

## OAKURA PLAN CHANGE 48 Hearing – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION

1. Kia Ora Koutou Commissioners, my name is Kelly Standish and I thank you for the opportunity to be heard today in support of the New Zealand Transport Agency's Submission and expert planning evidence on proposed private plan change 48.
2. As the submission and evidence was pre-circulated I will take this opportunity to summarise the key points of the Transport Agency's submission.
3. **Point a) relates to reverse sensitivity** effects on the amenity and health of persons residing in close proximity to State Highways as a result of increased road noise. In paragraphs 2.2 and 2.5 the transport Agency notes its support of the changes proposed in the s42A report of Ms Anna Stevens with regard to Reverse Sensitivity, specifically Policy 23.8 and the inclusion of the proposed noise bund within the proposed structure plan.
4. I note Mr Wesley supplementary s42A report notes the 3 m high noise bund to be identified as the preferred option of the Transport Agency. I wish to clarify that the Transport Agency are primarily concerned with ensuring reverse sensitivity effects are sufficiently addressed. Whether the bund is 2 m or 3 m in height is only significant insofar as it is pertinent to mitigating noise effects in conjunction with other proposed mitigations. I note that Mr King's evidence notes at paragraph 31 that a 2 m high bund will provide adequate attenuation. The agency are happy to accept the expert position regarding the height of the noise attenuation bund.

5. Paragraph 2.6 seeks to expand the reverse sensitivity provisions under Rule Res99b to be applied also to the Rural-Lifestyle areas of the Structure Plan. It is acknowledged that these lots are larger therefore a setback could be required. Any residential activity within the 80 m setback within the Rural-Lifestyle area would be subject to potential health effects associated with unavoidable noise from SH45. To mitigate those effects, the Transport Agency request a similar rule be introduced for the Rural-Lifestyle area to ensure the NZTA acoustic standards are achieved.
6. **Point b) relates specifically to Policy 23.9.** Whilst the Transport Agency is generally supportive of the inclusion of the policy, there remains uncertainty as to whether a roundabout is the appropriate treatment for the intersection. It is also unclear that a second access to State Highway 45 would be necessary or advantageous based on the information currently available.
7. The uncertainty regarding an appropriate solution is also discussed in the joint conferencing statement which followed the caucusing between the respective traffic experts on 16 July 2019. Currently, policy 23.9 references the inclusion of a roundabout and pedestrian underpass at the State Highway 45 and Wairau Road intersection. Should the plan change be granted, flexibility regarding the potential solution identified within the policy may be beneficial to future plan users given the current uncertainty regarding the eventual intersection treatment.

Regarding State Highway 45, the Transport Agency supports the conclusion reached in Ms Stevens Supplementary 42A report at paragraph 5.4 which seeks 'additional information to better understand the traffic effects and effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed traffic measures'.

8. **Point c) seeks clarification on when** a suitable safety solution for the SH45 and Wairau Roads intersection will be required to ensure the ongoing safety of the intersection. **Point d) highlights the current lack of certainty regarding funding** for an upgrade to the intersection. It is acknowledged that Methods of Implementation for Policy 23.9 identifies the need for discussion to be undertaken in conjunction with the Transport Agency. The Transport Agency therefore seeks certainty regarding the timing the upgrade is needed and a means to ensure development does not proceed past this point until funding for an appropriate treatment is agreed, and the solution identified, designed and constructed. Should the plan change be granted requiring further investigation and identification of the appropriate solution, it may be appropriate to include reference to timing for such an upgrade to ensure safety of the State Highway is not compromised before this is achieved.
9. The joint traffic expert conferencing and the review provided by Ms Greenough identify that construction of an additional access onto SH45 is not considered appropriate on the current information available as it doesn't meet the criteria for a Limited Access Road.
10. I am happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

