

BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONER

UNDER

the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER

of proposed Plan Change 33 to the Waipā District
Plan

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CAMERON BESWICK INDER ON BEHALF OF
THE HAUTAPU LANDOWNERS GROUP**

TRANSPORT

13 OCTOBER 2025

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Cameron Beswick Inder. I am a Principal Transportation Engineer and the transportation engineering manager at Bloxam Burnett & Olliver ("BBO"), a firm of consulting engineers, planners and surveyors based in Hamilton. I have been employed by BBO since 2004.
- 1.2 My professional qualifications and affiliations include a Bachelor of Engineering (Civils) degree from the University of Auckland (1998). I am a Chartered Professional Engineer and a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand. I am also a member of the Engineering NZ Transportation Group.
- 1.3 I have 25 years' experience in the field of transport planning and traffic engineering gained through employment in New Zealand and the United Kingdom.
- 1.4 I have experience in transportation and traffic engineering matters associated with resource management, including effects assessment for resource consents, subdivisions, plan changes and structure plans. I also have experience in the design of traffic infrastructure and facilities, road safety engineering, traffic calming, urban design, subdivision design, and traffic modelling.
- 1.5 I have appeared as expert transport planning and traffic engineering witness at hearings on numerous occasions including:
- (a) Plan Change 17 ("PC17") which rezoned Area 6 to Industrial Zone and Area 7 to Deferred Industrial Zone at Hautapu (2023).
 - (b) Titanium Park Limited and Rukuhia Properties Limited Private Plan Change 20 – Northern Precinct to the Waipā District Plan (2023).
 - (c) Ambury Properties Limited Private Plan Change to the Proposed Waikato District Plan (Ohinewai, 2020).

- (d) Rings Scenic Tours Private Plan Change to the Matamata-Piako District Plan (Hobbiton, 2019).
- (e) Waikato Regional Airport Limited Private Plan Change 10 to the Waipā District Plan (Hamilton Airport, 2018).

1.6 I have been engaged by the Hautapu Landowners Group (“**HLG**”) to present transport planning evidence in relation to Plan Change 33 (“**PC33**”) to the Waipā District Plan (“**WDP**”). Specifically, my statement of evidence will:

- (a) Highlight my evidence conclusions concerning transport matters in relation to Area 7 and Plan Change 17 (which “live zoned” Area 6).
- (b) Advise of any changes to my previous assessment (for PC17), in relation to PC33 and its purpose to live zone Area 7.
- (c) Address any transportation matters in relation to the proposed live zoning of Area 7 and any implications of commencing the development of Area 7 prior to 2030.
- (d) Comment on and respond to transportation matters raised in the section 42A Report.

Code of Conduct

1.7 I confirm that I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence and I agree to comply with it while giving oral evidence before the Hearings Commissioners.

1.8 This written evidence is within my area of expertise except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

2. THE HLG AND PLAN CHANGE 33

2.1 To avoid repetition, I refer to Mr Chrisp's evidence sections 2 – 5, that sets out the context and purpose of Plan Change 33.

3. PC17 TRANSPORT EVIDENCE ON BEHALF OF HLG FOR AREA 7

- 3.1 My transport evidence for HLG in relation to PC17 and my Memo¹ which was lodged as part of the request for PC33 for Area 7² recommended that Road 4 (shown as a short cul-de-sac road within Area 6 proposed Structure Plan at the time) should be extended to the Area 6 / Area 7 boundary to future-proof the ability for Area 7 to be developed for industrial purposes and avoid potential adverse transport effects arising from having to access Area 7 from Peake Road.
- 3.2 This recommendation was adopted for Road 4 on the finalised Structure Plan for Area 6 and the approved subdivision plan for Area 6³ shows the Road corridor (Lot 101) connecting to the Area 6 / Area 7 boundary in accordance with the Structure Plan. This confirms the connection of Area 7 to Hautapu Road, on the basis that the approved subdivision is implemented in accordance with the conditions of that consent.
- 3.3 I support this outcome, and I note Mr Hudson⁴ on behalf of Waipa District Council also supports it⁵. Furthermore, I agree with Mr Hudson's conclusion that there are no significant transport effects arising from the vesting of Road 4 and the use of it by Area 7 as a (live) industrial zone.
- 3.4 My HLG evidence also highlighted that Waipa District Council's proposed single lane roundabout design for the Hautapu Road / Victoria Road intersection would have insufficient capacity to accommodate PC17 traffic and therefore also Area 7 traffic, and there was no identified mitigation proposed as part of PC17.
- 3.5 I note Mr Hudson now confirms the roundabout design has been revised to provide a dual lane roundabout. Based on my PC17 transport review and analysis I expect this change will adequately accommodate the anticipated traffic for Area 6 and 7, and this will avoid the predicted congestion issues identified in my HLG evidence. I support this

¹ HLG Hautapu Industrial Zone – Area 7, Appendix 2, request for private Plan Change, 17 June 2024.

² Together referred to as **HLG evidence**.

³ S42A Report Appendix 6.

⁴ Waipa District Council's Transportation Engineering Manager.

⁵ S42A report Appendix 4.

amendment to the Hautapu Structure Plan. For completeness, I note that this represents the only change to my original HLG evidence and analysis I carried out in relation to PC17.

4. AREA 7 ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT TIMING TRANSPORT EFFECTS

4.1 I do not anticipate there to be any adverse transport effects generated by advancing the timing of the live zoning for Area 7 and subsequent development, provided that the following has occurred:

- Road 4 is vested in the Waipa District Council from Area 6 through to the Area 7 boundary,
- Road 4 is formed and completed to the required industrial road standard required by the Structure Plan up to the boundary of Area 7, and
- the required transport infrastructure upgrades on Hautapu Road are completed before Area 6 receives 224c certificate for subdivision in accordance with the Hautapu Industrial Structure Plan Area (HISPA) requirements.

4.2 On that basis, there is no transport planning and traffic effects-based reason to delay industrial development in Area 7 until 80% of Area 6 receives s224c certificate, or 31 March 2030 whichever is earlier.

5. SECTION 42A REPORT

5.1 I have reviewed the section 42A report prepared by Mr Nathan McLeay and the supporting appendices. I agree with Mr McLeay's conclusions and recommendations concerning transport matters, which are based on Mr Hudson's review comments summarised in section 2.4.3 a) to e) of the section 42A report.

5.2 I also agree with Mr Hudson⁶ that removal of reference to Area 6 in the HISPA key could result in potentially significant transport effects on

⁶ S42A report Appendix 4

Hautapu Road so this reference should not be removed. Equally, I consider that the developers of Area 7 should contribute a fair share toward the identified infrastructure upgrades needed to support Area 6 and 7 developments (however I appreciate that this is a matter for Council and the respective developers).

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 I confirm that my transport assessment work and evidence presented in relation to Area 7 at the PC17 hearing (HLG evidence) remains relevant and applicable for supporting the live zoning Area 7 in PC33, such that any potential adverse transport effects on the receiving environment can either be avoided or mitigated to acceptable levels.
- 6.2 From a transport planning and effects perspective, I agree with Mr Chrisp⁷ that there is no reason why the live zoning of Area 7 cannot occur now to enable its development for industrial purposes when Road 4 has been vested to the Area 6 / Area 7 boundary.

Cameron Inder

13 October 2025

⁷ Mark Chrisp planning evidence, paragraph 5.2