

**IN THE MATTER**

of the Resource Management Act 1991  
("RMA" or "the Act")

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**

of a hearing of submissions and further  
submissions on the Proposed Central  
Hawke's Bay Council District Plan Review  
(Stream 6 Mapping and Rezoning Requests)

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AARON CAMPION  
ON BEHALF OF LIVINGSTON PROPERTIES LIMITED**

Dated 31 October 2022

---

## **Introduction**

1. My name is Aaron Campion. I am a Technical Director and co-founder of Urban Connection Limited (“**UCL**”).
2. I hold a Post Graduate Diploma in Transportation Engineering from Canterbury University in New Zealand and a Higher National Diploma in Civil Engineering from Anglia Ruskin University in United Kingdom. I am certified as a Highway Development Control Professional by the Institute of Highway Engineers in the United Kingdom. I am a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand and a member of the Transportation Group New Zealand.
3. Prior to my role at UCL, which was established in May 2018, I held the role of Service Group Manager and was the National Service Line Leader for GHD’s National Transportation Planning and Traffic Engineering discipline.
4. A large portion of my career and related experience has centred on analysing the transport effects of land development proposals as well as developing and managing the implementation of development related infrastructure.
5. During this time, I have been responsible for reviewing a wide range of transport projects and developments, both for transport agencies and developers. This has included presenting evidence to various Council Hearings on behalf of the relevant Council and/or Applicant. Examples include commercial, residential, industrial, and mining developments.
6. I have also presented at the Coroners Court and performed the role of independent peer review on a range of transportation planning projects and developments.

## **Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses**

7. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. I confirm that I have considered all material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on evidence of another person.

## Scope of Evidence

8. I led the UCL team in preparing the Intersection Performance Assessment (“**IPA**”) dated August 2020 (attached to this statement of evidence at **Appendix A**) regarding a proposed subdivision of a site at 94, 96 Mount Herbert Road, Waipukurau (“**the Site**”). The IPA considered both a “Lower-case” and an “Upper-case” scenario development, ranging between 96 to 300 lots respectively. I also led the UCL team in preparing a Traffic Impact Assessment (“**TIA**”) dated May 2021 regarding the development of 88 rural lots on the Site (which has subsequently been consented under RM190126<sup>1</sup>). Through this process I was directly involved in assessing the proposed location, and determining what, if any changes in design were required to avoid or minimise potential traffic effects.
9. The Site is now the subject of a submission by Livingston Properties Limited (“**Livingston**”) on the Central Hawke’s Bay District Plan review seeking to rezone that land in accordance with Appendix A to that submission (“**the Concept Plan**”).
10. In this evidence I provide a summary of my expert opinion regarding the traffic related effects of the proposed rezoning of the Site in accordance with the Concept Plan, with reference to the IPA.
11. I set out below my conclusions reached in the IPA and my comments on how those conclusions relate to the traffic related effects of Livingston’s submission to rezone the land as per the Concept Plan. In particular, my evidence will cover:
  - (a) A brief description of the existing transport environment.
  - (b) The level of development traffic previously assessed in the upper-case scenario detailed in the IPA.
  - (c) The proposed rezoning as sought in the submission as it relates to traffic.
  - (d) The predicted traffic effects at the relevant intersections.
  - (e) Internal road design.
12. In preparing this evidence I have:

---

<sup>1</sup> The 96 lot lower case scenario referred to above was in relation to this consent application as lodged, with the number of lots approved being 88 rather than 96 as originally sought under that application

- (a) Reviewed the submission and supporting documents.
  - (b) Reviewed the s 42A report.
  - (c) Reviewed the previous IPA report and TIA.
  - (d) Made some minor amendments to the previous IPA, changes to which are outlined later in this evidence.
13. It should be noted that I have not conducted a recent site visit. A site visit was carried out previously during the preparation of the IPA and TIA.

### **The Proposal**

14. The proposed rezoning would enable development as generally set out in the Concept Plan. To give some general guidance, subdivision in accordance with that plan would provide for approximately 280 lots, and 0.5ha of supporting commercial precinct, comprising:
- (a) 110 high density (22/ha) retirement lots.
  - (b) 120 medium density (12/ha) residential lots.
  - (c) 50 lifestyle (2.5/ha) lots.
  - (d) 0.5 ha commercial precinct.
- or varying combinations of the same. The numbers above are a rough guide and the rezoning requested by Livingston in its submission would provide flexibility for a different yield depending on a range of factors but not going beyond the scope assessed in the IPA.
15. The Site is located as per Figure 1 of the IPA. Access into the development will be from Mt Herbert Road. As the main internal road progresses through the development, it is likely that shorter road sections will feed off from the main road and serve a smaller portion of lots.
16. The previous IPA was prepared to understand the potential traffic related effects that would be generated should a higher yield scenario be progressed at the site. The upper-case scenario that was tested, allowed for 300 urban residential dwellings, generating 3,270 vehicles per day and approximately 360 vehicles in the peak hour.
17. When preparing this statement and reviewing the IPA, I identified that incorrect gap acceptance parameters had been applied in the earlier

model of the Mt Herbert Road / Wellington Road Intersection. These parameters are not inappropriate, however more appropriate values have since been applied and the IPA report updated (refer my **Appendix B**).

18. This has resulted in changes to the model results provided in Table 9, and new SIDRA model results in Appendix C in the IPA. It should be noted that the change in model results is not considered to be significant or materially change the opinions or conclusions reached in the previous assessment, and the IPA otherwise remains the same as the August 2020 version.
19. The IPA assessed the operational capacity at the intersection of Mt Herbert Road with the Ennisclare Place entrance, as well as Mt Herbert Road/Wellington Road intersection. Note that at the time the IPA was completed, the Ennisclare Place entrance was to be main site entrance. The subdivision was then reconfigured relocating the new main access to Mt Herbert Road (as currently proposed as per the Concept Plan).
20. The assessment was conservative in nature, forecasting out the existing network traffic to the year 2050, including development traffic for the upper scenario and providing no allowance for trips by other modes. i.e. assuming 100% motorised trips.
21. The assessment demonstrated that both intersections would continue to operate well under these traffic conditions in 2050. The intersections experience some reduction in performance over this time, however the intersections both continue to operate within acceptable levels of service. Given the 30-year forecast and the level of conservatism applied, this is a robust approach and the observed reduction in performance is not unexpected.
22. The level of development currently anticipated by the Concept Plan, is expected to generate 2,947 vehicles per day, and approximately 325 vehicles in the peak hour.
23. The level of traffic associated with the Concept Plan, is marginally less than that originally assessed in the IPA and therefore the conclusions of the IPA remain unchanged with regards to this proposal and the anticipated traffic effects on the surrounding transport network. I.e., the effects are the same or less than that originally determined in the IPA.
24. The IPA did not consider the effect of the new site entrance that is to be established on Mt Herbert Road under the Concept Plan and assumed that all traffic would access the site via Ennisclare Place.

25. The dual access arrangement to the site is best addressed in the TIA, which outlined that approximately 82% of all traffic would access the site via the new site entrance, approximately 145m to the west of Ennisclare Place. The remaining 18% of site related traffic would be anticipated along Ennisclare Place.
26. Given that less traffic would be using Ennisclare Place than previously assessed, I have no concerns with the operational capacity of Ennisclare Place under the Concept Plan.
27. The new site entrance would be purpose built and given this would be serving less traffic than that which was originally assessed on Ennisclare Place, again, I have no concerns with the operational capacity of this intersection.
28. It is also recognised that the IPA assumed that all movements to the site would be by private motor vehicle and made no provision for other trips, either by walking, cycling or public transport. While this is a conservative approach to test wider network affects, it does not preclude the opportunity for other modes. For example, the dual access arrangement presented by the new access with Mt Herbert Road and Ennisclare Place create a loop which could support integration with public transport in the future.
29. The IPA also outlined the indicative internal roading layout that would be required to support the development. This generally outlined typical roading cross sections that would be required to support varying residential yields. While the yield arrangements will vary to that previously assessed, the principles of these cross-sectional requirements are expected to remain.
30. While I have assumed the development would progress in general accordance with the Concept Plan, I do not foresee any reasons which would preclude the applicant from being able to achieve an internal transport network that is compliant with Central Hawkes Bay District Council's engineering requirements.

### **Summary of Conclusions on the Proposed Rezoning**

31. The level of traffic effects associated with the Concept Plan is less than that which were previously assessed in the IPA. The IPA assessment undertaken was overly conservative with a 30-year forecast and assumed 100% of all movements would be undertaken by private motor vehicle. In practice, it would be usual to assess a forecast year of 10 – 20 years for a development of this scale and consider a reduction in vehicle movements to account for other modes.

32. Nevertheless, the IPA demonstrated that an appropriate level of service would remain available on the network in 2050 under these conditions. Therefore, the same or better would exist under this concept which has been assessed to generate less traffic movements.
33. This does not preclude the opportunities to explore integrating the development with public transport in the future, and promoting increased walking and cycling, both internally within the site and when undertaking trips on the surrounding network.

**Aaron Champion**

**31 October 2022**