
Under the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of the submission by the New Zealand Transport Agency on
Proposed Plan Change 23 by the Hartley Road Partnership

**Statement of evidence of Luke Thomas Braithwaite for NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi
– Planning**

16 March 2026

1 Qualifications and experience

- 1.1 My full name is Luke Thomas Braithwaite. I am a Senior Planner with NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA) where I have been employed since July 2020.
- 1.2 I hold a bachelor's degree in environmental planning (with a specialisation in terrestrial environments) from the University of Waikato and a graduate diploma in property valuation from Lincoln University. I am an intermediate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have nine and a half years planning experience within both the public and private sector.
- 1.3 My key responsibilities at NZTA include assessing and coordinating responses on land use development applications, consenting lead to capital works projects, network operation contracts and transport alliance work, and working with local councils on district plan reviews and plan changes.
- 1.4 In relation to the proposed Plan Change 23 by Hartley Road Partnership, I am project managing the NZTA overall response; this includes coordinating internal and external subject matter experts' responses to inform the decision making on each of the NZTA submission points and providing evidence based on the outcome of this decision making process.
- 1.5 I have authority to give evidence on behalf of NZTA.

2 Code of conduct

- 2.1 I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the current Environment Court Practice Note (2023). I have complied with it in the preparation of this statement of evidence. I also confirm that the matters addressed in this statement are within my area of expertise, except where I have relied on the opinion of subject matter experts. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

3 Scope and Summary of evidence

- 3.1 My evidence addresses the following matters as raised in NZTA's submission and Central Otago District Council Section 42A report:
 - a) Landscaping specifications,
 - b) Shading effects on the State Highway 8 carriageway,
 - c) Separation of industrial areas from State Highway 8,
 - d) Access direct to State Highway 8,
 - e) Intersection improvements to provide for the development,
 - f) Improvements to the Daphne Hull Underpass.

3.2 I have reviewed the Section 42A report from the Central Otago District Council prepared by Adam Vincent. I largely agree with the recommendations in the reports that the issues are likely able to be worked through subject to conditions. My evidence focusses on matters which I consider require further discussion and clarification as to how NZTA has come to the position outlined in this evidence. In summary:

- a) NZTA considers that the matters identified within our original submission have been either addressed in sufficient detail or amendments to the rules have been included that mitigate our concern so that NZTA is no longer opposed to the proposal.
- b) NZTA requests that the commissioners adopt the recommendations of the Section 42A report except as otherwise stated within my evidence.

4 Landscaping specifications

4.1 Paragraph 40 of the Section 42A report has sought the NZTA “thoughts on what level of landscaping they consider would be necessary to manage the effects of the proposal and achieve the objectives of the plan change”. NZTA considers that the purpose of this landscaping would be to provide screening from State Highway 8 so that the onsite industrial activity is not visible at any point from ground level to 1.8m above ground level when viewed horizontally from the State Highway 8 corridor.

4.2 As such, it is anticipated that the species will need to be selected by the landowner that will provide year around screening (evergreen planting) be of sufficient height to provide onsite screening from State Highway 8 (1.8m+) whilst ensuring that the height of the plants will not grow to a height where these would cause shading on State Highway 8 between the hours of 10:00am and 14:00pm on the shortest day of the year. It is also required that the planting be maintained to retain the minimum height. NZTA recommends that Rule 9.3.5.iv(d) be reworded as follows:

d. Within the proposed ‘Clyde Industrial Precinct’, a landscaped strip with a minimum width of 10 metres shall be provided and maintained alongside the boundaries of State Highway 8, Springvale Road, the Clyde Cemetery Reserve and the unformed legal road to the north of the site below an historic water race. The entire landscape strip shall be established at the time of initial subdivision or prior to any development of the site and shall create the opportunity for landscaping to provide visual enhancement and screening. The landscaped strip must not be paved or have any structures erected on it. Landscaping must form a visual screen of the subdivision or development that, at a minimum, meets the following performance requirements:

- 1. In relation to the Clyde Cemetery, must include species that will achieve a minimum height of 4.0m when mature and must be maintained with sufficiently dense plantings that, when mature, they will block direct line of sight measured horizontally at any*

point from ground level to 1.8m above ground level between the cemetery and industrial development within the Clyde Industrial Precinct.

2. In relation to State Highway 8 and Springvale Road:

- (a) include species that will achieve a minimum height of 2.0m at maturity or within two years of planting, whichever is lesser.*
- (b) maintain sufficiently dense plantings that, will block direct line of sight measured horizontally at any point in the road corridor from ground level to 1.8m above ground level.*
- (c) include species that are evergreen (sempervirent).*
- (d) be maintained to a height that avoids shading of the carriageway of State Highway 8 between 10:00 and 14:00 hours on the shortest day of the year.*

- 4.3 Provided that these criteria are complied with NZTA is satisfied that the landscaping will achieve the objectives of the plan change and the effects on State Highway 8 will be less than minor.

5 Shading effects on the State Highway 8 carriageway

- 5.1 NZTA made a submission (NZTA submission point 1) in opposition in part seeking that landscape vegetation in the buffer strip does not cause shading on State Highway 8 between the hours of 10:00am and 14:00pm on the shortest day of the year.
- 5.2 The Section 42A report discusses this point in paragraphs 63 to 65 and recommends adoption of the proposed addition in Rule 9.3.6.iv with the minor amendment to specify that this relates to the State Highway 8 carriageway only. This is to ensure that the rule does not apply to the entire State Highway 8 corridor.
- 5.3 NZTA agrees with the recommendation of the Section 42A report. Provided this change is adopted NZTA is satisfied that the landscaping effects on State Highway 8 will be less than minor.

6 Separation of industrial areas from State Highway 8

- 6.1 NZTA made a submission (NZTA submission point 1) in opposition in part seeking that the buffer area precludes paving or structures to preclude creep of industrial related activities into the buffer.
- 6.2 The Section 42A report discusses this point in paragraphs 63 to 65 and recommends adoption of the proposed addition in Rule 9.3.6.iv.

- 6.3 NZTA agrees with the recommendation of the Section 42A report. Provided this change is adopted NZTA is satisfied that the effects on State Highway 8 will be less than minor.

7 Access direct to State Highway 8

- 7.1 NZTA made a submission (NZTA submission point 2) in support in part seeking that there be no access, vehicle or other, direct to State Highway 8.
- 7.2 The Section 42A report discusses this point in paragraph 66 and consider the change to be largely semantic in nature, however, recommends the adoption of this wording change
- 7.3 NZTA agrees with the recommendation of the Section 42A report. NZTA is satisfied that the effects on State Highway 8 will be less than minor with or without the adoption of this wording change.

8 Intersection improvements to provide for the development

- 8.1 NZTA made a submission (NZTA submission point 3) in opposition as Rule 12.7.1(iii)(i) does not provide adequate mitigation for an appropriate intersection upgrade to provide for adequate left turn facilities that do not conflict with vulnerable road users.
- 8.2 The Section 42A report recommends in Paragraphs 67 - 70 that Rule 12.7.1(iii)(i) be split into two provisions, one being the access from the site onto Springvale Road and the other addressing the Springvale Road intersection. This amendment provides rule clarity allowing a single access to Springvale Road as a Permitted Activity without the requirement to subdivide the site prior to this access being formed, and provide details on the required intersection upgrades to accommodate the development.
- 8.3 In regard to the amendments to Rule 12.7.2.iii(i) to provide for a single access to Springvale Road from the site as a Permitted Activity, NZTA is comfortable with Council making this amendment.
- 8.4 In regard to the amendments of Rule 12.7.2.iii(j) which seeks to include provisions relating to the requirement for an auxiliary left turn lane for southbound traffic turning onto Springvale Road from State Highway 8 to provide for the development, NZTA agrees with the approach in the Section 42A report to require this upgrade to sufficiently manage the traffic generation of the development. This will mean that the intersection will be fit for purpose to safely accommodate the traffic associated with the development, whilst not reducing the intersection performance or safety. In addition, NZTA supports the replacement of 'and' with 'or' in the first sentence of the rule as shown in paragraph 75 of the Section 42A report.
- 8.5 NZTA agrees with the recommendation of the Section 42A report. Provided this change is adopted NZTA is satisfied that the effects on State Highway 8 will be less than minor.

9 Improvements to the Daphne Hull Underpass

- 9.1 NZTA made a submission (NZTA submission point 6) seeking a new provision to provide for the Daphne Hull Underpass (the underpass) to be investigated as to whether an upgrade is required to the underpass prior to the development of the site.
- 9.2 The Section 42A report discusses this point in paragraph 72 and recommends rejection of this new provision on the basis that the Department of Conservation (DoC) owns the land on the eastern approach, this would require third party approval and DoC did not submit on the plan change. However, the Section 42A report does note that the underpass can be considered as part of the subdivision proposal as part of Council's exercise of its control over the provision of access or through consultation with landowners if the subdivision aspect is not progressed.
- 9.3 NZTA agrees with the recommendation of the Section 42A report and agrees that Council can consider this matter as part of the subdivision proposal or at the time of the proposed change in land use. As this matter has been appropriately addressed, NZTA is satisfied that the effects on the State Highway 8 will be less than minor.

10 Summary

- 10.1 The Section 42A assessment has sufficiently addressed the matters that NZTA raised within their submission, and subject to the minor changes sought within my evidence to Rule 9.3.5.iv(d)(2), the recommendations appropriately mitigate the effects on the State Highway 8 network. Provided these recommendations are adopted NZTA considers that the effects on State Highway 8 are less than minor.
- 10.2 I request that the Hearing Panel accept the recommendations within the Section 42A report as these relate to the NZTA submission.

Luke Thomas Braithwaite

16 March 2026