

**Before an Independent Hearing Commissioner  
appointed by Selwyn District Council**

**In the Matter**

of the Resource Management Act  
1991

**And**

**In the Matter**

of a Resource Consent Application  
for land use consent to erect and  
operate a supermarket at 157 Levi  
Road, Rolleston by Foodstuffs  
(South Island) Properties Limited  
(RC216016)

**Summary of Evidence of  
Andrew David Carr  
(Traffic)**

---

Table of Contents

**INTRODUCTION ..... 2**

    Code of Conduct..... 2

**KEY OUTCOMES ..... 2**

    Lincoln-Rolleston Road / Levi Road Intersection..... 3

    Operation of the Site Accesses ..... 4

**WALKING/CYCLING TO SCHOOL ..... 5**

**ON-STREET PARKING ..... 5**

**SUMMARY / CONCLUSIONS ..... 6**

## INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Andrew (Andy) David Carr.
2. I provided a peer review of the Applicant's Integrated Transportation Assessment undertaken by Mr Smith of Abley, along with submissions received on the application. My comments on these were included as Appendices 9 and 10 of the s 42A report.
3. I have also subsequently reviewed the Statement of Evidence produced by Mr Smith.
4. In my reviews, I identified that in my view, insufficient information had been provided on the transportation aspects of the application to enable a full and detailed assessment of the anticipated (transportation) effects to be identified. Accordingly, I participated in expert witness conferencing with Mr Smith during July and August 2022, and this culminated in a Joint Witness Statement (**JWS**) being issued on 1 August 2022.
5. The JWS sets out a considerable amount of detail, which I have not repeated within this Summary Statement. Rather, I adopt and rely on the JWS for the purposes of this Statement.

## Code of Conduct

6. I confirm that I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on material produced by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in my evidence

## KEY OUTCOMES

7. There has been a lot of transport-related data presented, and some information in earlier reports has been superseded by later reports. To that end, it may be helpful for the Commissioner to initially focus on the JWS, which represents the latest thinking, before reviewing other reports. The JWS also includes refinements of earlier information (for example, specific wording around the Conditions of Consent).
8. There are two key areas to the traffic work in my view: the performance of the Lincoln-Rolleston Road / Levi Road intersection and the operation of the site accesses. I discuss each below.

## **Lincoln-Rolleston Road / Levi Road Intersection**

9. There is an intent through the Council's Long Term Plan for the current roundabout to be converted to traffic signals in 2 or 3 years' time. This timeframe would work well with the construction of the Pak n Save supermarket (if consent is granted). Under this scenario, Mr Smith and I agree that the traffic signals are able to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the supermarket.
10. However if the signalisation is delayed (or does not take place at all) – both of which are possible but unlikely – then the Applicant has proposed an improvement scheme to the roundabout of adding a second approach lane onto Levi Road. I consider that this will provide additional capacity at the roundabout such that the increased queues and delays that are created by the supermarket traffic are mitigated.
11. While the second approach lane has been shown to mitigate adverse effects, it has been developed in isolation from other technical disciplines. In my view it would assist if a single plan was to be produced by the Applicant that showed how the second lane would be able to be accommodated with respect to other technical disciplines (such as landscaping).
12. While it is not necessarily a matter for the consent, I highlight that in the Joint Witness Statement, it is recorded that a coordinated response between the Council and the Applicant to any works carried out on Levi Road and the intersection would be highly beneficial in minimising disruption to residents and travellers in the area.
13. At the main site access, pedestrians and cyclists will divert slightly into the site (this design improve their level of service when crossing this access). Council is agreeable to an easement around the main site access (as has been offered by the Applicant) to facilitate this.
14. With regard to the extent of land required for improvement schemes at the Lincoln-Rolleston Road / Levi Road intersection, some of the application site (at the northwestern corner) will be required to facilitate the anticipated traffic signals. It is not possible to state how much land will be required, as Council does not yet have a confirmed scheme for the traffic signals. I understand that the Applicant has offered an easement for this, but Council would wish this to become legal road reserve. However this difference in approach does not give rise to a traffic-related effect.
15. Some submitters have stated that Pak n Save is a destination in its own right. I can confirm that this has been taken into account within the modelling carried out, with one third of trips to/from the supermarket being trips that are presently occurring somewhere else on the network, but which then divert to visit the Pak n Save

instead. For clarity, these are assessed as new trips on the road network immediately adjacent to the supermarket, but in reality are trips that are already occurring elsewhere but which change route to instead visit the supermarket.

16. Submitters noted that the increased traffic would make it harder to cross the roads. The application allows for a formal pedestrian crossing on Lincoln-Rolleston Road and also on Levi Road. Further, if the Lincoln-Rolleston Road / Levi Road intersection was not signalised when the Pak n Save was to be opened, then there is a condition of consent in the Joint Witness Statement that a temporary pedestrian crossing on Lincoln-Rolleston Road just south of the intersection is to be put in place by the Applicant. For completeness, I expect that the signalised intersection would have pedestrian crossing phases on each approach.

### **Operation of the Site Accesses**

17. There are five points of access to the site (as listed in the initial Transportation Assessment). Accesses A and D allow for full turning movements, and I do not have particular concerns with these.
18. Access B is left-in/left-out only. However the angle of this access points drivers north, and towards a direction which may encourage right-out movements. This gives rise a condition of consent around monitoring, as if this is not operating as expected (ie if there are any right-turn movements) then mitigation will be required. In my view there are mitigation measures that can be put in place which can be carried out wholly within the application site and so will not affect any third parties.
19. Access E is left-in only. However I note that there are no physical restraints to prevent other movements, and in my view it is likely that drivers who have parked in the northeastern corner of the site or that have visited the clock-and-collect area will attempt to exit from Access E because it is the access that is the most conspicuous to them. Again though, if this was to occur, then the necessary mitigation measures can be implemented wholly within the application site and so will not affect any third parties. Accordingly a condition of consent is set out for the monitoring of this access.
20. Access C is left-out only and remains a point of difference between myself and the Applicant. In my view, it is likely that some drivers will attempt to undertake right-turn movements out of this access. This movement would take place close to the Lincoln-Rolleston Road / Levi Road intersection. Further, even if drivers are turning left, they are likely to be looking towards their right only as they exit (that is, towards the direction of approaching vehicles) and consequently may be unaware of pedestrians and cyclists approaching from their left, since looking left is not the natural direction to look in such an instance. In my view there is a risk associated

with this access, and furthermore, it will be difficult to mitigate this solely by measures within the application site itself. Rather, I consider that possible mitigation measures (such as the raised median suggested by the Applicant) would therefore affect third parties. This matter was raised by the Haylocks in their verbal presentation.

21. For this reason, I do not consider that Access C should be permitted. However, if the Commissioner was minded to allow the access (at least in the first instance) then the Joint Witness Statement sets out how the access should be monitored. The Joint Witness Statement also sets out that if Access C was either not constructed or was constructed but subsequently closed, there would not be any consequential adverse effects from this. Although it would result in increased traffic at other accesses, those accesses have sufficient available capacity to absorb this without significant effects on queues or delays.

## **WALKING/CYCLING TO SCHOOL**

22. Some submitters noted that Levi Road is used for travel to/from school. The proposed site accesses would create potential points of conflict between students and vehicles, but I consider that this is outweighed by the proposed of the Applicant for a dedicated walking/cycling route on the southern side of Levi Road. However the removal of Access C would be beneficial in that it removes a point of conflict.

## **ON-STREET PARKING**

23. Some submitters were concerned about staff parking on-street. The Applicant verbally confirmed to the Commissioner that staff would not be prevented from parking on-site and so I consider that this should be addressed through a condition of consent. From a transportation perspective, I consider that the following wording would be suitable:
24. The consent holder shall not take any action that discourages or prevents employees from parking their vehicles within the main parking area of the Site.
25. I note that if this is put in place then it is unlikely that staff or customers would park on-street. This then means that there would be no need to implement parking restrictions on Levi Road (as has been shown on some drawings produced by the Applicant).

## **SUMMARY / CONCLUSIONS**

26. With the provision of the additional information, particularly through the JWS, and the detail now available for the conditions of consent (appended to the JWS) I consider that the transportation-related effects of the proposal have been appropriately identified and evaluated.
27. I remain of the view that Access C should not be constructed due to my concerns regarding the ability of this access to operate safely.
28. Subject to this comment though, and subject to the conditions of consent, I consider that the proposal can be supported from a transportation perspective.

**Andrew David Carr**

**3 August 2022**