

**BEFORE THE KAIPARA DISTRICT COUNCIL PC78 HEARING PANEL**

**UNDER** The Resource Management Act 1991

**IN THE MATTER OF** Private Plan Change 78 (PC78) to the  
Operative Kaipara District Plan

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF TRANSPORT EVIDENCE OF MAT COLLINS**

**ON BEHALF OF KAIPARA DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**25 JANUARY 2021**

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Mathew Ross Collins. I have been engaged by Kaipara District Council (**The Council**) to prepare and present transport evidence relating to the consideration of Private Plan Change 78 (**PC78**).
- 1.2 I hold a Bachelor of Engineering (Honours First Class) (Civil) from the University of Auckland and have a post-graduate certificate in transportation and land use planning from Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, Canada. I have five years' experience as a transportation planner and engineer. I have been employed by Flow Transportation Specialists since February 2019, where I hold the position of Principal at the Auckland office.
- 1.3 The purpose of this statement is to highlight areas of agreement and disagreement with regard to other experts in my field relating to PC78. These experts are:
- (a) Leo Hills (Transport) on behalf of the Applicant
  - (b) Mark Tollemache (Planning) on behalf of the Applicant
  - (c) Philip McDermott on behalf of the Submitter
  - (d) James Lunday on behalf of the Submitter

## 2. AREAS OF AGREEMENT

- 2.1 Statement of Evidence of Leo Hills (6 November 2020)
- (a) Paragraph 10 – 16: I agree with Mr Hills' executive summary in paragraphs 10 to 16, subject to one area of disagreement as identified below
  - (b) Paragraph 56 – 58: I agree with Mr Hills that the staging of the proposed road link from Mangawhai Central to Old Waipu Road should be coordinated with the upgrade of Old Waipu Road, and that this matter can be addressed in future resource consents
  - (c) Paragraph 72(c)(1): I confirm that the 850 dwelling cap proposed in the s42a report excludes retirement village units, and that a specific cap for retirement village units is not needed on transport grounds
  - (d) Paragraph 72(c)(2): I agree with Mr Hills that a 3,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA cap for supermarkets should be incorporated, rather than a 5,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA cap as contained in the s42a report.

- 2.2 Statement of Evidence of Mark Tollemache (6 November 2020)
- (a) Paragraph 11.18: I support Mr Tollemache's proposed amendments to the transport caps, other to note that the supermarket cap should be reduced from 5,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA to 3,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA as discussed above.

- 2.3 Statement of Supplementary Evidence of Mark Tollemache (18 December 2020)
- (a) I support the proposed revisions to PC78 provisions, per the yellow highlight as included in Attachment 1 of Mr Tollemache's supplementary evidence, to the extent that these relate to transport matters, subject to any comments and recommendations from Mr Badham and Ms Neal (Council's Reporting Planners).

### **3. AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT / STILL IN CONTENTION**

- 3.1 Statement of Evidence of Leo Hills (6 November 2020)
- (a) Paragraph 72(e): I consider that the Structure Plan should identify Collector Roads as forming part of the cycle network. The Collector Roads will form the "spine" for cycling accessibility, enabling access to and from Molesworth Drive and the northern portion of PC78. I agree with Mr Hills that the consented roads to date have adequately provided for cycling, but in my opinion the future extension of this network should be secured through the Structure Plan, to avoid a situation where cycle facilities are not extended due to "value engineering".

- 3.2 Statement of Evidence of Mark Tollemache (6 November 2020)
- (a) Paragraph 11.18: From a transport planning perspective, I do not agree with Mr Tollemache's opinion that the proposed transport thresholds for various land use activities are not necessary. My reasoning for this is outlined Section 4.3 of my Peer Review Report (attached as Appendix 11 to the s42a report) and summarised in Paragraph 250 of the s42a report.

- 3.3 Statement of Evidence by Philip McDermott (13 November 2020)
- (a) Paragraph 2.20 and 12.6 and 12.7: I consider that the transport effects on the wider network have been adequately considered, to a level suitable for a Plan Change. I agree that PC78 may result in changes to the Council's investment and maintenance schedule, however this would normally be addressed by the Council through its Regional Land Transport Plan and forward works plan. On the assumption that Mangawhai Central absorbs

a higher degree of forecast population growth for Mangawhai, rather than fundamentally affecting the quantum of population growth, any change to the Council's investment and maintenance schedule due to PC78 are likely to be of a similar order of magnitude of cost.

3.4 Statement of Evidence of James Lunday (12 November 2020)

- (a) Paragraph 57: I disagree with Mr Lunday's opinion that the road layout is "car focused rather than pedestrian". I consider that the Structure Plan, along with amendments recommended in Paragraph 250 of the s42a report, provide an appropriate degree of connectivity and responds to logical desire lines for walking, cycling and general traffic modes. Further detailing of the transport network, including the local roads not shown in the Structure Plan, can be addressed as part of future resource consents and engineering plan approvals.

**4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 I consider that there are no fundamental issues in contention between myself and the Applicant's Transport Engineer. Subject to the recommendations made in the s42a report, I consider that there are no transport planning or engineering reasons to preclude PC78.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mat Collins', with a stylized, cursive script.

**Mat Collins**