Infrastructure Availability (Section 3); and
  - (c) Matters raised by Don McKenzie (Section 4).

## 2. **STRUCTURE PLANNING**

- 2.1 A number of submitters, including Pokeno Village Holdings Limited ("PVHL"), Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency ("NZTA") and Auckland Transport ("AT"), have expressed the view that structure planning and infrastructure planning should be undertaken prior to rezoning of additional land in Pokeno.
- 2.2 The s42A report notes that structure plans are not a requirement of the Proposed Waikato District Plan ("PWDP"). In reading the report I am left with the impression that structure planning is seen as a useful and optional site-by-site analysis tool, rather than a valuable Pokeno-wide tool to investigate the feasibility of providing infrastructure to inform decision making around zoning of land.
- 2.3 The s42A report notes that integration is important, but that it can occur in Pokeno without halting the live zoning of land, and that Council cannot wait for structure planning to be undertaken as more land needs to be zoned soon<sup>1</sup>.
- 2.4 The report recommends that questions about the delivery of infrastructure to support and enable the development land are dealt with by Council at the time of resource consent<sup>2</sup>.
- 2.5 This is despite acknowledging that settlement-wide issues are not easily addressed at a site-by-site level, creating difficulties for agencies like NZTA<sup>3</sup>. These difficulties are likely to arise from postponing the decision-making, and from not identifying funding mechanisms prior to development occurring.
- 2.6 This approach does not allow for the possibility that it may not be possible to provide some infrastructure components, or at least that they may be economically prohibitive to provide.
- 2.7 In the case of East Pokeno, the s42A report acknowledges transport connections are inadequate, concluding the area is not infrastructure ready, and therefore recommends application of the Future Urban Zone ("FUZ")<sup>4</sup>.
- 2.8 I agree the area is not infrastructure ready, but query whether the application of FUZ sets up an expectation that the land could be live zoned in future that may not be capable of being realised.

---

<sup>1</sup> S42A Report, paragraphs 84 – 86.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, paragraph 82.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, paragraph 83.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, paragraph 158

- 2.9 When discussing West Pokeno, the s42A report suggests "*further [transport] modelling once all other zonings in the vicinity are accounted for will be the most appropriate timing to address necessary upgrades*"<sup>5</sup>, and that any transport issues could be addressed via the subdivision process.
- 2.10 I agree that traffic modelling accounting for development of all newly zoned land in Pokeno is required. Unfortunately, the s42A report does not address who might undertake such modelling, when the results of that modelling might be available, or if resource consents should be granted in the absence of such modelling.
- 2.11 That approach means the cumulative impact of development of newly zoned land in Pokeno would not be known until some time in the future. If at that time it becomes evident that providing transport infrastructure to cater for all the development is not feasible, or economic, or cannot be delivered within a suitable timeframe; it may not be possible to then curtail development, particularly where development has already been consented or delivered.
- 2.12 The approach recommended in the s42A report does not guarantee that development of the land in Pokeno would be undertaken efficiently or effectively.
- 2.13 I understand it is not possible to live-zone land with development conditional upon further studies being undertaken. There is either sufficient evidence to zone the land for development, or in the event of insufficient evidence, the land should either be zoned Future Urban or remain rural.
- 2.14 I remain of the view that comprehensive structure planning, including traffic modelling, should be undertaken before additional land in Pokeno is live zoned.
- 2.15 In my view, the traffic modelling of Pokeno should be undertaken by Council with the involvement of the regional council, NZTA, and potentially AT.
- 2.16 The traffic modelling should include the entire Pokeno area including all State Highway connections, include development of all land to be zoned, and be undertaken for an appropriate planning horizon of at least ten years.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, paragraph 243.

3. **TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AVAILABILITY**

- 3.1 As outlined in my primary statement, there is insufficient evidence to confirm that appropriate transport infrastructure could be delivered for development of land sought by any of the submissions, at least not in an economically feasible manner.
- 3.2 While I remain of the view that zoning of greenfield land in Pokeno should be informed by a structure planning process, or at least traffic modelling, having been completed, in the event that the Panel is minded to provide some additional development immediately, I have attached a summary of the submissions seeking to rezone land in Pokeno with a simple traffic-light indication of the likelihood that suitable infrastructure could be provided.
- 3.3 In the table, a green signal indicates sufficient transport infrastructure either could be provided, or likely is able to be provided.
- 3.4 An amber signal indicates further investigation is required, but it is probable that the necessary transport infrastructure could be provided, or there are issues in providing sufficient transport infrastructure that are currently unresolved.
- 3.5 A red signal indicates, based on the evidence currently available, there is little to no likelihood that sufficient transport infrastructure could be provided.

4. **MATTERS RAISED BY DON MCKENZIE**

- 4.1 Like myself, Mr McKenzie has several concerns with the transport assessment of the Havelock Village proposal as presented in the evidence of Mr Leo Hills, including an inadequate assessment of the likely transport effects.
- 4.2 Mr McKenzie notes that the Havelock Village proposal relies on access to Yashili Drive, but the legal width of the existing access is only 12m, compared with a minimum width of 20m specified in Council standards for a road sufficient for providing access to more than 8 dwellings<sup>6</sup>.
- 4.3 I note that TaTa Valley Limited ("TVL") have recently lodged a resource consent application to provide access to the TaTa Valley site via Yashili Drive. That application includes a proposed driveway that matches the alignment of the some of the indicative Havelock Village roading network. Much of the

---

<sup>6</sup> Evidence of Don McKenzie for Yashili, paragraphs 53, 54.

driveway is proposed to have an 11.5m wide carriageway within a 20m wide corridor; however, the section leading from Yashili Drive has a 6.0m wide carriageway.

- 4.4 The proposed driveway may or may not be suitable for providing access to the TVL activity, but it is certainly inadequate for providing access to a development like the Havelock Village proposal.
- 4.5 Mr McKenzie expresses the view that the rezoning of the land or the proposal to connect Havelock Village to Yashili Drive should be deferred until the appropriate legal width can be provided<sup>7</sup>. I concur with Mr McKenzie on that point.
- 4.6 Mr McKenzie is also of the view that the Havelock Village proposal should have more traffic movements along the Hitchen Road route instead of Yashili Drive<sup>8</sup>. I do not agree.
- 4.7 The majority of Hitchen Road is formed to a relatively high standard, including a carriageway width of 11m, consistent with a collector road classification. The upper end of Hitchen Road has been formed to a lesser standard due to the smaller residential catchment in that area. The road is narrower and steeper than considered suitable for providing access to a significant number of dwellings, as would be the case if the Havelock Village land were rezoned.
- 4.8 While it may be possible for Hitchen Road to be upgraded to a higher standard in the future such upgrading, and particularly the required reduction in maximum gradient, may or may not impact private properties along that route.
- 4.9 For that reason, and others, I do not support all, or most, of Havelock Village being accessed only from Hitchen Road. As noted in my primary statement, I do not support Havelock Village being accessed from Bluff Road, for reasons including those leading the s42a report author to recommend declining the request to rezone Hopkins land in Pioneer Road.
- 4.10 Irrespective of my other concerns about the Havelock Village proposal, I remain of the view that development of the Havelock Village land must have at least two access routes of a high standard. As there is no evidence that

---

<sup>7</sup> McKenzie, paragraph 55.






















<sup>8</sup> McKenzie, paragraph 59.

such access could be provided, I recommend that the land not be zoned for development at this time.

**Wesley John Edwards**

**3 May 2021**

**ATTACHMENT A  
TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE READINESS SUMMARY**

<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Reasons</b>
89. CSL Trust and Top End Properties	Residential (49.3ha)		Insufficient evidence to demonstrate adequate infrastructure could be provided
	Rural Lifestyle (45.8ha)		No evidence that safe access could be provided on Ridge Rd
97. AC Shiu (Pokeno West)	Residential	 / 	It should be possible to provide adequate access and transport infrastructure for part of the land fronting Helenslee Road, but insufficient evidence to demonstrate that adequate infrastructure for all the land could be provided.
205. Rainbow Water	Residential		No evidence adequate access could be provided
360. K Yang	Residential		No evidence
451. S & T Hopkins	Residential or Rural Lifestyle or Large Lot Residential		Access relies on Pioneer Road and SH1 Expressway.
458. D Lawrie	Residential		No evidence adequate access could be provided, and unlikely to be provided economically.
502. SG Noh	Residential		No evidence
524. A Noakes	Residential		No evidence
598. Withers Family Trust	Residential		No evidence
754. P van Leeuwen	Rural Lifestyle		No evidence adequate access could be provided, and unlikely to be provided economically
862. Havelock Village	Residential (97.6ha)		Access via Yashili Dr would require purchase of additional land to provide a connection of adequate width and an appropriate intersection at Yashili Drive.
	Rural Lifestyle (52.3ha),		Access predominantly relies on Bluff Rd, Pioneer Road and SH1 Expressway. No evidence that infrastructure could be provided and effects addressed economically
	Commercial (0.35ha)		
	General Industrial (1.67ha)		
548. Grander Investments	Heavy Industrial		No evidence
574. TaTa Valley	Special Purpose - Resort		
668. C & A Reeve	Commercial		
983. Hynds Pipe Systems	Heavy Industrial		
54. Thorntree Orchards, 696. Parkmere Farms, 735. C&T Young	Future Urban		No evidence adequate access could be provided, and unlikely to be provided economically.