

BEFORE THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

UNDER	the Resource Management Act 1991
IN THE MATTER OF	Private Plan Change 80 to the Selwyn District Council Plan
AND	Two Chain Road Limited (The Applicant)

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF MATHEW (MAT) ROSS COLLINS
ON BEHALF OF SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Transport

21 October 2022

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Mathew (Mat) Ross Collins. I have been engaged by Selwyn District Council (Council) as its transport expert for PC80 since August 2021 and I prepared the Transportation Hearing Report, attached to Council's s42a report. As that report did not set out my qualifications and experience, I have set these out below.
- 1.2 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 Flow Transportation Specialists since February 2019, where I hold the position of Associate and Regional Manager at Flow Canterbury.
- 1.3 I have 7 years of experience as a transportation planner and engineer in public and private sector land development projects, which includes experience with strategic land use and transport planning, plan changes, Integrated Transport Assessments, development consenting, and notices of requirement.
- 1.4 My experience includes acting for Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council, Kāinga Ora, Whangarei District Council, Kaipara District Council, and various private developers throughout New Zealand. This work has involved:
 - (a) Plan Changes including Private Plan Changes 69, 70 – 73, 75, 76, 78 - 82 and the Proposed District Plan in Selwyn District, Private Plan Changes 25, 30, 32, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 63, 64 and Plan Change 79 in Auckland, Whangarei District Plan Changes for Urban and Services and Mangawhai Central Plan Change in Northland.
 - (b) Resource consent applications including large precincts: Drury South Industrial, Drury Residential, Redhills, Silverdale 3, Drury 1, Waiata Shores, and Crown Lynn Yards.
 - (c) Designation, Outline Plan of Works, and resource consent applications for major infrastructure including 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.

2 CODE OF CONDUCT

- 2.1 I have read and am familiar with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014, and agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above.
- 2.2 Other than where I state that I am relying on the advice of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this summary statement are within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

3 SUMMARY OF TRANSPORT MATTERS

- 3.1 I have reviewed the following Statements of Evidence and Summaries of Evidence from the Applicant:
- (a) Nick Fuller (Transport)
 - (b) Chris Blackmore (Traffic modelling)
 - (c) Kim Seaton (Planning).
- 3.2 I have reviewed the following evidence from the following Submitters:
- (a) Stuart Fletcher (Waka Kotahi).
- 3.3 Unless otherwise discussed below, I consider that matters identified in my Transportation Hearing Report have been resolved through evidence from the Applicant's experts.
- 3.4 In the following sections, I comment on the following matters:
- (a) Additional traffic modelling information, included in the evidence of Mr Blackmore
 - (b) Funding of transport infrastructure
 - (c) What constitutes an "upgrade"?
 - (d) The number of new intersections on Two Chain Road, serving PPC80.

4 Additional traffic modelling information

- 4.1 In his evidence Mr Blackmore provides a further assessment of the SH1/Dunns Crossing Road intersection, in response to comments in my hearing report

highlighting differences between the PPC80 and New Zealand Upgrade Programme (NZUP) Paramics traffic models.

4.2 Regarding the difference in overall travel demand between the PPC80 Paramics models and the NZUP Paramics model

- (a) Mr Blackmore notes that the PPC81/82 Paramics models (which include PPC80 development) are showing higher travel demand than the NZUP Paramics model, as the PPC81/82 models are based on the full development within urban zoned residential areas in Rolleston by 2033
- (b) Mr Blackmore considers that, based on forecast population growth for Selwyn it is unlikely that full development will occur within urban zoned residential areas by 2033. I agree with Mr Blackmore
- (c) In summary, the PPC81/82 Paramics models incorporate greater urban development within Rolleston compared with the NZUP Paramics model, and are likely to be overpredicting the congestion effects at the SH1/Dunns Crossing Road intersection in 2033.

4.3 Regarding the updated assessment for SH1/Dunns Crossing Road, discussed in paragraph 15 of Mr Blackmore's evidence

- (a) I understand that this includes all Private Plan Changes up to PPC82 as well as the updated NZUP design, including a left in/left out arrangement at the SH1/Rolleston Drive intersection
- (b) The revised modelling is demonstrating poor performance on the Dunns Crossing Road (average delay of 97 sec) and Walkers Road (average delay of 68 sec) approaches in the AM peak and PM peak respectively
- (c) The modelling results contained in the PPC80 ITA (as notified) indicated an average delay of 44 seconds on the Dunns Crossing Road approach during the AM peak and 16 seconds on the Walkers Road approach during the PM peak.

4.4 The updated modelling included in Mr Blackmore's evidence does indicate greater delays at the SH1/Dunns Crossing Road intersection, compared with the PPC80 ITA. However, as I note above, I agree with Mr Blackmore that the various versions of Paramics models used in the three assessments are likely to be overpredicting congestion effects for 2033.

- 4.5 In paragraphs 19 - 22 of his evidence, Mr Blackmore discusses the effect of allowing full access at the SH1/Rolleston Drive intersection, via a double lane roundabout, instead of restricting access to a left in/left out arrangement as proposed by Waka Kotahi as part of NZUP
- (a) His modelling results indicate that performance at the SH1/Dunns Crossing Road intersection improves considerably.
 - (b) The Dunns Crossing Road average delay reduces to 61 seconds in the AM peak, and the Walkers Road average delay reduces to 33 seconds in the PM peak.
- 4.6 In paragraphs 23 – 25 of his evidence, Mr Blackmore discusses an alternative form for the SH1/Dunns Crossing Road, being a multi-laned traffic signal intersection. In my view, while useful information, consideration of the type of intersection form sits with Waka Kotahi.
- 4.7 In summary, I consider that the proposed dual lane roundabout at SH1/Dunns Crossing Road is sufficient to support traffic from the PPC80 sites. I note that maintaining full access at the SH1/Rolleston Drive intersection via a double lane roundabout, instead of the left in/left out arrangement proposed by Waka Kotahi, could be implemented to improve peak hour performance at the SH1/Dunns Crossing Road intersection.

5 Funding of transport infrastructure

- 5.1 In paragraphs 43 – 45 of his evidence, Mr Fuller discusses the timing and funding of transport infrastructure upgrades that are needed to support PPC80. One funding mechanism that Mr Fuller indicates is Development Agreements, as indicated in Table 1 of Mr Fuller’s evidence.
- 5.2 In my experience Council staff are very proactive at entering into Developer Agreements with larger scale developments. I am currently assisting Council’s Transportation Manager with the calculation of the effect that two development areas within Rolleston have on the need to upgrade a nearby intersection. This information will be used as the basis for negotiating a Developer Agreement, and is similar to the information that I presented in Table 3 of my Transportation Technical Report (Appendix G to the s42A report).
- 6** I understand from Council’s Transportation Manager that Council has negotiated multiple successful Development Agreements, and that he is comfortable it is an

appropriate funding mechanism to deliver transport infrastructure upgrades where there are wider beneficiaries beyond just the Plan Change site.

7 What constitutes an “upgrade”?

- 7.1 In its submission, Waka Kotahi (PC80-0007) sought amendments to proposed Rule 22.9.x, to clarify what constitutes an “upgrade”. In my hearing report I supported Waka Kotahi’s position on this matter.
- 7.2 Following questions from Commissioner Thomas during the hearing for PPC81 and PPC82, Mr Fuller and I discussed minor amendments to the proposed Rules and ODPs for PPC81 and PPC82 to add clarity to the type of transport upgrades that are anticipated.
- 7.3 Consistent with the discussions that Mr Fuller and I have had on PPC81 and PPC82, Ms Seaton’s Summary Statement included amendments to proposed Rules 22.9.x and 24.1.3.x, to clarify what each upgrade includes. I support these amendments.

8 The number of new intersections on Two Chain Road, serving PPC80

- 8.1 In paragraph 43 of her technical report, Ms Faulkner (Council’s Landscape and Visual expert) recommends that there be only 1 vehicle access point from PPC80 onto Two Chain Road, at the eastern end of the site.
- 8.2 In paragraphs 54 – 55 of his evidence, Mr Fuller expresses his opinion that
- (a) A single access point onto Two Chain Road could be made to operate acceptably from a transport safety and efficiency perspective
 - (b) However, a single access point would create a low level of resilience and a less efficient transport network.
- 8.3 I agree with Mr Fuller. My preference is to maintain at least two intersections onto Two Chain Road, as is shown on the Outline Development Plan in Attachment 1 to Ms Seaton’s evidence.



Mat Collins

21 October 2022