BEFORE A HEARING COMMISSIONER
APPOINTED BY KĀPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL

Under the	of the Resource Management Act 1991
And	
In the matter	of an application for resource consent by Gresham Trustee Limited under section 88 of the Act, to undertake a 302-lot fee simple subdivision, the construction of 135 dwellings, and associated earthworks at 240 Kāpiti Road, Paraparaumu.

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JAMES WHITTAKER (TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT) ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

Dated: 26 October 2022

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is James Whittaker.

2. I hold a Bachelor of Arts degree with Honours in Geography from the University of Leicester (United Kingdom). I have more than 18 years' experience in the field of transport planning and traffic engineering, in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand, and am a member of Engineering New Zealand.

3. I am a Principal Transportation Planner at Stantec NZ, where I have worked for the past 17 years practising as a traffic planning/engineering specialist. During that time, I have been involved in a considerable variety of traffic and transportation planning projects throughout New Zealand, covering matters related to road design, traffic safety and traffic management. I have also undertaken many transportation assessments and provided traffic engineering advice for a large number of activities, including commercial, retail and residential developments and plan change applications throughout New Zealand.

4. This evidence is given in support of the proposed development application by Gresham Trustee Limited ("GTL"), to establish a residential townhouse development at #240 Kāpiti Road (the "Site") in Paraparaumu. I am authorised to give this evidence on behalf of GTL.

5. I confirm that this evidence relates to the revised proposal plans which have incorporated some changes in response to the submissions received and further discussions with Council, which primarily relate to urban design matters. As such, the application before this hearing includes the proposed development plans shown in the 'Design Group Stapleton Elliott' ("DGSE") Drawings dated 5 October 2022.

6. I note from a traffic and transport perspective the key difference reflected in the updated plans relates to a decrease in the number of dwellings, from 139 down to 135, and a commensurate reduction in on-site car parks from 170 to 166 spaces (which now includes provision for up to 10 accessible car parks), and a proposed new secure communal cycle storage area. These changes do not impact on my assessment nor its conclusions in any way, rather the reduced number of dwellings will trigger a small reduction in associated site traffic.

Code of conduct

7. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. This assessment has been prepared in compliance with that Code, as if it were evidence being given in Environment Court proceedings. Unless I state otherwise, this assessment is within my area of expertise and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

Background and role

8. By way of background, I first became involved with the project in 2021 when my company was approached by GTL to provide traffic engineering and transport planning inputs into the development of land within the Site for medium density residential activity. I was then responsible for working alongside the project team in developing the Site plans and for preparing the 14 February 2022 'Integrated Transport Assessment Report' ("ITA Report"), which accompanied the application for Resource Consent.

9. During the course of the project I have engaged with the traffic engineering representatives at Kāpiti Coast District Council ("Council"), in relation to the traffic and transport matters associated with the proposed Site development.

10. Having lived in the Wellington region for more than 15 years (prior to moving to Christchurch early in 2022), I am familiar with the Site location and the surrounding road network providing access to the development property, and can confirm that I have visited it during my involvement with the project.

Purpose and scope of evidence

11. In this matter I have been asked by GTL to present my views and findings in respect of the transportation related needs and effects of the proposed residential development at the Site. My findings draw from the work undertaken by myself and my company since our involvement began.

12. In preparing this statement of evidence, I have considered the following documents:

    (a) 14 February 2022 ITA Report;

    (b) 4 May 2022 Stantec response to Council's Request for Further Information ("RFI response"), and subsequent additional response to traffic queries by email dated 30 September 2022;

(c) 16 June 2022 'Peer Review of Transport Matters' prepared by Tonkin + Taylor ("Peer Review");

(d) the revised proposal as illustrated in DGSE Architects Drawings dated 5 October 2022.

13. I confirm that I have read the submissions received in response to the application's notification insofar as they relate to my area of expertise, as well as the Council's Section 42A Report ("s42A Report"), and Council's consultant Traffic Engineers 'Statement of Evidence[1]' dated 14 October 2022 prepared by Mr Shields to inform the s42A Report.

14. I have structured my evidence as follows:

(a) to summarise the key points and conclusions from the ITA Report, including:

(i) Site location and existing transport environment;

(ii) description of the proposed development plans;

(iii) Site access;

(iv) Site traffic generation and assessment of network impacts;

(v) proposed internal Site movement network including provision for active modes;

(vi) Parking.

(b) to respond to matters raised by submitters;

(c) to respond to the Council Officer's s42A Report and the Council's consultant traffic engineers' statement of evidence on traffic and transport matters; and

(d) to respond to the proposed consent conditions.

15. I then present my findings and, by way of summary here in my evidence, confirm the conclusions of the ITA Report that development of the Site as proposed can be achieved in an appropriate and safe manner from a transportation perspective, with the controls enabled by the proposed draft consent conditions.

[1] Dated 14 October 2022, prepared by Colin Shields of Tonkin + Taylor

INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

16. I was responsible for the 14 February 2022 ITA Report submitted as part of the proposed resource consent Application, and the subsequent responses to Council's Request for Further Information.

17. I do not intend to repeat the detail of the ITA Report here, but will summarise the key points as relevant to my response to submissions and the s42A Report. My ITA Report concludes that:

    (a) a suitable access strategy for the Site has been developed that provides for vehicular and active mode connection via Halsey Grove, along with walking and cycling links to Kāpiti Road that provide useful and convenient access to the public transport services and the wider walking and cycling networks;

    (b) an assessment of the development Site's forecast parking demand, including a detailed survey of the existing on-street kerbside parking 'spare capacity', shows that associated overspill parking from the Site can be appropriately accommodated;

    (c) assessment of the likely traffic generated by the new residential development indicates the addition of approximately 90-100 vehicles during the peak hours, once the Site is fully developed. I assess these volumes as being able to be accommodated on the local road network without causing safety or capacity concerns; and

    (d) overall, an appropriate transportation outcome for all users can be delivered for the Site.

18. The matters raised by submitters, the s42A Report and statement of evidence by Council's consultant Traffic Engineer, do not give me cause to amend my findings or conclusions. That said, some matters raised require my further comment, as described through the evidence.

19. Before doing so, it is relevant for me to briefly describe the key matters of my ITA Report.

Site Location and Existing Road Environment

20. The aerial photograph below shows the location of the Site in the context of the local transport network and land use. Located at #240 Kāpiti Road, the

Site is zoned ‘General Residential’ and has frontage to Kāpiti Road to the south, and the Halsey Grove stub road termination to the north.

21. Kāpiti Road is classified as a ‘Major Community Connector’ road and runs generally east-west past the Site. The Kāpiti Road formation in the vicinity of the Site includes a single traffic lane in each direction, painted central median, on-road cycle lane/shoulder space, and kerbside parking on the northern side of the road only (adjacent to the Site). A footpath and shared path are provided on the north and south sides of the road, respectively, whilst a new central island refuge crossing has recently been installed adjacent to the Site frontage, providing for pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross the carriageway in stages.

22. Kāpiti Road intersects with Cedar Drive at a give-way priority tee-intersection, which includes a right turn bay provision on Kāpiti Road for those vehicles turning into Cedar Drive, to wait clear of through traffic. Given the straight alignment of Kapiti Road in this location, sightlines for vehicles exiting Cedar

Grove comfortably exceed the industry standard 'Safe Intersection Sight Distance[2]' minimum requirement of 97m for 50kph roads.

23. Cedar Drive is classified as a 'Local / Neighbourhood Access Route' and comprises a single traffic lane in each direction, with kerbside parking, grass berms, and footpaths on both sides of the street. At its eastern end, Cedar Drive connects with and continues as Regent Drive, which has an equivalent formation and 'Local / Neighbourhood Access Route' classification. Regent Drive in turn intersects with Halsey Grove at an uncontrolled tee-intersection approximately 40 metres north of the Site.

24. Halsey Grove is formed as a short cul-de-sac providing access to two adjacent standalone dwellings before terminating at the Site's northern boundary. The road is formed as a two-way, with kerbside parking, grass berms and footpaths provided on either side of the street.

25. All roads in the vicinity of the Site are subject to 50kph posted speed limits.

26. To understand the existing traffic patterns on the road network in the vicinity of the Site, I have summarised available daily traffic count data in the table below.

Road	Location	Daily Traffic
Kāpiti Road	between Cedar Drive and Langdale Avenue	18,000[3]
Cedar Drive	between Kāpiti Road and Regent Drive	1,550
Regent Drive	between Cedar Drive and Halsey Grove	800
Halsey Grove	-	<20

27. In my opinion, the current traffic volumes accommodated on these surrounding streets are entirely in keeping with the form and function of the roads.

28. With regard to road safety, Chapter 2 of my ITA Report described the accident record for the road network in the vicinity of the Site, indicating a total of four crashes (all minor injury) have been recorded for the complete 5-year period 2017-2021. I have reviewed the crash record for the equivalent area for any further crashes recorded to date since the ITA was written, which shows one additional accident on Kāpiti Road near Langdale Avenue

[2] Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4A:Unsignalsied and Signalised Intersections
[3] As recorded by Council's traffic monitoring survey undertaken in November 2020

involving a moped rear-ending a vehicle in front that braked suddenly. The accident was recorded as a minor injury.

29. As I have described above, the established streets in the vicinity of the Site include footpath, shared path, and cycle lane provisions on Kāpiti Road, which provide for active mode connection to the commercial area to the south (including the Kāpiti Landing development), and the Paraparaumu town centre beyond.

30. Bus stops located on Kāpiti Road adjacent to the Site are served by route #260, which operates at half hourly intervals throughout the day between Raumati Beach, Paraparaumu Beach and Paraparaumu town centre/rail station.

Proposed Development

31. The proposed development (revised Proposal) provides for 135 residential townhouses comprising predominantly 2-bedroom typologies. The development is supported by 166 on-site car parks, with provision for a communal secure cycle parking facility to supplement the storage that will be available within the individual units and associated private yard areas.

Site Access

32. Vehicular access to the Site is proposed via connection to the Halsey Grove stub road, with the extension of the existing carriageway into the Site formed as a private Right-of-Way ("RoW"). In discussions at the project outset with Council's Transport Officers on Site access, their position was to avoid new and additional vehicle connections onto Kāpiti Road, that would impact on its primary 'through traffic' function as a 'Major Community Connector' and introduce new conflict points with the adjacent on-road cycle path. As such, the proposal plans were developed to achieve all vehicular access off the lower hierarchy road frontage of Halsey Grove (Local / Neighbourhood Access Route).

33. Pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the Site is proposed via footpath connections on either side of Halsey Grove to the north, as well as via three new pathway connections onto Kāpiti Road to the south. I note the proposal plans include pedestrian provision for public connectivity through the development Site via a RoW instrument over the Site's main north-south internal pathway, which presents some benefit for existing residents to the north in shortening the walking distance to destinations on Kāpiti Road east.

34. As proposed, the location and design of the Site connections are, in my opinion appropriate, and are capable of accommodating the scale of transport demands generated by the proposed townhouse activity, safely and efficiently.

Site Traffic Generation and Assessment of Effects

35. The expected traffic generation of the completed development is set out in Chapter 7 of the ITA Report, and draws from a combination of industry standards and surveyed data collected at other analogous medium density townhouse residential developments around Wellington. With the revised Proposals 'four' fewer dwellings, the analysis of expected total Site traffic generation can be summarised as follows:

    (a) 96 vehicles per hour ("vph") during the AM weekday commuter peak; and

    (b) 88vph during the PM weekday commuter peak.

36. My detailed analysis[4] of the adjacent road network performance at the key Cedar Drive / Kāpiti Road tee-intersection, shows that it operates with a Level of Service[5] ("LoS") 'A' on all movements except the right turn out of Cedar Drive, which operates at a LoS 'C' in both the 'current' and 'with development Site traffic' scenarios in the AM peak and LoS 'E' during the PM, with only minor increase in delays resulting from the extra Site traffic.

37. Such LoS performance for the right turn out movements from Cedar Drive are not, in my opinion, unusual for side roads that access primary streets (such as Kāpiti Road), noting the accident record at the intersection does not indicate any existing adverse safety concerns associated with the current LoS performance.

Internal Movement Network / Active Mode Provision

38. As described in my ITA Report at Chapter 6, access within the Site will be achieved by way of a private RoW which has been designed to a minimum 5.8m width, with appropriate widening on the bends to ensure safe tracking of larger vehicles such as rubbish trucks. The design therefore aligns with the

[4] Conservatively assuming all development traffic routes to/from Kāpiti Road, and none distributes via the local road network to the north

[5] Level of Service (LoS) is a six-level grading system for intersection performance (A to F), where Level A represents totally uncongested operation and minimal delays and queues, and Level F represents highly congested operation with long delays and extensive queuing

latest best practice industry standard NZS4404:2010 'Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure' ("NZS4404"), which seeks to provide a minimum 5.5-5.7m wide trafficable space for two-way carriageways accessing up to 200 dwellings, whilst avoiding the use of overly wide carriageways that could encourage higher operating speeds. The RoW design has therefore been developed to achieve a low-speed environment, commensurate with its residential laneway function, and includes the use of carriageway threshold treatments at points where pedestrian routes cross the laneway, supplemented by a proposed 15kph posted internal speed limit to appropriately manage vehicle speeds within the Site.

39. The development plans include a purposeful network of dedicated connected footpaths through the Site, providing an attractive pedestrian environment that achieves good permeability within the development. Where footpaths cross the RoW carriageway, different surface textural treatments will be used to provide an indication to drivers as to where pedestrians may walk, noting the RoW will not be carrying large volumes of traffic and, as described in the paragraph above, has been designed to achieve an appropriate low design speed outcome.

40. The internal Site paths in turn provide efficient connection to the Council's well established footpath, shared path, and cycle lane facilities immediately adjacent to the Site on Kāpiti Road, which provide convenient walking and cycling access to local retail destinations including the Caltex convenience store (approximately 200m from the Site), the 'Kāpiti Landing' retail hub further east (approximately 600-700m from the Site) that includes the New World supermarket, and town centre beyond..

41. In my view the movement network proposed to support the Site development will provide a safe and efficient movement system for all travel modes.

Parking

42. The latest car parking layout provided in the revised proposal includes a total of 166 on-site spaces to support the 135 dwelling units, with these designed to satisfy the parking bay dimension and manoeuvre aisle widths set out in the Kāpiti Coast District Plan ("District Plan"). Further, provision for 10 accessible car parks has been allowed for within the development plans, which exceeds the proposed provision currently being pursued through the District Plan's 'Plan Change 1A', and in doing so will ensure proximate access of accessible parks to the wider development units.

43. I note that since the ITA Report was written, Council has enacted the required change brought about by the 'National Policy Statement for Urban Development' ("NPS"), that requires all district plan rules, assessment criteria, policies and objectives that have the effect of setting minimum parking requirements, to be removed from the District Plan. Notwithstanding this, my ITA Report included detailed assessment of the anticipated parking demand generated by the proposal, along with a survey of available residual parking capacity in the nearby streets.

44. Drawing from my assessment of the Site's expected parking demand versus on-site supply, there is in my view ample residual capacity in the nearby kerbside parking areas to accommodate overspill from the Site, without adversely impacting on the safe and efficient operation of these surrounding roads.

ITA Report Recommendations

45. My ITA Report also included two recommendations for the adjacent transport network to accommodate the forecast uplift in traffic, as follows:

    (a) convert the current uncontrolled Halsey Grove / Regent Drive tee-intersection to a give-way (with priority given to traffic on the latter) to formalise the traffic priorities at the intersection; and

    (b) remark / extend the green coloured surfacing of the cycle lane at the tee-intersection of Kāpiti Road and Cedar Drive across the full intersection.

46. I consider these changes remain valid and have recommended they be incorporated as part of the proposed consent conditions, which I address later at paragraphs 81-83.

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

47. A total of 7 submissions were received in response to the development proposal's notification, with each of these including matters of concern relating to traffic and transport effects.

48. I note that a number of submitters raise essentially the same matters, which can be broadly grouped under the topics 'a' to 'g' below:

    (a) the proposed Site access arrangements;

(b) increase in traffic on the adjacent streets;

(c) development Site parking;

(d) proposed Site design relative to the District Plan's transport provisions;

(e) waste collection;

(f) inadequate provision for bike storage;

(g) lack of Electric Vehicle ("EV") charging.

49. I address these matters in turn, as follows.

Proposed Site Access Arrangements

50. Several submitters have raised concerns around the proposed Site access arrangements not including a vehicle connection to Kāpiti Road, and instead providing for sole vehicular access via Halsey Grove.

51. As I have described above at paragraph 32, early consultation with Council's transport Officers indicated potential safety concerns of establishing a new vehicle access to the Site off Kāpiti Road. As directed by the Council, the development plans have therefore been progressed to achieve sole access via Halsey Grove, noting the associated traffic analysis for this arrangement documented in the ITA Report (at Chapter 7) shows the additional development Site trips can be appropriately accommodated on the local roads, without requiring a direct vehicle access onto Kāpiti Road.

52. Submitters have also raised concerns around the ability for larger vehicles, including fire appliances, to access the Site. As described in my ITA Report at Chapter 8, the Site's internal movement network (including the extension of Halsey Grove) has been designed to enable rubbish trucks, fire appliances and furniture trucks to access and circulate through the Site. In my opinion, the access arrangements proposed will fully and appropriately accommodate the largest vehicles expected to visit the Site.

Increase in Traffic on the adjacent Streets

53. Submitters have raised concerns regarding the additional traffic that will be generated by the development Site giving rise to congestion on the local roads, increasing delays for the right turn out of Cedar Drive at the Kāpiti Road tee-intersection.

54. I acknowledge that some drivers may experience longer delays in making turns at the Kāpiti Road intersection, much in the same way as occurs now where a range of delays are experienced by drivers depending on the time of day and the traffic conditions. I have therefore used an intersection analysis tool (SIDRA) to inform the anticipated future intersection operation.

55. As I have described earlier at paragraph 35, Site traffic is expected to amount to around 88-96vph during the weekday peaks. Such additions are in my view not large, amounting to approximately 1-2 additional vehicles per minute on average on the connecting streets.

56. My ITA Report, at section 7.2, sets out the detailed analysis of these traffic additions on the performance of the Cedar Drive / Kāpiti Road intersection, to quantify any change in delay. The analysis summary from my ITA Report is included for reference below, noting the reduction of 4 dwellings in the revised proposal will result in some minor decrease in delays reported in the analysis table.

Approach	Movement	Base 2021		Base + Development Trips	
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Kapiti Road (West)	Left	A (4.7)	A (4.7)	A (4.7)	A (4.7)
	Through	A (-)	A (-)	A (-)	A (-)
Cedar Drive (North)	Left	A (7.6)	A (7.0)	A (8.7)	A (7.7)
	Right	C (19.2)	E (40.2)	C (22.1)	E (46.0)
Kapiti Road (East)	Through	A (-)	A (-)	A (-)	A (-)
	Right	A (7.5)	A (7.3)	A (7.6)	A (7.5)

LoS Results and 'Average Delay' in seconds (shown in brackets)

57. The results show the intersection will operate at a good LoS 'A' to 'C' for all movements in the AM, and all movements in the PM peak except for the right turn out of Cedar Drive, which operates at a LoS 'E' in both the base (i.e. current situation) and with the development trips added. The average delay for vehicles turning right out of Cedar Drive on Kāpiti Road with development Site traffic added to the network, is shown to increase by just 3 and 6-seconds during the AM and PM peaks, respectively.

58. I consider therefore that development of the proposed residential activity within the Site would not give rise to any significant change in current delays experienced at the intersection, nor will it lead to changes in driver behaviour that could result in safety concerns. Hence my interpretation that the scale and effects of the added Site traffic will be minor.

Development Site Parking

59. A number of submitters have raised concerns that the level of on-site parking proposed to support the development is inadequate, and will lead to congestion and safety concerns associated with Site residents and visitor vehicles overspilling into the surrounding streets.

60. Notwithstanding that the NPS has removed all minimum parking requirements from the District Plan, the development plans include provision for 166 on-site car parks to support the proposed residential activity. My ITA Report at Chapter 6 sets out detailed analysis of expected Site parking demand, drawing on parking data for other medium density residential developments in Wellington, which shows a parking demand for approximately 1.2 vehicles could be expected 'per dwelling'. Applying this to the revised proposals 135 units, gives a site-wide demand of 162 spaces.

61. I acknowledge that some extra demand may occur from time to time, depending on the resident mix, their vehicle ownership, and visitor patterns. The detailed on-street parking occupancy survey undertaken as part of the ITA Report demonstrates current kerbside parking demand in the streets surrounding the Site is low, with most residents' vehicles typically accommodated off-street. In my view then, there is provision to accommodate forecast Site overspill (which is assessed to be in the order of 20-30 vehicles), without materially impacting on the current parking amenity.

62. Noting that additional kerbside parking demand in the vicinity of the Halsey Grove / Regent Drive intersection could potentially impact on the visibility for vehicles turning to/from the side road, I recommend implementing yellow 'no stopping lines' around the intersection to avoid parked cars obstructing sightlines. A consent condition[6] capturing this approach is included as a means of ensuring an appropriately safe outcome.

63. Submitters Gilden also note that increased kerbside parking demand in the vicinity of the 90-degree bends on Cedar Drive and Regent Drive, could restrict forward visibility of drivers and lead to traffic safety issues. In my view such practices would be monitored by the Council as part of their ongoing network review and, if required, sections of yellow 'no stopping lines' could be introduced on these bends to manage kerbside parking practices, to avoid any safety concerns arising from additional kerbside demand. Whilst this

[6] Draft Consent Condition #9 of Appendix A in the s42A Report

would reduce the length of available kerbside for parking, in my opinion this would amount to the loss of perhaps no more than 5-10 parks, and would not therefore impact materially on the overall capacity of the available kerbside parking resource within the Site vicinity.

64. Overall, I consider that development Site parking overspill into the adjacent streets will not adversely impact on the current kerbside parking amenity, and that any potential impacts on the traffic sightlines are able to be adequately controlled through the implementation of kerbside parking restrictions.

Proposed Site Design relative to the District Plan Transport Provisions

65. Submitters Gilden raise several concerns around the proposed development not meeting the transport standards of the District Plan, as reported in the development Site's 'Subdivision and Land Use Application and Consent' report[7] ("Application"), including in relation to 'traffic generation', 'sightlines at intersections', and the shortfall in 'on-site parking provision'.

66. My ITA Report sets out an assessment of the proposal plans against the relevant Transport provisions of the District Plan at Chapter 4, including in relation to the three matters identified above.

67. In relation to Site traffic generation, District Plan Rule TR-R2 identifies a daily traffic 'threshold' of 100vpd, with developments generating less than this deemed not to warrant any detailed analysis of the associated off-site impacts. Where the expected traffic generation exceeds this, then a Transport Assessment is required to quantify the expected level of Site traffic and determine any associated impacts this may have on the safety and capacity of the surrounding road network. Chapter 7 of my ITA Report provides the required assessment and, drawing from this work, it is my view that Site related traffic can be appropriately accommodated without giving rise to any new safety or capacity issues.

68. In reference to sightlines, Chapter 6 of my ITA Report provides further explanation of the proposed Site access onto Halsey Grove in respect of Rule TR-R3 9, which requires a minimum 50m sightline for new accesses connecting onto a 50kph local road.

69. I note this minimum sightline standard typically relates to situations where an access joins a street on which traffic has priority over vehicles turning at the

[7] Subdivision and Land Use Consent Application and Assessment of Effects dated 8 March 2022 (prepared by Cuttriss Consultants)

Site. In the proposed situation, the Site access will form an extension of the current Halsey Grove stub road, with no requirement for traffic to give-way as it enters/exits the Site. As such, in this case the minimum sightline standard is not strictly 'applicable', noting that the straight alignment of Halsey Grove and connecting Site access will ensure that vehicles leaving the development have clear sightlines to the subsequent Halsey Grove / Regent Drive intersection to the north, as well as vehicles manoeuvring at the two established residential driveways on Halsey Grove.

70. Since the ITA Report was written, the District Plan rules around minimum parking requirements have been removed such that there is no longer any requirement to provide parking on the Site. Notwithstanding this, and as I have described in paragraph 61 above, my ITA Report included a detailed assessment of the Site's forecast parking demand versus supply and, drawing from this, it is my view that overspill parking from the Site can be appropriately accommodated and managed within the surrounding streets through the use of yellow 'no stopping lines', without giving rise to traffic safety concerns.

Waste Collection

71. Two submitters have raised concerns around the Site's waste collection arrangements, including in respect to collection frequency and that waste storage areas are inconveniently "*located at one end of the complex*".

72. I note the Application described the Site's waste collection areas have been sized to provide sufficient capacity to allow for approximately 3 collections per week. In my view the frequency of collection is something that will be monitored by the Residents association and waste collection contractor, with changes to frequency implemented as required.

73. With respect to the location of the waste collection points, the proposal plans show a total of six waste collection areas distributed throughout the Site, ensuring that all units are located within the required 30m of a communal waste and recycling storage points, except for approximately half a dozen that are located within approximately 35m. I consider these arrangements are appropriate.

Inadequate Provision for Bike Storage

74. Several submitters have raised concerns that there is no provision for a secure cycle parking facility within the Site.

75. As noted within my ITA Report at chapter 5, residents will be able to store cycles within the proposed units secure yard space, with the option available to install slim storage lockers for such purposes.

76. Notwithstanding, a consent condition has been proposed that will require the establishment of a communal cycle storage shed on-site for use by the residents, as an alternative to storing bikes in their own units/yards. I consider this addresses the concern raised by submitters on this matter.

Lack of EV Charging

77. Several submitters have raised concerns that the proposal plans do not include provision for EV chargers.

78. I note that a proposed condition of consent is now included that will require associated ducting for power to each on-site car park, to enable charging of EVs. I consider this an appropriate mechanism for ensuring EVs can be appropriately accommodated at the Site.

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICER'S SECTION 42A REPORT

79. I have read the conclusions reached in both the Transport Statement prepared by Mr Shields (Council's Traffic Engineer Advisor), as well as the Council Officer's s42A Report.

80. I note that Mr Shields analysis raises no material issues or differences of opinion to the evidence and analysis that I have provided, subject to the inclusion of a number of consent conditions recommended in the s42A Report, which I comment on below.

PROPOSED CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

81. Appendix A of the Council Planner's s42A Report includes a suite of conditions relating to transport matters, should the Application be granted.

82. I have reviewed the transport related draft conditions (Conditions 5 through 13) and consider them appropriate in that they address some form of possible effect.

83. In addition, I have recommended the wording of consent Condition #9[8] be adjusted to incorporate the road markings and signage required to implement

[8] Condition #9 requires the introduction of yellow 'no stopping lines' to avoid parked vehicles blocking driveways and maintain sightlines at the Halsey Grove / Regent Drive intersection.

the recommendations from my ITA Report, described earlier at paragraphs 45-46.

CONCLUSION

84. My evidence has assessed the traffic and transport matters that I am aware of in relation to the Application.

85. Overall, I conclude from a traffic and transportation perspective that the development of the Site as proposed can be established appropriately and safely, and that any potential adverse effects related to the Site can be appropriately mitigated through the adoption of consent conditions, as described.

James Whittaker

26 October 2022