

**Before the Hearings Panel
At Porirua City Council**

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of the Proposed Porirua District Plan

Between **Various**

Submitters

And **Porirua City Council**

Respondent

**Statement of evidence of Darrell Statham on behalf of Porirua City Council
(Transportation)**

Date: 31 January 2022

INTRODUCTION:

- 1 My full name is Darrell Statham. I am employed as the Manager, Transportation, City Infrastructure, at Porirua City Council.
- 2 I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of the Porirua City Council (**Council**) in respect of technical related matters arising from the submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Porirua District Plan (**PDP**).
- 3 Specifically, this statement of evidence relates to Submission 172, which is a proposal for part of the Cannons Creek Ridge Special Amenity Landscape (SAL) in the PDP to be re-zoned from General Rural Zone (GRZ) to Future Urban Zone (FUZ).
- 4 My evidence addresses whether the proposed re-zoning could accommodate comprehensive and integrated future development and not adversely affect the local transportation network.
- 5 I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 6 I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Engineering from the University of Canterbury.
- 7 I have worked for Porirua City Council, in my current role, since April 2019. Previously I was a self-employed Traffic and Transportation consultant, specialising in traffic/transport impacts, for 10 years. Prior to that I was the Traffic & Transportation Team Leader for AECOM Wellington.
- 8 I am a Chartered Professional Engineer, Certified RMA Decision Maker, Registered Development Contributions Commissioner and a Member of

the Engineering New Zealand Transportation Group with over 25 years professional experience in the Traffic and Transportation field.

Code of conduct

9 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing my evidence and will continue to comply with it while giving oral evidence before the Environment Court. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. Except where I state 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.

SUMMARY

10 I have been asked by the Council to provide transportation evidence in relation to Submission 172, which is seeking to have land re-zoned from General Rural (GRZ) to Future Urban Zone (FUZ). Part of the land has a Special Amenity Landscape (SAL) overlay in the PDP.

11 The Submission includes a Draft Structure Plan for the area, although its inclusion in the PDP is not sought at this stage.

12 My statement of evidence addresses whether the transportation assessment demonstrates that any development of the site would generally be able to achieve Policy 1 of the NPSUD in terms of a well-functioning integration into the local transportation environment.

13 In summary, my evidence is that the site is appropriate to be earmarked for future urban development such that it could provide a well-functioning integrated urban environment. This is because:

- 13.1 The site is located in close proximity (0.6km) to Waitangirua local centre via the Waitangirua Link Road, and 3km from the Whitby local centre via Te Ara Kāpehu (formerly known as the Whitby Link Road). Any future development of the land to the north of the Waitangirua Link Road could possibly provide more direct access to the Whitby local centre.
- 13.2 Access to the site is possible from the Transmission Gully Motorway via the Waitangirua Link Road. Access is also available from an existing access on Arahura Crescent in Waitangirua. Good connectivity within the site should be possible for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians. The site is on a proposed public transport route.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 14 My statement of evidence addresses the following matters:
- 14.1 Whether the applicant's transportation assessment demonstrates that any development of the site would generally be able to achieve Policy 1 of the NPSUD in terms of a well-functioning integration into the local transportation environment.
- 15 Urban design and Landscape effects are being considered by other experts.

EVIDENCE

- 16 The main issues are the proposed access points to/from the Waitangirua Link Road (e.g. safety, sightlines, Level of Service) and traffic generation of the anticipated level of development into the wider network.
- 17 It is noted that a subsequent plan change process (requiring a structure plan) and resource consents should address the detailed aspects so the

issue at hand is whether it is appropriate for the site to be earmarked for future urban development.

- 18 In my opinion, the transportation assessment (“the assessment”) which forms part of the application, demonstrates that there is scope for residential development within this site that could provide a well-functioning integration into the local transportation environment supporting a connected community with a range of housing options.
- 19 Access to the site can be provided from the Waitangirua Link Road and via an existing access on Arahura Crescent. The assessment acknowledges that the topography and protection of the SAL provides some challenges. The assessment recommends that at least two (2) intersections be made with the Waitangirua Link Road to provide vehicle access to the site acknowledging that the level change between the link road and the site will need careful management.
- 20 It needs to be noted that “*legal frontage*”¹ does not guarantee access. Access to/from the public transport network has to be safe and compliant to be permitted. The topography of the land in conjunction with the alignment of the Waitangirua Link Road may yet prohibit safe and compliant access being possible without extensive earthworks (thus potentially impacting financial viability). This is supported by the following statements:
- a. *“potential points of vehicular access from the Waitangirua Link Road are limited due to the typography of the site, most of which rises steeply from the road providing challenging gradients for roading”*². I specifically note the use of “*potential*” as opposed to *promised* or anything of that meaning.
 - b. *“the **indicative** location of individual site connections to the external roading network are assessed as appropriate, with*

¹ Item 2.1, General Site Details and Zoning

² Appendix 3, Item 4.2 ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY (Page 19 of 156)

future consideration of detailed intersection layout and design ensuring that the anticipated demands can be suitably accommodated”³ (emphasis added).

- 21 I agree with the ‘provisional’ reference in *“the challenging topography and presence of SNAs along a portion of the Link Road alignment / Site frontage presents some constraints in terms access. In this manner, the Waitangirua Link Road construction plans include provisional access locations to each of the respective Site lots, which logically have taken account of both the Link Road alignment (to ensure appropriate sightlines can be achieved) and topography, to ensure a practicable outcome for delivering vehicle connections to these adjacent properties”*⁴ but I do **not** agree that *“appropriate sightlines can be achieved”*⁵ noting that *‘appropriate sightlines **may** be achieved’* and therefore ensuring *“a practicable outcome for delivering vehicle connections to these adjacent properties”*⁶ **may** be possible. Further it is anticipated these new intersections would include localised widening to enable right turning vehicles on the Link Road to wait, clear of through traffic (subject to appropriate traffic modelling of each intersection).
- 22 Similarly, *“Provision for future access at the following approximate locations was a requirement of the Porirua Link Roads:”*⁷, does not guarantee access for the preceding reasons.
- 23 I do not agree with the statement *“opportunity for access from Link Road to all three land parcels (Lot 6 north and south and Landcorp) - commitment from PCC to provide this”*⁸ as whilst the opportunity for access has been accommodated for as much as possible in the design and construction of the Waitangirua Link Road the provision of

³ Appendix 7, Item 8, Conclusions (Page 135 of 156)

⁴ Appendix 7, Item 4.1 Vehicle Access (Page 122 of 156)

⁵ Appendix 7, Item 4.1 Vehicle Access (Page 122 of 156)

⁶ Appendix 7, Item 4.1 Vehicle Access (Page 122 of 156)

⁷ Item 2.1, General Site Details and Zoning

⁸ Appendix 3, Item 4.2 ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY (Page 19 of 156)

appropriate, safe, access to the public transport network is a Developer issue.

- 24 With respect to internal transport networks:
- a. I agree that *“resilience and the need for multiple access points between the sites and to the Waitangirua Link road”*⁹ will be necessary to facilitate such a development.
 - b. *“Noting that a single circulating roadway through the wider site extent at this stage is not considered practicable, provision for a future full-size City-bus service within the Site’s movement network is unlikely to be viable”*¹⁰ should **not** preclude the Proposed Structure Plan from planning for at least one (1) internal bus turn around facility and/or loop with appropriate walking connections from other points of the southern development.
- 25 No mention has been made of refuse and waste collection servicing. Whilst this will be seen as a detail design matter the steep topography and *“comprehensively higher density typologies and papakainga housing concentrates development in areas with the best aspect and least constraints by grouping dwellings together”*¹¹ means this is a significant safety risk that could be a significant issue (i.e. safety associated with refuse vehicles accessing refuse containers/sites (including the possible need to access refuse and waste collections in reverse) etc., refuse containers placed kerbside forcing pedestrians on to the road, insecure refuse containers on a steep high wind area resulting in littering etc). Therefore the effect of servicing ~500 dwellings at least two (2) times per week should have been identified as an input in to the Proposed Structure Plan (as reliance on NZS4404:2004 ‘Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure’ does

⁹ Appendix 3, Item 4.2 ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY (Page 19 of 156)

¹⁰ Appendix 7, Item 7, Internal Roading Arrangements (Page 134 of 156)

¹¹ Item 7.5, Servicing

not adequately address this issue). Nonetheless this on its own is not a fatal flaw of the Proposed Structure Plan noting that this issue will also be subject to the PDP Transport provisions and the Bylaw.

- 26 Provision can be made for good cycling and walking tracks both to and within the site. Connections to Belmont Regional Park can also be achieved. A possible public transport route will connect this site with the wider network. These will enable good recreational opportunities as well as multi modal options to surrounding areas.
- 27 Whilst I generally concur with *“there is no apparent traffic engineering or transportation planning reasons to preclude the rezoning of the Site to FUZ”*¹² the exception is that internal gradients, and their impact on connection to the Waitangirua Link Road, and the lack of redundancy in the internal network, may make this site impractical to develop (from a financial viability perspective) however that is not a matter to reject this proposal at this stage.
- 28 It would have been good for the submission to also have included a simple assessment of possible effects/limitations from other possible developments (e.g. no, simple, sensitivity analysis (SIDRA), high density housing providing at least one (1) other 500+ dwelling subdivision, etc.). However, again, this is not a fatal flaw of this submission.

CONCLUSION

- 29 The transportation assessment demonstrates that residential development on this site should be able to provide both a well-functioning internal transport network and safe connections to the public network. Good access to the site should be able to be provided and this should facilitate and promote multi modal transport choices.

¹² Appendix 7, Item 8, Conclusions (Page 135 of 156)

30 The proposed structure plan demonstrates, at this early stage, appropriate consistency with the recommendations of the transportation assessment and this approach would need to be maintained if the land is re-zoned.

Date: 31/01/2022

.....