

# Before an Independent Hearings Panel at Waimakariri District Council

---

*under:* the Resource Management Act 1991  
*in the matter* the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan  
*of:*

Summary Statement – Shane Isaac Binder  
Waimakariri District Council

On behalf of Waimakariri District Council

Summary Statement on Transport Relating to Hearing Stream 12D – Ōhoka RIDL

---

Dated: 1 July 2024

File Note: DDS-14-08

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. The purpose of this summary statement is to set out the key points from my evidence in relation to the Applicant's Evidence on the Proposed District Plan, Hearing Stream 12D.
2. My full name is Shane Isaac Binder, and I am the Senior Transportation Engineer for the Waimakariri District Council. My qualifications and experience are set out in full in my evidence-in-chief.
3. My summary statement has predominantly been based on assessing the information presented in the Applicant's Evidence to the Proposed District Plan, Hearing Stream 12D. I have reviewed the evidence presented for general planning, general transport, public transport, and greenhouse gas emissions by Mr. Walsh, Mr. Fuller, Mr. Milner, and Mr. Farrelly.
4. I have also received a copy of the supplementary evidence of Mr. Fuller, Mr. Milner, and Mr. Farrelly in preparing my summary statement. However, I have not responded to that as part of this summary, in accordance with the instructions I have received.

## **PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

5. I acknowledge that the recently published WDC Integrated Transport Strategy seeks to "explore opportunities and trial other innovative public transport schemes such as mobility as a service, on-demand public transport and vanpools integrated with Environment Canterbury services...[with] a focus on our rural communities such as Oxford or Cust."
6. I consider providing public transport services to existing areas of higher-density residential neighbourhoods in our major towns that lack public transport service to be of higher benefit and potentially lower cost than providing a new service to a new development relatively isolated from existing services.
7. I understand the submitter is proposing funding and operating a new service to Ōhoka for a ten-year period. I note that I am unable to speak to any concerns or approval from Environment Canterbury, as the operator of any potential future public transport service (once it is no longer provided by the submitter). However, I consider that this service is unlikely to be financially viable due to low demand (both existing and anticipated), and unattractive routing and transfers.

## **ASSESSMENT AND PROVISION OF TRANSPORT NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS**

8. I remain concerned around the need to consider the transport network beyond the immediate surrounding roads due to the substantially longer vehicle-based trips that the proposed development will likely require for most daily needs (based on the relative isolation and lack of a non-motorised network).
9. I note the surrounding roading network used to access "day-to-day" activities has almost no safe separated facilities for walking or cycling and no funding has been proposed or secured for any of the connections shown in the approved Walking & Cycling Network Plan in this area.
10. Multiple independent metrics have identified elevated traffic safety risks on the two primary corridors (Tram Road and Mill Road) used to facilitate the bulk of the anticipated vehicular trips. I also note that in the PC31 joint witness statement in relation to transport infrastructure, the following intersections were uniformly considered to require mitigations:

- Tram Road / Bradleys Road
  - Tram Road / Whites Road
  - Mill Road / Ōhoka Road
  - Flaxton Road / Threlkelds Road
11. I consider that the assumptions that underlie the PC31 joint witness statement remain unchanged, and the conclusions reached are still valid.
12. While Council routinely considers traffic operations across the roading network, intersection improvements in the Long-Term Plan are primarily there due to traffic safety issues; addressing traffic operation issues like side road delay is only a secondary benefit. As such, I do not agree with Mr Walsh's or Mr Fuller's new conclusions that the responsibility for these intersection improvements has shifted from the developer to Council, as concluded previously in PC31. I also understand that while new traffic generated by the proposed development could result in a "strong incentive" for Council to fund these improvements, the quantity of safety improvements across the District left out of the Long-Term Plan is already substantial. In other words, Council is already struggling to fund known safety deficiencies from available funding without adding new ones.
13. I acknowledge that existing transport infrastructure may already have safety deficiencies; however, I consider that there needs to be reasonable confidence the infrastructure improvements will be funded for delivery and maintenance in the future in order to meet a threshold of "well-served."
14. I consider it inappropriate to route a substantial amount of new traffic from the proposed development along existing corridors and through intersections that are likely to experience higher road safety risk without such improvements. I also note that Waka Kotahi approval and funding would be required for any improvements at the Tram Road / SH1 motorway overbridge / interchange, and I am unaware of any evidence from the submitter that this has been consulted upon or provided.

### **GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSIONS AND VEHICLE-KILOMETRES TRAVELLED (VKT)**

15. I note there is presently a very high reliance on private vehicles in the area in spite of walking and cycling access to an existing commercial development (Mandeville Village) akin to that proposed in this application. I thus continue to consider it unlikely that new residents of the proposed development who chose to walk, cycle, or use public transport will have a substantive impact on "day-to-day" GHG emissions and VKT resulting from the development being constructed at Ōhoka as proposed in the submissions.
16. I consider it likely that the proposed land use would create a substantial increase in both GHG emissions and VKT due to the new development. As such I continue to consider it necessary to consider the magnitude of GHG emissions created by the development before crediting any reductions to these new emissions.