

AK C PPCs 48, 49 & 50 – JWS Transport (Technical & Planning) – 26 October 2021

AUCKLAND COUNCIL:

PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 48: DRURY CENTRE PRECINCT – KIWI PROPERTY HOLDINGS

PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 49: DRURY EAST PRECINCT – FULTON HOGAN LAND DEVELOPMENT LTD

PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 50: WAIHOEHOE PRECINCT – OYSTER CAPITAL

JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT (JWS) OF EXPERTS IN RELATION TO TRANSPORT

26 OCTOBER 2021

Expert Witness Conferencing Topic: Transport (Technical)

Held on: 26 October 2021

Venue: 9:00am online via Microsoft Teams during COVID-19 Level 3 Lockdown

Independent Facilitator: Marlene Oliver

Admin Support: Cosette Saville

1 Attendance:

1.1 The list of expert participants is included in the schedule to this Statement.

2 Basis of Attendance and Environment Court Practice Note 2014

2.1 All participants agree as follows:

- (a) The Environment Court Practice Note 2014 provides relevant guidance and protocols for the expert conferencing session.
- (b) They will comply with the relevant provisions of the Environment Court Practice Note 2014.
- (c) They will make themselves available to appear at the hearing in person if required to do so by the Hearing Panel (as directed by the Hearing Panel's directions).
- (d) Mr Prosser and Ms Sinclair remain of the view that PPCs 48 – 50 should be declined for the reasons explained in detail in their evidence. The most useful and efficient approach to expert conferencing is to focus discussion on the issues stated below, and to focus on the transport upgrades required, should the Panel decide to approve the plan changes, and transport-related planning provisions.
- (e) This report is to be filed with the Hearing Panel.

3 Agenda – Issues considered at Conferencing

3.1 The issues identified as forming the agenda for conferencing were:

- 1) Traffic modelling assumptions
- 2) Network performance criteria
- 3) Transport upgrades required to support development enabled by the three Plan Changes
- 4) Required upgrades (i.e. nature of upgrade) and triggers for those upgrades
- 5) Transport related provisions
- 6) Next steps to achieve final drafting of the transport related provisions.

3.2 The following sections of this Joint Witness Statement address each of these issues, noting where agreement has been reached and, in the event of disagreement, the nature of the disagreement and the reasons for that disagreement.

4 Traffic Modelling Assumptions

4.1 The evidence of Mr Hughes and Mr McKenzie sets out the traffic modelling framework used to assess the effects and therefore mitigation for the Plan Changes. The traffic modelling has used the Supporting Growth Southern Sector SATURN model (S3M) with some changes as set out in evidence to assess network performance, along with supporting isolated SIDRA models.

Expert's position

4.2 Terry Church agrees with the traffic modelling framework used however considers that the limitations of the model have not been appropriately reflected when interpreting outputs, which then inform transport triggers. For example, the model does not capture disruption and effects caused by construction works related to the transport upgrades themselves.

5 Network Performance Criteria

5.1 The evidence of Mr Hughes and Mr McKenzie set out the network performance criteria used to evaluate the levels of development that could be supported by transport infrastructure. This analysis considers the criteria holistically, and they have formed the basis of the transport triggers in the Plan Changes. The network performance criteria assume:

Transport network element	Criteria
Peak hour queue lengths at the Great South Road/Waihoehoe Road intersection	Vehicles do not overspill to the adjacent intersection
Public transport delays at key locations of the network	Evaluation of bus delay at intersections taking into account overall journey time, and whether the delay affects the Drury area's PT uptake rates

Interpeak delays	Average intersection performance is better than Level of Service D across the network (note this has been amended from Hughes / Mckenzie EIC, and will be updated in rebuttal)
Northbound queuing on SH1	Queuing does not extend beyond the Drury interchange
Average daily link flows for roads connecting to the Great South Road / Waihoehoe Road intersection	Do not exceed 30,000 vehicles per day on two-lane roads

Experts' positions

- 5.2 Terry Church supports the approach taken in principle. However, the criteria used to assess and determine transport triggers should also consider criteria that protect the reliability and efficiency of bus routes within the immediate area (such as Waihoehoe Road westbound) rather than dampening down impacts by considering overall journey time the extent of queues on SH1 should align with Waka Kotahi design requirements. Terry would like to have clarification around the extent of queues on south-bound offramp. Terrys experience with Waka Kotahi (in designing and assessing land use impacts) is for static queues not to extend to be within 140m of the nose of the offramp diverge with the mainline. Extending beyond this point is not safe given the risk of high-speed crashes. Until these matters are considered in the evaluation, Terry disagrees with the criteria used to date to determine triggers.
- 5.3 David Mead agrees with Terry Church with respect to public transport importance. In addition, David Mead is concerned that the criteria do not give sufficient attention to long term resilience of the network.
- 5.4 The Applicants experts will provide further information on the public transport criterion, and report back.

6 Transport upgrades required to support development enabled by the three Plan Changes

- 6.1 The outcomes of the discussion on agenda items 3.1(3) and (4) are recorded in the tables in **Appendix 1** to this JWS. Areas of agreement and disagreement are recorded.
- 6.2 To assist in the transport upgrade discussion, a map showing the parcels of land that Kiwi Property Limited and Oyster have control over as of 22 October 2021 has been provided. The purpose of the map is to allow an understanding on what elements can be delivered according to a trigger table, such that a well-functioning transport network exists.

6.3 To assist in the transport upgrade discussion, a map showing the parcels of land that Kiwi Property Limited and Oyster have control over as of 22 October 2021 has been provided. The purpose of the map is to allow an understanding on what elements can be delivered according to a trigger table, such that a well-functioning transport network exists.

6.4 Appendix 1 draws on the applicants' views on the transport triggers and does not capture the proposed trigger wording from Mr Prosser and Ms Sinclair's evidence required to support the development enabled by the three plan changes to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the roading network and connectivity for all transport modes.

7 Transport related provisions and next steps to achieve final drafting of the transport related provisions

7.1 Further expert conferencing is scheduled for 2 November 2021.

7.2 An additional expert conference may be required in the week beginning 8 November 2021. This will be determined at the end of the session scheduled for 2 November 2021. This may require the Panel to issue amended Directions.

8 PARTIES TO JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT

8.1 The participants to this Joint Witness Statement confirm that:

- (a) They agree with the outcome of the expert conference as recorded in this statement. As this session was held online and there is an existing evidence exchange timetable, in the interests of efficiency, it was agreed that each expert would verbally confirm their position to the facilitator. This is recorded in the schedule below;
- (b) They have read Appendix 3 of the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it; and
- (c) The matters addressed in this statement are within their area of expertise.

Confirmed on 26 October 2021:

EXPERT NAME	PARTIES	EXPERTS CONFIRMATION REFER PARA 8.1
Andrew Prosser (Tr)	Auckland Transport (as submitter)	Yes
Lydia Smith (Plg)	Auckland Transport (as submitter)	Yes
Terry Church (Tr)	Auckland Council (as regulator)	Yes
David Mead (Plg)	Auckland Council (as regulator)	Yes
Craig Cairncross (Plg)	Auckland Council (as regulator)	Yes - attended from 9-11am

Joseph Phillips (Tr)	Drury South Limited	Yes
Pam Butler (Plg)	KiwiRail	Yes – attended from 9am-2pm
Andrew Mein (Tr)	Waka Kotahi	Yes
Cath Heppelthwaite (Plg)	Waka Kotahi	Yes - attended from 9am-2pm
Todd Langwell (Tr) as observer	Kāinga Ora	Observed parts
John Parlane (Tr)	Kiwi Property Holdings No2 Limited Oyster Capital Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	Yes
Don McKenzie (Tr)	Kiwi Property Holdings No2 Limited Oyster Capital Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	Yes
Daryl Hughes (Tr)	Kiwi Property Holdings No2 Limited Oyster Capital Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	Yes
Saulius Vingrys (Tr)	Kiwi Property Holdings No2 Limited Oyster Capital Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	Yes – attended from 9am-2:30pm
Hilary Papps (Tr)	Kiwi Property Holdings No2 Limited Oyster Capital Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	Yes
Nick Roberts (Plg)	Kiwi Property Holdings No2 Limited Oyster Capital Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	Yes
Rachel Morgan (Plg)	Kiwi Property Holdings No2 Limited Oyster Capital Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	Yes

Appendix 1

APPENDIX 1 - JWS TRANSPORT AND PLANNING 26 OCTOBER 2021

1. Agenda Item 3.1(2): Required transport upgrades

<p>Transport upgrade required by the Plan Changes, unless demonstrated that it is not required or a suitable alternative is in place</p> <p><i>(Equivalent DIFF project reference for information, as included in AT/AC submitter evidence)</i></p>	<p>Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)</p>				
	<p>Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)</p>	<p>Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport</p>	<p>Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants</p>	<p>Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited</p>	<p>Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi</p>
<p>1. Waihoehoe Road (interim) including Great South Road/Waihoehoe Road intersection upgrade (interim)</p>	<p>Yes – with traffic signals as opposed to roundabout and revised interim corridor design</p>	<p>No – full solution, enabling bus infrastructure (4-lanes)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes – with traffic signals as opposed to roundabout and revised interim corridor design</p>
<p>2. State Highway 1 widening – Stage 1B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SH1 Drury Interchange including ramps (DIFF 19-2) 	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>3. Drury Central train station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station (DIFF 5) • Station Connection (DIFF 6) 	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Transport upgrade required by the Plan Changes, unless demonstrated that it is not required or a suitable alternative is in place</p> <p><i>(Equivalent DIFF project reference for information, as included in AT/AC submitter evidence)</i></p>	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>4. Waihoehoe Road full upgrade between Fitzgerald Road and GSR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>GSR/Waihoehoe Rd/Norrie Rd upgrade (ultimate) (DIFF 9a)</i> • <i>New intersection on Waihoehoe Rd/Fitzgerald Road (ultimate) (DIFF 10b)</i> • <i>Waihoehoe Rd West upgrades between GSR and Fitzgerald Rd, including bridge replacement over rail (ultimate) (DIFF 23)</i> 	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<p>5. Direct connection from State Highway 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>New Drury Interchange connection to PPC48 (DIFF 34)</i> 	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<p>6. Mill Road southern connection</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<p>7. Mill Road northern connection</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<p>8. Opāheke northern connection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>NS Opaheke Arterial (up to Waihoehoe Stream as Interim Solution)(DIFF 13a)</i> 	Yes. Note that Precinct Plan shows a Collector Road, whereas the current notified Drury NOR D4 proposes a 30m arterial road.	Yes. Note that Precinct Plan shows a Collector Road, whereas the current notified Drury NOR D4 proposes a 30m arterial road.	Yes	Yes. Note that Precinct Plan shows a Collector Road, whereas the current notified Drury NOR D4 proposes a 30m arterial road.	Yes. Note that Precinct Plan shows a Collector Road, whereas the current notified Drury NOR D4 proposes a 30m arterial road.
<p>9. Active mode connections to the Drury Central train station</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

<p>Transport upgrade required by the Plan Changes, unless demonstrated that it is not required or a suitable alternative is in place</p> <p><i>(Equivalent DIFF project reference for information, as included in AT/AC submitter evidence)</i></p>	<p>Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)</p>				
	<p>Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)</p>	<p>Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport</p>	<p>Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants</p>	<p>Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited</p>	<p>Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi</p>
<p>10. Internal collector road network, including upgrades to existing rural roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Waihoehoe Rd East Upgrade (Fitzgerald Road to Cossey Road)(DIFF 4)</i> • <i>Fitzgerald Road upgrades (Waihoehoe Road to north of Brookfield Road) (DIFF 7)</i> • <i>Fielding Road upgrades (Waihoehoe Rd to East-West Collector Rd) (DIFF 8)</i> • <i>Intersection upgrade Waihoehoe Rd/Fielding Rd/Appleby Rd (DIFF 11)</i> • <i>Upgrade Brookfield Road (DIFF 14 excluding connection with Quarry)</i> • <i>New Collector Rd E-W from Fitzgerald Rd to Rail Station and intersections (Station Rd) (DIFF 15)</i> • <i>Fielding Rd upgrades for active modes (from Fitzgerald Rd to new E-W Collector) (DIFF 21)</i> • <i>New collector in N-S direction parallel to Fitzgerald Rd (Drury Boulevard) (DIFF 28)</i> • <i>New Collector in E-W direction between Flanagan Rd and Fitzgerald Rd (collector 2) (DIFF 29)</i> • <i>New 2-lane internal Collector Rd between Fitzgerald and Fielding Rd, E-W direction (DIFF 30-1)</i> 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Request that assessment criteria include roads and intersections.</p> <p>Request cross sections be revised.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Request that assessment criteria include roads and intersections.</p> <p>Request cross sections be revised.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Transport upgrade required by the Plan Changes, unless demonstrated that it is not required or a suitable alternative is in place</p> <p><i>(Equivalent DIFF project reference for information, as included in AT/AC submitter evidence)</i></p>	<p>Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)</p>				
	<p>Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)</p>	<p>Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport</p>	<p>Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants</p>	<p>Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited</p>	<p>Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade Fitzgerald Rd from DIFF Report Project #7 to Brookfield Rd (DIFF 33) 					
<p>11. Great South Road Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waihoehoe Rd to Drury I/C (DIFF 1a/1b) From Drury School to Waihoehoe Road (Interim solution) (DIFF 2a) Upgrades in Great South Rd/Firth Rd intersection (overlap with DIFF 12)(DIFF 46) Active mode corridor from Drury East Town Centre to Great South Road (DIFF 67) 	No	Yes	No	No	No

<p>Transport upgrade required by the Plan Changes, unless demonstrated that it is not required or a suitable alternative is in place</p> <p><i>(Equivalent DIFF project reference for information, as included in AT/AC submitter evidence)</i></p>	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>12. Brookfield Road connection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade Brookfield Road from Fitzgerald to Quarry Rd with new connection + intersections on Quarry and Fitzgerald (DIFF 14) 	<p>No (Terry Church), but would like to see indicative arrow on Precinct Plan.</p> <p>Yes (David Mead)</p>	Yes	No	No	Yes
<p>13. Bremner/Norrie Road upgrades</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim walking, cycling and bus connections to Drury Centre (includes Bremner/Norrie/Firth intersection upgrades, active mode on Norrie) (DIFF 12) 2-lane bridge over Bremner/Waihoehoe Road (at SH1)(DIFF 16a) 	No	Yes	No	No	No
<p>14. Upgrade rural network south/west of Plan Change area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade Fitzgerald Rd from Brookfield Rd to Ramarama Rd (DIFF 20) Upgrade intersection at Quarry Road/GSR (DIFF 22) Upgrade intersection at GSR / SH22 (DIFF 3) 	No, but consider as assessment criteria, when infringing the triggers.	Yes	No	Potential yes, subject to further information being provided by the Applicants experts	No, but consider as assessment criteria, when infringing the triggers.
15. New PT services across Drury	No	Yes	No	No	No

2. Agenda Item 3.1(3): Nature of upgrade and trigger

Note: Projects (1)-(9) are as per the Applicants evidence, transport trigger table in the precinct provisions and are cumulative.

Additional projects (10)-(15) are as per the Auckland Transport expert's evidence.

1. Waihoehoe Road interim	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>See interim cross section detail at Appendix 1A of the Plan Change provisions included in EIC.</p>	<p>Yes -</p> <p>Agrees with interim upgrades being required but disagrees with what is being proposed.</p> <p>Disagrees with a roundabout. An interim signalised intersection is preferred.</p> <p>Disagrees with the Waihoehoe Rd interim cross section at Appendix 1A. Proposes that the interim cross section reflects the long-term design of the westbound NOR design, such that once constructed, kerb lines, stormwater and services on the southern side of the final NOR design is fixed. This provides for one lane in each direction, a</p>	<p>No -</p> <p>Andrew Prosser disagrees with an interim solution, and is of the view that a fuller solution needs to be provided, from the onset.</p>	<p>Yes -</p> <p>Reviewing interim cross section design in light of comments from Terry Church. Applicants' experts will report back to the group.</p> <p>Interim signalisation has been tested previously, but will be reconsidered in light of Terrys comments, with report back.</p>	<p>Yes -</p> <p>Supports the revision in light of Terry Church's comment, in relation to the interim signalisation of the intersection.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Disagrees with the roundabout, supports the provision of an interim signalised intersection, for both capacity and safety reasons.</p>

1. Waihoehoe Road interim	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
	westbound bus lane and a 4m shared path. Terry proposes that a separate walking and cycling facility is provided to the south of the current bridge in the interim.				
<p>Trigger</p> <p>Required before any development occurs.</p> <p>Enables up to 710 dwellings.</p>	Yes, supports the interim upgrade being in place from day one, however the yield that the upgrade allows will be informed by revised modelling being undertaken by the Applicant on the interim solution.	This is not applicable, as Andrew Prosser does not agree with the interim upgrade.	Yes.	Yes, supports the interim upgrade being in place from day one, however the yield that the upgrade allows will be informed by revised modelling being undertaken by the Applicant on the interim solution.	Yes, supports the interim upgrade being in place from day one, however the yield that the upgrade allows will be informed by revised modelling being undertaken by the Applicant on the interim solution.

2. State Highway 1 widening – Stage 1B	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>State Highway 1 widening – Stage 1B (6-laning between Papakura and Drury, shared use path and bridge replacements)</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>As the works relieve pressure on Great South Road, north of Waihoehoe Road.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>As the works relieve pressure on Great South Road, north of Waihoehoe Road.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>As the works relieve pressure on Great South Road, north of Waihoehoe Road.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>As the works relieve pressure on Great South Road, north of Waihoehoe Road.</p>
<p>Trigger</p> <p>Required before any retail/commercial or community activities or more than 710 dwellings.</p> <p>Allows development of up to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 1,300 dwellings; and (ii) 24,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 6,000m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 800m² community GFA. 	<p>Terry Church seeks clarification on the performance of the Drury I/C southbound off ramp queue as requested above and constructability impacts of the Item 5 (full delivery of the ultimate Waihoehoe upgrade), prior to being satisfied with the yield.</p>	<p>Andrew will come back to this.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No, for the reasons identified in Joseph Phillips evidence, will review additional information being provided by the Applicants experts as this is made available.</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the confirmation of the interim solution with signalised intersection.</p>

3. Drury Central Train Station	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Drury Central Train Station (excluding the Park & Ride)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Terry Church and David Mead would like to see the construction of additional infrastructure, namely connectivity between the train station and the centre (the Key Retail Street and the Fitzgerald Road east-west connection) as shown in the Precinct Plan in PC48, provided at the same time as the Drury Centre train station.</p> <p>Terry Church and David Mead do not require the Park & Ride to be constructed (in accordance with the NOR), for the purpose of this provision.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Subject to the right infrastructure supporting the train station being in place (aligning with Andrew Prosser's first tranche – refer to Table 1 of Andrew Prosser's EIC).</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The Applicants experts confirm that assessment criteria is provided in the Plan Changes, to require a direct connection to the railway station, once the railway station is operational.</p> <p>The Applicants experts will go through this in further detail at the transport (planning) caucusing on 2 November.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Trigger (in combination with Direct connection from SH1 – Item 4 below)</p> <p>Required for more than:</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Terry Church seeks the same trigger as for Item 2 above, noting that he</p>	<p>No, this is an immediate requirement from 2023.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No, for the reasons identified in Joseph Phillips evidence, will review additional</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the confirmation of the interim solution with signalised intersection.</p>

3. Drury Central Train Station	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>(i) 1,300 dwellings; and (ii) 24,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 6,000m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 800m² community GFA.</p> <p>Allows development of up to: (i) 1,800 dwellings; and (ii) 32,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 8,700m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 1,000m² community GFA.</p>	<p>considers the network can cope with 710 dwellings, subject to the interim upgrades being assessed.</p> <p>Terry Church seeks clarification on the performance of the Drury I/C southbound off ramp queue as requested above and constructability impacts of the Item 4 (full delivery of the ultimate Waihoehoe upgrade), prior to being satisfied with the yield.</p> <p>David Mead is of the view that the Drury Central train station needs to be constructed prior to any development.</p>			<p>information being provided by the Applicants experts as this is made available.</p>	

4. Direct connection from SH1 to the Drury Centre	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Direct south-bound connection from SH1 to the Drury Centre (as shown in the Precinct Plan 2: Drury Centre)</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the ability to have an engineering solution due to the site constraints.</p> <p>David Mead is of the view that there needs to be reasonable certainty that this upgrade is achievable (from an engineering perspective) to be included in a trigger table.</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the ability to have an engineering solution due to the site constraints.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Daryl Hughes and Nick Roberts to provide any further details on preliminary engineering discussions to date.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Trigger (in combination with Drury Central train station – Item 3 above)</p> <p>Required for more than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 1,300 dwellings; and (ii) 24,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 6,000m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 800m² community GFA. <p>Allows development of up to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 1,800 dwellings; and (ii) 32,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 8,700m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 1,000m² community GFA. 	<p>Terry Church seeks clarification on the constructability impacts of Item 5 (full delivery of the ultimate Waihoehoe upgrade), prior to being satisfied with the yield.</p>	<p>No, this is an immediate requirement from 2023.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No, for the reasons identified in Joseph Phillips evidence, will review additional information being provided by the Applicants experts as this is made available.</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the confirmation of the interim solution with signalised intersection.</p>

5. Waihoehoe Road full upgrades between Fitzgerald Road and GSR	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Two general traffic lanes and two bus lanes, including a new bridge over the railway corridor;</p> <p>Signalisation and increased capacity at the Great South Road/Waihoehoe Road intersection.</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<p>Trigger</p> <p>Required for more than:</p> <p>(i) 1,800 dwellings; and (ii) 32,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 8,700m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 1,000m² community GFA.</p> <p>Allows development of up to:</p> <p>(i) 3,300 dwellings; and (ii) 56,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 17,900m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 2,000m² community GFA.</p>	<p>Yes - Subject to the network performance criteria being confirmed and worked through.</p> <p>David Mead is of the view that from a land use perspective this needs to be made available earlier than stated (for example, within 2-3 years of the first building being built or the first subdivision being consented).</p>	No, this is an immediate requirement from 2023.	Yes	Yes, for the reasons identified in Joseph Phillips evidence, will review additional information being provided by the Applicants experts as this is made available.	Yes, subject to the network performance criteria being worked through.

6. Mill Road southern connection	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Mill Road southern connection, described in the precinct provisions as southern connection between Fitzgerald Road and State Highway 1, including the Drury South interchange.</p>	<p>Yes, as it provides greater connectivity to the wider network. In noting this however, there is no certainty of this being delivered by the road controlling authorities. As a result, Terry Church and David Mead request assessment criteria to consider wider network effects rather than specific projects.</p>	<p>Yes, Andrew Prosser has concerns around resilience and considers it very important from this perspective.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Joseph Phillips notes the extent that this provides greater network resilience, and alternative northern connections for Drury South.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Andrew notes the importance of Mill Road as it provides network connectivity to the north, south and west.</p>
<p>Trigger (in combination with Opaheke Norther connection – Item 8 below)</p> <p>Required for more than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 3,300 dwellings; and (ii) 56,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 17,900m² other commercial GFA; <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (iv) 2,000m² community GFA. <p>Allows development of up to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 3,800 dwellings; and (ii) 64,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 21,000m² other commercial GFA; <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (iv) 2,400m² community GFA. 	<p>Yes, subject to the threshold assessment metrics being confirmed and worked through.</p>	<p>No, Auckland Transport experts have earlier trigger timing: (1,800 dwellings, 32,000m² retail GFA, 8,700m² commercial GFA and 2,000m² community GFA).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the network performance criteria being worked through.</p>

7. Mill Road northern connection	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Mill Road northern connection</p>	<p>Yes, as it provides greater connectivity to the wider network. In noting this however, there is no certainty of this being delivered by the road controlling authorities. As a result, Terry Church and David Mead request assessment criteria to consider wider network effects rather than specific projects.</p>	<p>Yes, Andrew Prosser has concerns around resilience and considers it very important from this perspective.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Joseph Phillips notes the extent that this provides greater network resilience, and alternative northern connections for Drury South.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Andrew notes the importance of Mill Road as it provides network connectivity to the north, south and west.</p>
<p>Trigger (in combination with Opaheke Northern connection – Item 8 below)</p> <p>Required for more than:</p> <p>(i) 3,800 dwellings; and</p> <p>(ii) 64,000m² retail GFA; and</p> <p>(iii) 21,000m² other commercial GFA; and</p> <p>(iv) 2,400m² community GFA.</p> <p>Allows development of up to:</p> <p>(i) 5,800 dwellings; and</p> <p>(ii) 97,000m² retail GFA; and</p> <p>(iii) 47,000m² other commercial GFA; and</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the threshold assessment metrics being confirmed and worked through.</p>	<p>No, Auckland Transport experts have earlier trigger timing: (1,800 dwellings, 32,000m² retail GFA, 8,700m² commercial GFA and 2,000m² community GFA).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the network performance criteria being worked through.</p>

7. Mill Road northern connection	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
(iv) 10,000m ² community GFA.					

8. Opāheke Northern connection	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Opāheke Northern connection (as an arterial through to Papakura)</p>	<p>Yes, as it provides greater connectivity to the wider network. In noting this however, there is no certainty of this being delivered by the road controlling authorities. As a result, Terry Church and David Mead request assessment criteria to consider wider network effects rather than specific projects.</p>	<p>Yes, Andrew Prosser has concerns around resilience and considers it very important from this perspective.</p> <p>Auckland Transport experts have an interim request (to go to Waihoihoi Stream (the northern boundary of PC50)), prior to the full arterial road being built.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Trigger (in combination with Mill Road northern and southern connections – Items 6 and 7 above)</p> <p>Required for more than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 3,800 dwellings; and (ii) 64,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 21,000m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 2,400m² community GFA. <p>Allows development of up to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 5,800 dwellings; and (ii) 97,000m² retail GFA; and (iii) 47,000m² other commercial GFA; and (iv) 10,000m² community GFA. 	<p>Yes, subject to the threshold assessment metrics being confirmed and worked through.</p>	<p>No to the Applicants trigger.</p> <p>Andrew Prosser proposes an earlier trigger, which relates to the interim improvement.</p> <p>The future improvements go beyond a 10-year horizon and need to be subject to an updated ITA.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the network performance criteria being worked through.</p>

9. Active mode connections to the Drury Central train station	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>As a minimum, direct, legible and safe pedestrian and cycle connections.</p> <p>See assessment criteria IX.8.2 in each precinct.</p>	<p>Yes, noting Terry Church's points raised above on the delivery of Key Retail Street and connection to Fitzgerald Rd (with the Drury Central Train Station) in addition to the alternative interim layout of Waihoehoe Road.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Trigger</p> <p>As development proceeds</p>	<p>Yes, subject to the above.</p> <p>David Mead notes he is not convinced that the assessment criteria is the correct way to deliver this, and this should be covered off as a rule (to be addressed at Planning caucusing).</p>	<p>Yes, Andrew Prosser is concerned to ensure connectivity, providing good linkages with active modes across all of the precincts, in particular connecting to the Drury Centre.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>

10. Internal collector road network, including upgrades to existing rural roads	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Collector roads are provided generally in the locations shown on the Precinct Plan 2 (PC48) and Precinct Plan 1 (PC49 and PC50); Rural road network upgrades consistent with indicative cross section details included at Appendix 1A of the Plan Change provisions included in EIC.</p> <p>The criteria require the rural road and intersections between a development site and the Fitzgerald Road / Waihoehoe Road intersection to be upgraded.</p>	<p>Yes. Terry Church supports the upgrading of existing rural roads and intersections as development progresses, other than Waihoehoe Road (east of Fitzgerald Road) as captured earlier. Terry supports the ultimate upgrade being provided where land ownership allows. Terry supports an interim solution, that allows long term carriageway elements to be locked in from the outset (as per the cross sections set out in Appendix 1A of the Plan Change provisions).</p>	<p>Yes, subject to Andrew Prosser's cross-sections as set out in his EIC.</p> <p>Andrew also noted his concern about the pavement condition and geometry, and is concerned that the existing rural roads will fail in the future.</p> <p>This is a matter that can be addressed through the EPA process.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Trigger</p> <p>As development proceeds</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>

11. Great South Road improvements	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Waihoehoe Rd to Drury I/C (DIFF Report # 1a)</p> <p>From Drury School to Waihoehoe Road (interim solution) (DIFF Report # 2a)</p> <p>Upgrades in Great South Road / Firth Road intersection (DIFF Report # 46)</p> <p>Active model corridor from Drury East Town Centre to Great South Road (DIFF Report # 67)</p>	No	Yes	No - beyond the scope of the Plan Change. Children can use the eastern footpath to reach Drury School, prior to school's opening in Drury East.	No	No
<p>Trigger</p> <p>Andrew Prosser has identified that this is required in 2022/26</p>	No	Yes	No	No	No

12. Brookfield Road connection	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Brookfield Road Link.</p> <p>Upgrade Brookfield Road from Fitzgerald to Quarry Rd with new connection + Intersections on Quarry & Fitzgerald.</p>	<p>Terry Church - No, but to ensure a future opportunity is not precluded, it would be good to show an indicative connection on the Precinct Plan.</p> <p>David Mead - Yes, David is of the view that from a land use perspective this is an important alternative to the east-west connection at the Drury interchange.</p>	<p>Yes, Andrew Prosser noted that this is included in the DIFF report and the Drury-Opaheke Structure Plan as a collector road.</p>	<p>No - Limited modelling didn't show significant benefits of providing the link.</p> <p>Not included as part of NOR process and therefore not considered as required. Developers don't have ability to acquire land.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, Andrew Mein agrees with Daryl Hughes that limited modelling has been done, but identifies benefits in the DIFF work, with or without Mill Road, alternative connection to wider network to and from the Plan Change areas.</p>
<p>Trigger</p> <p>Andrew Prosser has identified that this is required in 2026 (Item 13, in Table 1 of Andrew Prosser's EIC)</p>	<p>No (Terry Church), in terms of defining an absolute trigger.</p> <p>Yes (David Mead) – David supports a time-based trigger, but could be related to the commencement of development, for example.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>

13. Bremner/Norrie Road Upgrades	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Interim walking, cycling and bus connections to Drury Centre (includes Bremner/Norrie/Firth intersection upgrades, active mode on Norrie) (DIFF Report # 12)</p> <p>2-lane bridge over Bremner/Waihoehoe Road (at SH1)(DIFF Report # 16a)</p>	No	Yes	No - Outside of Drury East scope, not required for Drury East development.	No	No
<p>Trigger</p> <p>Andrew Prosser has identified that this is required in 2023</p>	No	Yes	No	No	No

14. Upgrade rural network south/west of Plan Change Area	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>Upgrade to intersection at GSR / SH22 (DIFF Report Project # 3)</p> <p>Upgrade Fitzgerald Rd from Brookfield Rd to Ramarama Rd (DIFF Report # 20)</p> <p>Upgrade Intersection at Quarry Rd / Great South Rd (DIFF Report Project # 22)</p>	<p>No, but the traffic modelling shows that there is reliance on the southern/western parts of the rural network. Terry Church would like to see assessment criteria included to allow the assessment of this part of the network, consistent with the Drury South Industrial Precinct.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No - current arrangement adequately supports Drury East development.</p>	<p>Potentially yes, subject to further transport modelling information being provided by the Applicants experts.</p>	<p>No, but Andrew Mein notes that this needs to be consistent with the Drury South Precinct.</p>
<p>Trigger</p> <p>Andrew Prosser has identified that this is required in 2023 (GSR) and 2026 (Fitzgerald)</p>	<p>No to the timing proposed by Andrew Prosser, however it would be good to link the trigger to Test 3 as presented in the revised Drury East Traffic Modelling Report, dated 30 September 2021.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Subject to the above.</p> <p>Joseph Phillips notes that this could be addressed through amendments to the current assessment criteria, rather than as a trigger.</p>	<p>No to the timing proposed by Andrew Prosser, however it would be good to link the trigger to Test 3 as presented in the revised Drury East Traffic Modelling Report, dated 30 September 2021.</p>

15. New PT services across Drury	Yes (Agree) / No (Disagree)				
	Terry Church and David Mead on behalf of Auckland Council (as regulator)	Andrew Prosser and Karyn Sinclair on behalf of Auckland Council (as submitter) / Auckland Transport	Daryl Hughes, Don McKenzie, John Parlane, Rachel Morgan and Nick Roberts on behalf of Plan Change applicants	Joseph Phillips on behalf of Drury South Limited	Andrew Mein on behalf of Waka Kotahi
<p>Improvement</p> <p>New Public Bus Services Across Drury.</p> <p>Establishment of new bus routes in Drury to provide integrated transport connections with new Town Centres, Rail Stations and residential developments.</p>	No	<p>Andrew Prosser confirms that Auckland Transport consider this as an important part of the 'kit' on the network, however does not need to be referenced as a trigger, as this is Auckland Transport's responsibility to deliver.</p> <p>Andrew Prosser confirmed that this amended position would apply to other Drury Plan Changes (including PC51 and PC61).</p>	No – public bus services should be funded by Auckland Transport.	No	No
<p>Trigger</p> <p>Andrew Prosser's updated position is that no trigger is appropriate.</p>	No	No	No	No	No