

**Before the Hearing Panel appointed by Canterbury  
Regional Council**

**IN THE MATTER OF** The Resource Management  
Act 1991

**AND  
IN THE MATTER OF** Applications CRC204106,  
CRC204107, CRC204143,  
CRC211629 and RC205104 to  
establish, operate, maintain  
and rehabilitate an aggregate  
quarry by Taggart Earthmoving  
Limited

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT**

**SECTION 42A REPORTING OFFICER  
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL  
TRAFFIC – CHRIS MORAHAN**

**DATED: 10 MAY 2021**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

1. My name is Chris Morahan. I am a Transportation Engineer with a Bachelor of Engineering (civil)(hons) from University of Canterbury and a member of Engineering New Zealand. I work for WSP as a Senior Transportation Engineer and have 12 years' experience working in transport engineering and planning.
2. While this is a Council Hearing, I acknowledge that I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as contained in section 7 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and have complied with it in the preparation of this summary.

**SCOPE OF REPORT**

3. This report is an addendum to my primary Section 42A report which is included as Appendix 8 of the Section 42A Officer's Report circulated on 8 April 2021. The purpose of this addendum is to provide a summary of my report and respond to matters raised in the Applicant's evidence and submitter evidence.
4. In preparing this addendum report, I have reviewed the statement of evidence prepared by Matthew Noon.

**SECTION 42A REPORT SUMMARY**

5. In my S42A report I concluded that the proposed conditions were appropriate for the proposal, with the exception of the access design. I recommended adding the following condition:

*"The access is constructed in accordance with the "Typical Rural Zone Commercial*

*Access” on sheet 218 of the Engineering Code of Practice, with the exception that the width should be tailored to accommodate a truck and trailer unit with 0.5m buffers.”*

6. With this additional condition, I considered that the development traffic will be accommodated on the road network with only minor adverse effects.

## **MATTERS RAISED IN EVIDENCE**

### **Access Design**

7. The applicant has accepted the recommendation to include the condition above. As such, I am satisfied that the proposed access is suitable for the development.

### **Additional Traffic Counts**

8. Mr Noon reports the results of recent traffic counts undertaken in March 2021. These recorded similar traffic volumes on River Road as previously reported (1,096 vehicle movements per day, compared to 1,165 vehicles per day reported in the original traffic assessment). As such, my conclusions relating to traffic volumes do not change.
9. These counts also provided data on pedestrians and cyclists, recording a weekday average of 58 pedestrians and cyclists on the path, and 15 cyclists on-road. This provides more context around the magnitude of the conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists but does not change my original conclusion.

### **Driveway Sensors**

10. In paragraph 9.11 Mr Noon states that *“this [vehicle trip generation] could be effectively monitored using appropriate sensors placed on the accessway to the site should this be considered necessary.”*
11. I consider that automatic sensors would likely be an effective way of monitoring compliance with any condition relating to daily vehicle movements.

### **Restrictions on Vehicle Routes**


12. In paragraph 14.5 Mr Noon states that *“In my opinion specific movement control measures, such as restrictions on heavy vehicle routes, are not required”*. I agree with this opinion.
13. In paragraph 14.6 Mr Noon states *“The applicant has confirmed that their vehicles are all GPS tracked as such, a monitoring and/or tracking system can be deployed that would allow the consenting authority to monitor movements if required to be compliant with any conditions of consent that may be imposed.”* I consider that making GPS tracking available to Council on request could be an effective way of addressing any future issues, were they to arise, due to heavy vehicles using unsuitable roads.

## Impacts on Safety of River Road/ Enverton Road Intersection

14. One submitter noted concerns with the increased truck volumes reducing safety for motorists turning out of Enverton Road into River Road<sup>1</sup>. This intersection is approximately 940m east of the proposed quarry access, and is on the route between the proposed quarry and the Cones Road depot.
15. The intersection is a Give Way controlled T-intersection, subject to a 50km/h speed limit.
16. Mr Noon's evidence shows that there have been no crashes recorded at this intersection in the last 5 years.
17. Aerial and streetview photographs suggest that sight distances are adequate, exceeding the minimum distances recommended by the Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4a (Table 3.2).
18. In my view, there does not appear to be any reason to expect that an increase in heavy vehicles in the order of 240 movements per day would have a more than minor impact on safety at this intersection.

## CONCLUSIONS

19. My original conclusion was that I considered that the development traffic can be accommodated on the road network with only minor adverse effects. Evidence put forward by Mr Noon and submitters has not changed this conclusion.

Signed:  Date: 07 May 2021

Name: Senior Transportation Engineer

---

<sup>1</sup> Pat Meyers