

**BEFORE THE KAIPARA DISTRICT COUNCIL'S HEARING PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the Act**)

AND

**IN THE MATTER**

An application for Private Plan Change 85 (**PC85**) -  
**MANGAWHAI EAST** by Foundry Group Limited  
(formerly Cabra Mangawhai Limited) and Pro Land  
Matters Company to rezone approximately 94-  
hectares of land at Black Swamp and Raymond Bull  
Roads, Mangawhai

---

**REBUTTAL STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LEO DONALD HILLS ON BEHALF OF THE**

**APPLICANTS**

**(TRANSPORTATION)**

**09 February 2026**

---

Jeremy Brabant

Barrister

Level 7, 50 Albert Street, Auckland Central

PO Box 1502, Shortland St, Auckland 1140

M: 021 494 506

E: [jeremy@brabant.co.nz](mailto:jeremy@brabant.co.nz)

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. My full name is Leo Donald Hills.
2. I have been asked by Foundry Group (formerly Cabra Mangawhai Limited) and Pro Land Matters Company Limited, to provide independent expert advice on Private Plan Change 85 Mangawhai East (PC85) to the Kaipara District Plan.

## **QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE**

3. My qualifications and experience are outlined in my primary evidence.

## **EXPERT WITNESS CODE OF CONDUCT**

4. Although this is not a hearing before the Environment Court, I record that I have read and agree to and abide by the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as specified in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I rely upon the evidence of other expert witnesses as presented to this hearing. I have not omitted to consider any material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

## **PROJECT INVOLVEMENT**

5. My project involvement is outlined in my primary evidence.

## **SCOPE OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE**

6. This statement of rebuttal evidence on behalf of the applications responds to various transport matters arising from the statements of evidence prepared by:
  - i. Mark Andrew Ross on behalf of Riverside Holiday Park 2007 Limited dated 30 January 2026.
  - ii. Summary Statement of Evidence of Jonathan Guy Clease, Planning, dated 23 January 2026.

## **RESPONSE TO EVIDENCE OF MR ROSS**

7. I have read the submission received by Mr Ross on PPC85 that provides comments relating to transport matters. I address the matter raised in the submission below:

- i. Safety of the Black Swamp Road / Insley Street intersection and the preference for a roundabout over a right-turn bay.

#### Black Swamp Road / Insley Street Intersection

- 8. I understand the submitter has concerns regarding the current safety level of the Black Swamp Road / Insley Street intersection and has preference for the roundabout option over the proposed priority-controlled layout (with full upgrade to include a right-turn bay layout).
- 9. As noted in the Safe Systems Audit (SSA) provided in the Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA), the proposed T-intersection provides similar safety outcomes compared to the roundabout option, with both options producing low SSA scores, indicating safe operation.
- 10. I note that the proposed layout of the intersection is well recognised and implemented across the Council and even the State Highway network (nationally).
- 11. It is also consistent with other recent similar residential Plan Changes in the Kaipara region which I have been involved with including PC84 (Moir Road / Tara Road intersection in Mangawhai) and PC81 (Awakino Point Road / SH14 intersection), both of which had upgraded priority T-intersections as their main access to the arterial network.
- 12. There are no transport matters raised by Mr Ross that change my professional opinion that the proposal is acceptable from a transportation perspective when considering the proposed transportation requirements secured through the Development Area provisions.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY MR CLEASE**

- 13. I have read the Supplementary Planning Statement of Evidence prepared by Mr Clease, relating to the recent changes to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and the new National Policy Statement for Infrastructure 2025 (NPS-I).
- 14. I note his comment in Paragraph 5.4 which states "*Of relevance to PPC85, the amendments to the NZCPS provide a more enabling policy framework against which any future application for resource consent for the shared path adjacent to the Insley Street causeway/ bridge will be assessed (as transport infrastructure within the CMA).*"

I also note his comment in Paragraph 6.3 which starts “*Of particular relevance to PPC85, Objective 1(c) seeks to ‘enable infrastructure to support the development and change of urban and rural environments to meet diverse and changing needs of present and future generations’*”

15. In general, I agree with Mr Clease that the NPS-I and the amendments to the NZCPS provide enabling national policy direction that should help to inform the assessment of any future resource consents necessary to deliver the PC85 infrastructure such as the Insley Street causeway/ bridge.

## **CONCLUSION**

16. I consider the Black Swamp Road / Insley Street intersection upgraded to a roundabout is not necessary given the similar and low SSA scores when comparing the current proposed layout (priority-controlled intersection with a full right-turn bay) with the roundabout option, and given the proposed layout is widely used.
17. Overall, I consider that the PPC85 is acceptable and an appropriate use of the site from a traffic engineering / transportation planning perspective. In my opinion, there is no traffic engineering related reason to decline the plan change.

---

**Leo Hills**

09 February 2026