

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF MARK GEORGESON ON BEHALF OF WELHOM
DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

TRANSPORT EVIDENCE

1. SUMMARY OF KEY CONCLUSIONS

1.1 My transport evidence relates to the proposed Private Plan Change ("**Plan Change**") to rezone approximately 14.7ha of land in the northern fringe of the Masterton township ("**Site**").

1.2 Two transportation matters provide the substantive focus of my summary statement of evidence. The first relates to the performance and safety of the State Highway 2 ("**SH2**") / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection, through which the Site achieves vehicle access. The second matter relates to access for and by modes of travel other than by car. I have driven and walked the location multiple times.

SH2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive Intersection

1.3 I have carried out traffic modelling of the SH2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection, making allowance for the consented Cashmere Oaks subdivision to be completed, 10 years' worth of growth in through volumes on SH2 and traffic generation of development within the Site.

1.4 The residential traffic generation rates I have adopted are based on measured traffic generation rates of the existing Cashmere Oaks subdivision, while the retirement village traffic generation rates I have adopted apply those recorded at a modern equivalent Summerset village.

1.5 The State Highway traffic growth rate of 2% (applied over ten years) is based on historical growth in annual average daily traffic volumes on SH2 north of Masterton.

1.6 The modelling results presented in my evidence show that the Plan Change does not impact materially on the operation of the intersection, with prevailing conditions of low delays and a good level of service for drivers turning out of Cashmere Oaks Drive during peak times.

1.7 The modelling does not demonstrate that a change in intersection form (such as to a roundabout) is needed, and Ms Muirson's evidence outlines a safety risk assessment and a safety management approach that would be appropriate to address any safety concerns with the priority intersection,

proposed as as matters of control and discretion in the Wairarapa Combined District Plan ("**District Plan**") rules.

Accessibility for Non-Car Travel

- 1.8 There is a network of footpaths through the Cashmere Oaks subdivision (both existing and under construction). These paths connect with the existing path on the western side of SH2 and to Miro Street, providing established options for connecting with adjacent communities and walking towards Masterton.
- 1.9 The Cashmere Oaks subdivision roads are designed so that cyclists can share the road with vehicular traffic. The existing path on the western side of SH2 is used by some cyclists currently and cyclists will also have the option to use Miro Street to access the Masterton urban area.
- 1.10 While there is currently a bus service that services the north-eastern part of Masterton and connects this area to the town centre, I consider it to be too remote to serve the proposed development on the Site. Assessment and provisioning for a future bus service into the Cashmere Oaks catchment can be considered through the subsequent resource consent process.

Concluding comments

- 1.11 The intersection of Cashmere Oaks Drive and SH2 will continue to perform well, taking into account increased traffic from the development. There are several ways to improve the functionality of the intersection, but there is no evidence to suggest that a roundabout is needed for the Plan Change to progress. I am of the view that the transport needs and effects arising from development enabled by the Plan Change can be appropriately managed and tested as needed through the resource consent stages to follow.

2. MATTERS OF AGREEMENT

Intersection Modelling

- 2.1 Mr Connelly says at paragraph 66 of his evidence that the default SIDRA parameters are likely to be an appropriate starting point for intersection analysis. I agree, and confirm I have adopted the default gap parameters in the SIDRA analysis. The performance statistics reported in the ITA at Figure 8-8 and that I summarise at paragraph 7.5 of my evidence are the relevant outputs and demonstrate good ongoing performance of the priority intersection.

- 2.2 Mr Connelly mentions in the same paragraph that good practice is for the existing gap acceptance behaviour to be surveyed, to inform calibration of the traffic model. I agree, but in this instance (and other similar ones) found that because existing volumes are low, and delays and queues are small, sample measurements of gap selection are elusive.
- 2.3 My AM peak model of the existing intersection reports a 95th percentile queue length of less than one vehicle for the right turn out, which is consistent with my own observations of no instances of more than one vehicle waiting to turn right out of Cashmere Oaks Drive.
- 2.4 I note the comment given by Mr Connelly at his paragraph 93 that a roundabout at this location may not be the only solution, and earlier at paragraph 70 that the (priority) intersection may operate satisfactorily. I agree and have demonstrated that the intersection will continue to function safely, without the need for a roundabout to be established.

Travel by Other Modes

- 2.5 In terms of buses, I agree with Mr Connelly at paragraph 122 where he states that the proposed development should be considered with a broader view and that bus services and connections should be led by the Council. As set out at Section 11 of my primary statement of evidence, further consideration and assessment can be given to this matter at the time of resource consent.
- 2.6 I acknowledge that connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists continues to be developed. I accept that currently pedestrians and cyclists connecting through to Miro Street need to access out to SH2 before travelling further south. I am aware from discussions with the Council that a future connection may involve a pathway in the rail corridor, where pedestrians and cyclists would be able to travel from the southern end of the Cashmere Oaks subdivision to Oxford Street or the established pathways (and bridge) within the Waipoua River environment.
- 2.7 While there is currently no planning or funding set aside for this pathway, I agree that it presents an obvious next extension to the active mode network, providing a dedicated path for the growing catchment to the north.
- 2.8 In terms of the path alongside SH2, I accept the 200m section between Cashmere Oaks Drive and Fourth Street is built to a width of about 1.5m, and is sub-standard as a shared facility. There is the opportunity for this path to be widened and for a crossing point of SH2 to be established in the 50km/h location of Fourth Street (like the existing one south of Third Street), to enable

pedestrians and cyclists to cross the road and access the paths on the eastern side of SH2, and avoid doing so at the Cashmere Oaks intersection where there is no connection to the existing paths down the embankment below the road. This would in my view be one of the series of additions to the location that would benefit the community as a whole. It can be identified and assessed through the subsequent resource consent process, and considered alongside other improvements (such as a pathway in the rail corridor) that may be progressed in the interim.

3. KEY OUTSTANDING ISSUES

- 3.1 From the evidence of Ms St Amand, I note the reference made at paragraphs 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5 of Waka Kotahi's approval in 2009 of the SH2 / Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection being satisfactory for all development within the Opaki Future Development Area, as it was defined at the time shown by the plan attached to the 22 December 2009 letter appended to her statement at Appendix 1. That plan shows the Opaki Future Development Area including the Site.
- 3.2 I acknowledge the caveat on that approval that the average lot density did not exceed the district plan activity requirement of 1200sqm, and simply make the observation that the development area considered by Waka Kotahi at the time incorporated the subject land, and its traffic generation, connecting to Cashmere Oaks Drive. At an average lot size of 1200sqm versus the residential zone standard of 400sqm, inclusion of the Plan Change site would translate to one third of the traffic generation I have assessed for Scenario 1.
- 3.3 As I understand her paragraph 6.8, Ms Speight suggests that increasing development densities in the (reduced and now current) Opaki Future Development Area might be a better option than extending the residential zone further out, and suggests this would better inform planning and investment for infrastructure.
- 3.4 I note that this outcome would still rely on traffic accessing the area via Cashmere Oaks Drive, and its intersection with SH2, with traffic outcomes that may be no different from those associated with the Plan Change Request.
- 3.5 I note the point made by Ms Speight at her Paragraph 7.18 that while consultation on the Interim State Highway Speed Management Plan 2023-2024 ("ISMP") is complete, further consideration of speed management within the corridor can be progressed through the Speed Management Plan time cycle which is to be produced for the 2024-2027 period. It is stated that

consultation for this, and consideration of new speed limits, is planned for May to June 2023.

Traffic Generation Rates

- 3.6 At paragraph 49(b), Mr Connelly refers to a published traffic generation figure for Outer Urban Dwellings of 0.9vph, and suggests that my calculated rates are low. I note that the 0.9vph figure comes from a sample size of just one location, and dates back to beyond 2011 when the Research Report was published. As stated by Mr Connelly at paragraph 50 of his evidence, the derived rate I have utilised to present data relative to location provides a good indication of potential traffic. I do not believe the trip rates need to be used with caution, as he suggests. Mr Connelly, at paragraph 54 of his evidence, agrees with the traffic generation rates I have used for the retirement village.

Intersection Modelling

- 3.7 Mr Connelly does note at paragraph 67 that delays could be expected to be higher than latest figures. I appreciate modelling is not an exact science and there will be variable performances around the stated outputs. Even then, I do not believe the differences will be significant given the low base.
- 3.8 Further, at paragraph 69, Mr Connelly considers that sensitivity testing should be undertaken. I accept that sensitivity testing is appropriate in some instances, but again in this case, given the low base and good result achieved of the tested scenarios, I am of the view that the risk of resulting outcomes and conclusions changing is small, and not of a level requiring further modelling.

Travel by Other Modes

- 3.9 There is an existing and expanding network of connectivity for people to choose to travel by modes other than car. The existing built (and under construction) network of footpaths provide for future residents of the Site to connect with others in the community and south towards the Masterton township, either via links through the new subdivision roads ("**Road 3**") to Miro Street or via the path on SH2. Cyclists can do the same.
- 3.10 Mr Connelly mentions at paragraph 117 that the footpaths from the end of Coralie Place, to Miro Street, are not readily apparent, intuitive or direct. This is different to the location to which I am referring, and by contrast I believe the new path from the end of Road 3 does provide a logical and direct connection to Miro Street.

- 3.11 For road safety matters, I rely on the evidence of Ms Muirson, and note her key themes, that:
- (a) SH2 in the vicinity of Cashmere Oaks Drive does not have the look and feel of a rural road, but rather it is a highly modified environment (and increasingly moreso) that can be regarded as having a peri-urban context.
 - (b) The crash modelling presented by Waka Kotahi uses national averages and a 'blunt' tool to predict crashes at this location, which are not substantiated by the historical safety record of the location and the wider Masterton district. These figures are therefore not specific to the Site.
 - (c) The Cashmere Oaks Drive intersection with SH2 can continue to operate safely as a priority intersection and does not need to be rebuilt as a roundabout.
 - (d) There is a package of improvements that can be further developed at resource consent time in response to satisfying safety assessment matters, in combination with any speed changes in the corridor that may be progressed separately by Waka Kotahi. I add to these the pedestrian and cycle improvements I have referred to.
- 3.12 While a reduced speed limit on SH2 will better reflect the existing peri-urban context of SH2 north of Masterton past Cashmere Oaks Drive, it remains my view that wholesale infrastructure changes are not needed to respond to the effects of residential development enabled by the Plan Change. I nonetheless support Waka Kotahi's continued progress of speed limit reviews in the corridor, to be considered alongside future resource consents.

Mark Georgeson

8 March 2023