

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)**

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

ON BEHALF OF

ANDREW CARR (SUBMITTER #158)

12 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) and a supplementary statement of evidence (dated 5 July 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 those statements of evidence.
- 1.3 The purpose of this summary statement of evidence is to provide an overview of my position, as outlined in those two statements of evidence.
- 1.4 This summary statement of evidence has been prepared in accordance with the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court of New Zealand Practice Note 2023.

2. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 The Submitter is a qualified and experienced traffic engineer, and prepared a Transportation Assessment which evaluated the transport-related effects of the submission (Annexure A to my Evidence in Chief). However, to avoid any perceptions of a conflict of interest, I was asked to undertake an independent peer review of the Transportation Assessment (Annexure B to my Evidence in Chief).
- 2.2 Having carried out this peer review, I sought some additional information relating to a sensitivity test for a slightly higher traffic generation rate, and this was duly provided (Annexure C to my Evidence in Chief).
- 2.3 On the basis of my peer review I concluded that:
 - a. The traffic generated by the development of the site can be accommodated on the adjacent roading network without capacity or efficiency issues arising, and even the busiest intersection will operate with low queues and delays. This remains the case, even under the sensitivity test that I requested.

- b. The crash history in the vicinity of the site does not indicate that there would be any adverse safety effects from the proposal.
- c. Although the nature of Large Lot Residential Zones means that they are located outside urban areas, in this case the site is reasonably proximate to Rangiora town centre.
- d. Although the proposal is for a rezoning, I consider it is likely that there will be a high degree of compliance with the transportation requirements of District Plan.
- e. The ODP produced for the sites is an appropriate response to the zoning, from a transportation perspective.

2.4 The Officers' assessment of the site is set out in Section 5.4 of the s 42A report produced by Mr Mark Buckley, and in paragraphs 29 to 40 of Appendix F, being the Statement of Evidence of Mr Gregory. In summary, in large part I agree with their conclusions subject to the matters noted below.

2.5 Mr Gregory considers that the existing width of Cones Road is not sufficient to support the proposed rezoning, and seeks a Rule is included in the District Plan to require the road formation to be upgraded. In my view, such matters are addressed at the time of subdivision (and this appears to also be the position of Mr Buckley). Rather, at this (rezoning) stage I consider that it is only relevant to demonstrate that there are no constraints to a suitable scheme being implemented. In that regard, I consider that the 20m legal width of Cones Road is ample for any improvement scheme.

2.6 Mr Buckley notes that it is important to ensure that development of 308 Cones Road integrates into any future development of 90 Dixons Road, and I agree. From a transportation perspective, I consider that this is achieved through having the primary roading link located on the common boundary between the two land parcels, such that either lot can gain access onto it.

2.7 The Submitter spoke with Mr Buckley, and during the conversation Mr Buckley sought information about whether any lots formed by a future

subdivision of the site would need to have direct access onto Cones Road or Dixons Road. Again, 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. However, any direct access onto either frontage road would need to be located in a position that complied with the provisions of the District Plan (such as separation from intersections and other accesses, and the provision of appropriate sight distances), otherwise the Council is able to decline consents for that access.

3. CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 Based on the technical assessment and my peer review attached to my Evidence in Chief, I consider that there are no traffic and transportation reasons why the site could not be rezoned as LLRZ.
- 3.2 Having reviewed the Officers' Reports, there appears to be just one point of difference between us, as Mr Gregory seeks a specific Rule that requires the formation of Cones Road to be upgraded. I do not consider that such a Rule is necessary as these matters are addressed at the time of subdivision (and this also appears to be the position of Mr Buckley). In this case, there are no constraints to implementing a future improvement scheme, if deemed necessary.
- 3.3 In his report, Mr Buckley recommends that the submission is accepted and that the site is rezoned as LLRZ. From a traffic and transportation perspective, I agree with his recommendation.

ANTONI FACEY

Dated 12 July 2024