

BEFORE THE FAST-TRACK EXPERT PANEL

AT CHRISTCHURCH

IN THE MATTER of the Fast-track Approvals Act
2025

AND

IN THE MATTER of applications for Pound Road
Industrial Area [FTAA-2505-
1057]

**EVIDENCE OF PETER THOMAS RODGERS FOR COMMENTS BY CHRISTCHURCH CITY
COUNCIL**

Dated: 31 October 2025

Christchurch City Council
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch, 8011
PO Box 73016, Christchurch, 8154
Solicitor: BK Pizzey
Tel: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Code of conduct	1
Summary of Evidence	2
Trip Generation	3
Internal Roads	3
External Roads	
Barters Road	4
Hasketts Road	5
Pound Road	5
Intersection spacing	6
Accessways	6
Lot 29 Sight distance	6
Pound Road Roundabout	6
Subdivision Assessment Matters	
Stage 1: Walking and cycling access	7
Stage 2: Walking and cycling access	8
Heavy vehicles	9
SH1/Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersections	10
Other Transport matters	13
Proposed Draft Conditions	14
Conclusion and Recommendations	16

INTRODUCTION

1. **My full name is Peter Thomas Rodgers (Peter Rodgers) I hold a Bachelor of Engineering Degree (with Honours) in Natural Resources Engineering from Canterbury University, New Zealand.**
2. I am employed as a Transport Network Planner at Christchurch City Council and have been invited to provide expert evidence for the Council's comments on RMA/2025/2386 the Pound Road Industrial Development [FTAA-2505-1057] (the application).
3. I have over 10 years' experience in Traffic Engineering at Christchurch City Council, as a Traffic Engineer within the Traffic Operations team and as a Transport Network Planner in the Transport Asset Planning team.
4. My experience relevant to this evidence includes:
 - (a) Road safety
 - (b) Intersection design
 - (c) Subdivision and roading design
 - (d) Providing Transport advice on Resource Consent Applications
 - (e) Providing Transport advice and direction for the transport networks for new subdivision development

Code of conduct

6. Although this is not an Environment Court Hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023) and agree to comply with it. Except where I state I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

Documents reviewed

7. In preparing this evidence I have reviewed the following documents:
 - 7.1 Otautahi Christchurch Future Transport 2024-54
 - 7.2 Christchurch District Plan
 - 7.3 Infrastructure Design Standard Christchurch City Council 2022
 - 7.4 Austroads Guide to Traffic Management Part 6: Intersections, Interchanges and Crossings Management 2020
 - 7.5 Application Documents and subsequent plan amendments
 - 7.6 Development Contribution Policy 2024/2025
 - 7.7 Asset Management Plan & Activity Management Plan
 - 7.8 Land Transport Rule Setting of Speed Limits 2024 As at 15 January 2025
 - 7.9 NZTA Waka Kotahi Safe System Assessment Guidelines 2022

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

8. Agreement has been achieved on many transport issues with consent conditions yet to be finalised. The structure of my evidence therefore follows the transport issues listed in the Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) for the application prepared by Novogroup dated 10 July 2025
9. I agree that improvements to Barbers, Hasketts and Pound road will be required, and that any such improvements should be done in accordance with the Christchurch City Council's Infrastructure Design Standards (IDS).
10. The walking and cycling access for Stage 1 proposed is acceptable with minor modifications to the path alignment, and with the provision that the traffic signals at the Waterloo Road / Pound Road intersection is upgraded to allow pedestrians to cross.
11. The walking and cycling access for Stage 2 and beyond will require a shared path along or parallel to the Pound Road corridor, and there are a number of ways in which this could be achieved.
12. The mitigation to the adverse effects on the capacity and efficiency of the SH1 / Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road resulting from the development

has a large number of uncertain elements and project risks. This may require an alternative funding mechanism and a staging condition.

EVIDENCE

13. My statement of evidence generally addresses the following matters from the Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA), and covers the following:

- Trip Generation
- Road and cross sections
- Internal Roads
- External Roads
 - o Barbers Road
 - o Hasketts Road
 - o Pound Road
- Intersection Spacing
- Accessways
- Lot 29 Sight distance
- Pound Road Roundabout
- Subdivision Assessment matters
 - o Stage 1: Walking and cycling access
 - o Stage 2: Walking and cycling access
 - o Heavy Vehicles
 - o SH1/ Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road
- Other Transport matters relevant to roads under Council control

TRIP GENERATION

14. I generally accept the overall trip generation and heavy vehicle trip generation described in the ITA, however note that this trip generation does not account for the possibility of behaviour change and mode shift for commuter traffic. For freight activities there is no alternative, however for commuter trips there is potential to reduce the traffic impacts by mode shift from private vehicles to cycling, micromobility and / or public transport which may be influenced by infrastructure provision.

15. The requirement of an ITA as set out in Council's ITA guidelines¹ is that it covers all

¹ Integrated Transport Assessment Guidelines, Christchurch City Council, September 2015

transport modes and considers whether the proposed development will be accessible by all modes and, if not, what needs to change to ensure that accessibility.

16. Data on travel modes collected by Statistics New Zealand and published at the Commuter Waka² webpage includes information on the proportion of trips by travel mode based upon the 2018 and 2023 census. In other industrial areas of Christchurch, cycling is 2-6% of arrival modes, with higher % generally closer to the centre of the city. Given that the adjacent industrial area has 2% of trips arriving in that area by cycling, and the nearby residential areas have 2% of trips departing by cycling, this indicates that this development has potential for a similar proportion of trips.
17. This information may not be directly analogous to the trip generation from the extensive TRICS databases, however it indicates the potential for mode shift to mitigate the impacts anticipated by the increased traffic volumes associated with the development and highlights the importance of considering these modes in the design.

INTERNAL ROADS

18. I agree with and adopt the ITA's assessment that the proposed cross-sections for the internal roads is acceptable on the assumption that detailed design at the engineering acceptance stage can be made consistent with the IDS.

EXTERNAL ROADS

BARTERS ROAD

19. Barthers Road currently carries traffic volumes in the range of 1000-3000 range, and this is not anticipated to increase to over 3000. The IDS³ requires a formed shoulder of 2.0m (of which at least 1.0m shall be sealed) for a rural road carrying traffic in the 1000-3000 range.
20. The proposed 7.0m carriageway plus 1.0m sealed shoulders cross section will be acceptable provided that this also includes an additional 1.0m of formed width as unsealed shoulder.
21. I propose that the adverse Transport effects of the development on Barthers Road could be suitably managed by condition such that the Barthers Road frontage be upgraded in accordance with the IDS requirements designed for the expected

²Commuter Waka data visualisation tool <https://www.stats.govt.nz/tools/commuter-waka/>

³ Christchurch City Council Infrastructure Design Standard, Part 8: Roading, April 2022

future traffic volumes and traffic composition indicated in the ITA.

22. This condition will ensure that the upgrade is suited to the expected traffic volumes generated by the development it serves and consistent with Council's standards and consistent with the requirements of other similar developments.

HASKETTS ROAD

23. Hasketts Road currently carries traffic volumes in the range of around 3000 vehicles per day. A traffic count in 2018 recorded the average daily traffic of 2,956.
24. The current cross section of Hasketts Road has a 6m carriageway with (generally) no shoulder.
25. The proposed mitigation to the adverse effect of the development increasing traffic on Hasketts Road is widening the carriageway to 7.0m and the shoulder to 1.0m
26. Due to the higher existing traffic volumes on Hasketts Road, in order to meet the requirements of the IDS and the recommended shoulder width from Austroads, the cross section for an upgrade of Hasketts Road will need to be 2.5-3.0 of which at least 2.0m is sealed.
27. It is also noted that 14 Hasketts Road (Lot 5 DP 23834) sits outside the application site however it will be ineffective for the Hasketts Road to be upgraded excluding just this small section (and will negate some of the benefits of such an upgrade).
28. I propose that the adverse Transport effects of the development on Hasketts Road could be suitably managed by condition such that the Hasketts Road frontage (including 14 Hasketts Road) be upgraded in accordance with the IDS requirements designed for the expected future traffic volumes and traffic composition indicated in the ITA.
29. This condition will ensure that the upgrade is suited to the expected traffic volumes generated by the development it serves and consistent with Council's standards and consistent with the requirements of other similar developments.

POUND ROAD

30. The existing formation of Pound Road between Waterloo Road and the site access is 7m with a 2.5m shoulder on the eastern side, which is consistent with the IDS and Austroads requirements, and approximately 0.5m on the western side, which is not.
31. The existing formation of Pound Road – which the majority of the development traffic is proposed to use – will therefore need upgrades in order to meet the IDS

requirements.

32. I propose that the adverse Transport effects (with the exception of the adverse effects on the operation of the SH1/ Pound Road and Pound Road/Waterloo Road intersections) of the development on Pound Road could be suitably managed by conditions such that the Pound Road frontage be upgraded in accordance with the IDS requirements designed for the expected future traffic volumes and traffic composition indicated in the ITA.
33. This condition will ensure that the upgrade is suited to the expected traffic volumes generated by the development it serves and consistent with Council's standards and consistent with the requirements of other similar developments.

INTERSECTION SPACING

34. The ITA identifies intersection spacing within the site as generally compliant with the 40m spacing in the Christchurch City Council Infrastructure Design Standards. 40m spacing assumes all roads to be classified as local roads, however the QTP modelling in Appendix 5 of the ITA indicates that Road 1 will carry the majority of the site traffic when fully developed. It should therefore be considered to be operating as a Collector Road, with an intersection spacing of 150m.
35. The ITA identifies an internal intersection approximately 119m from the Pound Road access.
36. I accept the ITA's assessment on the adverse effects from this non-compliance, noting that it is consistent with Austroads guidance and the expected queue length is unlikely to affect the operation of this internal intersection.

ACCESSWAY

37. I agree with the ITA's assessment of the accessway width to Lot 44

LOT 29 SIGHT DISTANCE

38. I agree with the ITA's assessment of the potential sight distance non-compliance for Lot 29.

SITE ACCESS OPERATION – POUND ROAD ROUNDABOUT

39. I agree with the ITA's assessment of the proposed Pound Road roundabout and confirm that a design speed of 60km/h is acceptable.
40. Site Access Operation – Barters Road & Hasketts Road Accesses
41. I agree with the ITA's assessment of the proposed Barters and Hasketts Road

access

SUBDIVISION ASSESSMENT MATTERS

42. I generally agree with the ITA's assessment relating to the need for internal service lanes and pedestrian accessways.
43. However, an accessway connecting Road 4 to Pound Road through Stage 3 was raised as a possibility to facilitate pedestrian and cycle access through to stages 2 and 3, as an alternative or partial alternative to a shared path along Pound Road. This would be acceptable to Council.
44. I agree with the ITA's assessment relating to the internal roads being suitable to accommodate bus services, in the event that in future Environment Canterbury changes the bus route to go through the development. If this does occur then this will improve the accessibility of the development to Public Transport, but if it does not then the last leg of any journey to the development via public transport will need to walk from the bus stops on Waterloo Road as a pedestrian.

STAGE 1: WALKING AND CYCLING ACCESS

45. The proposed shared path is acceptable for walking and cycling access (and by extension Public Transport access) for Stage 1.
46. A suitable facility for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Pound Road and/or Waterloo Road will however be needed. In order to facilitate this I have requested a change in the alignment of the path to connect to the Waterloo / Pound Road intersection and to include upgrading the Waterloo / Pound Road traffic signals.
47. I consider that the proposed access through an off-road shared path through the stormwater reserve connecting to the existing pedestrian, cycling and public transport networks along Waterloo Road to be acceptable, subject to the following conditions:
- 47.1 That the alignment of the shared path through Stage 1 connects to the Pound Road / Waterloo Road traffic signals. This is needed in order to connect the internal path and cycling network within the development to a suitable location where pedestrians and cyclists can cross Pound Road and Waterloo Road.
- 47.2 That the cycle-only signalised crossing on the north Pound Road approach to the Pound Road / Waterloo Road traffic signals be upgraded to a shared pedestrian and cycle crossing. This is needed as the current facility is not designed to operate for pedestrians and without this change, Stage 1 of the

development will not be connected to the rest of the pedestrian, cycling and public transport networks.

STAGE 2+: WALKING AND CYCLING ACCESS

48. The shared path through the stormwater reserve and crossing at the Waterloo Road / Pound Road intersection is suitable for Stage 1. However, Stage 2 and beyond involve opening the road access onto Pound Road through the new Road 1 / Pound Road roundabout.
49. This will provide an alternative, shorter route by road to destinations within the Stage 2 and some of the Stage 3 area. The design of this is primarily for motor vehicles and does not accommodate pedestrians nor cyclists.
50. On-road cycle lanes are provided along Pound Road and are marked extending to approximately 270 metres north of Waterloo Road. From this point, northbound cyclists will need to ride within the 0.5m sealed shoulder, within the unsealed shoulder (which may be, at best, uneven), or within the traffic lane.
51. Southbound cyclists originating from Stage 2 of the development may ride within an existing approximately 1.5-2m sealed shoulder on the Waterloo Business Park side of Pound Road.
52. For destinations within or originating from Stage 2, the path through the internal road network is too long to be considered appropriate access and the Pound Road corridor is the much more direct route. This corresponds to a walking distance from Stage 2 to the nearest bus stop of 1.2km (min) to 1.8km (max) using the internal road network. However using Pound Road, these distances are reduced to 0.6km(min)-1.2km(max).
53. The IDS requires separate cycle facilities on rural minor arterial roads. Particularly on roads carrying significant volumes of heavy traffic, additional separation between cyclists, pedestrians and the live traffic lane.
54. The adverse effect that this will result in is pedestrians and cyclists unwilling to take a longer detour through the subdivision and using the most direct route – Pound Road and walking or cycling within the unsealed road shoulder.
55. This adverse effect will be more than minor, as any cyclists who do take this route as the most direct route to their destination will be put at risk of serious injury or death. While the likelihood may be low due to lower numbers of cyclists expected on this route, traffic volumes including heavy vehicle volumes are currently high and expected to increase, and it is not expected that zero cyclists will use this

route and the potential severity means that this effect must be addressed. The NZTA Safe System Audit Guidelines⁴ suggest that an effect like this is a “*Serious safety concern that must be addressed and requires changes to avoid serious safety consequences.*”

56. Mitigation of this adverse effect could include a shared path along the Pound Road frontage or an alternative largely parallel to Pound Road.
57. There may be technical difficulties leading to higher costs to doing this such as the space available around existing power poles. While undergrounding the power is an option I note that it is generally an expensive one, and there may be other options to explore such as routing the path around the power poles by vesting a strip of land along the Pound Road frontage as road reserve in order to accommodate a 2.5m shared path around the existing power poles.
58. A suitable condition to address this could be that a shared path be provided along the Pound Road frontage of the site upon development of Stage 3.

HEAVY VEHICLES

59. For activities that will generate more than 250 heavy vehicle trips per day, whether there are any effects from these trips on the roading infrastructure.
60. Heavy vehicle movements generated by the development will affect Pound Road, Barters Road and Hasketts Road.
61. Barters Road and Hasketts Road are proposed to be widened to better accommodate heavy vehicles, provided that this is in accordance with the IDS requirements.
62. Pound Road along the site frontage currently carries over 3000 vehicles per day (9,025 average daily traffic as of a count on 18/9/2019 outside the Templeton Golf Course) . It has kerb and channel extending up to about 270m north of Waterloo Road, and beyond that has an approximately 7m for traffic lanes (measured between edgelines) with an approximately 0.5m sealed shoulder on the west side and an approximately 1.5-2m sealed shoulder on the east side, where the road shoulder was widened and streetlighting installed around 2017.
63. It is noted in the ITA that Pound Road and SH1 are both arterial roads which are intended to function to carry heavy vehicles. It is true that this is the intended function of these roads. However, Pound Road along the site frontage has insufficient road shoulder width on the west side to meet IDS requirements,

⁴ Safe System Audit Guidelines, Waka Kotahi NZTA, October 2022

adjacent to the northbound traffic lane, .

64. Road shoulders carry out two functions – structural and traffic. The structural function is to provide lateral support to the road pavement layers and also helps to prevent water infiltration. Traffic functions includes (but is not limited to) an initial recovery area for an errant vehicle, clearance to lateral obstructions such as power poles, a refuge for stopped vehicles, and space for cyclists.
65. The CCC IDS requires 1.5 to 2.0m sealed shoulder. Austroads recommends 1.0m sealed shoulder on roads carrying traffic volumes over 2000 vpd with 10% heavy vehicles.
66. (Refer to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 3 Geometric Design 4.3.1)
67. The adverse effect of heavy vehicle movements generated by the development on Pound Road is increased wear on the road shoulder.
68. The scale of this adverse effect is more than minor as the majority of the traffic generated by the development will contribute to the wear. However it is noted that this will not be the only source of wear on the road.
69. Mitigation: The applicant has not proposed a mitigation to this. However, Council's proposed mitigation is that the road frontage is upgraded in a way which is in compliance with IDS requirements.

SH1 / POUND ROAD & POUND ROAD / WATERLOO INTERSECTIONS

70. The ITA identifies that the key traffic effect in the immediate vicinity is the operation of the SH1/Pound and Pound / Waterloo intersections. The **adverse effect** of this is impacts on the efficiency and capacity of the SH1/Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersection.
71. The **scale** of this adverse effect is concluded to be acceptable *subject to the mitigations proposed*. The ITA concludes that **not** providing these mitigations could lead to notable adverse capacity and safety effects. I agree with and accept this conclusion of the ITA.
72. The **mitigation** proposed is described in the ITA. I consider that this will address the adverse effect, however the likelihood of delivery of the mitigation is extremely uncertain for reasons that I will outline below.
73. The ITA states that undertaking these upgrades are outside the applicants control. While there are separate approvals from various agencies and road controlling authorities including NZTA Waka Kotahi, Kiwirail and CCC, I see no reason why undertaking the upgrades would be entirely outside of the applicants control, as

elsewhere in the city there have been and continue to be roading upgrades carried out by developers both on CCC roads and NZTA State Highways, ranging from footpaths and local road intersections to new state highway roundabouts, new signalised intersections and alterations to existing signalised intersections.

74. This also appears to be based upon an assumption that NZTA and/or CCC will implement the required improvements. As far as I am aware, at this point neither NZTA nor CCC have committed towards making these improvements, and there is no guarantee that such improvements will eventuate and therefore, if the development progressed without suitable conditions in place, a strong likelihood that no mitigations to these adverse effects – which are expected to be significant - will occur. I understand that NZTA is initiating a study – which may in time include this area – however will defer to NZTA as to the strength of that commitment.
75. Increases in traffic movements through the SH1/Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo intersections can be attributed to several sources including airport development growth and background growth. However, the Transport Assessment indicates a significant volume of traffic on Pound Road (45-64% of site traffic⁵ – approximately 30-40% of total Pound Road traffic at 2038) can be directly attributed to this subject fast track application.
76. Council has not previously intended to make capacity improvements in this location and no such project has been in Council's Long Term Plan (LTP) capital programme.
77. As Council has not included the intersection upgrade in the LTP, it does not appear as a growth project in the Development Contributions Policy Schedule of capital expenditure for assets. Funding of the intersection upgrade(s) cannot therefore be sourced from development contributions at this time.
78. However, as highlighted in the Development Contribution Policy, financial contributions enable the Council to charge a developer for the cost of work required to mitigate the effects of development on the natural and physical environment caused by the new development.
79. As set out in NZTA Integrated Transport Assessment guidelines adverse effects can be managed through a combination of physical works, altering the development proposal or providing funds towards mitigating the effects created

⁵ **Integrated Transport Assessment: Appendix 5: Traffic Modelling Report**, Section 5, Figures 5.1 to 5.4

by the proposal.

80. As the District Plan does not make provision for financial contributions, Council cannot impose a condition to that effect. However a financial mechanism would assist with the funding of the improvements in the LTP, although it may not guarantee it.
81. A 'developer agreement' can be a mechanism in which funding for infrastructure upgrades occur. Such agreements are common as part of the engineering approvals process. A commitment to enter into such an agreement with a specified cost share proportion could be an option available to Council and the applicant.
82. As well as alignment with Councils strategic directions and community outcomes, LTP projects are currently selected using a multi criteria approach based on a scored assessment against transport pillars of Safety, Access, Environment and an overarching criterion of affordability. Such a funding commitment would assist in aligning with the affordability criteria, however otherwise it does not have the strongest alignment with Council's strategic priorities for the Long Term Plan.
83. In addition, the Council receives direction on the Long Term Plan from the Mayor and Councillors, and the Long Term Plan is subject to public consultation and subsequent amendments if approved by elected Council.
84. While the proposed improvements to Pound Road appear simple there are significant deliverability risks. This involves introducing an additional one (or two) traffic lanes on Pound Road crossing the rail corridor. This is subject to Kiwirail approval due to the impact on the rail corridor and understanding the requirements for the level crossing for this upgrade, and Kiwirail's resourcing and capacity to process and approve plans, is critical to understanding the costs and risks.
85. In other Council Transport projects, there has been significant cost escalations associated with delays in Kiwirail approvals and work within the rail corridor. In one such project the delay costs alone have been reported in the media as over \$9 million and the total project costs are much higher.
86. With significant risks of cost escalation and delays, there is a possibility that there is little to no appetite from Council staff and / or from elected members for Council to take on another such project in the LTP at such high risk of cost increases. This may also mean that any eventual benefits or mitigations in terms

of travel time savings may not outweigh the costs of delivering those benefits.

87. A further approach regarding the intersection and capacity improvements could be to provide a condition precedent that, rather than the condition offered that Lot titles is deferred until December 2027, that the development may not proceed beyond a certain stage prior to the intersection and capacity upgrade occurring.
88. I recognize that a staging condition goes somewhat against the idea of a fast-track proposal. However, it is my opinion that land use development and the infrastructure needed to accommodate the effects of such development should be aligned. In the absence of any confirmed projects, then the mitigation may need to be delivered by the development if the effects are to be mitigated at all, or for the staging condition to delay the impacts of the development until the mitigation has been implemented.
89. Therefore, if the panel chooses to apply such a condition, I offer the following suggestions for possible trigger points as to when the stage restriction kicks in:
- a. No further development shall occur after the completion of the first stage of the proposal until the capacity improvements at the SH1 / Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersections are under construction.
 - b. No further development shall occur after the completion of the first stage of the proposal until the modelling has been updated and demonstrated to the satisfaction of Council and NZTA that the SH1/Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersections can safely accommodate the additional traffic demands associated with the proposal
90. The alternative approach of leaving the assessment to resource consent stage would not mitigate the adverse effects, because the District Plan only enables such network assessments where the high trip generator rule is triggered. This approach does not effectively address the collective, strategic effects of rezoning as individual resource consents often do not trigger the high trip generator assessment threshold and thus the wider network effects remain unresolved.

OTHER TRANSPORT MATTERS RELEVANT TO ROADS UNDER COUNCIL CONTROL

91. Council is currently initiating a maintenance project along Pound Road, from Waterloo Road to McLeans Island Road. This excludes the recently improved section between Yaldhurst Road (SH73) and Ryans Road. The project will

primarily focus on shoulder widening for safety and resilience of the corridor and strengthening the road pavement in both depth and width to reflect the high impact of freight vehicles on the road surface. The next stage of this project is looking at the section between Buchanans Road and the Fulton Hogan Quarry near Roberts Road.

92. The project is in response to growth in heavy vehicle traffic on the corridor and offers a safer separation between heavy, fast-moving traffic and cyclists.
93. The fast track application suggests mitigations to several locations, suggesting that such infrastructure upgrades would be undertaken by the Road Controlling Authorities.
94. I defer to NZTA's response to the panel on this matter in relation to NZTA roads, however apart from the Pound Road corridor project highlighted above, there are no other committed road and infrastructure improvements at this time that support the suggestion that Council is able to deliver the local road improvements as identified in the application.

PROPOSED DRAFT CONDITIONS

95. I propose the following draft conditions:

Roading

96. All roads shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the CCC Infrastructure Design Standard (IDS). Physical works shall not commence until a Council engineering officer confirms that the Design Report, Plans and Design Certificate complying with clause 3.3.1 of the IDS and the Contract Quality Plan and Engineer's Review Certificate complying with clause 3.3.2 has been received by Council.

Safety Audit

97. The Consent Holder shall provide Safe System Audits (Road Safety Audits) undertaken by a suitably qualified independent traffic engineer at the scheme design stage, engineering acceptance (detailed design) stage and post construction stage.

Street lighting

98. Street lighting is to be installed in the new road(s) to vest in compliance with Part 11 (Lighting) of the Infrastructure Design Standard.

Stage 1: Barters Road and Waterloo Road / Pound Road

99. That at the applicants cost the Barters Road frontage, including the two new road intersections, shall be upgraded to meet the CCC IDS standards for a

rural road carrying the anticipated future traffic volumes. This is to occur prior to the opening of Stage 1 taking access off Barthers Road.

100. That at the applicants cost, prior to the opening of Stage 1 of the development, a 2.5m shared path is constructed connecting the development to the Waterloo Road / Pound Road traffic signals
101. That at the applicants cost the northern Pound Road approach to the Waterloo Road / Pound Road traffic signals be upgraded from the current cycle only crossing to a shared cycle and pedestrian crossing

Stage 2: Pound Road

102. That at the applicants cost the Pound Road frontage be upgraded to meet the IDS standards for a minor arterial road carrying the anticipated future traffic volumes. This is to occur in conjunction with development of Stage 2 taking access off Pound Road.
103. That at the applicants cost the 2.5m shared path constructed as part of Stage 1 is extended to the new Pound Road roundabout, or a suitable alternative arrangement agreed with Council that also achieves a walking and cycling connection parallel to Pound Road.
104. That either or both of the following, or another alternative which addresses the mitigation to the SH1 / Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersections:
 - 104.1 No further development shall occur after the completion of the first stage of the proposal until the capacity improvements at the SH1 / Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersections are under construction.
 - 104.2 No further development shall occur after the completion of the first stage of the proposal until the modelling has been updated and demonstrated to the satisfaction of Council and NZTA that the SH1/Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersections can safely accommodate the additional traffic demands associated with the proposal

Stage 4: Hasketts Road

105. That at the applicants cost the Hasketts Road frontage be upgraded to meet the IDS standards for a rural road carrying the anticipated future traffic volumes. This is to occur prior to the opening of Stage 4 taking access off Hasketts Road, and is to include the frontage of 14 Hasketts Road.
106. That the intersection of Hasketts Road, Maddisons Road and Barthers Road be upgraded in general accordance with the scheme plans attached to the application or a similar alternative agreed with Council. This is to occur prior to

the opening of Stage 4 taking access off Hasketts Road.

Post-Construction road markings

107. The applicant must provide at a post-construction stage as part of the section 224 documentation:

107.1 An as-built roadmarking and signage plan of all roads to vest and any existing roads changed, including any changes identified as required post-construction, whether through a safety audit, technical review or other means.

107.2 An accompanying text description of the extent of any regulatory road markings or traffic control devices (including intersection controls, special vehicle lanes, shared paths) in the format specified by Council needed for a resolution report.

108. **Advice Note:** Council staff will provide guidance on the required format for the text description.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

109. I consider that;

- (a) In addition to the new internal road networks, all frontage work is subject to an engineering design acceptance process. This process includes quality assurance to ensure that the infrastructure changes will be safely designed to required standards. Overall, I am satisfied that given the road corridor width and the proposed conditions of consent, that a safe and accessible access arrangement can be made to work via Barthers Road, Hasketts Road and Pound Road.
- (b) The engineering approvals process provides a suitable opportunity to address detailed safety and design issues such as parking and parking restrictions, removal of non-frangible power poles, location and form of the proposed path provision. As such, I am satisfied that subject to the upgrades following the Infrastructure Design Standards,
- (c) The access designs have been based on a lower speed limit than the existing 80kph environment. This is an acceptable approach on the basis that the activity is not intended to take direct access onto the

frontage roads, and that it is the development activity itself which will change the roadside environment from rural to urban (industrial) requiring a change in speed limit.

- (d) The proposals have the potential to affect the safety and efficiency of Pound Road at its intersection with Waterloo Road and SH1. Mitigation of any adverse effects can be managed through a combination of physical works, altering the development proposal or providing funds towards mitigating the effects created by the proposal. In the absence of a programmed improvement project that would be funded through development contributions, it is recommended that an alternative financial mechanism should be pursued and that a staging condition be considered.
- (e) Shared pedestrian/cycle paths should be provided to support safe access. This feature should be secured by way of a consent condition.

Dated 31 October 2025

Peter Rodgers

