

IN THE MATTER OF

An application for resource consent under the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER OF

of an application to Kapiti Coast District Council for non-complying resource consent for a proposed 53 lot subdivision (including earthworks and infrastructure) at Otaihanga, Kapiti Coast.

BETWEEN

The Mansell Family
(The Applicant)

AND

Submitters

AND

Kapiti Coast District Council
(The Council)

**JOINT WITNESSES STATEMENT OF
TRANSPORT & ROADING EXPERTS**

Held on: 24 August 2022

INTRODUCTION

1. This joint note summarises a meeting held on 24 August 2022 at KCDC, on the topic of transport and roading matters associated with the **design of the proposed shared path** included in the resource consent application by the Mansell family. The primary purpose of this meeting was for traffic expert conferencing directed by the Panel in Minute 2.
2. In Minute 2 the Panel requested that the Traffic experts:
 - 14.a. Shared Path – for the purpose of resolving outstanding differences regarding lighting, grades, and surfacing. As an output, we require a Joint Witness Statement that sets out agreed matters, any outstanding areas of disagreement, and the reasons for the disagreement.
3. Attendees at the 24th August 2022 discussion were:
 - (a) Harriet Fraser (HF) on behalf of the Mansell Family.
 - (b) Nick Taylor (NTa) on behalf of the Mansell Family.
 - (c) Neil Trotter (NTr) on behalf of KCDC.
4. All experts confirm that attendance at these joint witnesses conferencing is carried out in their capacity as independent expert witnesses in accordance with the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 Part 7 and Appendix 3 relating to expert conferencing.
5. This note records the main items discussed, actions arising, and areas of agreement/ disagreement as requested by the Panel.
6. The following table lists a range of traffic topics associated with the design of the shared path and indicates whether the experts agree or disagree along with their reason for their view if in disagreement.

Topic	Discussion	Agree/ Disagree
Section of path being discussed.	Length shown on Cuttriss Drawing 22208 SK15 Sheet 4 of 8.	Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr
Desired function of the path. Who is likely to use it, when use it and for what purpose.	Primarily pedestrian connection, cyclists secondary. Cyclists mainly local residential users, northern end Tieko St, northern part of subdivision. Mainly commuter	Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr

Topic	Discussion	Agree/ Disagree
	<p>(work,school)some recreational.</p> <p>Pedestrians mainly recreational, including walking a loop. Local residents including all of Tieko Street and some from wider Otaihanga settlement.</p>	<p>Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr</p>
<p>Likely level of usage.</p>	<p>Up to five cyclists per hour at busiest times.</p> <p>Up to 20 pedestrians in busiest hours.</p>	<p>Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr</p> <p>Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr</p>
<p>Availability of alternative route via existing road network.</p>	<p>Cyclists can use Tieko Street to Otaihanga Road as alternative route.</p> <p>Same for pedestrians but the distance becomes an impediment.</p> <p>Tieko Street to Otaihanga Road on existing roads a safer alternative during hours of darkness.</p>	<p>Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr. NTa noted that school commuters will likely head to Paraparaumu College via Tieko Street. Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr NTr disagrees (in part). Tieko Street will be a safer option once the upgrades to the Tieko Street are implemented (as per Drawing 22208 SCH1 sheet 18 Revision Q), but without these being in place Tieko Street is currently largely unlit and has no separate provision for pedestrians and in my opinion is less safe for use by pedestrians and cyclists than the shared path during the hours of darkness.</p>
<p>Understanding of CPTED matters</p>	<p>Varying guidance, none of us experts, leave to expert statement.</p>	<p>Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr.</p> <p>NTr noted that CPTED and Austroads not always</p>

Topic	Discussion	Agree/ Disagree
		consistent in the guidance.
Design speed for cyclists	<p>Design speed for cyclists not a key factor in design, primarily for pedestrians.</p> <p>Expected maximum cycle speeds on path of 10-15km/h. At this speed can mix safely with pedestrians.</p>	<p>Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr</p> <p>Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr Ntr noted that his recommendation of a 30km/h design speed was to achieve a certain level of design rather than an expectation that cyclists would be travelling at 30km/h.</p>
Path width	2.5m to allow for additional clearance to fences.	Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr
Maximum grade of path	Maximum of 5% in the design.	<p>HF and NTa comfortable with vertical alignment of path given 5% a gentle grade, other paths in District with similar or steeper paths, minimization of earthworks, low anticipated usage and mainly for recreational purposes.</p> <p>NTr has safety concern with the combination of the grade and surfacing. In particular loss of control for cyclists when braking. Bend at Ch0 of greatest concern.</p>
Path surfacing	Crushed compacted gravel in design.	HF and NTa consider that a crushed compacted gravel with quality design and construction can deliver an enduring surface treatment. If for any reason the surface

Topic	Discussion	Agree/ Disagree
		<p>of the path does not perform as expected, defects are likely to appear within the first year after construction and can be addressed, and additional sections formed in a permanent surface if needed.</p> <p>NTr maintenance concern, seeks bound surface of some sort. cyclist loss of control on gravel and pedestrian ease of use particularly the mobility impaired. . NTr believes that there are surfacing materials that are available (e.g. stoneset.co.nz) that look like a natural surface and can be porous but are bound,</p>
<p>Need for lighting</p>	<p>In design no lighting of the path.</p> <p>Discussed addition of a light at the end of the shared path in the vicinity of Ch0 to light the bend in the path and the turning area.</p>	<p>HF and NTa do not consider lighting of the path to be needed or desirable as do not want to encourage after dark use. Submitters and CPTED expert also concerned about lighting.</p> <p>NTr has safety concerns regarding lack of lighting, in particular the need to see the path.</p>
<p>Additional safety mitigation measures identified during conferencing.</p>	<p>Add in extra 10m of seal on approach to Ch0</p> <p>Ease boundary corner at crest at Ch50.</p> <p>Council owned street light at</p>	<p>Agreed by HF, NTa, NTr to assist with addressing some of NTr's concerns.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Agree/ Disagree
	<p>Ch0 to light bend and turning, could be solar powered.</p> <p>Ensure lighting pole at Lot 101 end adjacent to the path.</p> <p>Reduce path width to 2.5m.</p> <p>These details to be added to Cuttriss plan 22208 SK 15 Rev A.</p>	

Date: 30th August 2022

Harriet Fraser

Harriet Fraser



Nick Taylor

N.S. Trotter

Neil Trotter