

Before Gisborne District Council

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (the **RMA**)

In the matter of applications by Gisborne District Council for resource consents to modify a stopbank at Te Karaka

Statement of Evidence of Glen Stuart Randall on behalf of Gisborne District Council Transport, Road Safety and Design

14/09/2026

MC.

Solicitors:

Jessica Easton | Brandon Watts
PO Box 90750, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142
DX CP24063
T: +64 9 336 7500
Jessica.Easton@mc.co.nz | Brandon.Watts@mc.co.nz

Statement of evidence of Glen Stuart Randall on behalf of Gisborne District Council

1 Executive summary

- 1.1 My evidence addresses transport, road safety and design matters associated with the proposed road raising works required by Gisborne District Council's proposal to modify the stopbanks at Te Karaka. My involvement has been limited to the road raising component, for which I acted as technical lead and design manager.
- 1.2 I have relied on the design drawing set, the preliminary design Road Safety Audit dated May 2026, and the WSP Consent Submission Response Memo dated 28 August 2026. I have also considered the Pine Hollow Family Trust submission and the section 42A report.
- 1.3 I consider that the detailed design appropriately responds to the relevant transport and road safety matters, including the applicable Austroads and Traffic Control Device guidance and the actions arising from the preliminary Road Safety Audit.
- 1.4 In relation to the Pine Hollow Family Trust property, I consider that the road raising works will not adversely affect access for vehicle types anticipated, and that safe access can be maintained.
- 1.5 I acknowledge that localised drainage changes will occur; however, these have been considered in the design and are expected to remain within the road reserve. Temporary construction effects are separate from the permanent transport design matters addressed in my evidence.
- 1.6 Overall, I agree with the section 42A report conclusion that the transport effects of the proposal are minor and acceptable. In my opinion, the residual traffic and road safety effects in relation to the Pine Hollow Family Trust property will be less than minor.

2 Introduction

- 2.1 My full name is Glen Stuart Randall. I am employed by WSP New Zealand as a Transport Engineer, and currently hold the position of Technical Principal – Transport Engineering. I am based in the Napier office.
- 2.2 I have been asked by Gisborne District Council to provide evidence in respect of its application for resource consents to modify the stopbanks around Te Karaka (the **Stopbank Proposal**).

3 Qualifications and experience

- 3.1 I am a Chartered Professional Engineer (1157238), an Engineering NZ Chartered Member, and an International Professional Engineer.
- 3.2 I hold a Master of Engineering (Transport) from Stellenbosch University, and a Bachelor of Science (Civil) from the University of Cape Town.

- 3.3 I have 27 years' experience in transport engineering. Key areas of expertise are transport planning, land development, road safety and design management.

4 Code of conduct

- 4.1 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

5 Scope of evidence

- 5.1 In my evidence, I will respond to:
- (a) matters raised by the Pine Hollow Family Trust.
 - (b) the Section 42A report.

6 Involvement with the Stopbank Proposal

- 6.1 I have not been involved in the Stopbank project, but rather the raising of the State Highway as a consequence of the stopbank project. WSP was originally engaged by Gisborne District Council to undertake the conceptual design of the road raising at three locations; namely two along the state highway and one along Rangatira Road. Once the concept design had been completed, a Road Safety Audit was commissioned, which has influenced the detailed design.
- 6.2 On 5 May 2026, WSP were commissioned to undertake the detailed design of the road raising project. At the time of preparing this evidence, the detailed design drawings have yet to be approved by the client.
- 6.3 My role in the road raising project was as technical lead / design manager. I provided technical support to the designer, ensuring the design aligns with current design guidelines while limiting the extent of work required to achieve the required stopbank levels. I reviewed the design drawings and the response memo.
- 6.4 The stopbank levels were provided to WSP by others, and this has been used in the road raising design.
- 6.5 A notable meeting I attended was on 18 March 2026 in which both NZTA and GDC officials discussed the conceptual design where NZTA provided feedback on the appropriateness of the concept designs. I did not attend client meetings as this was performed by the Project Manager. Meetings I have attended have been limited to internal design coordination and reviews.
- 6.6 I have not undertaken a site visit and have relied upon site visits undertaken by others together with site photos.

7 Evidence

7.1 My evidence relies on the following documents:

- (a) Design Drawing set Te Karaka SH2 RP406/8.50 to RP416/1.83;
- (b) Preliminary Design Road Safety Audit (RSA) dated May 2026; and
- (c) WSP Consent Submission Response Memo dated 28 August 2026.

7.2 I am satisfied that the design drawings meet all relevant design guidelines that typically apply to state highways; namely the Austroads and Traffic Control Device (TCD) guidelines. Austroads has been used to determine the horizontal and vertical alignment parameters and sight line distances while TCD has been used for line marking and signage.

7.3 The preliminary RSA included safety risks associated with the design and I prepared the designer response. The actions from the RSA have been incorporated into the detailed design.

7.4 The response memo addressed the following key matters raised by Pine Hollow Family Trust: the functionality of the SH2 accessways for horse floats, disability vans and other property vehicles; sight distance and safe entry/exit movements following the road raising; road marking and signage changes, including no-overtaking controls; drainage within the roadworks footprint, including retention of existing drainage paths and culvert extensions where practicable; and the distinction between permanent design matters and temporary construction effects such as access, dust, noise, vibration, traffic management and equestrian operations.

7.5 In this statement of evidence, I conclude that the road raising will not have a detrimental impact with regard to access by the anticipated vehicle types, nor will the safety of the access be compromised as minimum sightline requirements are achieved. With regards to no overtaking markings, these were not highlighted in the safety audit nor are they deemed necessary at this location.

7.6 I also conclude that drainage has been considered in the design noting that localised drainage changes will occur due to the road raising but would be contained within the road reserve.

8 Submitter Concerns

8.1 My evidence is limited to the Pine Hollow Family Trust submission which has expressed road safety concerns associated with the road raising.

8.2 The response memo dated 28 August 2026 addresses the concerns raised. An updated memo was issued on 2 September 2026 to include an outstanding item regarding sightline distances.

8.3 The following sightline checks were undertaken:

- (a) Safe Intersection Sightline Distance - minimum sightline distances are achievable in both directions once the road raising and new driveway has been constructed.

- (b) Stopping Sight Distance - sightline checks for waiting right turning vehicles entering the premises were also checked and deemed compliant.

8.4 I consider the overall traffic and road safety effects for this property to be less than minor.

9 Response to section 42A report

9.1 The section 42A report concludes that the overall transport effects of the project will be minor and acceptable. I agree with that conclusion.

9.2 The matters raised in relation to road safety, stopping sight distance and access have been addressed through the WSP response memo and reflected in the detailed design where appropriate.

9.3 The report also references that NZTA, who are the road controlling authority, are in support of the road raising.

9.4 I therefore support the section 42A report assessment and recommended conditions to ensure the road raising works and upgrades meet GDC's Engineering Code of Practice.

10 Conclusion

10.1 For the reasons set out in my evidence, I consider that the proposed road raising works have been appropriately designed from a transport, road safety and access perspective.

10.2 In relation to the Pine Hollow Family Trust property, I consider that access can be maintained for the anticipated vehicle types and that the relevant sightline requirements can be achieved following the road raising works.

10.3 Overall, I agree with the section 42A report conclusion that the transport effects of the proposal are minor and acceptable. In my opinion, the residual traffic and road safety effects in relation to the Pine Hollow Family Trust property will be less than minor.

Glen Stuart Randall

14/09/2026