

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 TATA VALLEY LIMITED
(TRANSPORT)**

12 May 2021

BUDDLE FINDLAY

Barristers and Solicitors
Auckland

Solicitor Acting: **Vanessa Evitt / Mathew Gribben**
Email: vanessa.evitt@buddlefindlay.com / 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.
- 1.2 I have provided statements of primary and rebuttal transport evidence in relation to proposed rezoning sought TaTa Valley Limited (**TVL**)¹ of land at 242 Bluff Road and 35 Trig Road, Pokeno (**Site**).

Transport and traffic effects of the proposed rezoning

- 1.3 My primary evidence assessed the transport and traffic effects of the proposed rezoning sought by TVL, along with its integration from a transport perspective with Pokeno.
- 1.4 The 242 Bluff Road property currently connects to Potter Road to the northwest. The 35 Trig Road property currently connects to Trig Road to the west and Potter Road to the north. These existing connections are not intended to be modified as part of the proposal (ie still to be used as farming access).
- 1.5 It is proposed to provide a new main accessway to the Site through land owned by associated companies to TVL which connects to Yashili Drive in Pokeno.
- 1.6 Based on the modelling assessment detailed within my primary evidence:
- (a) The proposed principal access can operate safely and efficiently (including the two one-lane sections).
 - (b) No additional mitigation is required within the local network to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed rezoning.
 - (c) No discernible changes to the operation of the key local intersections is experienced as a result of the proposal and the adjoining Havelock proposal (addressed in a separate brief of evidence for Havelock Village Limited).
 - (d) The local transport network can operate safely and efficiently.
- 1.7 The construction of the new proposed principal access via Yashili Drive is important to ensure safe and efficient access to the Site and support rules in the TaTa Valley Resort Zone (**TVRZ**) to achieve this outcome.

¹ Submitter 574 and further submitter 1340.

- 1.8 There are likely upgrades required for intersections / roads in the wider Pokeno area to serve the increased traffic from all 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. 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). On that basis I consider there does not need to be any specific staging or triggers in the TVRZ related to those wider cumulative impacts or upgrades.
- 1.9 The Resort Zone enables events (amongst other things) and I consider any events onsite over 500 person capacity should require detailed assessment of peak traffic movements and how these will be managed on-site.

Response to submitter issues

- 1.10 In my rebuttal evidence, I responded to the evidence filed by:
- (a) Todd Langwell for Hynds Pipe Systems Limited regarding traffic distribution in the local area; and
 - (b) Michael Wood (Planning) for Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. As discussed in my rebuttal evidence, Mr Wood for Waka Kotahi did not raise any further issues, did not oppose the submissions and now has a neutral position on the rezoning.

Traffic distribution in the local area

- 1.11 Mr Langwell (on behalf of Hynds Pipe Systems Limited) had raised an issue regarding traffic distribution in the local area. I consider the Hitchen Road / McDonald Road route distribution assumptions I have used to be appropriate. Regardless, the key point is there are two routes to/from the site to Pokeno (and motorway ramps) and thus if one becomes more congested the other will be used more.
- 1.12 There have been issues raised by Mr Langwell relating to pedestrians, cyclists, rail crossing and heavy vehicles. In my opinion, these are issues that are not significant or can be addressed by the revised provisions.

Section 42A report

1.13 In my rebuttal evidence, I also commented on transport related matters arising from the s42A report. I generally agree with the s42A report including the revised provisions outline by Mr Scrafton in response to the s42A report.

Summary

1.14 Based on the modelling and assessment outlined in my evidence, I remain of the view that the full extent of development enabled by the rezoning proposal can be appropriately supported by the proposed primary access arrangements (as I have detailed above) and will maintain appropriate levels of safety and efficiency on the local surrounding road network.

1.15 Accordingly, I conclude that there is no traffic engineering or transportation planning reason to preclude acceptance of the rezoning proposal.

Leo Hills

12 May 2021