

# Hearing G - Growth; Designations

## Review of submitter evidence - transport

---

<b>Prepared for</b>	Timaru District Council
<b>Project Number</b>	TDC-J053
<b>Revision</b>	F
<b>Issue Date</b>	27 May 2025
<b>Prepared by</b>	Mat Collins, Associate Transportation Engineer

---

### 1. Introduction

My full name is Mathew Ross Collins. I hold a Bachelor of Engineering (Hons) from the University of Auckland and have a post-graduate certificate in transportation and land use planning from Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, Canada.

I have been employed by Abley Ltd since September 2023, where I hold the position of Associate Transport Planner. I have ten years of experience as a transportation planner and engineer in public and private sector land development, which includes experience with strategic land use and transport planning, plan changes and district plan reviews, Integrated Transport Assessments, development consenting, and Notices of Requirement.

My experience includes acting for NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council, Selwyn District Council, Kāinga Ora, Whangārei District Council, Kaipara District Council, and various other Councils and private developers throughout New Zealand. This work has involved:

- Assisting Councils and submitters with District Plan Reviews including Far North District Council District Plan Review, Partially Operative Selwyn District Plan Environment Court appeals (various), Waimakariri Proposed District Plan, Auckland Council Plan Change 79, Whangārei District Council Urban and Services Plan Changes.
- Plan change applications including multiple Selwyn District Private Plan Changes, Drury East, Drury West, Warkworth North, Mangawhai Central, Avondale Jockey Club, and Pukekohe Raceway;
- Resource consent applications including for large precincts such as Drury South Industrial, Drury Residential, Redhills, Silverdale 3, Drury 1, Waiata Shores, and Crown Lynn Yards; and
- Notices of requirement, Outline Plan of Works, and resource consent applications and reviews for major infrastructure including Supporting Growth Alliance Drury Arterials NoR Package and North Auckland Package, Healthy Waters St Marys Bay Stormwater Water Quality Programme, Watercare Huia Water Treatment Plant replacement, Watercare Huia 1 Watermain replacement, and several Ministry of Education Schools.

Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing

this report. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person. There are no conflicts of interest that would impede me from providing independent advice to the Hearings Panel.

Abley staff have acted as Timaru District Council's (Council's) transport expert for the Transport and Signage chapters of the Proposed District Plan. 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.

## 2. Urban Growth Rezoning: Engineering Memo

I have been provided with the Urban Growth Rezoning: Engineering Memo, dated 21 October 2024, Kevin Kemp (Timaru District Council)<sup>1</sup>. The Memo as attached to the s42A Growth Preliminary Report<sup>2</sup> sets out all information and analysis that the Council Infrastructure Group requested in advance of being able to properly assess the submissions seeking some form of urban / rural lifestyle rezoning and / or timetabling associated with FDAs. The purpose of the request was to set out the requirements so that Council Officers could be fully informed of the transport implications of the amendments proposed in submissions and to provide recommendations to inform the final Section 42A Report .

The memo noted the following points:

- *For urban rezonings / FDAs, and where the density proposed for Rural Lifestyle / FDAs would result in a material increase in yield, it is likely that a transport assessment will be necessary. If that is the case a suitably qualified and experience transportation engineer should provide an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA).*
- *Proposed District Plan Rule TRAN-R10 sets out the parameters for a basic and full ITA (noting that this rule is subject to submission). A suitably qualified and experience transportation engineer would be able to provide guidance as to the extent and scope of an ITA based on the nature and extent of the rezoning submission.*
- *For Rural Lifestyle / FDAs, the types of matters to be considered would be:*
  - *The proposed density, and accordant potential yield of new lots (refer to appropriate standards to calculate such as NZTA Research Report 453);*
  - *Condition and capacity of the existing supporting road network, and identification of any need for localised upgrades;*
  - *Traffic count (and potential increase), vehicle crossings.*
  - *Opportunities to provide pedestrian / cycleway connectivity (where relevant, that is peripheral urban locations proximate to existing connections).*
  - *Vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT).*
- *For Urban rezonings / FDAs, the types of matters to be considered with relation to transport would include:*
  - *Type of rezoning and vehicles generated (i.e. Industrial rezonings vs Residential).*
  - *Traffic generated by the new rezoning (referenced to NZTA Research Report 453);*
  - *Condition and capacity of the existing supporting road network, and identification of any need for localised upgrades, or capacity improvements at intersections within the wider network.*
  - *Assessment of increased traffic and parking demand, and implications on the efficiency, effectiveness and safety of the wider network.*

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.timaru.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0010/945514/Attachment-B-Memo-TDC-Engineering-Requests-24-Oct-2024.pdf](https://www.timaru.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/945514/Attachment-B-Memo-TDC-Engineering-Requests-24-Oct-2024.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.timaru.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/945511/TDC-Rezonings-Preliminary-Report-v3-Final.pdf](https://www.timaru.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/945511/TDC-Rezonings-Preliminary-Report-v3-Final.pdf)

- Any proposals for new roads.

As identified below, the submitter information packages received have not provided the analysis as requested, and an appropriate level of assessment necessary to consider the amending proposals has therefore not been undertaken by any submitter.

### 3. Review of submitter information packages

I have reviewed the submitter information packages set out below. As noted above, none of those packages have provided the evidence or analysis sought by the Council and they contain limited or no assessment of transport effects.

In the absence of any meaningful transport assessment, to assist the section 42A officer and Hearing Panel to understand the level of effects associated with each proposal, I have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the potential trip generation are likely to result if submissions were accepted.

I have classified each site as follows:

- **No net effects:** These submitters support the notified PDP
- **Localised effects:** These submitters seek rezoning that is likely to generate less than 10 veh/hr
- **Moderate scale effects:** These submitters seek rezoning that is likely to generate 10 – 50 veh/hr
- **Large scale effects:** These submitters seek rezoning that is likely to generate more than 50 veh/hr, or extension of, or change the timing of, an FDA.

I have also recorded the information I have reviewed in relation to each submission in order to undertake my assessment.

#### 3.1 No net effects

The following submitters support the notified PDP, therefore I consider no further evidence from the submitter is required:

- Submitter 34: McCutcheon, Tarrant, Sullivan, Ellery.
  - Supports FDA7 as notified
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.

#### 3.2 Localised effects

The following propose rezoning that is likely to generate less than 10 veh/hr:

- Submitter 32: Bruce Selbie and Mary Washington.
  - Seek Rural Lifestyle Zone with estimated yield of 5 lots
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 145: Tristram Johnson.
  - Seeks Residential zoning with an estimated yield of 6 dwellings.
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 160: D & S Payne
  - Seeks to rezone FDA11, I understand that Council's Planner has recommended a yield of 6 lots.

- INFORMATION TO SUPPORT TIMING OF REZONING OF FDA11, prepared by Lynette Wharfe, dated 28 February 2025, reviewed.

I consider there may be smaller scale and localised transport effects that can likely be managed through the resource consent process if these submissions were accepted.

I have given consideration of the Transport Rules in the pDP, to identify any critical issues (such as boundary constraints that preclude complying with minimum accessway widths, insufficient sight lines at vehicle access points, etc) that would make rezoning unsuitable. In my opinion there are no matters that would preclude compliance with the Transport Rules, although I note that Submitter 32 would require a new vehicle access(es) to SH79, and any vehicle crossing onto NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi's (NZTA) network requires its approval.

### 3.3 Moderate and large scale effects submissions

These submissions are likely to generate 10 – 50 veh/hr:

- Submitter 11: GA & SA Morton and Woollcombe Trustees 2 Limited
  - Seeks Rural Lifestyle zone with a yield of approximately 20 lots
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 19: Waitui Deer Farm Limited
  - Seeks Rural Lifestyle zone with a yield of approximately 30 lots
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 30: Chris and Sharon McKnight
  - Seeks Rural Lifestyle zone for approximately 27ha with a yield of approximately 12 lots
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.

These submissions are likely to generate more than 50 veh/hr, or propose the extension or change of timing of an FDA:

- Submitter 20: T J and A K O'Neill and C and F Trustees 2006 Ltd.
  - Seeks to rezone site to General Residential Zone with yield of approximately 100 lots
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 27: AS Rabbidge, HR Singline and RSM Trust Limited.
  - Seeks to change FDA9 priority, but not rezoning. FDA9 is estimated to have a yield of 87 lots<sup>3</sup>
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 33: Pyke, Ford, Andrews, Talbot, Wilkins & Proudfoot, Craig, Mackenzie.
  - Seeks to extend FDA10 to include an additional 10.8ha of land. This is estimated to have a yield of around 20 lots, based on the Property Economics estimate that the 44ha FDA10 site could yield 75 lots<sup>3</sup>
  - Supporting Information for a Rezone Request report, prepared by Milward Finlay Lobb dated February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 128: Warren and Elizabeth Scott.

<sup>3</sup> Table 10, [Attachment-A-Timaru-Residential-Capacity-Property-Economics.pdf](#)

- Seeks to rezone FDA3 to enable development. FDA3 is estimated to have a yield of around 147 lots<sup>3</sup>
- MEMORANDUM REPORT: PTDP – Hearing G – Response to RFI, prepared by Davis Ogilvie, dated 20 February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 157: Ryan De Joux.
  - Specifically seeks to amend FDA14 priority. FDA14 is estimated to have a yield of around 718 lots<sup>3</sup>
  - Memo providing response to Council queries, unattributed author and undated, reviewed.
- Submitter 190: North Meadows 2021 Ltd & Thompson Engineering (2002) Ltd.
  - Seeks to rezone approximately 16ha of land to General Industrial Zone
  - MEMORANDUM REPORT: PTDP – Hearing G – Response to RFI, prepared by Davis Ogilvie, dated 20 February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 203: Pages Trust and Russell Trust (also refer to Submitter 211: Rolling Ridges Trust and Submitter 216: Simstra Family Trust)
  - Seeks to immediately rezone 251, 273, 279 and 295 Pages Road to General Residential Zone. These properties are largely within FDA2
  - Seeks to change FDA2 priority to 2 years. FDA2 is estimated to have a yield of around 490 lots<sup>3</sup>
  - Letter from GRESSON DORMAN & CO, dated 20 February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 227: Rose Westgarth & Jan Gibson.
  - Seeks to rezone FDA1 to enable development. FDA1 is estimated to have a yield of around 664 lots<sup>3</sup>
  - Response to Hearing G Preliminary s42A report, prepared by Davis Ogilvie, dated 20 February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 231: Timothy Graeme Blackler.
  - Seeks to rezone to General Residential, approximately 10.5ha, to enable aged care development. No anticipated yield provided.
  - MEMORANDUM REPORT: PTDP – Hearing G – Response to RFI, prepared by Davis Ogilvie, dated 20 February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 237: Aitken, Johnston & RSM Trust Limited.
  - Seeks to rezone to General Residential, to enable 140 – 240 dwellings
  - MEMORANDUM REPORT: PTDP – Hearing G – Response to RFI, prepared by Davis Ogilvie, dated 20 February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 241: J R Livestock Limited.
  - Seeks to introduce a FDA to enable future General Industrial Zone
  - MEMORANDUM REPORT: PTDP – Hearing G – Response to RFI, prepared by Davis Ogilvie, dated 18 February 2025, reviewed.
- Submitter 248: White Water Properties Limited.
  - Seeks to rezone FDA13 to enable development.
  - Memo providing response to Council queries, unattributed author and undated, reviewed.

These submissions may result in effects that cannot be adequately managed through the resource consent process. Referring to my discussion in Section 2, I consider that the submitter evidence does not provide sufficient information to understand the potential effects of rezoning.

None of the information provided by any of the abovementioned submitters evidence confirms whether the amendments sought:

- Aligns with the objectives and policies of the Transport Chapter of the PDP
- Will manage the potential effects on the safe and efficient operation of the existing transport network
- Will be integrated with the existing and future transport networks, and/or will not foreclose opportunities for an integrated and connected transport network, including providing a Development Area Plan and/or Outline Development Plan where relevant to ensure an integrated and connected transport network.

For example, immediately rezone 251, 273, 279 and 295 Pages Road to General Residential Zone as sought by Submitter 203: Pages Trust and Russell Trust, Submitter 211: Rolling Ridges Trust, and Submitter 216: Simstra Family Trust, could compromise transport connections between FDA2 and Pages Road, such as the roading connection to Pages Road/Hunter Hills Road intersection shown in the draft Development Area Plan (DAP).

- Will be supported by appropriate transport infrastructure, particularly where submitters seek to bring forward the timeframe for rezoning Future Development Areas, as the submission may not align with Councils funding for the necessary infrastructure to support development.

I also note that Submitter 227 (Rose Westgarth & Jan Gibson) refers to a draft Integrated Transport Assessment, prepared by Abley on behalf of Council, for the FDA1, FDA2, FDA4 Structure Plan. As one of the authors of this report, I confirm that the draft Integrated Transport Assessment was prepared to support the Development Area Plan package, and was in conjunction with analysis associated with all servicing of the site. The draft Integrated Transport Assessment does not provide a detailed analysis of effects on the existing and future transport networks, or staging with necessary infrastructure upgrades, that I consider would be required before FDA1 is rezoned.

### 2.3 Cumulative effects of rezoning submissions

Should the Hearing Panel be inclined to approve a number of the submissions that I have classified as having potential moderate or large-scale effects, I suggest that the Panel request that an assessment of the cumulative effects of the rezoning(s) be undertaken.

This would consider the location and likely generation and distribution of traffic from each site (as should be provided in response to those matters outlined in Section 2), and identify where there is the potential for cumulative effects that may lead to adverse impacts on the operation or safety of key transport infrastructure.

It is difficult to request submitters to consider cumulative effects individually as:

- they may not have sufficient information relating to other submissions
- if each submitter is asked to consider cumulative effects multiple assessments may be undertaken with conflicting and contrasting results.

An assessment of cumulative effects is somewhat dependent on the scale and extent of submission(s) that the Panel would seek to approve; but for the reasons outlined above should be undertaken collectively.

## 4. Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) / Canterbury Regional Council (CRC) submissions

I have also been asked to comment on NZTAs submission [143.198] for FDA14 in relation to Submitter 157: Ryan De Joux (which seeks to bring forward the rezoning of FDA14), and the submission(s) from CRC which seeks the removal of both FDA14 (as above) and FDA13 in relation to Submitter 248: White Water Properties Limited (which seeks to bring forward the rezoning of FDA13).

NZTA opposes FDA14 on the basis that it does not integrate with the existing urban area and therefore is not likely to achieve a reduction in VKT's. Additionally, NZTA notes the area is adjacent high-speed



environments and is concerned that objectives of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) and provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) are unlikely to be achieved. NZTA seeks the deletion of FDA13. CRC seeks the deletion of FDA13 and FDA14 on the basis that these areas provide for urban growth well beyond the short and medium terms as would be associated with the district plan.

Given the absence of any transport analysis supporting bringing forward the rezoning of FDA13 and FDA14, I consider that rezonings should not be brought forward, nor should the DAP process identified in SCHED15.

However, in my view neither the NZTA's or CRC submissions do not, in themselves, provide sufficient evidence that FDA13 and FDA14 should be deleted. Further consideration of alternative locations for future development is recommended, should FDA13 and FDA14 be rejected, and this should be through a holistic assessment rather than purely focused on transport outcomes.

**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**