

BEFORE THE CENTRAL HAWKE'S BAY DISTRICT COUNCIL
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS COMMISSIONER

UNDER The Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF A NOTIFIED RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION FOR
SUBDIVISION TO CREATE 11 LOTS (8 RURAL LIFESTYLE LOTS, 2
BALANCE LOTS, AND A LOT TO BE AMALGAMATED AS A
BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT) AT MANGAKURI ROAD
(RM230016)

BETWEEN **SR & BJ WILLIAMS CHARITABLE TRUST BOARD**
Applicant

AND 24 Submitters

Central Hawke's Bay District Council
Consent Authority

AND

BRIEF OF EVIDENCE BY GEORGE WYNN EIVERS

INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

- 1 My full name is George Wynn Eivers and I reside in Hastings.
- 2 I hold a Bachelor of Engineering (Civil) with Honours from the University of Canterbury (2001). I am a Chartered Professional Engineer (CPEng), an International Professional Engineer (IntPE), and a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand (CMEngNZ).
- 3 I have over 23 years' experience in traffic engineering, road design and transportation planning. I am currently employed as a Director at East Cape Consulting Limited which I incorporated in November 2018.
- 4 Between 2001 to 2003 and again between 2010 and 2018, I worked for the specialist consultancy then known as Traffic Design Group Limited (now part of Stantec) in the Auckland and Napier offices.
- 5 Between 2003 and 2010 I worked for the multi-disciplinary engineering consultancy Mouchel PLC (Public Limited Company) in England.

EXPERT WITNESS CODE OF CONDUCT

- 6 Although these proceedings are not before the Environment Court, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and that I agree to comply with it.
- 7 I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that except where I state I am relying on information provided by another party, the content of this evidence is within my area of expertise.

INVOLVEMENT WITH THE PROJECT

- 8 Through ECC I was engaged by the Applicant to prepare the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for the Application.
- 9 I conducted a site visit on 15 November 2022.

10 I have prepared this Statement of Evidence as an independent expert on behalf of the Applicant to provide transportation and road design advice.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

11 This evidence covers the transportation related aspects of the Application. I adopt the original TIA, dated 2 December 2022, submitted with the Application, and the further information response (s92 letter), dated 29 September 2023, as part of my evidence.

12 In preparing this evidence I have read and considered aspects of the following documents related to my expertise:

- a) The '*Technical memorandum for an application for subdivision consent under the Resource Management Act 1991 in respect of 42 Okura Road, Elsthorpe*', from Mr Chris Rossiter, Principal Transportation Engineer, Stantec NZ.
- b) Submission #25 provided by Fire and Emergency New Zealand from Mr Jacob Yee.
- c) The brief of evidence on behalf of the Applicant by Mr Simon Gabrielle.

MEMORANDUM FROM CHRIS ROSSITER, PRINCIPAL TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER, STANTEC

13 The memorandum from Mr Chris Rossiter supports the approval of the application with conditions, from a transportation perspective. The conditions recommended in section 12.2 are generally considered to be appropriate with the exception of points a and b which are copied below:

a. Prior to any earthworks or construction activities commencing, the consent holder shall submit a Safe System Audit of Williams Road between Mangakuri Road and Okura Road. The Safe System Audit shall be undertaken in accordance with the New Zealand Transport Agency/Waka Kotahi "Safe System audit guidelines for transport projects", published October 2022 and by completed by Suitably Qualified

Professional Engineers. The purpose of this condition is to provide an assessment of the existing road conditions and identify potential mitigation works to address potential safety concerns

b. The consent holder shall pay for the installation of any new signage (e.g. warning signage or changes to speed limits) identified as necessary in the Safe System Audit. This signage must be installed prior to construction or earthworks activities commencing.

- 14 These conditions lack specificity which was noted earlier in the memorandum. Section 11.10 states:

A Safe System Audit would provide a formal assessment of the existing road conditions and identify potential mitigation works to address concerns. I recommend that the Applicant commissions a Safe System Audit by Suitably Qualified Professional Engineers and submits this to Council. Although I do not consider that it would be appropriate for the Applicant to be responsible for mitigating any existing safety concerns with the road, I consider that where the risk of crashes will clearly be affected by the subdivision, it would be appropriate for the Applicant to contribute to mitigation works.

- 15 I recommended the Transport conditions clarify that the Applicant should only be responsible for mitigating safety concerns associated with the subdivision. I will recommend a specific rewording of these conditions to be tabled at the hearing as part of an amended draft condition set on behalf of the Applicant.

EVIDENCE FROM SIMON GABRIELLE, SENIOR CIVIL ENGINEER, STRATA GROUP

- 16 I note that Mr Simon Gabrielle recommends amendment to point d of Mr Chris Rossiter's memorandum. In particular:

I feel that this condition is better met by having the detailed design approved by FENZ prior to Engineering approval.

- 17 I support the change to this recommendation. As noted in the TIA, Okura Road has an existing width of approximately 2.4m which helps to manage vehicle speeds. For this same reason specific areas along the ROW's should be identified for fire appliance operation and widened accordingly. Elsewhere

along the ROW's narrower widths can be adopted subject to fire appliance swept paths.

CONCLUSIONS

18 In summary, I agree with Mr Chris Rossiter that:

Overall, I consider that there are no transport reasons why the subdivision consent could not be granted. If consent is to be granted, I consider that additional conditions should be imposed to address the concerns identified in this memorandum.

19 I am happy to answer any questions at the hearing.



George Eivers

11 June 2024