

MDC Plan Change 51: Precinct 4 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 further submission on proposed plan change 51. I hold a Bachelor of Arts in Economics and Environmental Studies and have practiced as a Planner for central and local government and the private sector. I am an associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and have five years planning experience.
2. As the submissions were pre-circulated, I will take this opportunity to summarise the Transport Agency's key points and outstanding matters. I have read the officers s42A report and note the applicant's rejection of the Transport Agency's submission and further submission.
3. **The Transport Agency remains supportive of the inclusion of the following approaches and matters within proposed plan change 51:**
 - a. Planned and integrated residential growth in the Manawatu Region.
 - b. The promotion of a multi-modal land transport system within the proposed structure plan.
 - c. The inclusion of policies which ensure all new lots will have safe and adequate vehicle access from the roading network.
4. As noted in the s42A report, a meeting was attended by NZTA on 11 July with staff and consultants representing Manawatu District Council. I confirm that it was agreed between the parties at that meeting that a funding mechanism for an ultimate solution to the potential intersection failure could occur outside of the District Plan process. The Transport Agency is committed to ongoing engagement with Manawatu District Council in this regard.
5. The key outstanding matters in the Transport Agency's submission therefore relate to the need for an intersection treatment at the North Street/Pharazyn Road/SH 54 intersection. The Transport Agency notes that the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) undertaken by OPUS consultants and the subsequent review by Beca Limited identify the proposed development will ultimately cause the intersection to fail.

6. Of concern to the Transport Agency is the expected timing of this failure. There is currently a lack of certainty regarding how the proposed development will be managed to avoid exceeding the point at which the safety of the State Highway is compromised. The Agency accepts that a solution doesn't necessarily need to be in place at this time. It does maintain however that a policy to ensure development is not allowed to progress beyond the point of an intersection failure occurring should be embedded within the plan through an appropriate policy.
7. During the aforementioned meeting, the appropriateness of including the term 'Stage 3' as a 'trigger point' within the plan was discussed. 'Stage 3' is understood to represent 50% of the proposed development and was identified by the Transport Agency as a means of providing certainty that adverse effects could be managed to ensure a suitable intersection treatment would be achieved prior to any adverse effects to the State Highway occurring.
8. If a suitable alternative trigger can be identified and imbedded within policy then the primary intent of the Agency's submission in this regard would still be met. This was confirmed to Council by email and is submitted as an appendix to the s42A report by Ms Harris. The s42A report appears to suggest that annual monitoring by Council will be sufficient to address these concerns. There remains a lack of detail regarding how any monitoring undertaken by Council would be used to ensure development does not progress beyond the point at which an intersection failure results in effects to the safe operation of the State Highway at Site 3.
9. With regard to NZTA's further submission, it is understood from the officers s42A report that 'essential infrastructure' within policy 4.4 was not intended to apply to non-council infrastructure.
10. Although the State Highway is not identified as 'essential infrastructure' within the current provisions of the plan, it is infrastructure that is critically important in terms of providing a safe roading network for existing users. Its ongoing safe operation is also essential to enabling future development such as is proposed for Precinct 4.
11. Accepting that Policy 4.4 is not intended to be utilised for infrastructure outside of that owned by Council, the Transport Agency seeks an alternative policy to ensure due consideration of the impact of the development to the State Highway is considered by decision makers at the appropriate time.

12. The Transport Agency will continue to engage in good faith with the Council regarding a potential solution and the funding of such a solution outside of the District Plan process. Certainty however is still sought within the District Plan provisions to ensure that the safety of the intersection and road users is not compromised in the interim.
13. I am happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.