

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

**Statement of evidence of Colin Robert Shields on behalf Kāpiti Coast District
Council (Effects on Transport)**

Date: 5 November 2025

INTRODUCTION:

- 1 My full name is Colin Robert Shields. I am employed as a Senior Principal Transport Planner at Tonkin & Taylor Limited.
- 2 I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of the Kāpiti Coast District Council (Council) in respect of technical related matters arising from the submissions and further submissions on the Private Plan Change 4 (PPC4) to the Kāpiti Coast District Plan (District Plan).
- 3 Specifically, this statement of evidence relates to the following matters:
 - a) Existing transport conditions.
 - b) PPC4 transport impact.
 - c) Compliance with District Plan requirements.
 - d) Access for any future rezoning of the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) land west of PPC4.
 - e) Response to submitters.
 - f) Conclusion and recommendations.
- 4 I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 5 I hold the qualifications of Master of Science in Transport Engineering from the University of Newcastle Upon Tyne (UK).
- 6 I have over 35 years transport planning and engineering experience gained within New Zealand and internationally, managing the appraisal, design, and delivery of a wide range of transport projects and providing transport planning inputs to the master planning, consenting (under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)), design and delivery of residential, commercial and education land development projects.

- 7 I am a Chartered Professional Engineer (CPEng) with Engineering NZ and I am a Chartered Member of Engineering NZ (CMEngNZ).

Code of conduct

- 8 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023¹. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing my evidence and will continue to comply with it while giving oral evidence before the Environment Court. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. Except where I state I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

SUMMARY

- 9 My name is Colin Robert Shields.
- 10 I have been asked by the Council to provide transport evidence in relation to technical related matters arising from the submissions and further submissions on the Private Plan Change 4 (PPC4) to the Kāpiti Coast District Plan (District Plan).
- 11 My statement of evidence addresses the following matters:
- a) Existing transport conditions.
 - b) PPC4 transport impact.
 - c) Compliance with District Plan requirements.
 - d) Access for any future rezoning of the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) land west of PPC4.
 - e) Response to submitters.

¹ <https://environmentcourt.govt.nz/assets/Practice-Note-2023-.pdf>

- 12 I confirm that the proposed site access and the adjacent road network can safely and efficiently accommodate the predicted traffic flows from PPC4. I note that a safe crossing location is proposed for pedestrians along with an extension of the existing footpath on Ratanui Road to provide a safe connection for future residents of the site. I do note though that the site is not within an easy walking distance to a bus service and hence there will be a reliance on the car for most trips.
- 13 The ITA and RFI responses provide a review of the District Plan transport requirements and the appropriateness of these being applied at the consenting stage. I confirm I agree with the findings that there are no concerns with the rules being applied to development of the site for either a retirement village or residential development. I also note that either development option would be considered a 'major traffic activity' under Rule TR-R10 of the District Plan requiring a transport assessment at the consenting stage, with the Council having discretion over consistency with all District Plan transport policies
- 14 Multiple submissions were received relating to transport matters and I have addressed each of these matters in my evidence.
- 15 I consider that the PPC4 provisions coupled with the existing District Plan provisions are appropriate to address any transport matters at resource consent stage.
- 16 Therefore, in relation to transport, I see no reason not to approve PPC4.

INVOLVEMENT WITH THE PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 4 (PPC4)

- 17 I have been involved with PPC4 since November 2024 when I was engaged by the Council to review the Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) which was subsequently attached as Appendix G of the PPC4 Notification Document. Based on my review, and discussions with Council officers, a Request for Further Information (RFI) was issued to

the Requestor on 16 January 2025. I was then subsequently asked by the Council to review the Requestor's response to the RFI (dated 14 February 2025). Following my review, I confirmed my agreement with the responses to the RFI and that there were no outstanding transport issues.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

18 My statement of evidence addresses the following matters:

- a) Existing transport conditions.
- b) PPC4 transport impact.
- c) Compliance with District Plan requirements.
- d) Access for any future rezoning of the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) land west of PPC4.
- e) Response to submitters.
- f) Conclusion and recommendations.

Existing transport conditions

19 I have reviewed the assessment of the existing transport conditions provided in the ITA and in the Requestor's RFI response and I confirm that they are an accurate description of the existing transport conditions.

PPC4 transport impact

20 I confirm that the PPC4 development assumptions have been used in the assessment of the transport effects of the proposal contained in the ITA and the Requestor's RFI response. I confirm that the proposed site access and the adjacent road network can safely and efficiently

accommodate the predicted traffic flows from PPC4. I note that a safe crossing location is proposed for pedestrians along with an extension of the existing footpath on Ratanui Road to provide a safe connection for future residents of the site. I note that the site is not within an easy walking distance to a bus service and hence there will be a reliance on the car for most trips.

Compliance with District Plan Requirements

- 21 The ITA and RFI responses provide a review of the District Plan transport requirements and the appropriateness of these being applied at the consenting stage. I confirm that I agree with the findings that there are no concerns with the rules being applied to development of the site for either a retirement village or residential development. I also note that either development option would be considered a ‘major traffic activity’ under Transport Rule 2 requiring a transport assessment at the consenting stage, with the Council having discretion over consistency with all District Plan transport policies.

Access for any future rezoning of the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) land west of PPC4

- 22 Ms. Sweetman, the Council’s consultant planner, asked me to consider whether the rezoning of the PPC4 site in isolation to the land west of the site would compromise that land’s future development from a transport perspective should it also be rezoned in the future. I understand that this was to assist her in responding to submissions regarding a piecemeal approach to rezoning. I have carried out an initial review of potential access options.
- 23 The area of land west of PPC4 is shown highlighted in pink in Figure 1 below and includes (highlighted in red) part of the 65 Ratanui Road site that will remain RLZ:

Figure 1 – land west of PPC4



- 24 There are potentially three options for access to the land to the west.
- 25 Option 1, access via the PCC4 site ,which would be subject to agreements with the PPC4 developer and dependent on the final design and layout of PCC4.
- 26 Option 2, access using Ratanui Road. This could potentially be possible subject to being able to provide a safe and efficient access design given that the existing preschool access is directly opposite. This would also be subject to providing upgrades to the exiting footpath on Ratanui Road and providing a safe pedestrian crossing of Ratanui Road. The design of the site access and any pedestrian improvements would be subject to agreement with Council.
- 27 Option 3, access to Mazengarb Road via the existing private access road. This would be subject to any legal access rights, easements or covenants etc. The existing private access road width, along with the wide berms, appears to provide sufficient width for the access road to be widened if required and the existing access onto Mazengarb Road

has good sightlines. Intersection spacing with the adjacent Stella Close and College Drive (circa 50m north and south) would need to be assessed in terms of compliance with standards and discussions with Council would need to be had to confirm if the road would need to be brought up to adoptable standard.

- 28 Based on my initial review, there are potential options for access to the land west of PPC4, but this would be subject to detailed design and investigations to confirm if any of these options are deliverable.

Response to submitters

- 29 I have read and considered the submissions that relate to transport matters. Across the submissions, a number of similar transport themes were identified. To avoid repetition, I have provided my response to submissions in relation to themes raised (and subsequent sub themes) and identifying submitters that the response applies to. In my discussion I indicate whether I agree or disagree with the various submissions, my reasons, and I comment on the implications, if any, for PPC4.

Increased safety risk on Ratanui Road with additional traffic from PPC4

- 30 Several submissions² raised concerns that the risk of accidents on Ratanui Road would increase as a result of development at PPC4, including adjacent to the existing pre-school access. The ITA demonstrates through analysis of NZTA crash data that Ratanui Road does not have an existing safety problem. Furthermore, the ITA has demonstrated that the additional traffic generated by PPC4, along with the PPC4 site access proposed, is unlikely to increase the risk of

² Samuel Day (submitter 1), Rhys Evans (submitter 3), Kim Hobson (submitter 4), Derek and Helen Foo (submitter 7), Ian Powell (submitter 9), Paul Coggan (submitter 15), Ingrid van Iperen (submitter 17) and Roy and Meryl Opie (submitter 18)

accidents on Ratanui Road and will not impact on the safety of the existing pre-school access.

- 31 Furthermore, since PPC4 will be considered a major traffic activity (i.e. generating more than 100 vehicles per day) which is a restricted discretionary activity under Rule TR-R10 of the District Plan, Council will have discretion over consistency with relevant District Plan provisions (including approval of the proposed PPC4 site access design) at a future resource consent stage. This will also include the provision of conditions should consent be granted. This will ensure that a safe form of access is provided to the PPC4 site.
- 32 I therefore consider that there is not an existing safety problem on Ratanui Road, that the adjacent road network can safely accommodate the predicted traffic flows from PPC4 and that suitable conditions can be included at a future resource consent stage to ensure consistency with relevant District Plan provisions.

Pedestrian safety on Ratanui Road

- 33 Three submissions³ raised concerns about inadequate provision made for pedestrians to cross Ratanui Road and that increased traffic volumes will create unacceptable safety risks to children and recreational pedestrians. Figure 9.1 of the ITA provides a feasibility concept design of the PPC4 access onto Ratanui Road. This includes provision of a pedestrian crossing point in the form of a new refuge island on Ratanui Road to the west of the new access. This also includes extension of the existing footpath on the south side of Ratanui Road from the pre-school to the proposed crossing point and therefore linking to the existing footpath on the north side of Ratanui Road. The

³ Rhys Evans (submitter 3), Derek and Helen Foo (submitter 7) and Paul Coggan (submitter 15)

concept design also demonstrates that the access will not impact on the safety of the existing pre-school access.

- 34 Section 11.1 of the ITA also indicates, in respect of the option for residential development, that additional connectivity to potential future development adjacent to the PPC4 site would be a matter of discretion for Council for consideration at a future resource consent stage. Furthermore, since PPC4 will be considered a major traffic activity, Council will have discretion over consistency with relevant District Plan provisions (including approval of the developer-funded proposed PPC4 site access design and footpath extension works) at a future resource consent stage. This will also include the provision of conditions should consent be granted. This will ensure that a safe and efficient form of access is provided to the PPC4 site.
- 35 It is my opinion that safe provision for pedestrians on Ratanui Road can be provided and that this can be conditioned at the resource consent stage.

Cyclist safety on Ratanui Road

- 36 Derek and Helen Foo (submitter #7) stated that increased traffic volumes will compromise cyclist safety on Ratanui Road. I have reviewed a Council cycle count survey carried out in March 2024, which indicated 21 cyclists per day (i.e. an average of one cyclist per hour) on Ratanui Road adjacent to the site. These cyclists were also spread throughout the day and not concentrated at peak work or school hours.
- 37 I consider this to be a very low volume of cyclists on Ratanui Road and the crash data reviewed in the ITA does not demonstrate an existing safety problem for cyclists on Ratanui Road. It is my opinion that the additional traffic from PPC4 will not compromise safety for the very low number of cyclists on Ratanui Road.

Increased congestion on Ratanui Road with additional traffic from PPC4.

- 38 Numerous submissions⁴ raised concerns that congestion on Ratanui Road would increase as a result of development at PPC4. The ITA and the Requestor's responses to the RFI, demonstrates by comparison with traffic carrying capacities contained in NZS4404, that Ratanui Road is predicted to operate within capacity with the additional traffic from PPC4. The assessments also demonstrates that the access will not impact on the efficiency of the existing pre-school access. Furthermore, through detailed Sidra intersection capacity modelling, the Requestor has demonstrated that the proposed PPC4 site access with Ratanui Road, and the Ratanui Road intersections with Mazengarb Road and Otaihanga Road will all be operating within capacity with the additional traffic generated by PPC4. All of these assessments took into account future traffic increases on Ratanui Road as a result of other planned/possible residential developments including the consented Mansell 150 residential subdivision lot (RM241010) at 117-155 Otaihanga Road (Mansell development).
- 39 Furthermore, since PPC4 will be considered a major traffic activity, Council will have discretion over consistency with relevant District Plan provisions (including approval of the proposed PPC4 site access design) at a future resource consent stage. This will also include the provision of conditions should consent be granted. This will ensure that an efficient form of access is provided to the PPC4 site.
- 40 It is my opinion that the traffic generated by PPC4 can be efficiently accommodated on Ratanui Road and the adjacent road network and that suitable conditions can be included at a future resource consent stage to ensure consistency with relevant District Plan provisions.

⁴ Samuel Day (submitter 1), Rhys Evans (submitter 3), Kim Hobson (submitter 4), Russell Halliday (submitter 5), Derek and Helen Foo (submitter 7), Sarah and Dane Coles (submitter 8), Ian Powell (submitter 9), Alex Metcalfe (submitter 13) and Ingrid van Iperen (submitter 17)

Assessments are based on 2023 traffic flows and do not take into account further developments in the area and a wider area transport plan is required.

- 41 Several submissions⁵ indicated that the assessments do not take into account the Mansell development and traffic flows are based on 2023 levels. The capacity assessments undertaken within the ITA and RFI responses took into account future traffic increases on Ratanui Road as a result of other planned/possible residential developments (including the Mansell development). These assessments indicate that the proposed PPC4 site access with Ratanui Road, and the Ratanui Road intersections with Mazengarb Road and Otaihanga Road will all be operating within capacity with the additional traffic generated by PPC4 and wider background traffic growth on Ratanui Road from other developments in the area.
- 42 In respect of the query on the use of 2023 data, I have reviewed more recent traffic count data on Ratanui Road, from June 2025 using the Mobile Road website ([Mobile Road](#)). This actually indicates a slightly lower average daily traffic flow of 6,172 vehicles compared to the 6,300 daily traffic flow reported for 2023 in the ITA.
- 43 I consider that the Requestor has satisfactorily taken into account the traffic effects of the PPC4 and other potential developments in the adjacent area in their assessments.
- 44 Submitters also stated that some form of overall transport plan for the Otaihanga area is needed before any re-zoning is approved. As detailed in paragraph 30 above, the capacity assessments undertaken in the ITA took into account future traffic increases on Ratanui Road as a result of other planned/possible residential developments including the Mansell development. In addition, since PPC4 will be considered a major traffic activity, Council will have discretion over consistency with relevant

⁵ Rhys Evans (submitter 3), Derek and Helen Foo (submitter 7), Sarah and Dane Coles (submitter 8), Alex Metcalfe (submitter 13) and Paul Coggan (submitter 15)

District Plan provisions (including approval of the developer funded proposed PPC4 site access design) at a future resource consent stage. This will also include the provision of conditions should consent be granted. This will ensure that a safe and efficient form of access is provided to the PPC4 site.

- 45 It is my opinion that an overall transport plan is not required since the ITA demonstrates that PPC4 can be safely and efficiently accommodated taking into account future potential traffic increases on Ratanui Road from other potential developments.

Changes to speed limits

- 46 Three submissions⁶ requested that the existing 50 km/h posted limit be extended on Ratanui Road. Changes to posted speed limits are the responsibility of the Council as the Road Controlling Authority and are beyond the scope of what the Requestor can do. Council changes to speed limits are usually incorporated within Speed Management Plans. Under the NZTA One Network Framework, Ratanui Road is defined as a 'peri-urban' road providing access from residential properties on the urban fringe, where the predominant adjacent land-use is residential, but usually at a lower density than that found in urban residential locations. On peri urban roads on street activity is discernible and local in nature but also at lower levels than in urban areas. Under the Setting of Speed Limits Rule 2024 (which sets out the criteria, requirements and procedures to be followed by Road Controlling Authorities when reviewing and setting speed limits), peri urban roads can have a speed limit of between 50 and 80km/h. As such, I consider that the existing speed limits of 50 km/h and 60 km/h are appropriate for Ratanui Road.

⁶ Derek and Helen Foo (submitter 7), Ian Powell (submitter 9) and Alex Metcalfe (submitter 13)

- 47 I have discussed the submitters' suggestion to extend the 50 km/h posted speed limit with Council and currently there are no Council proposals to change the posted speed limits on Ratanui Road. This is primarily due to the existing low density development fronting Ratanui Road and the low number of intersecting roads/ driveways (noting the PPC4 proposal with one access does little to change this situation). As such the Council consider that there is very little 'side friction' (i.e. activities to reduce the speed of vehicles) to promote or reinforce a 50km/h speed limit. Therefore, the Council consider that the existing speed limits are likely to remain unchanged for the near future.
- 48 I would agree with the Council's conclusion for the current situation but I would recommend that, if other developments come forward on Ratanui Road, that the Council undertake a speed limit review in the future to assess whether any speed limit changes are required.
- 49 Ian Powell (submitter #9) also did not agree with the Requestor's statement that traffic travels at moderate speeds. I have reviewed traffic speed surveys carried out by the Council in February 2025. Within the 50 km/h speed limit, these surveys indicate average vehicle speeds of up to 46.9 km/h and within the 60 km/h speed limit, these surveys indicate average vehicle speeds of up to 58.7 km/h. 85th percentile surveyed speeds (i.e. the speed at or below which 85% of the drivers travel on a road) were marginally higher at up to 52.7 km/h in the 50 km/h speed limit area and up to 63.9 km/h in the 60 km/h speed limit zone. The average speeds are below the posted speed limits and the 85th percentile speeds are very close to the posted speed limits. I conclude that traffic is currently travelling at or very close to the posted speed limits and the existing crash record does not indicate a road safety issue in relation to speed.

Public transport

- 50 Several submissions⁷ highlighted that there is a lack of public transport on Ratanui Road and that new bus services should be provided. Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) are responsible for the planning and delivery of public transport services in this area and public transport provision is beyond the scope of what the Requestor (and also the Council) can do. I have discussed this issue with Council who contacted GWRC regarding the scope to improve public transport services on Ratanui Road. GWRC responded that currently no bus provision in this area will be made by GWRC since the area is classed as a rural zone and transport rates are not provided to support bus services.
- 51 For the current situation I would agree with the GWRC position since bus services require financial support to remain operational. If rezoning takes place and other developments come forward in the area adjacent to Ratanui Road that would result in transport rates being realised, then I recommend that in the future that the Council discuss with GWRC the scope to introduce bus services in this area.
- 52 Derek and Helen Foo (submitter #7) also indicated that the nearest bus stop is beyond a convenient walking distance for those with mobility issues. The nearest bus stops to PPC4 are on Mazengarb Road which is up to 1.3km (or circa 15 minute) walk from PPC4, which I do not consider to be a reasonable walk distance/time to a bus stop and hence I would agree with the submitter's comment. The ITA does acknowledge that bus service uptake from PPC4 would be relatively low, which I agree with.

⁷ Derek and Helen Foo (submitter 7), Ian Powell (submitter 9), Alex Metcalfe (submitter 13), Hayden Mihaila-Milburn (submitter 14) and Roy and Meryl Opie (submitter 18)

Single point of access

53 Two submissions⁸ highlighted concerns that a single point of access will create in terms of congestion, and a risk that there is no alternative access during emergencies and maintenance. There are no District Plan Rules or Council design guidance that set thresholds on the maximum number of dwellings that can be served from a single point of access. Also, based on my discussions with Council, there are a number of existing similar sized developments across the District consented and occupied with a single point of access that are understood to operate without any congestion, emergency access, maintenance or safety issues including:

- a) Charles Fleming Retirement Village, Parata Street, Waikanae - consisting of circa 138 villas, 54 apartments, 120 care beds and 78 assisted living rooms.
- b) Kapiti Village Metlifecare Retirement Village, Guildford Drive, Paraparaumu - consisting of circa 200 villas and 33 serviced apartments.

54 In terms of the submitter's issues with a single point of access I comment as follows:

- a) Congestion - as indicated in paragraph 30 above, the proposed access will operate well within capacity and therefore I do not consider a single point of access would create congestion issues.
- b) Emergency access - as part of any resource consent application the views of FENZ, NZ Police and St Johns would be sought and also there are no known emergency access issues at existing developments with a single point of access. I do not consider a single point of access

would create any emergency access issues. It is my opinion that the key issue to consider for any future resource consent is not that this is a single point of access but that the design of the site access and internal roads can safely accommodate emergency vehicles in accordance with FENZ design requirements (eg road widths, turning facilities, gradients fire hydrant, hardstands etc). This would be addressed through conditions at the resource consent stage.

- c) Maintenance – Noting the access will be within the road reserve, then any maintenance works in the road reserve require a formal approval process with the Council called a CAR (Corridor Access Request). This will require approval of Traffic Management Plans which will need to indicate how access by all vehicles will be maintained. I do not consider a single point of access would create any maintenance issues.

55 Section 11.1 of the ITA also indicates in respect of the option for residential development, that additional connectivity to potential future development adjacent to the PPC4 site would be a matter of discretion for Council for consideration at a future resource consent stage. As such there could be scope for an additional access point in the future.

Ratanui Road is used as a rural road and neighbouring rural properties user rights should be protected

56 Two submissions⁹ raised concerns that Ratanui Road is used by many as a rural road (including used by ponies and horses) and that neighbouring rural properties user rights should be protected. The Council's District Plan classifies Ratanui Road as a Local Community

⁹

Lang Family Trust (submitter 2), and Derek and Helen Foo (submitter 7)

Connector route. This road classification has the following function and characteristics:

- a) Larger urban roads linking local roads to the connector network.
- b) In rural areas, includes minor roads linking smaller rural communities to the connector network.
- c) Provides main access routes through suburbs.
- d) Connect local centres.
- e) Traffic movements mainly locally generated.
- f) Significant walkways / cycleways between local centres, schools and employment areas.
- g) May be some routes with relatively high traffic volumes.
- h) Expect moderate speed.

57 Given the existing urban posted speed limits of 50 and 60 km/h, the relatively high daily vehicle traffic flows (as reported in the ITA) of circa 6,300 and a mix of low density residential and pre-school uses, I do not consider that Ratanui Road is operating as a 'rural road' and I consider it is operating as per the Council's classification as a Local Community Connector.

58 I assume that the submitters' reference to ponies and horses using Ratanui Road is in relation to equestrian use and not uncontrolled animals on the road. Although there is no data available indicating the number of equestrians on the road, the crash data within the ITA does not indicate that Ratanui Road has a safety problem with horse riders and the crash data indicated that there were no equestrian related crashes. Furthermore, the ITA has demonstrated that the additional traffic generated by PPC4, along with the PPC4 site access proposed, is unlikely to increase the risk of accidents on Ratanui Road.

59 I therefore consider that Ratanui Road is performing its Local Community Connector role safely and efficiently and that the traffic effects of PPC4 can be mitigated without adversely affecting adjoining properties or their current use of Ratanui Road.

Construction traffic impacts

- 60 Two submissions¹⁰ raised concerns about an increased safety risk from construction traffic with one submission indicating that there will be a *“minimum of 8,000 loads of fill / soil alone (55,000 M³)”*. 55,000m³ is stated in both section 3.6.1 of the Notification document and section 2.2 of the Appendix H Civil Engineering report. However, no information has been provided by the Requestor on the number of construction vehicles and hence it is unclear to me where the submitter has obtained the *“8,000 loads”* from. I would not expect that a private plan change request would have the level of detail to indicate a construction methodology, including numbers of construction vehicles. I consider that this is normally, and more appropriately, addressed as part of a future resource consent application and Council conditions regarding provision and approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan prior to commencement of any construction work to ensure the safety of all road users is maintained.

Parking

- 61 Russell Halliday (submitter #5) queried whether adequate on-site parking for staff and visitors will be provided. In accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, there are no minimum parking requirements in the District Plan (except relating to accessible parking spaces). While there is no requirement to provide on-site parking, I would expect that the development will do so, and hence I do not anticipate that there would be any PPC4 related parking on Ratanui Road. At the resource consent stage, I would anticipate that conditions relating to the design of on-site parking to be in accordance with District Plan requirements will be applied. I therefore consider that the parking effects of the proposal can sufficiently be mitigated at

¹⁰

Kim Hobson (submitter 4) and Derek and Helen Foo (submitter 7)

the resource consent stage without having an effect on the efficient and safe functioning of the local roading network.

No essential services within close proximity of PPC4

- 62 Hayden Mihaila-Milburn (submitter #14) stated there are no essential services within close proximity of PPC4 and this will isolate residents. I do not agree with this comment since the site is located circa 4km (or 6 min drive) north of the Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre which provides essential services within close proximity of the site.

Various issues

- 63 Alex Metcalfe (submitter #13) requested that a number of road enhancements should be assessed as part of PPC4 including:
- a) Address the ongoing, perpetual, very poor condition of the road surface over the railway level crossing on Otaihanga Road.
 - b) Install a traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing where the cycle way along the Expressway crosses Otaihanga Road.
 - c) Change the name of the stretch of Otaihanga Road from the junction with Ratanui Road to Old SH1 to be 'Ratanui Road'.
 - d) Replace the junction at Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road with a roundabout.
 - e) Construct properly formed pavements and cycleways along the entire lengths of Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road.
 - f) Address the very narrow pavement where Ratanui Road joins Mazengarb Road. The pavement here is so narrow that a wheelie bin completely blocks the pavement such that pedestrians are forced to step into the road.
 - g) Reopen the access from Otaihanga Road to the Expressway going south towards Wellington. This was the main access point for contractors when the Expressway was being built.
- 64 I do not consider that these are relevant to the consideration of PPC4 and are beyond the scope of what the Requestor can action.

Conclusion and Recommendations

- 65 I confirm that the proposed site access and the adjacent road network can safely and efficiently accommodate the predicted traffic flows from PPC4. I note that a safe crossing location is proposed for pedestrians along with an extension of the existing footpath on Ratanui Road to provide a safe connection for future residents of the site. I do note though that the site is not within an easy walking distance to a bus service and hence there will be a reliance on the car for most trips.
- 66 The ITA and RFI responses provide a review of the District Plan transport requirements and the appropriateness of these being applied at the consenting stage. I confirm I agree with the findings that there are no concerns with the rules being applied to development of the site for either a retirement village or residential development. I also note that either development option would be considered a 'major traffic activity' under Rule TR-R10 of the District Plan requiring a transport assessment at the consenting stage, with the Council having discretion over consistency with all District Plan transport policies
- 67 Multiple submissions were received relating to transport matters and I have addressed each of these matters in my evidence.
- 68 I consider that the PPC4 provisions coupled with the existing District Plan provisions are appropriate to address any transport matters at resource consent stage.
- 69 Therefore, in relation to transport, I see no reason not to approve PPC4.

Date: 5 November 2025

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'C. Shields', is positioned above a horizontal dotted line.

Colin Robert Shields