

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Plan Change 2 to the
Hamilton City District Plan – Te Awa Lakes
Private Plan Change

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DAVID JOHN ROBERT SMITH ON BEHALF OF
FONTERRA LIMITED AND PORTS OF AUCKLAND LIMITED**

TRANSPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is David Smith. I am a Technical Director, Transportation Planning at Abley Transportation Consultants ("**Abley**").
- 1.2 My role in respect to Fonterra Limited's ("**Fonterra**") and Ports of Auckland Limited's ("**POAL**") submission on Proposed Plan Change 2 to the Hamilton City District Plan – Te Awa Lakes Plan Change ("**PPC2**" or "**Plan Change**") has been to provide advice in relation to traffic and transportation matters.
- 1.3 My statement of evidence for Fonterra focuses on my broader consideration of the assessment of effects including a focus on Te Rapa Road and the Fonterra ramps. My statement of evidence for POAL focuses exclusively on effects in the vicinity of the Horotiu Interchange and the POAL site, and I will present my findings at the conclusion of this summary statement.

2. FONTERRA

- 2.1 The following is a summary of my Fonterra evidence.
- 2.2 I have read and considered the Integrated Transport Assessment ("**ITA**") prepared as part of the Assessment of Environmental Effects ("**AEE**") for PPC2 and evidence prepared by the Council's and the Applicant's traffic experts.
- 2.3 I consider that the existing transport environment in the ITA and evidence has generally been reported accurately and the selection of future infrastructure as reported in the ITA is appropriate. However, I note that there is no provision for

additional capacity on the Te Rapa Road corridor identified in the ITA or Mr Apeldoorn's evidence.

- 2.4 I am concerned that the Te Awa Lakes development envisaged by PPC2 would not comply with the compact city form aim, and consequently, runs contrary to Hamilton City Council's strategic transport planning and policy framework. The Plan Change has the potential to undermine the key strategic outcomes sought by Access Hamilton, HUGS and Future Proof. In my view, any change to key delivery documentation, such as the Operative Hamilton District Plan, that is inconsistent with the strategic direction of these documents, risks undermining both regional and national strategic guidance for land transport.
- 2.5 I consider that PPC2 being located 12km from Hamilton Town Centre and 5km from the nearest significant piece of transport infrastructure (at the Base), and with limited access to public transport, would offer few travel options for residents other than by driving. The Plan Change site is isolated from the rest of the city, including education facilities, and my evaluation of Statistics New Zealand commuter travel and vehicle ownership data demonstrates the likelihood that the development will be car dependent.
- 2.6 I have reviewed the transportation models relied on by Mr Apeldoorn for his assessment and whilst I consider them to be generally fit-for-purpose, I am concerned that the residential and commercial trip rates assumed for the development are under-represented by approximately 250 vehicle trips in peak hour, which will impact primarily on Te Rapa Road. I am further concerned that the modelling at 2041 has assumed that Te Rapa Road will be four-laned, an infrastructure project that is not included in the Council's Long Term Plan and, as I understand, is neither funded nor planned.
- 2.7 The residential component of the Plan Change will exacerbate traffic flows and congestion in the commuter tidal flow direction towards Hamilton in the morning peak and away from Hamilton in the evening peak. I have undertaken an assessment informed by the modelling outputs included in Mr Apeldoorn's evidence of the impact of PPC2 on the existing and likely future two-lane Te Rapa Road corridor. I have concluded that the corridor between Hutchinson Road and Ruffell Road will be operating near capacity by 2041 under the current permitted baseline and much of this corridor will operate at or over capacity (potentially by as much as 18%) with the addition of PPC2 traffic.
- 2.8 I believe that a robust assessment of the feasibility and viability of appropriate mitigation along the Te Rapa Road corridor should be undertaken for PPC2, acknowledging that the cost to four-lane this corridor is estimated to be

approximately \$17.5 million and a project of this scale or nature is not currently funded or planned.

- 2.9 In my view, the mitigation proposed in the ITA should be extended to include:
- (a) performance monitoring on the Te Rapa Road corridor in both directions between Hutchinson Road and McKee Street, including the Fonterra Interchange;
 - (b) addition of a direct link on the River Ride to the south of the Fonterra factory; and
 - (c) engagement with Fonterra in the design of cycle safety improvements on the Fonterra ramps.

3. PORTS OF AUCKLAND

- 3.1 I conclude with a summary of my evidence for Ports of Auckland.
- 3.2 Agreement has been reached between Perry Group and POAL in relation to transport-related changes to PPC2 to address POAL's concerns. Those changes relate to:
- (a) monitoring of the performance of the Horotiu Interchange, including monitoring the number of pedestrians and cyclists travelling through the Interchange; and
 - (b) cycle improvements on the River Ride to the north of the Plan Change site connecting to Horotiu Bridge School to provide an attractive and well-used facility.
- 3.3 My statement of evidence focuses on the justification for those specific changes.
- 3.4 I have also considered the additional policies referred to in paragraph 8.12 of Mr Arbuthnot's evidence, specifically 3.8.1.1f and 3.8.1.2i to "ensure the safety, efficiency and long term sustainability of the transport network" and support the inclusion of these policies within PPC2.

Dave Smith

2 December 2019

