

BEFORE THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW HEARINGS PANEL

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF the hearing of submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

AND

hearing of submissions and further submissions on Variations 1 and 2 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

Hearing Stream 12E: Rezoning Requests

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LISA MARIE WILLIAMS
(TRANSPORT)
FOR RICHARD AND GEOFF SPARK
(PDP SUBMITTER 183 / VARIATION 1 SUBMITTER 61)**

Dated 2 August 2024

Aston Consultants Limited
Resource Management and Planning
PO Box 1435
Christchurch

Attention: Fiona Aston
Phone: 0275 332213
Email: fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz

Counsel instructed:
David Caldwell, Barrister
Bridgeside Chambers
PO Box 3180
Christchurch

Phone: 021 221 4113
Email: dcc@bridgeside.co.nz

Introduction

1. My name is Lisa Marie Williams.
2. My area of expertise, experience, and qualifications are set out in my First Statement of Evidence dated 4 March 2024 for this hearing stream.
3. The purpose of this supplementary evidence is to respond to matters raised in the Officer's Report dated 22 July 2024 relevant to my evidence.

Code of Conduct

4. I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023) and I agree to comply with it. Except where I state that I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

Response to Officer's Report

5. In my evidence below I have focussed on the key matters raised in the evidence of the officers' report. This includes three key aspects raised by Mr Gregory:
 - (a) The small commercial zone indicated on the ODP including:
 - (i) the nature of / range of uses anticipated,
 - (ii) whether this should be more centrally located for residents to access via walking and cycling, and
 - (iii) access to be via a local road rather than directly from the Rangiora Eastern Link (REL) road.
 - (b) Block B Road intersections with the REL road are not supported.
 - (c) Block C requires additional analysis required before a rezoning is supported.
6. In addition to the points raised by Mr Gregory the following matters were raised by Mr Wilson and Mr Jolly which also relate to transport:
 - (a) Block A - The second east-west road connection over the Northbrook Stream should be retained.

- (b) Block B – consideration of the alignment of the ODP roads and connectivity to the west and south.
 - (c) Use of local roads rather than the REL road for property access in Block A.
7. In respect of Block C, Mr Wilson has recommended¹ an overlay of potential CMUZ/GIZ is added over Block C. There is general agreement that this approach is appropriate. From a transport perspective, this would allow the more detailed considerations regarding the range of land uses and road connections to be investigated, once additional information is available regarding the changes anticipated to the road network near the site. Given there is agreement on this approach, no further discussion on this matter is provided.
8. The other matters listed above are discussed and responded to in the following sections.

Commercial Zone

9. In summary, Mr Gregroy's evidence² suggests that the commercial zone could cater for a wider range of local shops and services than had been assessed, should be located more centrally for walking and cycling access from Blocks A and B, and that it should be accessed via local roads rather than directly from the REL road.
10. The small commercial zone indicated in Block A is anticipated to provide for a specific landuse (primarily a café). I am advised by the submitter that this location has been selected to reflect the location, including:
- (a) Overlooking the Northbrook Stream, Council Park, and with views to Mt Grey in the distance,
 - (b) To service pedestrian and cycle traffic close to the Northbrook Wetlands (existing) and Northbrook Trail (future), and
 - (c) Proximity for potential to provide catering to the Northbrook Museum and function centre.
11. Noting the above the preference is to maintain this commercial zone in the location proposed and for the specific use anticipated. This can be serviced off a local road;

¹ Paragraphs 648 and 664 of Mr Wilson's S.42A Report for Hearing Stream 12E.

² Paragraphs 24-32 of Mr Gregroy's evidence attached to the S.42A Report for Hearing Stream 12E.

however, not all local roads are not shown on the ODP. Therefore, this direction has been included in the amended narrative³.

12. I do agree that a commercial centre, which is more central to Blocks A and B, could provide local shops and services to meet some of the day to day needs of future residents within walking and cycling distance. To try and accommodate Mr Wilson's amendments⁴, the submitters preference is that a commercial node for this purpose be provided in addition to the one proposed for the café. The submitters' preferred location is the north-east corner of Block B. This option has been shown on the amended ODP and narrative⁵.
13. I can support this location on the basis of it providing pedestrian / cycle access to Boys Road and the REL road, with vehicular access via local roads. The specific types of activity and size would be determined at subdivision and land use consent stage; however, traffic volumes would be anticipated to be modest, noting that this would be anticipated to primarily cater for local services with a higher proportion of walking and cycling trips. Noting this, I am confident that such a commercial node could be accommodated in Block B to meet the intent of the changes suggested by Mr Gregory and Mr Wilson.

Block B Road intersections with the REL road

14. In summary Mr Gregory considers the following in respect of road intersections with the REL road, for Block B:
 - (a) Does not support a roundabout, but could accept alternative intersection layouts with the REL road where they do not impact on the REL road flow⁶,
 - (b) A preference for Block B road intersections to Boys Road and not to the REL road.
15. I do not support removal of the road intersections with the REL road for the following reasons:
 - (a) The Councils notified South-East Rangiora ODP narrative outlined that the REL is intended to provide the primary north and south road connection for the ODP⁷. This suggests that integrating the REL into the future residential road network is appropriate.

³ Attached to Mr Thomson's supplementary evidence.

⁴ In paragraph 632 of Mr Wilson's S.42A Report for Hearing Stream 12E.

⁵ Attached to Mr Thomson's supplementary evidence.

⁶ Refer to paragraph 42 of Mr Gregory's evidence.

⁷ Notified District Plan, Appendix DEV-SER-APP1 - South East Rangiora Outline Development Plan.

- (b) The objectives⁸ stated in the designation documents for the REL include that is “*intended to provide an alternative route into or around Rangiora; reduce congestion on the main north-to-south strategic route through Rangiora, ... and **service expected growth in the east of the township***” [emphasis added]. This suggests that provision for traffic associated with residential growth is part of its intended function.
 - (c) Network management and efficiency on the REL road should be balanced against wider transport objectives, rather than given sole priority.
 - (d) Appropriately designed intersections directly with the REL road would offer the most efficient travel option for destinations to the north and south. For example, alternative routes via Boys Road could add up to 0.8km of additional travel distance for some trips from the southern parts of the ODP. This should be avoided where more direct routes can be safely and efficiently accommodated.
 - (e) Road connections from the ODP to the REL road provide better integration with the ODP road network. This includes links towards the east, in the event of residential growth east of the REL road, in the longer term.
16. Noting the above, I consider that it is more appropriate to focus on ensuring that appropriate intersection designs are achieved to balance efficiency of the REL road with other transport outcomes.
17. The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) attached to my statement of evidence outlined that a basic ‘T’ intersection design could result in significant delays for the right turn movement from the ODP to the REL road; however, all other movements operated at good levels of service without impacting the through traffic function of the REL road. There is no reason to constrain these movements, and it is my opinion that as a minimum, intersections allowing these turning movements should be provided for, recognising the benefits described above.
18. There are a variety of right turn treatments that could be applied to cater for these movements (not just roundabouts), whilst also maintaining priority to traffic on the REL road. Mr Gregory’s evidence suggests that such an outcome could be acceptable.

⁸ Notice of Requirement, Waimakariri District Council, Rangiora East Road Connection, – Pursuant To Section 168 Of The Resource Management Act 1991.

19. The REL designation is more than 40m wide, and there are no space constraints within the development area that would limit the ability to achieve any intersection design considered appropriate.
20. Whilst there is agreement that the right turn movement onto the REL road would require further design consideration, it is my opinion that this is best undertaken at design stage, where more detail regarding the road widths, speed limits, and safety can be considered.
21. For the avoidance of doubt, if the right turn movement was not able to be accommodated at design stage, I am confident that the future residential traffic can still be accommodated within the road network. This scenario was considered in the ITA attached to my evidence⁹. This illustrated¹⁰ that if those right turn movements were re-directed to Boys Road, the Boys Road intersections continued to operate at good levels of service for all movements.
22. Noting the obvious benefits for maintaining road intersections from Block B to the REL road, where it can be provided safely and efficiently, I consider it is appropriate for these road intersections to remain on the ODP. To direct considerations regarding intersection design at subdivision stage, the ODP narrative has been amended to further emphasis the need for these road intersections to prioritise the through traffic functions of the REL road.

Block A Second Northbrook Road Bridge

23. Mr Wilson's report recommended that a secondary east-west connection from the REL over the Northbrook, as shown on the notified ODP, be retained. There are several reasons for not including this in the proposed ODP:
 - (a) Initial advice from other disciplines suggest that a second road bridge would impact the river ecology and that there may be construction challenges affecting the location.
 - (b) A pedestrian/cycle bridge is proposed to maintain local movements. This can be provided within a reserve that provides space for a road bridge if it can be achieved at a later date.
 - (c) This connection is not considered necessary to service the ODP, noting that:

⁹ Refer to paragraphs 89-94 of the ITA attached to my statement of evidence.

¹⁰ Appendix 4 of the ITA attached to my statement of evidence.

- (i) The REL road has been realigned further east than the notified location and closer to the other north-south primary road east of the Northbrook, reducing the size of the residential area serviced and travel distance between these two routes.
 - (ii) Boys Road and Northbrook Road provide good east-west connections between the REL road and the other North-South Primary Roads. There is also a secondary east-west link just north of the Northbrook.
 - (iii) There is ample space for local roads to service the residential properties either side of the Northbrook without this connection.
24. Overall, noting the reasons above, I consider there is little loss in terms of connectivity for vehicle trips if this road bridge is not provided. There is no loss of connectivity for pedestrian and cycle trips. The ODP would not preclude a road bridge in this location at a later date however given the uncertainty regarding whether a second road bridge is the best outcome, my recommendation is that it is not included on the ODP.

Block B – alignment of roads, and connectivity to the west and south

25. Mr Jolly had indicated a preference for a cross-roads intersection between the secondary roads for Block A and B, rather than two separate 'T' intersections. Whilst this could be accommodated, I agree with Mr Wilson¹¹ that 'T' intersections are preferable, and as such, this is not discussed further. I note there is already a direct link for pedestrians and cyclists due to the location of the green link in Block B.
26. There is general agreement that it is desirable for Block B to have future connections to the west and south; however, as set out by Mr Wilson¹², there are challenges in achieving these connections. The ODP design does however seek to provide flexibility to achieve these connections in the future, if they become possible. For example, the alignment of the ODP road alongside the SMA flow path leaves open the ability to connect to the south in the longer term. This would allow some flexibility over the location, which is considered a preferable option to indicating a fixed road connection to the south on the ODP.
27. The ODP framework does also enable a local road or pedestrian / cycle connection to be extended across the railway line near Gefkins Road / Denchs Road and Hegan Reserve, should agreement between Council and KiwiRail enable that in the future.

¹¹ Paragraph 616 of Mr Wilson's S.42A Report for Hearing Stream 12E.

¹² Paragraph 640 of Mr Wilson's S.42A Report for Hearing Stream 12E.

28. Given the uncertainty regarding this potential connection, it has not been indicated as a road connection on the ODP. However, some discussion has been added to the narrative to signal the potential for further consideration of these connections.
29. Noting the above, I consider the ODP transport framework provides for the potential to connect to the south and west to the extent that it is reasonable to at this time.

Local Roads and Property Access

30. The ODP indicates key road connections but does not show all local roads. The roads on the ODP provide the framework from which other local roads for property access are determined at subdivision stage. The location and design of those roads, including whether they are through roads, crescents or short cul de sacs, is best considered at subdivision stage where there is a greater level of detail available for consideration, such as intersection spacings.
31. In respect of Block A, Mr Gregory suggests the Commercial Centre /café should take access from a local road which is agreed, as discussed above. Mr Wilson, however, seems to go further, suggesting that there be no property access with the REL road for Block A. This does not align with our understanding of the design intent for Block A, noting:
 - (a) This section will likely be a 50km/h speed environment, and the width will likely be constrained by the future Northbrook bridge. In addition, cycle lanes and kerb side parking are anticipated based on the indicative cross sections for the designation¹³.
 - (b) This section services the residential zone located on both sides of the REL road and as outlined above,¹⁴ is intended to be a primary road for the ODP. This suggests it should be integrated with the development of the residential subdivision including appropriate transport environments for integration of pedestrians and cyclists¹⁵ and property access.
 - (c) The District Plan transport rules will already include appropriate property access controls to ensure this can be managed safely, based on the future classification of the road. For example, on-site manoeuvring and separation distances from intersections.

¹³ Refer to the cross sections in Appendix C to the Council's Designation.

¹⁴ Paragraph 15 above.

¹⁵ Avoiding property access entirely could lead to poor urban design outcomes, as discussed in the urban design evidence of Nicole Lauenstein.

32. Noting the above, I do not agree that there is a need to avoid residential property access with the REL road within Block A. Whilst the subdivision design could service those dwellings off other roads, I consider it un-necessary.

Conclusion

33. Mr Wilson has recommended an overlay of potential CMUZ/GIZ is applied for Block C. There is general agreement that this approach is appropriate.
34. In respect of Block A and B, the ODP layout and narrative have been amended in response to the matters raised in the S.42A report and Council evidence, as described above. In summary these include:
- Retention of the commercial centre, and narrative regarding the use for a café and vehicle access via local roads.
 - An option to accommodate a commercial node for a wider range of local shops / service, more central to the ODP, in the north-east corner of Block B with vehicle access via local roads within Block B.
 - The Block B road alignment is left open for potential future connections to the west and south, in the event that these can be achieved in the longer term / subject to agreement / development by third parties.
 - Direction in the narrative regarding priority for traffic on the REL road when considering the design of the two Block B road intersections. Direction to avoid any direct property access or additional local road intersections to the REL road, within Block B.
35. I consider the above changes appropriate from a transport perspective and, that the residential zones proposed for Blocks A and B can be integrated into the transport network in a safe, efficient, and appropriate manner which provides for the travel needs of the future residents.

Lisa Williams

2 August 2024