SUMMARY STATEMENT OF LUKAS GERHARD VAN DER WESTHUIZEN (PPC85 – TRANSPORT)

1. INTRODUCTION

My full name is Lukas Gerhard van der Westhuizen. I have prepared a statement of transport evidence in this matter dated 01 December 2025 and a statement of rebuttal evidence dated 9 February 2026.

2. SUMMARY OF PRIMARY EVIDENCE

2.1 As the Hearing Panel will be aware, I have reviewed the ITA prepared by Mr Hills and supporting documentation, including the Structure Plan, Development Area Provisions, and relevant submissions on PC 85 relating to transport matters. My evidence addresses the predicted traffic generation and modelling assumptions; the proposed road layout and walking and cycling networks; intersection capacity and safety (including SIDRA modelling and the Safe System Assessment); infrastructure upgrade triggers and plan provisions; and the feasibility and critical importance of the Insley Street shared path connection to Mangawhai Village.

3. SUMMARY OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

3.1 As outlined in my rebuttal evidence, the majority of transportation matters between Mr Hills and myself are now resolved. In particular, I agree with his operational assessment of the Moir Street / Insley Street roundabout, and he has accepted my broader recommendations regarding infrastructure triggers, plan provisions, and the delivery of the shared path.

3.2 The only area of disagreement now relates to the form of intersection control at Black Swamp Road / Insley Street / Tomarata Road.

3.3 In particular, in my rebuttal evidence, I emphasise that:

(a) While a priority-controlled T-intersection with a right-turn bay may provide operational capacity and represent a commonly

applied treatment, it does not alter the fundamental conflict geometry of the intersection and therefore does not achieve the same level of risk reduction as a roundabout;

(b) The Safe System Assessment assumptions relied upon by Mr Hills understate both crash likelihood and severity in a 60 km/h environment, where right-angle and head-on conflicts remain present and carry a material risk of fatal or serious injury;

(c) A roundabout fundamentally changes crash mechanisms by removing right-angle and head-on conflicts and reducing approach speeds through geometry, thereby delivering inherent and more robust Safe System outcomes; and

(d) While additional safety treatments (such as signage, markings, lighting, medians, and turning bays) can improve the performance of a priority-controlled intersection, they do not achieve the same level of risk reduction as a roundabout.

3.4 While a roundabout is, in my opinion, the clearly superior safety outcome, the absence of a roundabout would not, in isolation, constitute sufficient transport grounds to decline PPC 85, provided all other recommended mitigation measures are adopted and any priority-controlled T-intersection is subject to detailed design incorporating appropriate safety treatments.

3.5 I am happy to answer any questions.

Lukas Gerhard van der Westhuizen

18 February 2026