

BEFORE PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER OF a proposed plan change to rezone land at 611
Rangitikei Line to establish the Whiskey
Creek Residential Area

SUMMARY OF TRANSPORT REVIEW OF CHRIS ROSSITER (SECTION 42A OFFICER)

Summary Statement of Chris Rossiter BSc, BA(Open), CPEngNZ

- [1] My full name is Michael Christopher Rossiter. I hold the position of Principal Transportation Engineer at Stantec New Zealand Limited (Stantec). I have been in this position since 2013 and have been employed at Stantec (and TDG prior to its incorporation with Stantec) since 2006. Prior to joining TDG (now part of Stantec) in 2006, I was employed as a Principal Systems Engineer and Technical Manager with BAE Systems in England.
- [2] I hold the academic qualifications of Bachelor of Science from the University of Exeter and Bachelor of Arts (Open) from the Open University.
- [3] I am registered as a Chartered Engineer with Engineering New Zealand. I have over 35 years engineering experience including 15 years' transportation engineering in New Zealand on a wide range of projects involving transportation engineering, transportation planning and assessment, analytical investigations and road safety audits.

Code of Conduct

- [4] I confirm that I have prepared this summary in accordance with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in Part 7 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. The issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise except where I state that I am relying on the evidence or advice of another person. The data, information, facts and assumptions I have considered in forming my opinions are set out in the part of the evidence in which I express my opinions. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I have expressed.
- [5] I have been engaged by Palmerston North City Council to review the transportation elements of the Plan Change Application.

Summary statement

- [6] My transport engineering review of the application and the additional information received in response to the request for further information is attached to the s42A report prepared by Mr Asgar, at Appendix G.
- [7] My review of the Urban Design and Landscaping Report identified aspects of the proposed road cross-sections that are inconsistent with the Palmerston North City Council (PNCC) Engineering Standards. In my opinion, these are matters that could be addressed as part of the Engineering Approval process and do not affect the assessment of the plan change transport effects.
- [8] I consider that the proposed cycle network could be improved with an off-road shared path along (immediately adjacent to) Road 1 to provide a safer route for inexperienced cyclists, for example school children. Road 1 provides a more direct route than the proposed paths through the reserve and it is important that such facilities are provided on routes (such as Road 1) that are most likely to be used, to promote active modes of transport. I recommend that there should be a provision in the plan to provide for this outcome, although I have not sighted this in the provisions that I have reviewed to date.
- [9] The primary access to the Plan Change site will be via a new roundabout on Benmore Avenue. I agree that this is an appropriate intersection form and that this will be able to operate with low levels of delay. I have identified some potential safety concerns with the concept design which enables high speed entry and exit for some paths. These concerns and also concerns about the effects of the design on property access will need to be addressed. I have recommended a policy that allows flexibility with the design and intersection configuration so that this can be resolved at the subdivision development stage.
- [10] I have concerns regarding the effects of additional traffic on the operation of the Rangitikei Street / Bennett Street signals. In my opinion the information provided in relation to the signals is subjective, without analytic basis. Based on my own observations, the Bennett Street signal phase is running at close to capacity at peak times with average side road delays of 40-50 seconds which represents a Level of Service D. No information has been presented as to the spare capacity of

the signals. If the additional demands means that queues are unable to clear on each cycle, there could be a rapid increase in delays. I cannot therefore be confident as to the cumulative impact of traffic on the level of service of this intersection.

- [11] I disagree with Ms Fraser's proposed amendment to Policy 2.8 in relation to the roads (in Ms Fraser's evidence at paragraph 35), because it is internally contradictory. I understand that the reason for the change is to maintain flexibility around the detail of the cross section. However a collector road under the engineering standards is required to have a width of 19.2 m, so the policy could not specify a minimum width of 15.5 **and** compliance with the engineering standards. This would be a confusing policy in practice.
- [12] In principle, flexibility with the collector road standard width may be appropriate where it is adjacent to the local amenity reserve (where it would be vested in Council), but in my opinion this policy outcome should provide for road design to be 'generally' in accordance with the engineering standards. This would provide some flexibility in detailed design (such as possible reductions in footpath widths from road reserve where adjacent to a local amenity reserve), and would allow for engagement between the developer and the Council (including infrastructure and reserves teams) at the time of subdivision.

3 June 2022

Chris Rossiter