

**BEFORE THE KĀPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL
TE URUHI TO KĀPITI ISLAND GATEWAY PROJECT**

Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of a resource consent application by Kāpiti Coast District Council under section 88 of the Act, to carry out the Te Uruhi to Kāpiti Island Gateway Project

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MEGAN KATE TAYLOR (TRANSPORTATION
ENGINEER) ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**

Dated: 19 September 2022

BUDDLE FINDLAY

Barristers and Solicitors
Wellington

Solicitor Acting: **David Randal / Esther Bennett**
Email: david.randal@buddlefindlay.com / esther.bennett@buddlefindlay.com
Tel 64 4 499 4242 Fax 64 4 499 4141 PO Box 2694 DX SP20201 Wellington 6011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS 4

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICER'S SECTION 42A REPORT 9

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is **Megan Kate Taylor**.
2. I am an Associate Transportation Engineer and Team Leader for the Central Region Transport Advisory Section of Beca Limited.
3. I hold a Bachelor of Engineering (Hons), in Civil Engineering, from the University of Canterbury, Christchurch. I am a Chartered Professional Engineer and an Engineering New Zealand Chartered Member.
4. I have 15 years of experience in the transportation engineering profession working for private consultancy firms. I have worked providing consultancy services for a wide range of clients around New Zealand including central government agencies, local authorities and land developers in the infrastructure and transport sectors.
5. The Transport Impact Assessment, which accompanied the application for resource consents and Assessment of Effects on the Environment (**AEE**) lodged with Kāpiti Coast District Council (**Council**) in July 2021¹ in respect of Te Uruhi – Kāpiti Gateway Project (**Project**), was prepared by my colleagues under my supervision. I was the reviewer of that report.
6. I was then involved in preparing an update of that technical assessment in response to refinement of the Project and the information request by the Council under section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**). The updated assessment (**TIA**) is dated 15 December 2021.²
7. The key refinement in relation to the Project, as it relates to my evidence, was the removal from the Project of potential car park areas associated with Paraparaumu Beach Golf Club and Maclean Street, and the inclusion of an extension to an existing car park area (shown in figure 5.2 of the TIA) near another existing car park area to be reconfigured (see figure 5.1 in the TIA) in the southern part of Maclean Park Reserve.
8. In preparing my technical assessment and my evidence I have:

¹ The resource consent application was originally lodged on 20 May 2020. However, it was withdrawn on 1 July 2021 and a new application was lodged. The date of the resource consent application and AEE to which my technical assessment was appended is 29 June 2021.

² The 15 December 2021 version replaced the earlier (July) version that originally accompanied the AEE. The TIA is Appendix 9 to the AEE, and references in this evidence to the TIA or to "my technical assessment" are references to the 15 December 2021 version, unless specified otherwise.

- (a) reviewed the submissions, with a focus on those relating specifically to my evidence;
 - (b) read comments on an earlier version of the technical assessment provided by Mr Rodenburg of Tonkin + Taylor;³
 - (c) read the Traffic Peer Review Report by Tonkin + Taylor dated 23 February 2022;⁴
 - (d) read the section 42A report; and
 - (e) read the evidence of **Rebecca Cray** (in respect of landscape, visual, and natural character effects), **Emma McLean** (on planning matters), and the other witnesses for the applicant, including **Alison Law**.
9. In preparing the TIA Beca staff attended the site on several occasions. Whilst I have not visited the site at this stage, I will visit the site in advance of the hearing.

Code of conduct

10. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. This evidence has been prepared in compliance with that Code, as if it were evidence being given in Environment Court proceedings. Unless I state otherwise, this evidence 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.

Purpose and scope of the evidence

11. The TIA contains an evaluation of the transport planning and traffic engineering matters relevant to the Project, including the Project's potential transport and traffic effects in terms of the safe and efficient operation of the surrounding transport network.
12. My evidence does not repeat in detail the technical matters discussed in the TIA. Rather, in this evidence I:
- (a) present the key findings of the TIA, in an executive summary;

³ Available here: <https://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/media/4y4mmrvb/rm210149-information-for-transport-review-20-07-2021.pdf>

⁴ Available here: <https://www.kapiticoast.govt.nz/media/wtzhrfrf/rm210149-te-uruhi-kapiti-traffic-peer-review-report-23-02-2022.pdf>

- (b) comment on issues raised in submissions; and
- (c) comment on the section 42A report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

13. The parking survey, site observations and historic images demonstrate that the loss of car parking spaces associated with the Project buildings and associated use, will be replaced with new car parks in Maclean Park and on Marine Parade, resulting in a "like for like" replacement of car parks in the area.
14. The demand for car parking near Te Uruhi will be generated by the Project, Kāpiti Island Tours and visitors to the beach area. A proportion of this demand already exists and is associated with previously consented activities. An increase in the maximum visitor numbers to Kāpiti Island is not being sought as part of this application.
15. In any case, in order to:
 - (a) balance the parking supply that will be reduced as part of the Te Uruhi development (i.e. replace the spaces lost to the Te Uruhi building); and
 - (b) provide additional off-street parking options to account for anticipated increases in visitors (i.e. people wishing to access Te Uruhi, Maclean Park and Paraparaumu Beach);

the Council proposes to re-mark one existing car parking area south of Ocean Road (Area 1⁵), to provide 15 additional spaces, and construct one new car parking area (Area 2⁶) to provide 19 new car parking spaces. This gives a net gain of two parking spaces as a result of the Project. These are works that are planned for in the Maclean Park Management Plan, which was prepared by the Council and iwi in 2017. In addition, a total of 290 publicly available car parks have been identified within a 500m walking radius of the Project. This is a distance that most able-bodied people are capable of walking and is a measure that is typically used by transportation engineers to evaluate parking demand and provision.

16. The location, layout and number of disability car parks provided will meet the District Plan requirements and these spaces will continue to be located

⁵ Identified as Area 1 in the Beca report "Kāpiti Coast Gateway Transport Impact Assessment, 15 December 2021 and located opposite the properties of 63, 62 and 61 Marine Parade.

⁶ Identified as Area 2 in the Beca report "Kāpiti Coast Gateway Transport Impact Assessment, 15 December 2021 and located opposite the properties of 58, 57, 56 and 55 Marine Parade.

throughout Maclean Park in a safe, user-friendly and appropriate manner. This means that disability car parks are located close to the front entrance of Te Uruhi building and near pedestrian pathways.

17. The Project includes changes to the exiting shared pedestrian and cycle path around Te Uruhi. I have reviewed these changes and found that pedestrians and cyclists will still be able to safely move through this area along the designated paths.
18. The vehicle accesses proposed for the development and the new car parking area meet the District Plan requirements and have been designed to mitigate anticipated safety and amenity issues associated with site access.
19. Existing and future traffic demands were tested at the intersection of Marine Parade, Manly Street and Kāpiti Road. This analysis found that the roundabout currently operates well, with a Level of Service A and will continue to do so with future traffic demands. I acknowledge that there may be localised delays at the roundabout when large events occur on Maclean Park, however these temporary events cannot be designed for and the typical operation of the roundabout is very good.
20. In conclusion, my view is that the Te Uruhi development will not give rise to material additional road safety risks, and it will have a negligible effect on parking availability in the area.

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

Accuracy of parking demand projections

21. Several submitters have raised concerns about the accuracy of the parking demand projections in the TIA, including Mr and Ms Burgess, Mr Barnett, Ms Knight, Mr Guy, and Dr Davey. I clarify below the parking analysis that has been undertaken and specifically address the proposed provision of new car parks in Maclean Park.
22. The introduction of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (**NPS-UD**) in August 2020 removed, through Policy 11, the requirement for District Plans of certain territorial authorities⁷ to set a minimum number of off-street car parks. The associated changes to the Kāpiti Coast District Plan mean that the Plan does not state a minimum required number of car parks

⁷ Including the Council, a tier 1 authority.

for various activities, including the proposed Te Uruhi – Kāpiti Gateway Project.

23. The District Plan instead identifies in Policy TR-PARK-P8 that "*new subdivision and development shall provide for safe vehicular and pedestrian access and appropriate vehicle parking areas*". In my opinion the proposed parking supply achieves the outcomes specified in this Policy, through a near "like for like" replacement of car parks, while allowing for the mixture of activities that take place at Maclean Park, in a safe manner.
24. The proposed parking supply analysis is based upon the following understanding:
 - (a) The Project will result in a near "like for like" replacement of car parks.
 - (b) The Kāpiti Island Tours is not expected to place an increased demand on the existing car park supply.
 - (c) Maclean Park attracts people for a variety of activities and therefore car parks throughout this area are shared by people often visiting more than one activity while parked in the area.
25. Based on the parking analysis undertaken, Te Uruhi has a parking demand of four car parks and the Project results in gain of two car parks. This is a net loss of two car parks within the Project area. However, I consider this difference to be negligible due to the available public car parks in the wider area and the linked multi-purpose trips to Maclean Park.

Issues with on-road parking

26. The submitter, Dr Davey, identified that at peak parking times visitors to the area park on the local street grass berms, creating hazards such as obstructing views of traffic.
27. I agree with the submitters that illegal parking can have detrimental effects on road safety and this is also recognised by the Council. Parking on grass berms, along with roadside plots, shrubs, flower beds and footpaths, is an offence under the Council's Traffic Bylaw 2010 and an infringement fine is associated with this offence.
28. Poor parking behaviour, however, may not necessarily be due to a lack of parking supply but can also be the result of visitors being unaware of available parking areas.

29. As mentioned above, there are 290 publicly available car parks a 500m walking radius of the Project, a distance most able-bodied people are capable of walking (and therefore a measure that is typically used by transportation engineers to evaluate parking demand and provision). With this many car parks available, it is recommended that a combination of education and enforcement is increased to address the submitter's concern.
30. In summary, I do not expect the Project to place additional demands on car parking in the Maclean Park area, when considering the carparks currently available. The effects of the Project are managed by the proposed new parking areas and therefore I do not consider that the existing poor parking behaviour is a matter to be dealt with through the Project.

Campervans

31. It is understood that some submitters (namely Mr and Ms Burgess, Ms Holden and Mr Wilson, Mr Barnett, and Ms Knight) are concerned that the new car parking areas may attract campervans, which could result in an increase in overnight use detracting from the amenity values enjoyed by people in the area and the over-subscription of the existing freedom camping spaces. The existing spaces available for use by freedom campers are located opposite numbers 54, 62 and 69 Marine Parade.
32. As a transportation engineer, I will not comment on potential effects on amenity values, as this is outside my field of expertise.
33. The Council has provided me with a record of the complaints it has received over the past five years with respect to freedom camping along Marine Parade, Paraparaumu Beach. I have specifically reviewed this information to understand the current extent of overcrowding at the existing facilities, to determine if the existing supply is meeting the existing demand.
34. The information provided showed campervan issues along Marine Parade accounted for 37 out of a total of 71 complaints for the whole district over the five years (September 2017 through to August 2022). Of those 37 complaints, eight related to overcrowding at the freedom camping areas on Marine Parade.
35. While it is possible that there may have been some under-reporting of this issue, given such a low number of overcrowding events, in my view it is reasonable to infer that the existing supply is suitable for the existing demand in the area. As such, in my view, it is unlikely that the Project will make any

material difference in terms of campervan usage and associated issues in the area. In her evidence **Ms Law** notes the measures that the Council could use if any issues were to arise.

Increased traffic congestion

36. Several submitters are concerned that "*there will be increased traffic congestion and greater vehicle movements directly resulting from the Gateway as it has multiple functions*" (this is from the submissions of Mr Barnett and Ms Knight).
37. These potential issues are examined in detail in Section 7 of the TIA. This section of the report describes the existing and expected future operation of the transportation network. In particular, it provides intersection modelling detail of the roundabout at the intersection of Marine Parade, Kāpiti Road and Manly Street.
38. The transport modelling analysis shows that the Project would not result in any significant change in the performance of the roundabout and the intersection will continue to operate at a Level of Service A.
39. As above, I acknowledge that there may be localised delays at the roundabout when large events occur on Maclean Park, however these temporary events cannot be designed for and the typical operation of the roundabout is very good. Based on this analysis, my view is that the existing network can readily accommodate the proposed Project.

Signage

40. The signage around the proposed Discovery Centre was raised as a concern by several submitters who would like further detail on the extent of signage that would be provided.
41. I will comment on the traffic signage, with respect to the proposed changes within Maclean Park.
42. The proposed new car parks will be signed with parking and regulatory signage. Some examples of this include accessible car parking signage to accompany the car park markings and give way signage for vehicles exiting the car park areas. This signage is provided to manage the use and safe operation of the car park and adjacent transport network.

43. This proposed transport signage will be the same as is seen throughout the Council's parks and is required to complement the regulatory pavement markings. These signs and markings are recommended for safe driving behaviour.

Safety concerns

44. Dr Davey raised concerns about the safety record at the roundabout intersection of Marine Parade, Kāpiti Road and Manly Street. In particular, Dr Davey is concerned about the lack of recorded crashes at the intersection in the Beca report.
45. As identified in Section 3.3 Crash Data section of the TIA, the data is from the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency Crash Analysis System (**CAS**). This database is a source of all crashes reported to the New Zealand Police.
46. The CAS search found five reported crashes at this roundabout over the last 10 years, including one minor injury crash. Three of the crashes were loss of control single vehicle crashes, one was a rear-end crash and one was caused by a vehicle failing to give-way when merging from the right. There were no particular weather, seasonal or timing trends associated with these crashes. Therefore, I have not identified any significant existing safety concerns that would be affected by the proposed development.
47. Dr Davey, in his submission, has highlighted a potential safety issue associated with the *"mixing of pedestrians walking from the boat club car park, across the car park and beach boat access track (with cars and boat trailer moving along it) and the bridge to the biosecurity pod"*.
48. I consider the boat club car park will continue to be used by Kāpiti Island Tour visitors, as it is very close to Te Uruhi and close to where the boats load and unload passengers. Therefore, the car park will remain a slow speed environment due to the small size of the area, vehicles manoeuvring with trailers and people walking through it and pedestrians walking to and from their parked cars.
49. In addition, as part of the Project, pedestrians will be able to access the Beach via the bridge adjacent to Te Uruhi. This is also likely to remove some pedestrians from the carpark, as a more direct route to the beach will be available.

50. The crash search undertaken did not identify any crashes in this car park and given that I do not anticipate any changes to the car park, I therefore have not identified any new safety concerns.

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICER'S SECTION 42A REPORT

51. I have read the Council Officer's Section 42A Report and note that the Council Officer and I are in agreement, including in relation to submissions received. I have also reviewed the conditions of consent with respect to transport matters (described in the Report and discussed in **Ms McLean's** evidence) and agree with the proposed conditions.

Megan Kate Taylor

19 September 2022