

**BEFORE**

Independent Commissioners appointed  
by Tasman District Council

**IN THE MATTER**

of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**

of an application by C J Industries Ltd  
for land use consent RM200488 for  
gravel extraction and associated site  
rehabilitation and amenity planting and  
for land use consent RM200489 to  
establish and use vehicle access on an  
unformed legal road and erect  
associated signage



**EVIDENCE OF GARY PAUL CLARK ON BEHALF OF CJ INDUSTRIES LTD  
(TRANSPORT)**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My full name is Gary Paul Clark. I hold the position of Director of Traffic Concepts Limited. My qualifications, experience and involvement in the project are outlined in by evidence in chief dated 15 July 2022.
- 1.2 The applicant has applied for resource consents authorising the extraction of gravel, stockpiling of topsoil, and reinstatement of quarried land, with associated amenity planting, signage and access formation at 134 Peach Island Road, Motueka:
  - (a) RM200488 land use consent for gravel extraction and associated site rehabilitation and amenity planting and
  - (b) RM200489 land use consent to establish and use vehicle access on an unformed legal road and erect associated signage
- 1.3 The applicant has also subsequently applied for a discharge permit (RM 220578).

- 1.4 My evidence in chief addressed the effects of the activities for which consent is sought on transportation matters and responded to issues raised in submissions and in the Tasman District Council's (TDC) s 42A report.
- 1.5 Following on from the s 42A report, TDC released a s 42A Addendum Report (TDC report number REPC22-11-21A) on 28 October 2022. This included a supplementary technical report on traffic effects from Ari Fon in Attachment 5. This supplementary statement responds to matters relating to traffic raised in those two documents. It also comments on conditions of consent.

## **2. s 42A ADDENDEM REPORT**

- 2.1 The traffic matters are discussed in Section 6 of the s 42A Addendum Report. In reviewing the analysis contained in Section 6 it shows there is general agreement with my traffic assessment by the Mr Fon (Council's Traffic Consultant). The traffic effects can be managed and are no more than minor, subject to some recommendations by Mr Fon and the reporting planner. These recommendations are noted below and have been included in the draft conditions of consent.
- 2.2 Section 6.27 of the s 42A Addendum Report sets out the matters that are in contention which are set out below:
  - (a) The need to widening [sic] the access from Motueka River West Bank Road up to the bridge to 6m to allow for two vehicles to pass.
  - (b) The recommended bridge width (3.5m)
  - (c) The need for passing bays along the haul road
  - (d) The proposed speed limit on the sealed haul road (as opposed to unsealed surfaces on site)
  - (e) Clarification whether public access is possible on the haul road or whether the public will be excluded. As noted by Mr Fon:

“if there is the likelihood of any public access on the paper road, then measures will be required to ensure safety of members of the public while trucks are using the section of the access road that is formed on the paper road”

- 2.3 It is recommended that the first 35 metres of the driveway is widened to six metres to allow two trucks to pass. The main purpose of this recommendation is to reduce the likelihood of a truck waiting on Motueka River West Bank Road and holding up traffic. While this is unlikely due to the number of vehicles using the access, the management of trucks and the low flows along the road, the applicant accepts the recommendation.
- 2.4 I believe there is no contention over the recommended bridge width. Mr Fon has agreed that 3.5 metres is wide enough, and I agree to this width as well. I note that the design of the bridge may require a slightly wider bridge deck. Accordingly, the condition should refer to a minimum width (3500mm) rather than an exact width.
- 2.5 The next matter relates to need for passing bays. Mr Fon has recommended passing bays be provided, where practical, to address a concern around inconvenience. As noted in the TIA trucks use a call through system which removes the need for passing bays to manage trucks needing to pass each other.
- 2.6 However, concerns over public access (raised in the S 42A) on the haul road is something that needs to be addressed. Firstly, I note that access from Motueka River West Bank Road is not available for the general public as it is private land. Accordingly, the only public access to the crown land and paper road is from the north. Most of the crown land and paper road will remain unformed and will resemble a paddock as shown below, and this will limit the use of the road by the public:



- 2.7 The other consideration is the need or reason why the public would use the crown land or paper road. As it doesn't provide access to anything particular, it is unlikely to generate a demand for its use.
- 2.8 In considering the matters above and the design of the haul road, I do not believe there is an effect that needs to be mitigated. The speeds on the haul road will be managed (15 km/h), the sight lines along the haul road will enable any user of the access to be easily seen and appropriate actions to be taken. However, if the Commissioners see there is an effect that needs to be mitigated then the applicant is prepared to install passing bays as set out in the draft conditions.
- 2.9 Section 6.18 discusses speed limits on the haul road. The speed limit for the haul road will be 15 km/h. This will apply to all of the haul road noting that it will be sealed for all of its length.
- 2.10 Section 6.21 and 6.22 provides commentary on the road capacity.
- 2.11 Section 21 provides an extract of my assessment of the road capacity and the ability of the road to accommodate the increase truck movements.
- 2.12 Section 6.22 provides Mr Fon's opinion on the truck movements and is not an assessment of capacity. It is his view that the truck movements will be noticeable. The reporting planner has agreed with a statement by Mr Fon.
- 2.13 Within my evidence in chief, I go into detail around travel times in Sections 7.6 to 7.8. Cars travelling at 80 km/h will take around 80 seconds to travel from Alexander Bridge to the entrance to the site. The application will increase the number of truck movements along this section for two inward and two outward movements per hour. This equates to one truck every fifteen minutes.
- 2.14 A motorist traveling along this section this road is unlikely to see a truck for the short 80 seconds of travel and at the most one truck should they come across one. I also note that only two truck an hour (one every 30 minutes) is travelling in the opposite direction. In my opinion the increase in truck movements would be indiscernible to a motorist based on the above calculations.

### **3. CONDITIONS OF CONSENT**

3.1 The draft conditions of consent provided in Attachment 2 of the Section 42A Report have been reviewed. I have reviewed proposed conditions 26 through to 36 and agree that they are appropriate and provide the mechanism to mitigate the potential adverse effects.

3.2 The conditions of consent (Conditions 58 through to 61) relating to traffic movements are appropriate. There is one propose change to condition 59. The speed limit on all of the haul road (sealed and unsealed) is restricted to 15 km/h. Accordingly, the proposed reworded condition is as follows:

59. All vehicles shall observe a speed limit of 15 km/h when using the haul road or traveling within the site. It is the consent holder's responsibility to inform the drivers of this speed limit.

Gary Clark

4 November 2022