

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY  
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991  
("the Act")

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of submissions by Waka Kotahi NZ  
Transport Agency (submitter 275) on  
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan Review  
– Hearing Stream 5

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF STUART PEARSON ON BEHALF OF WAKA KOTAHI  
NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY**

**23 August 2023**

---

My name is **STUART PEARSON** of Christchurch and I work for Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi). I prepared a primary statement of planning dated 4 August 2023. This document is a summary of the key points from that statement in relation to Hearing Stream 5 (HS5) of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan Review.

## 1. Summary of Evidence

1.1. As noted in my primary statement, my evidence considers the matters described below with the following conclusions:

1.1.1. NOISE-R16 - I consider that the recommendations of Dr Chiles and Ms Heppelthwaite on this rule are appropriate to address noise effects on noise sensitive activities in close proximity to the state highway. I recommended that NOISE-R16 be amended in accordance with these recommendations in Section 10 of Ms Heppelthwaite's evidence.

1.1.2. SIGN-S3 – I have relied on the expert advice of Mr Swears in relation to digital sign standards. Overall, I agree with the reasonings and recommended amendments in the s42A report on these standards in relation to a fixed cross dissolve of 0.5 seconds and to include day and night dwell times of 2 minutes and 15 minutes, respectively, for digital sign transitions. These amendments are also supported by Mr Swears in Section 4 of his primary statement.

1.1.3. SIGN-S1 – Mr Swears has addressed content controls for signage as it appears that standards associated to this do not align with SIGN-P3. This policy seeks to ensure that content should be managed to ensure the safe, efficient and effective operation of the transport system. I consider the recommendations made by Mr Swears to address content for signs via amendments to SIGN-S1 and the associated definition of 'elements' are appropriate standards that could be used to manage content and would give effect to the outcomes sought by SIGN-P3.

1.1.4. Table TRAN-1 – I consider that clarity could be given to the high trip generating activities table by utilising Equivalent Car Movements (ECM) rather than the current split approach of vehicle movements per day (vmpd) and heavy vehicle movements per day (hvmpd). Mr Swears describes the benefits of such an approach in Section 5 of his primary statement. Mr Swears also suggests amendments that can be made to the high trip generating thresholds to ensure that the safe, efficient and effective transport system can be appropriately managed. Overall, I consider that Table TRAN-

1 should be amended in accordance with these recommendations and to also include a definition of ECM as set out in paragraph 8.20 of my evidence.

1.1.5. Table TRAN-8 – I acknowledge that this may be considered out of scope but I would like to bring attention to this section of the Transport chapter as I have identified that any vehicle crossing onto the state highway network is required to be designed to a Diagram E, Perspective E standard. I consider this to be an onerous requirement where a Diagram C, Perspective C vehicle crossing design onto the state highway would be appropriate for less than 30 equivalent car movements per day. The s42A report had rejected the Waka Kotahi submission on TRAN-R5 to require all vehicle crossings onto the state highway to be a restricted discretionary activity as this would be an onerous requirement. Without amendments to Table TRAN-8 as per my suggestions, I think this could result in many resource consents being required for vehicle crossings where this should not be required. Therefore, to be consistent with the recommendations of the s42A report, I consider that Table TRAN-8 should be amended as per paragraph 8.15 of my evidence.

1.1.6. EW-P1 – I consider that the earthworks chapter does not appropriately recognise state highway infrastructure, given the exclusions of transport infrastructure in the Energy and Infrastructure chapter. To ensure that the state highway is appropriately recognised in EW-P1, I recommend that it be amended to provided for the continued operation of infrastructure, including the state highway. There are many instances where earthworks are required to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of the state highway network, which includes general maintenance or repair work associated with natural hazards.

1.2. Where I have not made any further comments or recommended amendments on the provisions within HS5, then I consider that the recommendations in the s42A report are suitable, and I agree with them.

1.3. Overall, I consider that the amendments raised in my evidence to be necessary to appropriately address effects on the state highway, provide clarity to the associated provisions, remove potential onerous requirements, and improve the effectiveness of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan.

**Stuart Pearson**

**23 August 2023**