

**Before: the Kapiti Coast District Council Hearings Panel**

**District Plan Review: Infrastructure**

---

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('**RMA**' or '**Act**')

In the matter of a submission by the New Zealand Transport Agency  
(submitter number 457) on the Proposed District Plan

and in the matter of Chapter 11 - Infrastructure

---

**Primary statement of evidence of Robert Arnold Harris for the  
New Zealand Transport Agency**

Dated 29 July 2016

---

## **Introduction**

1. My full name is Robert Arnold Harris. I am a Principal Planning Advisor within the Planning and Investment Group of the New Zealand Transport Agency ("**Transport Agency**").
2. I hold a Master of Applied Science in Resource and Land Management from Lincoln University; accreditation since 2008 under the Making Good Decisions Programme, and a background of over 25 years working in resource management planning, strategic and financial planning; parks management; land management and conservation fields in New Zealand. The particular areas of expertise I bring to this brief of evidence are resource management and spatial planning.
3. I recently joined the Transport Agency. Prior to that I worked for (from the most recent) the Local Government Commission; Environment Waikato on the Waikato River settlements; Franklin District Council, as Planning Unit Manager, South Waikato District, as a consultant preparing their 2009/19 CCLTP, the Cawthron Institute, as a consultant, Nelson City Council and the Department of Conservation as either a consultant or staff member.
4. I confirm that I have the authority to give evidence on behalf of the Transport Agency.

## **Code of Conduct**

5. I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses and agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my areas of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed. I understand the Code of Conduct requires me to assist the Hearings Panel impartially on matters within my expertise, and not to advocate for the Transport Agency.

## Scope of evidence

6. The remainder of my presentation of evidence covers the following matters and moves from the general to the specific:
  - a. Overview of the Transport Agency's mandate;
  - b. The topics covered in our submission and dealt with today;
  - c. General outcomes sought with regard to the planning framework;
  - d. Research commissioned by the Transport Agency and the Kapiti Coast District Council ("**Council**") for estimating future traffic flows in around the sub-regional centre in particular;
  - e. The planning implications of the traffic modelling; and
  - f. Relief sought.

## Background information on the Transport Agency

7. The Transport Agency is a Crown entity<sup>1</sup>. Its objective is to contribute to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system in the public interest. It has a statutory objective under the Land Transport Management Act 2003:

*"to promote an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system."*

8. The Transport Agency sets out to provide an integrated approach to transport planning, funding and delivery. This includes investment and co-investment in local roads, public transport, walking and cycling, as well as the construction, operation and maintenance of State highways.
9. While the transport system as a whole is owned and operated by several parties, including local authorities there is only one network. The One Network approach tries to balance the needs of all road users, although

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 93(2) Land Transport Management Act 2003.

clearly some modes and road formations are favoured over others in any given location depending on;

- a. Pre-existing development patterns;
  - b. Existing infrastructure;
  - c. Demand for alternative modes of transport;
  - d. New demand factors such as population growth' and
  - e. New development influencing existing infrastructure.
10. The Transport Agency in framing its submission on the Proposed District Plan (“**PDP**”) has factored in these considerations. Like the Council, the Transport Agency has a brief to support economic growth and productivity, but it must ensure that the whole local network operates as safely and as efficiently as possible given existing constraints.

### **Relevant topics covered in the Transport Agency’s original submission**

11. When preparing this evidence I drew on the Transport Agency’s initial submission, which covered the following general points, as well as seeking specific relief:
- a. The State highway network is an economically strategic asset/physical resource;
  - b. There is a need to address the impact of development on existing and proposed transport infrastructure;
  - c. It is important to ensure that growth coincides with the provision of anticipated new infrastructure;
  - d. Growth areas need to access the existing transport network (This includes routes and connections necessary to safely and efficiently operate existing infrastructure and cope with changing travel demand);

- e. On some occasions it may be necessary, among other things, to assist infrastructure development through provision for financial contributions;
  - f. It will remain important to regulate sensitive land uses located alongside existing State highway and identified future transport corridors; and
  - g. Multi-modal solutions may be necessary to support, or in addition to, the above.
12. It should be noted that the Transport Agency has also submitted on the Airport Zone Plan Change (“**Plan Change 84**”). It is supportive of the purpose of Plan Change 84 in a general sense in respect of removing a prohibited status for specified large format retail activities within the zone and replacing that status with a discretionary or non-complying one according to the activity. I agree that this better reflects the level of risk from adverse effects of those commercial activities to the environment and also will better reflect the purpose of the Act.
13. The Transport Agency however considers that this will bring forward or create trip generation that otherwise would not affect the road network. This highlights the importance of ensuring that a strong regulatory framework is in place under both the zone rules and for infrastructure as a whole. Such a framework would, ideally, be able to reliably set specified traffic generation thresholds (related either to generic Gross Floor Area (**‘GFA’**) triggers or specific activity levels on a site) linked to a requirement for Integrated Traffic Assessments (**‘ITA’**).
14. While the Transport Agency’s initial submission on the PDP requested a number of alterations to the PDP, most of the points concern the wording of definitions. With specific exceptions the submission otherwise largely support the Council’s wording and the underlying scheme of the PDP.
15. The Transport Agency in making its submission also agreed with the Council’s hierarchical approach to commercial activity and the zoning structure in a general sense. The Transport Agency considers it to be an effective tool for linking new development to old and avoiding,

remedying, or mitigating adverse effects on existing infrastructure. It provides a systematic spatial framework for sustainable management of existing infrastructure in a general sense and for transport infrastructure in particular.

### **General planning outcomes sought by the Transport Agency in its submission**

16. These are, unsurprisingly:
  - a. For the PDP to explicitly recognise that State highways are an important facilitator of economic development and in turn their operation is affected by growth and changes in land use patterns;
  - b. The corollary is that controls on developments (irrespective of the development history or ownership) are considered integral not incidental to sustainable management of physical resources such as the road network;
  - c. To protect the ability of the road network and related parts of the transport system to continue operating in a safe and efficient manner;
  - d. That growth areas have access to the existing network in a way that does not place undue pressure on other users or other parts of the network;
  - e. To make sure that the PDP provisions cover sensitive land uses like residential occupation so they do not affect the safe and efficient operation of network infrastructure;
  - f. To ensure that new developments impacting on network infrastructure, or having the reasonably likely potential to do so, can trigger a requirement for an equitable contribution to the cost of upgrading infrastructure – a matter for Chapter 12; and
  - g. To have a planning environment that does not discourage a balance of different modes of public and private transport for future resilience.

## Information gaps and Transport Agency Research

17. The Transport Agency in carrying out its statutory mandate needs to continually model and predict demand on behalf of the whole community. In this next section I briefly summarise the main outputs from recent Transport Agency modelling of Paraparaumu's traffic scenarios, as this is important in explaining the Transport Agency's detailed approach to provisions in the Proposed District Plan in the tables following.
18. Preliminary observations (traffic counts and intersection data) and modelling suggests there will be an increase in pressure on key parts of the network such as Kapiti Road, which is already experiencing overload at some peak periods under its partly two lane configuration. I note that current traffic along Kapiti Road is over 14,000per day/lane during peak periods – over the desirable limit of 10,000per day/lane.
19. The Transport Agency therefore needed to clarify and restate its assumptions in its predictive modelling, given the level of its investments. Tony Brennand, a Transport Agency Principal Transport Outcome Planner, is available to the Panel if you wish more detail on these matters.
20. Work commissioned from Beca consultants<sup>2</sup> suggests that, all else equal, increased demand over the next 15 years will occur on the expressway interchange with Kapiti Road and be referred from and along Kapiti Road; both airport and non-airport zone related traffic. This pressure will likely be increased if more 'large format retail' development occurs along Kapiti Road and creates an enhanced destination effect.
21. The likely increased pressure would be in part due to an increase in turning involved as new destinations become stronger attractors, in part

---

<sup>2</sup> In March/April 2016, the Transport Agency, working with the Council, commissioned Beca Consultants to review existing models and available information and use this to re test the likely development scenarios, taking into account proposed development arising from the Airport Zone and other predicted changes that might alter current transport flows and/or levels of service. I note that a traffic consultant to Kapiti Coast Airport Holdings Ltd also had input into the base assumptions of this recent iteration by Beca Consultants, although he has had no subsequent responsibility for any of the reported outputs.

due to the synergy between adjacent developments<sup>3</sup>. Inevitably this will affect through traffic, including traffic exiting the expressway. The projected population increase would also reinforce these trends – see the table in Appendix A.

### Response to the section 42A report

22. The Transport Agency supports the overall structure and focus of the PDP provisions in the Infrastructure Chapter (Chapter 12) as it highlights the integral relationship between development and transport infrastructure.
23. Where I depart from the section 42A ('s.42A') recommendations is made clear in the table below, otherwise it they are considered to implement both the general comments in the Transport Agency's submission, as well as more specific points of clarification or definition requested.

#### Specific relief and comments listed in the table below.

Transport Agency position	Reasons or issues	s.42A Report response	s.42A paragraph reference	s.42A, Appendix 3 page reference
Support the definition 'major traffic activity' being retained	Reinforces an effects based approach	Agree with s.42A recommendation	1342	p4
Clarify and retain the term 'vehicle movement'	Definition important for planning for effects of development	Agree with s.42A recommendation	1196	P4
Include 'SH' in the references to 'road'	Agrees with the Transport Agency's submission	Definition modified to include SH	1345	pp7-8
Remove any reference to the Western Link Road	Agree with the Transport Agency's submission	References removed in accordance with the Transport Agency's	989	P38

<sup>3</sup> I note that in this respect there is around 24,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA in the Airport Zone with potential for up to four times that area as a controlled activity and significantly more as a restricted discretionary activity

		submission		
Neutral	Removal of Freight hierarchy maps. Consider it could be a topic to revisit in a wider sense as they are an assessment tool	Neutral, but maps were clearly unsupported – see also Policy 11.23	1394	pp9-11
General support for retaining rule 11C.1.2 relating to 'Traffic Generation'	Important for defining and predicting adverse effects. Managing effects on infrastructure requires good definitions	Agree with s.42A recommendations	1178-1183	p21
General support retaining rule 11C.3.1 covering 'Major Traffic Activities' not on a Limited Access Road	Important in a general sense for defining and predicting adverse effects on infrastructure	Agree with s.42A recommendation	1178-1183	pp21 & 32
Retain rule 11C.3/2 on indications of "traffic levels"	Assists in assessment of adverse effects on infrastructure	Agree with s.42A recommendation	1178-1183	p21
Rule 11.34 relating to safety of transport users	The Transport Agency recommended deletion of reference to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (' <b>CPTED</b> ') as being too broad	Agree with the insertion of (c), but still concerned that the implementation of CPTED guidelines. Is a coarse planning mechanism. I note that my argument was used in the s.42A Report against incorporating references in the PDP to the Transport Agency's Policy Manual – need for consistency. Essentially it is	1132, 1137, 1140	p23

		about relevance and the wording should reflect that. Not all of the CPTED guidelines are necessarily compatible with operating a transport network in all places		
General support for setting increased 'traffic thresholds'	Pragmatic, as it sets a realistic threshold for assessing significant traffic generation from a site/area	Agree with s.42A recommendation	1178-1183	p24
Neutral - Airport Zone exemption from traffic generation rules & thresholds	Require care in avoiding duplication in requirements on development in the Airport Zone	Not opposed to s.42A recommendation in principle, merely think it needs to be refined. The Airport Zone GFA and site specific rule standards requiring traffic assessments have a different purpose and the ITAs in each case should reflect that in their content and focus.	1202	pp33-34
The Transport Agency's submission on removal of the phrase "Travel Statements"	Removes lack of clarity	Agree with s.42A recommendation as it implements the Transport Agency's submission	1067	p39
The Transport Agency's submission on including references to the Transport Agency's policy manual in	This would enable references to technical car parking standards	Agree with s.42A recommendation that the submission was too broad and it can be met via reference to specific parts of the manual	1035	p40

plan				
The Transport Agency's submission on 11.2 'reverse sensitivity'	Amendments needed to clarify rule	Generally agree. Placement is the only question	145 & 154	
The Transport Agency's submission to remove the word 'minimised' and replace with avoid, remedy, or mitigate	Brings the wording in line with the Act	Agree with the s.42A recommendation	173 & 179	
The Transport Agency's submission on on Policy 11.7 -to include the Transport Agency as an infrastructure provider	Recognises reality	Agree with s.42A recommendation as incorporating the essential message	202 & 204	
The Transport Agency's submission on Policy 11.8 (b) (i)	Recognise that development should be aligned with investment	Agree with s.42A recommendation as accepting the intent of the submission	215, 217, 219	
The Transport Agency's submission on Policy 11.9	To clarify the policy on infrastructure in sensitive areas and separate hazards from other sensitive areas such as natural and built heritage	In part agree with s.42A recommendation. Still think that 'inappropriate' needs further definition – the PDP needs to interpret the Act not only repeat it	232, 236 & 249	
The Transport Agency's submission on 11.29	Includes the Transport Agency as an infrastructure provider	Agree with s.42A recommendation as accepting the intent of the submission by referring to 'providers'	202	

The Transport Agency's submission on 11.32	Removal of the word 'minimised' and its replacement with avoid, etc	Agree with s.42A recommendation as accepting the intent of the submission	1121, 1122	
The Transport Agency's submission on 11.33	Removal of the word 'minimised' and replacement of the term 'excessive noise area'	Agree with s.42A recommendation as accepting the intent of the submission	1098, 1099	
The Transport Agency's submission on 11.35	Sought to include reference to balancing discouragement of parking overflow and car travel	Agree with s.42A recommendation	1149, 1153	

24. Further addenda to this evidence will be provided prior to the relevant hearings convened to hear evidence and submissions on the following:

- a) Chapter 6 – Working Environment
- b) Chapter 12 – Financial Contributions

**Robert Arnold Harris**

29 July 2016

## Appendix A – Kapiti population estimates and projections (2013–2043)\*

Population projections - 2013 Census base

POPULATION UNIT AREA	2013	2043	CHANGE	% CHANGE
Otaki Forks	1540	1630	90	5.85%
Otaki	5960	6770	810	13.6%
Kaitawa	570	830	260	45.6%
Te Horo	840	1210	370	44%
Peka Peka	380	850	470	124%
Waikanae East	2240	2540	300	13.4%
Waikanae West	3530	5530	2000	56.6%
Waikanae Park	1990	2310	320	16%
Waikanae Beach	3160	4060	900	28.5%
Paraparaumu Beach Nth	3680	4520	840	22.8%
Paraparaumu Central	8950	9090	140	1.56%
Paraparaumu Beach Sth	5080	5026	-54	-1.06%
Raumati Beach	5000	5790	790	15.8%
Raumati Beach South	3720	4270	550	14.8%
Maungakotukutuku	1030	1730	700	68%
Otaihanga	1250	1630	380	30.4%
Paekakariki	1740	2010	270	15.52%
Kapiti Island	10	10	0	0
<b>Projected total</b>	<b>50,670</b>	<b>59,806</b>	<b>9,136</b>	<b>18%</b>

Projected change in the proportion of >65 years = 25-35% over 30 years

Projected change for 0-14 year cohorts = decline from 18.34-15.33%

Projected change for 15-39 cohorts = decline from 22.8-21%

Projected change for 40-64 cohorts = decline from 34.33%-28%

\*The projections are based on an 'all else equal' basis of population dynamics and are extrapolated from previous residence, fertility, immigration and death estimates based on the 2013 Census.

