

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management
Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of the Proposed District Plan
for Waimakariri District

**HEARING STREAM 12C: REZONING REQUESTS (LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL
ZONE)**

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ANTONI FACEY
(TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION)**

ON BEHALF OF

ANDREW CARR (SUBMITTER #158)

5 July 2024

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Antoni Peter Facey.
- 1.2 I have previously provided a Statement of Evidence (dated 13 February 2024) regarding traffic and transportation matters in respect of the Submitter's request for the rezoning of 308 Cones Road and 90 Dixons Road (**the site**). My qualifications and experience remain as set out in that Statement of Evidence.
- 1.3 I have been asked to review and provide comment on the s 42A report of Mr Buckley, which in turn relies upon advice from Council's consultant traffic engineer Mr Gregory. I have also reviewed and commented as appropriate on the answers of Mr Buckley to the Panel's questions.
- 1.4 I confirm I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

2. RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICERS

- 2.1 The Officers' assessment of the site is set out in Section 5.4 of the s 42A report and in paragraphs 29 to 40 of Appendix F, being the Statement of Evidence of Mr Gregory. For completeness, part of Appendix F was authored by Council's Senior Transportation Engineer Mr Binder, but he does not specifically refer to the site.
- 2.2 As a point of clarification, in paragraph 30 Mr Gregory refers to "*Mr Carr's evidence*". As an interested party, Mr Carr is unable to give expert traffic-related evidence in this matter, and I confirm that the evidence on traffic and transportation matters has been provided by myself.
- 2.3 In large part, I agree with Mr Gregory's comments regarding the site location and I note that in his view, Rangiora town centre is within a viable cycling distance of the site. I agree.

- 2.4 In his paragraphs 33 onwards, Mr Gregory discusses the formed width of Cones Road and concludes that *“the existing width is not sufficient to support the proposed rezoning”* and in paragraph 85 concludes that he is only able to support the rezoning request provided that a Rule is included in the District Plan that requires the formation of Cones Road be upgraded. Given his previous comments, I assume that he means that he believes widening is required.
- 2.5 I addressed this matter in paragraphs 5.12 to 5.15 of my Evidence in Chief, where I set out that in my view this was an issue that was not relevant to rezoning per se, because the 20m legal width of Cones Road is ample for any improvement scheme. Rather, in my view it is sufficient at this stage to show that there are no impediments to an improvement scheme, and for the details of such a scheme to be addressed when subdivision consents are sought. I do not consider that there are any such impediments.
- 2.6 This also appears to be the view of Mr Buckley, who does not recommend that any Rule is included in the District Plan to reflect Mr Gregory’s comments. Rather in his answer to the Panel relating to paragraph 301, 308-309, Mr Buckley describes that *“upgrades to the road network are standard matters addressed by subdivision”*. I agree.
- 2.7 I have reviewed the s 42A report of Mr Buckley. I note that in his paragraph 234, he highlights that it is important to ensure that development of 308 Cones Road integrates into any future development of 90 Dixons Road. I agree, and from a transportation perspective I highlight the ODP narrative which states *“the position of the east-west section of the primary route is fixed and lies directly on the common boundary between the two land parcels”* so that *“either landowner is able to form, or partially form, the road, in order to provide access to their parcel without the need to use any land belonging to the other”*. However because it is positioned on the boundary, there is no impediment to either landowner gaining access onto it and thereby facilitate an integrated development.
- 2.8 Mr Buckley also comments in paragraph 237 that the site is in *“close proximity”* to the Park and Ride facility in River Road. I have assessed this and confirm that the Park and Ride is located slightly less than 3km from the southwestern corner of the site. By way of context I note that in his answer to the Panel’s questions (paragraphs 306 and 313) Mr Buckley

described that parts of Rangiora and Kaiapoi are 3.5m from the Park and Ride facility, as is the site at 2 Auckland Street, Ashley.

- 2.9 I am aware that the Submitter, Mr Carr, has spoken with Mr Buckley to clarify a number of matters, and during the conversation Mr Buckley also raised concerns about whether any lots formed by a future subdivision of the site would need to have direct access onto either Cones Road or Dixons Road.
- 2.10 In my view this is a matter for consideration when subdivision consents are sought, because at this stage there are no impediments to gaining access solely via the internal roading layout. Moreover, the operative and proposed District Plans both set out criteria for where vehicle crossings can be located, such as requiring a minimum separation from intersections and other accesses, and suitable sight distances. If direct lot access is proposed at some point in future and the provisions of the relevant District Plan are not met then the Council is able to decline consents for that access.
- 2.11 Overall though, in my view the site is so large that there will certainly be subdivision layouts where vehicle crossings to lots directly onto the frontage roads can be avoided.

3. CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 Ultimately in his report Mr Buckley recommends that the submission is accepted and that the site is rezoned. From a traffic and transportation perspective, I concur and remain able to support the submission for the site to be rezoned as LLRZ.

ANTONI FACEY

Dated 5 July 2024