

CAR Supporting Tool D: QLDC Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

This CAR Supporting Tool provides responses to common questions that arise during application and review of Corridor Access Requests (CARs).
The FAQs in Table 8 below, are grouped to support both CAR reviewers and applicants / PCBUs.

FAQs

Table 8: CAR Supporting Tool D FAQs table

Audience	Question	Response
CAR team	Do all CAR applications require the same level of review?	No. The CAR process is risk-based. Review effort and the level of scrutiny applied should be proportionate to the risk, impact, and context of the proposed activity.
CAR team	Are NZGTTM templates mandatory for TMP submissions?	No. NZGTTM templates are examples only. CAR reviewers should assess whether sufficient information has been provided, regardless of format.
CAR team	What is the CAR reviewer actually assessing during peer risk review?	The reviewer is assessing whether the applicant has applied a structured, proportionate, and justified risk management process — not redoing the risk assessment or approving safety outcomes.
CAR team	How should perceived overuse of TTM controls be addressed?	By asking the applicant to explain how the controls manage identified risks and contribute to reducing risk in the specific context. Reviewers should not prescribe alternative controls.
CAR team	What if risks cannot be meaningfully quantified?	Lack of quantification does not invalidate a risk assessment. Where uncertainty cannot be reasonably reduced, it should be documented and addressed through justification, conditions, or heightened assurance where appropriate.
CAR team	When should additional analysis (e.g. traffic modelling) be requested?	Where uncertainty remains that cannot be resolved through the submitted information and further analysis is reasonably practicable and relevant to the decision.
CAR team	Can a CAR be accepted if the CAR team and applicant do not fully agree?	Yes. Disagreement does not automatically preclude access. Where appropriate, access may be authorised with documented reasoning, conditions, or heightened assurance. QLDC must be satisfied, based on the information available and any conditions imposed, that corridor access can be authorised consistently with its statutory and network management responsibilities.”
CAR team	What is the purpose of a conditional WAP with heightened assurance?	To manage uncertainty where risks are considered manageable, allowing access to proceed while applying additional monitoring and quality assurance.

Audience	Question	Response
CAR team	Does heightened assurance mean the RCA is taking on risk ownership?	No. The applicant remains responsible for managing health and safety risks. Heightened assurance supports the RCA's network and regulatory duties only. It may include additional checks, documentation requirements, or monitoring, proportionate to the risk and subject to operational requirements and available resources.
CAR team	What if internal SMEs have differing views?	Differing professional views are expected. Advice should be documented and, where necessary, escalated in line with the escalation pathway.
Applicant / PCBU	Can the council tell me what controls or TTM layout to use?	No. Under NZGTTM and HSWA, it is the applicant's responsibility as the PCBU to identify risks and determine appropriate controls.
Applicant / PCBU	Do I have to submit a CAR for all activities near the road corridor?	Not necessarily. Over time, QLDC may periodically update published guidance to clarify how low-risk or low-impact activities are treated under the CAR process. Where updated guidance is provided by QLDC, the applicant PCBU will still be required to consult with the CAR team through the early engagement process so that QLDC can confirm whether corridor access authorisation is required.
Applicant / PCBU	Do I have to use NZGTTM TMP templates?	No. NZGTTM templates are not mandatory. Any format may be used provided the required information is clearly presented.
Applicant / PCBU	Can I rely on a generic TMP or PARS?	Generic TMPs may be used where appropriate, but applicants must demonstrate that the scheme is suitable for the specific site and context.
Applicant / PCBU	Why is my CAR taking longer than expected?	CAR processing time depends on the quality and completeness of the submission and the level of risk or uncertainty involved. Requests for clarification or further information may extend review time.
Applicant / PCBU	What qualifications are required to prepare a TMP?	NZGTTM does not prescribe specific qualifications. The applicant's PCBU must ensure the TMP is prepared by a competent person.
Applicant / PCBU	What qualifications do CAR reviewers have to review my TMP?	CAR reviewers undertake a structured peer review to assess completeness, justification, and network implications. They do not approve safety outcomes or redesign TMPs.
Applicant / PCBU	Does NZGTTM mean I can use less TTM?	Not automatically. NZGTTM supports appropriate and proportionate controls based on risk. Reduced controls must be justified through risk assessment.
Applicant / PCBU	What happens if we disagree with the CAR review outcome?	Disagreements can be addressed through clarification, escalation, or independent review as outlined in the QLDC escalation process and guidance.
Applicant / PCBU	Can access still be authorised if uncertainty remains?	In some cases, yes. Where uncertainty cannot be reasonably resolved, access may be authorised with documented reasoning, conditions, or heightened assurance.

Audience	Question	Response
Applicant / PCBU	Does issuing a WAP mean the council has approved my safety plan?	No. A WAP authorises corridor access subject to conditions. Responsibility for health and safety risk management remains with the applicant.

End of CAR Supporting Tool D