

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS COMMISSIONER AT
SELWYN**

IN THE MATTER OF

Clause 21 of the First Schedule of
the Resource Management Act 1991
(Plan Change 75)

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

YOURSECTION LIMITED
(Applicant)

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF ANDREW ALAN METHERELL
(TRANSPORT)**

Dated: 3 November 2021

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF ANDREW ALAN METHERELL:

- 1 My name is Andrew Metherell. and I prepared a Statement of Evidence on behalf of Yoursection Limited (the Applicant) dated 18 October 2021, in which my qualifications and experience are set out.
- 2 PC75 will enable residential development in a part of Rolleston where residential development has been anticipated and planned for in terms of transport infrastructure. It is located adjacent to the arterial Lincoln Rolleston Road which provides good connections for movement to the Rolleston town centre, industrial area, and options for connections to the east via either SH1 or Selwyn Road.
- 3 Development of PC75 would enable a new east-west Primary Road which enables completion of a further portion of the CRETS Collector Road that has been an integral part of the road network development in the south of Rolleston. The road provides important east-west connectivity through the township.
- 4 Connections to the Falcons Landing subdivision to the north are available for local connectivity with other residential neighbourhoods, and the adjacent PC78 land can also be integrated with from a transport perspective.
- 5 The Outline Development Plan revised in response to Council Officer recommendations provides further certainty that a connected local road and cycle network will be achieved that integrates with the surrounding transport network.
- 6 In response to the Council Offer summary statement of 29 November 2021, a further adjustment has also been made to the ODP to include a cycle connection on the primary road, noting that the infrastructure provision will be consistent with the road to the west.
- 7 Additional local roads are shown compared with the notified version, including a secondary connection to Lincoln Rolleston Road and realignment of a north-south Secondary Road to better connect between the east-west Primary Roads. Pedestrians will be provisioned for on roads in accordance with District Plan rules. The transport

network proposed will allow connectivity with public transport routes as they evolve.

- 8 The ITA assessment of road network performance aligns well with the additional modelling assessment set out in the Council Officer report. Essentially, I consider the analysis demonstrates that the additional traffic generated by PC75 can be accommodated efficiently in the planned road network. I consider the rezoning would not materially affect the timing of any upgrades being planned by Council.
- 9 At a local level, I disagreed with the Council Officer recommendation that the intersection of the east- west Primary Road with Lincoln Rolleston Road must change the ODP wording from "possible roundabout" to "roundabout". My concern was primarily the inference it would be fully the responsibility of the PC75 developer to implement.
- 10 My analysis demonstrates that a standard priority controlled intersection, as is provided at other intersections on Lincoln Rolleston Road, can accommodate future traffic volumes with acceptable delay. In the medium term, a case for a roundabout will likely exist given the increasing right turn movements from the Primary Road into Lincoln Rolleston Road. However, this will be when or after all of potentially zoned (i.e. land subject to Plan Changes) development in Rolleston is built out, and is potentially beyond the timeframe of the District Plan.
- 11 In my opinion, a roundabout intersection is required to be centred on Lincoln Rolleston Road for land efficiency and safety reasons, and in anticipation of long term development on the eastern side of Lincoln Rolleston Road. This requires land that is not owned by the requestor and based on the small 14% contribution PC75 makes to critical turning volumes it would be inappropriate to require construction of the roundabout as part of the development, as a sole responsibility of the PC75 land developer.
- 12 In my opinion, the analysis demonstrates that the upgrade to a roundabout is a matter for planning through the Long Term Plan process. From the Council Officer summary statement, I understand they acknowledge that a roundabout will be a matter for cost share, and the primary requirement is not to foreclose the opportunity for a future roundabout through insufficient land being available on the

PC75 site. I consider that the removal of “possible”, supported by the revised ODP text proposed by Ms Seaton in her summary statement, will ensure that outcome is achieved, and enable the timing and cost share of implementation to be considered at subdivision in a fair and equitable manner.

RESPONSE TO THE EVIDENCE OF MR FULLER AND MR BOYES

- 13 I have considered the further submitter evidence of the MON Group by Nick Fuller and Nick Boyes. I agree with Mr Fuller’s statement¹ that there is broad agreement with myself that the proposed zoning of a neighbourhood centre will generally be acceptable from a transportation perspective, although there will be a need for more detailed transportation assessment of the specific development layout at the time of seeking resource consent.
- 14 Within my evidence in chief (at paragraph 78) I set out matters that I consider relevant for future assessment. Mr Boyes in his evidence has set out the rules framework that is likely to trigger the need for resource consent. I note that the highlighted matters do not include the specific transport related assessment matters at the level of detail that I discussed.
- 15 However, and as broadly noted by Mr Boyes, the site will be subject to the Chapter 17 Business Zone Roading rules. In addition to standard access and layout requirements, there are two specific rules of relevance which I expect will likely be triggered requiring a more detailed assessment of access for a development:
- (a) Rule 17.3.4 requiring restricted discretionary assessment for access to Lincoln Rolleston Road if the **site** generates 100 *equivalent car movements per day* or more (as set out in Rule 17.3.1.5). Assessment matters are set out at 17.3.5.
 - (b) Rule 17.3.6 which requires a **vehicle crossing** generating more than 250 *vehicles per day* to be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity. Assessment matters are set out at 17.3.7.

¹ Nick Fuller Evidence 13 September Paragraph 10

- 16 I also understand that subdivision rule 24.1.4.1 enables Council to have discretion at an earlier stage of assessment. That rule enables assessment of how an individual lot will achieve access onto Lincoln Rolleston Road, being an arterial road.
- 17 Mr Fuller has assessed² that the potential daily traffic generation of the site is in the order of 2,390 vehicles per day for a 2,088m² GFA development, which I noted may be an underestimate of traffic generation. At that level of traffic generation which is significantly higher than the trigger, I consider that even a staged development with multiple vehicle crossings is likely to trigger one or both of the above trip generation rules. Those assessment matters would generally enable Council to require consideration against the matters I raised in my evidence.
- 18 Mr Boyes also recommends that Site Layout Option 1 is adopted. I understand Mr Fuller has not specifically assessed the relative merits of the individual options, except to highlight that key transport rules relating to vehicle crossing position rules should be able to comply with the District Plan standards. It appears that his rule assessment has not considered the potential influence of land requirements and intersection position for a future roundabout.
- 19 If the MON Group submission is generally accepted, I consider it preferable for the ODP to convey some flexibility in the precise area identified for a neighbourhood centre. That will enable the design of the centre, and of the vehicle access arrangements in particular, to respond to a more detailed transport assessment at the time of land use consent, and preferably at the time of subdivision. Ms Seaton has addressed that in her summary statement, with the revised ODP text referencing the centre to be in the "general location shown".

CONCLUSION

- 20 In my opinion, PC75 will enable logical and planned expansion of the southern Rolleston residential area with a suitable level of integration with existing and future transport networks.

² Nick Fuller Attachment 1, Paragraph 7

- 21 From a transport perspective, I support the revised ODP set out in the summary evidence of Ms Seaton which I consider addresses the Council Officer comments and submitter requests.
- 22 I am happy to answer any questions concerning my evidence.

Dated: 3 November 2021

Andrew Metherell