

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
APPOINTED BY THE WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Proposed Waikato District Plan

BETWEEN **RANGITAHİ LIMITED**

Submitter [No. 343]

AND **WAIKATO DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Local Authority

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF
IAN DAVID CLARK FOR RANGITAHİ LIMITED**

HEARING 25: RAGLAN

TRANSPORT

21 MAY 2021

Solicitors on Record

BURTON PARTNERS
SOLICITOR — TONY NICHOLSON

PO Box 8889, Symonds Street, Auckland 1150, DX CP24147
P 09 300 3775 F 09 300 3770 E jeremy.carr@burtonpartners.nz

Counsel

Dr R A MAKGILL
BARRISTER

PO Box 77-037, Mt Albert, Auckland 1350
P 09 815 6750 E robert@robertmakgill.com

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Ian David Clark. I provided evidence in chief (**EiC**), dated 17 February 2021, and evidence in reply (EiR), dated 3 May 2021, on transport matters related to Rangitahi Ltd's submission on the Proposed Waikato District Plan (**pWDP**).
2. I outlined my qualifications, experience and commitment to comply with the Environment Court Expert Witness Code of Conduct in my EiC.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

3. I summarise my EiC as follows:
 - (a) Rangitahi has made significant investment in the transport network serving the development of the Rangitahi Peninsula. The external works required are already in place, acknowledging that the spine road within the site is still being constructed;
 - (b) The single transport project that was identified for Raglan in the Council's Long Term Plan (2018-28) related to the Wainui Road bridge. My EiC noted that the primary driver was the structural condition of the bridge, with traffic capacity at peak times being a secondary driver. The Long Term Plan (2018-28) indicated that a decision should be included within the 2021 Long Term Plan, with design and construction expected to take place between 2023-26;
 - (c) My assessment of the operation of the current single lane bridge indicates that an increase in capacity will be required soon after 2030 (although this assumes that no further land is rezoned through the pWDP and it clearly depends on the rate of development);
 - (d) Further residential development in Raglan West is proposed, and the Waikato 2070 document puts forward a number of potential new transport links;
 - (e) I consider that the existing road access through the Rangitahi Peninsula is suitable for access to the proposed FUZ in Rangitahi South and would assist rather than preclude opportunities for the future road links to the west and east that are identified conceptually

in Waikato 2070;

- (f) I support Rangitahi's submissions to increase the number of dwellings in the Rangitahi Structure Plan area, from a transport perspective, as this would make use of the roading investment already made, without causing additional/new bottlenecks. Also, it would support the policy in the pWDP that seeks to focus urban growth in existing urban communities that have capacity for expansion, including Raglan.

4. I summarise my evidence in reply as follows:

- (a) My EiR responded to the evidence of Ms Baloyi for the Koning Family Trust and the report of Mr Fourie which was provided as Appendix 3 to the s.42A report. It also provided an update on the timing of the Wainui Bridge project, based on the most recent consultation draft version of the Long Term Plan for 2021 to 2031. The bridge is now identified to be upgraded between 2031-35;
- (b) My EiR set out the main differences in traffic modelling methodology and assumptions between Ms Baloyi and I. These included the use of different traffic data and different land use assumptions, leading to different traffic forecasts, and significant differences in the traffic modelling approach.
- (c) In my EiR I maintained my original position, that an increase in the capacity of the current single lane on the Wainui Bridge will be required soon after 2030, even without rezoning any additional land. The addition of signal controls to the one lane bridge would, in my view, be likely to increase delays and would be ineffective as mitigation.
- (d) Taking account of the update in the recent draft LTP's timeline for upgrading the bridge, I consider that FUZ is the most appropriate zoning for Rangitahi South and Raglan West.

REPLY TO S.42A REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

5. I comment on the s.42A Rebuttal Evidence (dated 10 May 2021) as follows:

- (a) Ms Buckingham no longer considers two-laning of the bridge to be a necessary requirement for rezoning the Koning land because I (and

Ms Baloyi) have found that two-lanes would not be required until at least 2030¹. This is a misinterpretation of my EiR which concludes that an increase in capacity of the bridge will be required soon after 2030 without rezoning any additional land.

- (b) I do not support Ms Baloyi's assessment that signal controls will assist with bridge capacity, and defer the need to upgrade to two-lanes by 2030 (or earlier if further land is rezoned through the pWDP).

Dated this 21st day of May 2021

Ian David Clark

¹ Section.42A Rebuttal Evidence, Table 1, paragraph 11.