

BEFORE THE HEARINGS COMMISSIONERS FOR THE WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

AND
IN THE MATTER of hearing submissions and further submissions on the
Proposed Waikato District Plan

Hearing 25 – Zone Extents

PARTIES REPRESENTED POKENO WEST LIMITED (97)

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF LEO DONALD HILLS FOR
POKENO WEST LIMITED (97)**

Transportation

May 2021

Counsel Instructed:

Peter Fuller
LLB, MPlan, DipEnvMgt, BHortSc.
Barrister
Quay Chambers
Level 7, 2 Commerce Street
PO Box 106215
Auckland 1143
021 635 682
Email: peter.fuller@quaychambers.co.nz

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Leo Donald Hills. I am a Director at the firm Commute Transportation Consultants Ltd (Commute).
- 1.2 I confirm that I have the qualifications and expertise previously set out in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of my primary evidence.
- 1.3 I am providing Transport evidence in relation to the proposed rezoning sought by Pokeno West Limited at 53 Munro Road (and various other properties near the vicinity).
- 1.4 My evidence assesses the transport and traffic effects of the proposed rezoning sought by Pokeno West Limited, along with its integration from a transport perspective with Pokeno.
- 1.5 The proposed rezoning includes up to five potential connections between the site and the existing road network including one connection via Huia Road and the remaining four connections via Helenslee Road and Munro Road respectively.
- 1.6 Based on the modelling assessment detailed within my evidence, this has shown that:
 - (a) widening is likely required along several local road intersections to accommodate additional lanes to cater for the future traffic volumes;
 - (b) Right turn bays are likely required at several intersections (subject to demand for right turn movement);
 - (c) A number of signalised intersections are required along Pokeno Road. In this regard, the phasing time with nearby intersections should be synced to improve the performance of these intersections and reduce delays and congestion.
- 1.7 It is important to note that my evidence only assesses the traffic effects at the key local intersections, considered relevant to the rezoning proposal. The traffic generated by this rezoning proposal has been taken into account. However, I understand that there are several other submissions seeking rezoning within Pokeno (including residential). It is difficult to ascertain the number or size of these submissions, the traffic expected to be generated, the traffic patterns and therefore the traffic effects to the wider surrounding road network.
- 1.8 Based on the modelling assessment detailed within my evidence, this has shown that there are likely upgrades required for intersections / roads in the wider Pokeno area to serve cumulative development. In my opinion these upgrades (other than ones directly

related to gain access to individual sites) should be constructed by the Council as part of its management of the network with any contribution from Pokeno West Limited being paid through the development charges 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 one rezoning).

- 1.9 I have also prepared a rebuttal statement, relating to evidence filed by Mr Wes Edwards for Pokeno Village Holdings Limited relating to Pokeno west Limited (97).
- 1.10 I have also commented on transport related matters arising from the s42A report.
- 1.11 Mr Edwards concludes that the ITA does not consider the cumulative impact with the other submissions seeking land to be rezoned.
- 1.12 In this regard, it is difficult to ascertain the number or size of other submissions that will be approved / changed zoning, the traffic expected to be generated, the traffic patterns and therefore the traffic effects to the surrounding road network. In this regard I consider that, when writing my evidence, Council's s42A Framework Report provided the best basis for determining the appropriate future environment as it reviews all proposals.
- 1.13 In terms of wider network effects, 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 can be considered through future subdivisions, development contributions or targeted rates. This is similar to the process in the development of the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) in that, while significant areas of land were up zoned in the development of the AUP, the exact details of the upgrades were left to future applications / processes.
- 1.14 I therefore consider it appropriate to first confirm the extent of live zoning before the details of the upgrades are finalised (both Residential and Business zoning) within Pokeno. Subsequent to this, (with some certainty of the extent of live zoning), Council can choose to undertake further investigations, such as reviewing existing assessments (e.g, the Beca report) to ensure the initial assumptions align with the development estimates and update / finalise if necessary.
- 1.15 Significantly, from a transportation perspective, there are detailed engineering solutions that can be found in the future to enable the subject rezoning to occur.

- 1.16 In terms of accessibility, it is important to plan now for a comprehensive walking / cycling and public transport network to ensure that any development that occurs within the area does not preclude active mode and public transport facilities being provided. This however needs to be undertaken once all zoned land is confirmed.
- 1.17 Accordingly, I conclude that there is no traffic engineering or transportation planning reason to preclude acceptance of the proposed rezoning.
- 1.18 I agree with the S42A report that any transportation issues can be addressed through subdivision processes and related LGA processes.