

BEFORE THE MATAMATA-PIAKO DISTRICT COUNCIL

Independent Hearing Commissioner(s)

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER a resource consent application (Council Reference: 102.2023.12883) by Matamata-Piako District Council to establish and operate an indoor sports and recreation facility at Matamata College, Station Road, Matamata.

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF BRUCE HARRISON

Traffic Engineer

16 July 2024

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Bruce John Harrison. I hold a Bachelor of Engineering (Civil) degree from the University of Canterbury, obtained in 1984.
- 1.2 I am a self-employed transportation engineer, trading as Harrison Transportation, Tauranga.
- 1.3 I have approximately 40 years' experience in the traffic and transportation engineering field and have previously held traffic engineering positions with several engineering consultancies and a District Council.
- 1.4 I have visited the application site and am familiar with the surrounding environment.
- 1.5 I have read the Section 42A report prepared by Emily Patterson, consultant planner acting on behalf of Matamata-Piako District Council (MPDC) in relation to the application for resource consent by MPDC, and I am familiar with the issues that have been raised in submissions.

2.0 CODE OF CONDUCT

- 2.1 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and I agree to comply with it. The evidence I will present today is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on information provided by another party. I have not knowingly omitted facts or information that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

3.0 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 3.1 I have been asked to provide expert transportation evidence in relation to a resource consent application by the applicant to establish and operate an indoor sports and recreation facility at Matamata College, Station Road, Matamata.

3.2 I have previously prepared a Transportation Assessment Report for the proposed indoor sports stadium, dated 30 October 2023.

3.3 My evidence addresses matters under the following headings:

- Transportation Assessment Peer Review – BBO
- Travel Parking and Management Plan
- Section 42A Report and Consent Conditions
- Conclusion

4.0 TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW – BBO

4.1 BBO has carried out a review of the Transportation Assessment Report. The review is dated 25 June 2024. The review summarises BBO's initial comments and request for further information, from a review carried out in November 2023, together with my response to the request for further information. The key aspects of the review and request for further information were as follows:

- Overflow parking effects.
- Traffic generation.
- Access.
- Parking area capacity.
- ITA requirements.

4.2 The review agreed with the proposed mitigation of effects through use of a Travel and Parking Management Plan for large events. I will discuss this plan in Section 5 of my evidence.

4.3 The BBO review identified a number of recommended conditions of consent, which have been included the Section 42A report. I will comment on these in Section 6 of my evidence.

5.0 TRAVEL PARKING AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

- 5.1 A draft Travel and Parking Management Plan (TPMP) has been prepared, dated 2 February 2024. The plan is intended to cater for large events with up to 400 people, to be held up to six times per year. These events are expected to have parking demand of up to 182 spaces. With 94 spaces proposed to be provided on-site, this leaves an overflow parking demand of up to 88 spaces to be accommodated on the adjacent streets.
- 5.2 The purpose of the TPMP is to both minimise the parking demand and manage the overflow parking effects on the adjacent streets.
- 5.3 Minimising the parking demand will be achieved by minimising the use of private vehicles for travel to and from the stadium. The proposed measures include:
- Encouraging participants who live within the local Matamata area to walk, bike, or ride share when travelling to and from the site.
 - Advising participants from outside of the local area that the invited clubs and groups will be required to provide shared transport, such as passenger vans and buses.
- 5.4 Managing the overflow parking effects will be achieved by the use of temporary traffic management (TTM) measures along Station Road and the adjacent side streets. TTM measures are proposed to be designed, installed, and supervised by suitably qualified people for each event. The TTM measures are expected to include:
- A temporary reduced speed limit along Station Road.
 - The provision of temporary pedestrian crossing points across Station Road.
 - Management of the on-street parking including use of temporary “*no parking*” road cones in critical locations near intersections and at high-use driveways.
 - Measures to prevent non-residents from parking on the adjacent side streets, such as the placement of temporary “*no parking*” road cones along these streets and/or the provision

of thresholds that allow entry by residents, but turn away visitors.

- Management of the site access to Station Road.

5.5 The TPMP proposes that monitoring of the on-street parking be undertaken for every large event to determine the effectiveness of the TTM measures.

5.6 The TPMP is proposed to be reviewed at a minimum of every 12 months to identify any changes that may be required.

6.0 SECTION 42A REPORT AND CONSENT CONDITIONS

6.1 I have reviewed the Section 42A report and concur with the comments given in the report.

6.2 I have also reviewed the recommended consent conditions. Conditions 38 to 40 require the TPMP to be implemented for all large events (201 to 400 attendees) that occur within the facility.

6.3 In my reports, I have assessed the expected parking demand based on the typical use of the facility for sports activities. I do note however that the parking demand will vary considerably depending on the type of activity. For example, the parking demand for adult sports activities in the evenings and weekends is expected to be significantly higher than the parking demand for regular weekday use by the adjacent school. I understand that some of these regular school activities may exceed the 200-person threshold, but yet will have a very low parking demand. To recognise the different parking characteristics of the different activities, I recommend that the regular use of the facility by the school, during school hours, be excluded from the requirement to provide a TPMP.

6.4 The parking demand for non-school activities may also vary significantly, depending on the activity. In particular, not all activities of over 200 attendees will result in the parking demand exceeding the proposed parking provision. For these activities, a generic TPMP may be appropriate, that states that the expected parking demand is

not expected to exceed the proposed parking provision, and therefore a TTM plan is not required.

6.5 While 94 on-site car parking spaces are proposed, I consider that a small degree of overflow parking onto the adjacent roads will be acceptable. For example, Station Road between Rimu Street and Kowhai Street can accommodate approximately 26 cars parked on the northern side of the road. While in practice cars will park on both sides of the road, I consider that an overflow parking demand of up to approximately 26 vehicles will be acceptable. When combined with the proposed 94 on-site car parking spaces, this gives a potential supply of 120 car parking spaces.

6.6 To allow for the expected variation in parking demand between different activities, and to recognise that a small degree of on-road parking is acceptable, I recommend that an additional advice note be added below recommended consent condition 39 stating *“It is recognised that not all activities of over 200 attendees will result in the parking demand exceeding the proposed parking provision. For these activities, a generic TPMP may be appropriate, that states that the expected parking demand is not expected to exceed 120 spaces, and therefore a TTM plan is not required.”* I also recommend that recommended condition 40 be amended to read:

“The TPMP shall be reviewed at a minimum of every 12 months to identify any improvements required to the management measures. Each revised TPMP shall be submitted to Council’s Monitoring Officer to be approved by Council’s Roading Team Leader or Roading Manager for approval no less than 20 working days prior to the next large event on the site”.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 I have reviewed the BBO review of the Transportation Assessment Report and generally concur with the comments given in the review.

7.2 I have reviewed the Section 42A report and concur with the comments given in the report. I do however recommend that:

- The regular use of the facility by the school, during school hours, be excluded from the requirement to provide a TPMP.
- An additional advice note be added to the recommended consent conditions, as given in paragraph 6.6 above.
- Recommended consent condition 40 be amended to read as per the suggested wording at paragraph 6.6 above.

Bruce Harrison

16 July 2024