

Hearing G - Growth; Designations

Review of additional submitter evidence - transport

Prepared for	Timaru District Council
Project Number	TDC-J053
Revision	D
Issue Date	24 July 2025
Prepared by	Mat Collins, Associate Transportation Engineer

1. Introduction

Abley has been engaged by Council to assist with the transport aspects of submitter evidence relating to the Proposed District Plan (pDP): Hearing G – Growth; Designations. This technical note summarises my review of submitter evidence received in June 2025, and of submitter presentations at the hearing.

My qualifications and experience are set out in my previous memorandum: **Hearing G – Growth; Designations: Review of submitter evidence – transport, dated 27 May 2025.**

I have been asked by Mr Matt Bonis, s42A Reporting Officer to provide a preliminary consideration of the evidence provided by Submitters to Hearing G – Growth, to assist the Panel and Submitters prior to the Hearing commencing on 8 July 2025.

This technical note, aspects of which were read out at the Hearing, has been updated to respond to the Panel's Minute 42, which at [7] stated:

'We direct that the technical report authors provide their summary statements, along with any further responses from matters arising at the Hearing'.

I have reviewed the transport-related evidence provided by the following submitters, which is discussed in the sections below:

- S19 Waitui Deer Farm Ltd, Geraldine Downs
- S20 DJ O'Neill & O'Neill Trustees 2023 Ltd
- S128 W and E Scott, FDA3 Geraldine
- S160: D & S Payne, FDA11 Geraldine
- S231 T Blackler, 10 Burke Street, Pleasant Point
- S237 Aitken Johnston and RSM Trust Ltd, FDA6 Geraldine.

2. S19 Waitui Deer Farm Ltd, Geraldine Downs

I have reviewed the following documents:

- Statement of Evidence of Melissa McMullan, dated 27 June 2025.

Ms McMullan states that transport effects of development of the site can be assessed through SUB-S1 and SUB-S6. No assessment of transport effects has been provided by the submitter. I consider that SUB-S1/S6 does not provide sufficient scope for Council to assess all actual or potential transport effects of the rezoning, as the scope is limited to onsite transport matters and does not provide for consideration of transport effects on the existing transport network.

At the hearing Ms McMullan suggested that a Restricted Discretionary status be provided for transport matters, requiring a full Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) prior to development occurring. In my view it is important for transport matters to be appropriately considered prior to rezoning, to identify any constraints in the existing transport network and provide mechanisms to ensure any required mitigations or upgrades are delivered in conjunction with development.

I have not undertaken an independent assessment of transport effects for the rezoning, and my position from the 27 May 2025 memorandum remains unchanged.

3. S20 DJ O'Neill & O'Neill Trustees 2023 Ltd

No assessment of transport effects has been provided by the submitter. I have not undertaken an independent assessment of transport effects for the rezoning, and my position from the 27 May 2025 memorandum remains unchanged.

However, I am broadly comfortable with identifying this site as a Future Development Area (FDA), if Council sees this as a priority area for growth:

- Network Capacity: There are no fundamental capacity constraints in the surrounding transport network that would preclude urbanisation of the site, based on my understanding of the Timaru Transport Model (owned by Council). Traffic generated by future development is likely to route via Connoor Road to Otipua Road, before dispersing through the local east–west road network toward State Highway 1 (SH1). While SH1 is currently under pressure through the Timaru urban area, development of this site is unlikely to generate greater adverse effects on SH1 than urban expansion in other parts of the town.
- Intersection Performance: The offset (left/right stagger) between the Connoor Road and Hassall Street intersections on Otipua Road may present operational issues during peak periods. However, I do not consider this to be a critical constraint. Further intersection performance assessments can be undertaken as part of any future rezoning process.
- Site Access: There are no visibility or sightline constraints on Connoor Road that would prevent the formation of suitable vehicle access points to the site.
- Connectivity and Resilience: The site presents opportunities to integrate with and extend the surrounding transport network. This includes a potential connection to O'Neill Place—likely to be extended as part of the adjacent residential development to the east—as well as up to two new connections to Connoor Road.

4. S128 W and E Scott, FDA3 Geraline

I have reviewed the following documents:

- Transport Assessment, prepared by Antoni Facey, dated 27 June 2025.

I do not consider that Mr Facey's assessment provides sufficient detail to fully understand the potential transport effects of rezoning the site.

Given the site could generate approximately 100 vehicle movements per hour (veh/hr), I consider the Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) should have been scoped as a *Board-level* ITA, in accordance

with NZTA Research Report 422. This should include analysis of crash history, confirmed vehicle volumes on surrounding roads, network congestion points, network connectivity, and active modes accessibility.

Additionally:

- I consider Mr Facey has incorrectly applied the AUSTROADS turning warrant diagram when assessing the SH79/Templer Street intersection. If SH79 carries 400 veh/hr during the peak period, then Q_M should be 400 veh/hr ($Q_M = QT_1 + QT_2 + Q_L$ per AGTM- Part 6 Figure 3.26), rather than the 200 veh/hr assumed. Under this corrected input, a right-turn bay would be required if right-turn demand exceeds ~30 veh/hr—which the proposed rezoning is likely to generate.
- While I support Mr Facey's identification of potential upgrade requirements on Templer Street, it is unclear how these works would be delivered or funded.

No further transport evidence was presented at the hearing.

5. S160: D & S Payne, FDA11 Geraline

I have not reviewed the submitter presentation at the hearing, but I understand that Ms Wharfe has suggested a 1.5ha density, which could enable 10 lots (my previous assessment was based on an estimated 6 lot yield as advised by Mr Bonis).

I consider that the proposed increase of four lots is unlikely to generate a noticeable effect on the surrounding transport network. However, I recommend that all lots be accessed via the local road network rather than directly from State Highway 79 (SH79), and I understand the submitter does not propose vehicle access from SH79.

That said, there may be a fair apportionment of transport infrastructure costs to consider, which I did not address in my initial screening of submissions. I am not aware of whether Council has undertaken any detailed assessment of the transport infrastructure costs required to support full development within FDA11. For example, wider development of FDA11 would likely require upgrades to Templer Street, similar to those identified for FDA3 (refer to my comments on submission S128 – W and E Scott, FDA3 Geraldine).

If FDA11 were to be rezoned in its entirety, the costs of necessary transport infrastructure would typically be apportioned fairly across all landowners. However, if the Payne site is rezoned and developed in isolation, there is a risk that the submitter may not be required to contribute to upgrades that will ultimately benefit the wider development area. This may result in inequitable infrastructure funding.

6. S231 T Blackler, 10 Burke Street, Pleasant Point

I have reviewed the following documents:

- Statement of Evidence of Andrew Carr, dated 25 June 2025, including Appendix A: Transportation Assessment, dated 25 June 2025.

Mr Carr provides a detailed assessment of transport effects for the proposed retirement village. However, I understand the rezoning sought is to General Residential Zone (GRZ), and there is no certainty in terms of a retirement complex, nor mechanism to achieve the outcome they have included in the 'concept plan' provided by the submitter.

GRZ could enable significantly higher trip generation than the proposed retirement village. Assuming a development yield of 12 dwellings/ha (approximately 120 dwellings), peak hour traffic could range from 100 to 120 veh/hr - higher than Mr Carr's estimate of 95 dwellings.

While Mr Carr considers TRAN-R10 sufficient to manage effects via the resource consent process, I disagree. In my opinion

- TRAN-R10 and TRAN-S20 may not apply where initial subdivision (e.g. balance or superlots) occurs without a concurrent land use consent. This can result in cumulative effects going unaddressed through a piecemeal development approach.
- No mechanism is proposed to secure access via George Street, and there may not be scope to require this through the resource consent process
- No mechanism is proposed to secure the footpath on Burke Street, as recommended in Section 7.2.3 of the Transport Assessment. A footpath connection to Fredrick Street is shown, but it is unclear whether the submitter proposes a new footpath on that street. TRAN-Table 8 requires footpaths on both sides of a Local Road in Residential Zones, and there may not be scope to require this through the resource consent process

As noted above, and even if the site were limited to just a retirement complex with the 'concept plan' being established as an Outline Plan (in the district plan), the submitter may be unable to deliver the access onto George Street, as this would require third party property. Therefore, all access in and out would be by Burke Street.

Despite these concerns, I do not consider there are any fundamental transport constraints that would preclude future urbanisation of the site, whether as a retirement village or residential development (subject to further assessment). From a transport perspective, the site could be identified as a Future Development Area if Council considers it a priority area for urban growth.

At the hearing, I understand that the submitters experts considered that Mr Carr's assessment was predicated on both general residential development and a retirement village. I disagree with this view:

- In paragraph 3.7 of Mr Carr's Statement of Evidence, he acknowledges that his assessment does not include consideration of "the full extent of development" – i.e. developing the site for general residential activity
- In paragraphs 3.8 – 3.11 Mr Carr expresses his opinion that TRAN-R10 enables this assessment, should the site be developed for general residential activity.
- As laid out above, I disagree with Mr Carr about the suitability of relying on TRAN-R10 to manage transport matters through the consenting process if rezoning was approved.

7. S237 Aitken Johnston and RSM Trust Ltd, FDA6 GERALINE

I have reviewed the following documents:

- Transport Assessment, prepared by Antoni Facey, dated 27 June 2025.

I do not consider Mr Facey's evidence sufficient to assess the potential transport effects of rezoning this site.

Given the development could generate approximately 250 veh/hr, the ITA should have been scoped as a *Board-level* ITA per NZTA RR422. This would require consideration of crash history, confirmed traffic volumes on nearby roads, potential congestion points, and active mode connectivity.

I also have concerns regarding Mr Facey's analysis of the Richard Pearse Drive/Factory Road/Wilkin Street roundabout. He references Figure 7.7 of the AUSTROADS Guide to Traffic Management Part 3 to suggest sufficient capacity. However, this figure assumes a 40m inscribed diameter roundabout, while the subject roundabout is approximately 30–35m in diameter and would therefore have reduced capacity.

Auckland

Level 1/70 Shortland Street

Auckland 1010

Aotearoa New Zealand

Wellington

Level 1/119-123 Featherston Street

Wellington 6011

Aotearoa New Zealand

Christchurch

Level 1/137 Victoria Street

PO Box 36446, Merivale

Christchurch 8146

Aotearoa New Zealand

hello@abley.com

+64 3 377 4703

abley.com