

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

Submission under the Resource Management Act 1991 on Private Plan Change 46 – 160 Bangor Road, Selwyn District Plan

To: Selwyn District Council, Planning Department
PO Box 90
ROLLESTON 7643

Submitter: NZ Transport Agency
PO Box 1479
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

Pursuant to Clause 5 the Resource Management Act 1991, the **NZ Transport Agency** (NZTA) hereby makes this submission in respect of Plan Change 46.

NZ Transport Agency's submission is:

1. NZ Transport Agency Supports in Part Plan Change 46.
2. NZ Transport Agency (the Agency) is responsible for contributing to an affordable, integrated, safe and responsive and sustainable land transport system. In this context the Agency is responsible for the safe and efficient operation and improvement of the State Highway Network. The Agency has an interest in the proposal as the site has SH 73 along its north east boundary and SH 77 along the southern boundary.
3. Specific concerns of the Agency relate to:
 - Reverse Sensitivity
 - Location of higher density development
 - Direct Property Vehicle Access to State Highway 77 & 73
 - Future Access to SH 73

Reverse Sensitivity

4. The Agency manages the effects of reverse sensitivity on the State Highway network by requiring separation and setback distances between habitable buildings and the road edge; and requiring design and construction of sensitive activities to meet "maximum" internal sound levels of AS/NZ2107:2000. What we seek in terms of mitigation depends on the traffic volume and speeds of the State Highway adjoining sensitive activities. Development for residential purposes is considered a sensitive activity.
5. Based on the traffic volumes and speed of SH73 and SH77 the Agency would require a 20m Environmental Buffer Area from the road edge to discourage any noise sensitive activity, and require that effects of road noise is mitigated within 80m from the road edge through acoustic internal building design to the AS/NZ2107:200 standard.
6. Proposed Rule 4.9.5 by the applicant will meet our guidelines for a 20m environmental buffer. However proposed Rule 4.9.6 will not meet our guidelines for mitigating the effects of a noise sensitive activity, as only buildings within 40m are required to be acoustically insulated.

Requested Relief:

7. Reword proposed rule 4.9.6 to provide for 80m of acoustic internal noise insulation from the road edge of State Highway.

Location of higher density development

8. The density of development to some extent defines the urban boundary and is a factor in determining our speed limit decisions. In the case of this proposal the Agency see the opportunity to better define the urban boundary and hence consider speed limit reductions, but is of the view that balanced development to either side of the state highway is important for clearly establishing an intuitive speed transition zone.
9. Based on the density of development to the south of SH 77 the Agency are supportive of the higher density lots up to the eastern side of the proposed second access to SH77. This change would support the Agencies strategic objectives on this corridor by balancing the urban development on the northern and southern sides of SH77. We are not supportive of higher density lots from the western side if the proposed second SH77 road access to the western boundary of the proposed zone (refer Attachment). Having a higher density of development along this section of the zone will result in an unbalanced urban edge which can produce implications for managing and setting speeds limits.

Requested Relief:

10. Remove higher density 3700m² lots between the western side if the proposed second SH77 road access to the western boundary of the proposed zone as per attachment. Replace these with 2ha lot density.

Direct Property Vehicle Access to State Highway 77 & 73

11. Direct property vehicle access for higher density lots adjoining SH77 is proposed. This is likely to be appropriate for those lots proposed up to the eastern side of the proposed second access to SH77, and this will have an impact on considering appropriate future speed limits on SH77. The Agency does not support lots from the western side if the proposed second SH77 road access to the western boundary of the proposed zone for the reasons detailed above.
12. The Agency seek no direct property vehicle access to SH 73, so as to maintain the strategic function of SH 73 and to retain a tight and intuitive urban boundary.

Relief Sought:

13. No direct property vehicle access to the zone from SH77 from the western side if the proposed second SH77 access road to the western boundary of the proposed zone. No direct property vehicle access to SH 73. That this explicit requirement be embedded in the rules and ODP.

Future Access to SH 73

14. Through early consultation the Agency indicated that having access to SH73 would be desirable for the North West growth area of Darfield to achieve integrated urban design. However we saw that any such access would be best placed closer to the urban core of Darfield, to the south east of the proposed zone. However land to the south east is not presently being proposed to be developed, however the applicant has indicated on the ODP a

potential future road connection. We see a future connection from the zone to the south east as very important from a connectivity perspective.

Relief Sought:

15. The ODP, associated policy and rules strengthened to ensure that there is an explicit requirement for a road connection to the east to secure future connections back into the urban area and ultimately onto SH73 closer to Darfield township.

The NZ Transport Agency does wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Dated at Christchurch this 23rd day of September 2013.



 **Steve Higgs**
Planning and Investment

Address for Service:

NZ Transport Agency
PO Box 1479
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

Attention: Caroline Hutchison

Phone: (03) 966 7808

[illegible]

No direct property vehicle access to
Stl 73