

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of an application to **HAMILTON
CITY COUNCIL** for private plan
change 7 to the operative
Hamilton City District Plan by
**GREEN SEED CONSULTANTS
LIMITED**

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LEO DONALD HILLS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Leo Donald Hills. I am a traffic engineer and director of Commute Transportation Limited (**Commute**).

Qualifications and experience

1.2 I hold a Master of Civil Engineering (2000) and a Bachelor of Engineering with Honors (1996), both from the University of Auckland. I am a Chartered Professional Engineer (CPEng) and a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand (CMEngNZ).

1.3 I have over 23 years' experience as a specialist traffic and transportation engineer. During that time, I have been engaged by local authorities and private companies/individuals to advise on traffic and development issues covering safety, management and planning matters of many kinds.

Expert Witness Code of Conduct

1.4 I have been provided with a copy of the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court's 2014 Practice Note. I have read and agree to comply with that Code. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying upon the specified evidence of another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

2. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

2.1 I was engaged by GSCL to undertake an Integrated Transport Assessment ("ITA") of PC7 to the Hamilton City District Plan ("District Plan"), which is located at the northwestern edge of Hamilton. The Plan Change area is currently zoned 'Future Urban' under the District Plan.

- 2.2 Based on the modelling and assessment outlined in the ITAs and through expert conferencing, I consider that the full extent of development enabled by PC7 can be appropriately supported by the existing road network and upgrades to the existing transport network (as I detail below), to maintain appropriate levels of safety and efficiency on the surrounding transport network.
- 2.3 A number of transport upgrades will be required from the outset (i.e. prior to occupation of any dwellings in the Plan Change area) to support the residential development proposed by PC7. These include:
- (a) Construction of the roundabout at the intersection of SH39 and the new collector road within PC7 (**Collector Road 1**);
 - (b) Construction of road frontage upgrades to Exelby Road (eastern side only) and Burbush Road (both sides), when the first connections are made to these roads; and
 - (c) Walking and cycling connections from the PC7 development to the existing walking / cycling network.
- 2.4 Other upgrades are required (in particular to the Burbush Road – Exelby Road link and Exelby Road / Burbush Road intersection); however, these are not in my opinion required until at least 500 dwellings are established within the Plan Change area or until an access is provided from PC7 to Burbush Road.
- 2.5 In my opinion, the revisions to the PC7 provisions (as outlined above and attached to the reply evidence of Mr Tollemache and Ms Fraser-Smith) appropriately address and respond to all traffic and transportation matters raised by submitters, including landowners and local residents. These provisions also include appropriate triggers to ensure that all the required transport upgrades I have identified are implemented in a timely manner.
- 2.6 I note that there will be cumulative traffic effects on the roading network surrounding PC7 from both that development and others planned in the local and wider area. Thus, I do not consider that all of the required transport upgrades should be the sole responsibility of PC7 (e.g. upgrading Exelby Road / Rotokauri Road intersection). In this regard, I also note that the Council has a range of tools it can use to fund and implement those upgrades in an equitable manner, including development contributions and targeted rates.
- 2.7 As reflected in the various Transport JWS, the only remaining matters of disagreement between myself and Mr Black (as contributor to the section 42A report for HCC) as at the close of the transport conferencing on 14 October 2021 were as follows:

- (a) The need to upgrade the Rotokauri Road / Exelby Road intersection, and Exelby Road (north of Burbush Road), as a result of PC7;
 - (b) The form of the Exelby Road / Burbush Road intersection upgrade; and
 - (c) The final upgrade of the Exelby Road (south) / Burbush Road. In the JWS Mr Black agrees with the interim upgrade; however, expresses concern regarding the final upgrade and requested that I provided additional commentary.
- 2.8 In my view, for the reasons I have set out in my EIC and reply evidence, the traffic generated by PC7 does not result in the requirement to upgrade the Rotokauri Road / Exelby Road intersection, and Exelby Road (north of Burbush Road).
- 2.9 While there is agreement between myself and Mr Black regarding the trigger for upgrading of the Exelby Road / Burbush Road intersection, at the time of preparing the Transport JWS dated 14 October 2021, they previously considered this upgrade should be a roundabout. Mr Sharman has now advised (by email dated 15 October 2021, sent to all participants in the transport conferencing) that Mr Black now agrees this upgrade should be a single priority intersection with right-turn bay only, as I propose. So, this issue is now resolved, as I understand Mr Sharman will confirm when he presents at the hearing.
- 2.10 In terms of the ultimate upgrade of Exelby Road (south) / Burbush Road route I have provided additional commentary / analysis in paragraphs 3.32 – 3.33 of my reply evidence and thus consider the proposed upgrade to be appropriate.
- 2.11 I have no outstanding matters of disagreement with Messrs Wood or Tindall for Waka Kotahi.
- 2.12 A number of matters raised by Ms Perring remain unresolved. However for the reasons I have stated in my reply evidence, I consider Ms Perring’s issues are unfounded or overstated and / or are covered by the proposed provisions. In addition, as referred to in my paragraph 2.9 above, Mr Black and myself are in agreement as to most of the upgrades necessary to address effects on the local network and thus alleviate the concerns raised by Ms Perring.
- 2.13 Overall, I consider that PC7 is acceptable and an appropriate use of the site from a transport planning perspective and that there is no reason from that perspective for the proposed rezoning not to be approved.

Leo Donald Hills
20 October 2021