

**Before an Independent Hearings Panel**

**The Proposed Waikato District Plan (Stage 1)**

**IN THE MATTER OF** the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

**IN THE MATTER OF** hearing submissions and further submissions on the Proposed  
Waikato District Plan (Stage 1):

**Topic 25 – Zone Extents**

---

**HIGHLIGHTS PACKAGE  
LEO DONALD HILLS ON BEHALF OF HAVELOCK VILLAGE LIMITED (HVL)  
(Transportation)**

**13 May 2021**

---

**BUDDLE FINDLAY**

Barristers and Solicitors  
Auckland

Solicitor Acting: **Vanessa Evitt / Mathew Gribben**

Email: [vanessa.evitt@buddlefindlay.com](mailto:vanessa.evitt@buddlefindlay.com) / [mathew.gribben@buddlefindlay.com](mailto:mathew.gribben@buddlefindlay.com)

Tel 64-9-358 2555 PO Box 1433 DX CP24024 Auckland 1140

## 1. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 1.1 My full name is Leo Donald Hills. I am a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand. I confirm that I have the qualifications and expertise previously set out in paragraphs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of my primary evidence.
- 1.2 I am providing Transport evidence in relation to proposed rezoning sought by Havelock Village Ltd (“**HVL**”)<sup>1</sup> of land at 5 Yashili Drive, 88 Bluff Road, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road, Pokeno (“the **Site**”).
- 1.3 My evidence assesses the transport and traffic effects of the proposed Havelock rezoning sought by HVL, along with its integration from a transport perspective with Pokeno.
- 1.4 The HVL proposal provides two opportunities for direct road connections to Pokeno, through Yashili Drive and Hitchen Road. I consider this to be an appropriate level of connectivity which provides direct routes to the town centre, future rail station, community facilities such as the school and employment areas.
- 1.5 Based on the assessment detailed within my evidence, the following can be concluded:
- (a) The key local intersections currently operate well, featuring minimal delay conditions. The key local intersections are shown in Appendix A; and
  - (b) No discernible changes to the operation of the key local intersections are experienced as a result of the Havelock proposal and the TVL resort facility (addressed in a separate brief of evidence for Tata Valley Ltd).
- 1.6 There are likely upgrades required for intersections / roads in the wider Pokeno area to serve the increased traffic from several submissions seeking rezoning within Pokeno. In my opinion these upgrades should be constructed by the Council as part of its management and upgrade of the transport network. Individual developers can contribute to the costs of those upgrades through development contributions or targeted rates. I consider this to be consistent with the fact that upgrades are the result of cumulative effects from multiple sites (and so hard to attribute to any single rezoning). It would be inequitable to assign responsibility to only one rezoning.
- 1.7 On that basis, I consider there does not need to be any specific staging or triggers in the Havelock provisions related to those wider cumulative impacts or upgrades. These

---

<sup>1</sup> Submitter 862 and further submitter 1291.

matters could also be addressed through subdivision and development applications as Council retains discretion over effects on infrastructure.

- 1.8 The proposal can incorporate an extended public transport route (utilising the proposed collector road loop from Yashili Drive to Hitchen Road) through the Site to service the development.
- 1.9 The proposal can include walking and cycling facilities throughout to suitably accommodate residents and to connect the Site to Pokeno. These details would be part of the design for resource consent.
- 1.10 The roading network will be refined and developed through the usual subdivision and engineering approval processes. The site design process, which I have been a part of, has ensured that these roads can meet acceptable standards (road, width, gradient, alignment), and can accommodate the requirements of the Waikato District Council (noting the exception as discussed further in paragraph 1.19 of this summary evidence).
- 1.11 I have also prepared a rebuttal statement, relating to evidence filed by:
  - (a) Don McKenzie for Yashili New Zealand Dairy Co Limited;
  - (b) Todd Langwell for Hynds Pipe Systems Limited;
  - (c) Wesley Edwards for Pokeno Village Holdings Limited (PVHL);
  - (d) Michael Wood (Planning) for Waka Kotahi (NZTA).
- 1.12 In terms of wider network effects raised in particular by Mr Edwards, I have identified that there will be a number of upgrades required to serve Pokeno in the future. However, I consider that the most appropriate time to consider the exact upgrades required in Pokeno is when all zoning requests are finalised and I still consider can be considered through future subdivisions, development contributions or targeted rates.
- 1.13 I note however, if there is a concern regarding an information gap and if the Panel were of the mind to require additional assessment of transportation matters, then at the time of resource consent applications an assessment of effects of traffic generation on the wider network could be provided. Mr Tollemache has proposed a traffic generation rule for subdivision activity in Pokeno to implement this.
- 1.14 Mr Edwards and Mr McKenzie have raised a number comments regarding fine detailed assumptions within transport assessments I have undertaken. In my opinion, these

assumptions are reasonable and, in any event, would not materially change the overall result.

- 1.15 There have been issues raised by Mr McKenzie and Mr Langwell relating to pedestrians, cyclists, rail crossing and intersection treatment. In my opinion these can be addressed by the revised provisions as outlined by Mr Tollemache which require assessment of the potential impacts from the Havelock proposal on parts of the local network.
- 1.16 Mr Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency does not raise any further issues and I agree with his proposed amendment to the assessment criteria in relating to including reference to intersections with State Highway 1.
- 1.17 I generally agree with the S42A report that any transportation issues can be addressed through subdivision processes (noting the potential trip generation rule outlined by Mr Tollemache) and related LGA processes.
- 1.18 Mr Edwards also provided additional rebuttal evidence on behalf of PVHL. Mr Edwards considers that the legal width of the existing access to Yashili Drive is only 12m, compared with a minimum width of 20m specified in Council standards.
- 1.19 In the absence of additional land width, I also consider there are other potential options including only constructing one side of the road with a 7m carriageway and a berm and 2.5m wide footpath on the northern side of the new road. This solution, while not ideal, would allow full access to HVL land and would continue to provide an acceptable level of walking and cycling access.
- 1.20 Mr Edwards also considers that the proposed access to the TaTa Valley site via Yashili Drive, which features sections with a 6.0m wide carriageway is inadequate for providing access to a residential development like the Havelock Village proposal.
- 1.21 I agree with Mr Edwards that a 6.0m wide carriageway is insufficient to accommodate the HVL development. The 6.0m wide carriageway will only provide access to the TaTa Valley site. If the HVL development is constructed, the Yashili Drive connection will be upgraded, with a possible upgrade arrangement detailed previously in paragraph 1.19 of this summary evidence.
- 1.22 Mr Edwards notes that upper end of Hitchen Road has been formed to a lesser standard than the majority of the road, with narrower and steeper sections than considered suitable for providing access to a significant number of dwellings.

Mr Edwards concludes that all, or most, of Havelock Village should not be accessed only from Hitchen Road.

- 1.23 In this regard, the recently constructed upper section of Hitchen Road has indeed been constructed with a narrower 8m carriageway (rather than 11m for the rest of the road). For an 8m carriageway to be able to function as a collector road, on-street parking would need to be removed from one side of the road and / or the carriageway slightly widened / upgraded to achieve a clear through lanes (without parked cars) of 6.5-7.0m.
- 1.24 In terms of the road gradient, I consider a local road gradient (typically maximum of 12.5%) would be sufficient to be used by HVL provided the bus route was directed to Yashili Drive intersection (road designed to collector road gradient of 10%).
- 1.25 I agree with Mr Edwards that HVL should not be solely accessed from Hitchen Road (or generally only one other road). The proposal includes two connections to the local road network, that being at Hitchen Road and at the new Yashili Drive intersection. I consider that these two connections can safely and efficiently cater for the residential traffic anticipated to be generated by the proposal.
- 1.26 Based on the assessment outlined in the ITA and my evidence, I consider that the full extent of development enabled by the HVL submission can be appropriately supported by the existing and upgraded road network (as I have detailed above), to maintain appropriate levels of safety and efficiency on the surrounding road network.
- 1.27 Accordingly, I conclude that, with respect to the traffic and transport engineering aspects of the proposal, the proposed rezoning should be accepted.

**Leo Hills**

13 May 2021

## APPENDIX A – KEY INTERSECTIONS

