

**BEFORE THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT
COUNCIL HEARINGS PANEL**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management
Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a submission by Survus
(submission 250)

REBUTTAL STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ANDREW DAVID CARR

Date 2 July 2024

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Andrew (**Andy**) David Carr. My qualifications and experience remain as set out in my Evidence in Chief.
2. I confirm that have prepared this evidence in accordance with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in Part 9 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. The issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise except where I state that I am relying on the evidence or advice of another person. The data, information, facts and assumptions I have considered in forming my opinions are set out in the part of the evidence in which I express my opinions. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I have expressed.
3. I have been asked to review and provide expert opinion on the transportation-related aspects of the s 42A report prepared by Mr Mark Buckley, Principal Policy Planner at Waimakariri District Council, relating to the Submitter's site at 25 Ashley Gorge Road.
4. Mr Buckley in turn relies on the Statement of Evidence of Mr Mark Gregory, Council's consultant transport planner. Consequently I firstly address Mr Gregory's comments as they inform Mr Buckley's views.

RESPONSE TO MR GREGORY

5. At the outset I note that there is a reasonable degree of agreement between myself and Mr Gregory. He sets out that the scale of trip generation will not give rise to efficiency issues (his paragraph 21) and ultimately is able to conclude that he supports the submission (his paragraph 28). I concur.
6. He does however raise a number of issues.
7. He is of the view that there would be merit in reviewing the speed limits on the frontage roads when subdivision consents are sought. In my experience this is not uncommon, although I also agree with My Gregory that this is ultimately the responsibility of the Council to address. However such a future review of speed limits does not preclude the rezoning of the site at this stage. I note that the ODP narrative already reflects this and

sets out that “*future consideration needs to be given to reducing the posted speed limits on the existing local roads as development proceeds*”.

8. He notes that the Outline Development Plan (ODP) is “*insular*” with little penetration from the south and sets out that it is “*predominately accessible by High Street and Bay Road*”. In respect of the latter, High Street and Bay Road form the eastern and western site frontages. Accordingly I would expect that they both play a role in accommodating site access. Towards the north is rural land and I would not expect any connectivity in this direction.
9. Towards the south of the site is a row of properties and to the south of that, Queen Street. This is a narrow road subject to a 30km/h speed limit, and is not suited in my view to a large increase in traffic. That said, the ODP shows a walking and cycling route is proposed to be provided between the site and Queen Street. This would therefore create a route for pedestrians and cyclists on a slow-speed, lightly-trafficked road that I consider is appropriate for the needs of these types of road users.
10. I therefore do not agree with Mr Gregory that a roading connection is needed to/from the south of the site, but rather, in my view a walking and cycling route in this direction is an appropriate design response.
11. Mr Gregory also seeks a “*continuous connection through the site*”. I am unsure as to his rationale for this comment because the ODP already clearly shows such an east-west through route is provided between High Street and Bay Road. Due to the absence of development to the north and the unsuitability of Queen Street for large traffic volumes, I would not expect any north-south through route to be provided.
12. Mr Gregory mentions the ability to walk between the site and Oxford town centre and Oxford Area School. I do not consider that the ODP precludes this, although as with any development, there needs to be recognition that existing development patterns influence the ability to develop future subdivisions. Taking into account that the transportation networks and land use patterns within the existing areas of Oxford are already constructed, I consider that the ODP provides appropriate transport network connectivity and integration.
13. That said, I agree with Mr Gregory that it is important to support the creation of walking and cycling links towards the south. The narrative that accompanies the ODP already mentions that “*the local roads connecting to Oxford provide direct links for pedestrian*

and cyclist access to the amenities and facilities of Oxford". I consider that this could be strengthened as Mr Gregory indicates, to specifically also add that "*Wide legal road reserves of High Street and Bay Road create the opportunity for further enhancement of walking and cycling routes, especially between the site and the town centre and Oxford Area School*". In my view this ensures that these non-car linkages will be considered at the time that subdivision consents are sought. I am aware that this additional wording is now proposed to be included within the narrative.

14. In paragraph 27, Mr Gregory refers to the "*concept ODP*" indicating that this has "*substantial reliance*" on accessways. I am assuming that he is referring to the concept subdivision plan that was provided as part of the submitter's evidence. I understand however that this was only provided to the Council as an indication of one possible way in which the site could be developed, and as a means of ensuring that all technical considerations for Three Waters were addressed.
15. Because the application is not for subdivision, I have not carried out a full review of this potential subdivision layout against the District Plan provisions within the Transportation Assessment or my Evidence in Chief. Rather, my review has been carried out against the proposed ODP, as I make clear in paragraph 8.1.1 of the Transportation Assessment.
16. Ultimately when acknowledging that the submission can be accepted, Mr Gregory sets out three reservations. The first of these is that he seeks an alternative ODP is developed which makes "*greater provision for connections*". I consider that the level of transport connectivity shown is appropriate, with roading connections to the two roads to the east and west, and a walking/cycling route to the south. Due to the limited width of Queen Street, I do not consider that a roading connection to the south would be appropriate. However in my view it would be appropriate to specifically highlight non-car connectivity between the site and the town centre and the school, which can be (and is now proposed to be) done through the ODP narrative.
17. Secondly, Mr Gregory seeks that the ODP "*allows future connections to the town*". Taking into account that there is already existing development present to the south, I do not consider that in practice this could be done to any greater extent than presently proposed. However in my view the addition to the ODP narrative noted above will positively contribute to this.

18. Thirdly, Mr Gregory seeks that the ODP “*demonstrates internal network connectivity*”. However the ODP already shows one east-west through route for vehicles, and there is also a second east-west through route which can be used by those walking and cycling. In my view, the ODP already demonstrates internal connectivity, at a level appropriate for an ODP.

RESPONSE TO MR BUCKLEY

19. The traffic matters are raised in Mr Buckley’s paragraph 426. I have addressed the matters pertaining to provision for connectivity / future connections to the town and internal network connectivity above and therefore do not address them further here.
20. I note though that Mr Buckley references “*two right of ways that have six properties that connect off them*”. This comment appears to relate to the indicative subdivision plan that was provided, since the ODP does not include this level of detail. As I set out above, I understand that this indicative subdivision plan does not have a formal status but was only provided to demonstrate to the Council how subdivision *might* occur in future and to ensure robust technical analyses.
21. As such, I do not consider that the higher-level rezoning request sought through the submission is the appropriate forum in which to provide a detailed technical assessment (or rebuttal) of the number of lots that can be served by an access. This is why no such detailed assessment was included in the Transportation Assessment or my Evidence in Chief. In my experience, this is the type of matter that is appropriately dealt with at the time that subdivision consents are sought. I note though that the detail of this particular comment appears to have originated with Mr Buckley rather than Mr Gregory - Mr Gregory only discusses accessways in general terms (his paragraphs 16 to 19) and does not mention specific concerns with accessways at this particular site nor with a threshold of six properties.
22. For completeness, I have reviewed the answers provided by Mr Buckley to the Hearing Panel’s questions. However none of his responses affect traffic and transportation matters relating to this site.

CONCLUSIONS

23. Having read the reports of Mr Buckley and Mr Gregory, I have recommended one change to the ODP narrative, to add that "*Wide legal road reserves of High Street and Bay Road create the opportunity for further enhancement of walking and cycling routes, especially between the site and the town centre and Oxford Area School*". This will ensure that non-car linkages are addressed in detail at the time that subdivision consents are sought. I am aware that this additional text is now proposed by the submitter.

24. Overall, I remain able to support the submission from a transportation perspective, and consider that there are no traffic and transportation reasons why the zoning sought is inappropriate in this location.

Andy Carr

2 July 2024