

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF CHRISTOPHER WILLIAM GROOM

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE E – ROXBURGH CRESCENT

A. INTRODUCTION

- [1] My full name is Christopher William Groom. I prepared a s42A report dated 23 April 2025 (**s42A Report**) and a Statement of Reply evidence dated 15 May 2025.
- [2] I have been engaged by Palmerston North City Council to provide expert witness evidence in relation to the transportation matters of Plan Change E to the Palmerston North District Plan (**PCE**).
- [3] I have reviewed the Transport Assessment for the Roxburgh Crescent Plan Change prepared by my colleague Matthew Evis and I support the findings of the report.

B. SUMMARY OF TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

- [4] The anticipated yield of the plan change area is approximately 104 households. The full development of the site is expected to result in approximately 83 morning peak trips and 707 daily trips over a typical weekday. This results in a net reduction of 44 morning peak trips and 683 daily trips compared to industrial activities, which is a 49% reduction in daily traffic volumes. Therefore, there is sufficient capacity available to support traffic generated by the proposed Plan Change area without having a detrimental impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.
- [5] The internal roading network as outlined in the Structure Plan, will provide permeability and connectivity between the site and the surrounding roading network. The site is also well connected to the public transport network with a five-minute walk to a bus route with a 15-minute peak frequency and a 30-minute off-peak frequency.

C. UNRESOLVED MATTERS

- [6] The remaining unresolved matters can be summarised as:
- (a) Road B becoming optional, which I consider as necessary to delivering a well-connected and walkability within the area for future landowners.

- (b) Angled parking adjacent to the reserve is preferred to provide access for people using the Manawātū River corridor.
- (c) No support for the use of private roads.

D. FRANCES HOLDINGS LIMITED

Parking provision

- [7] With regards to the proposed 20.5m cross section (road type D), the submitter queried the need for 90-degree parking and requested parallel parking instead. In my view, 90-degree parking is required to provide sufficient parking for the users of the Manawatu River Pathway and adjacent public open spaces.

Pedestrian and cycle access

- [8] Regarding pedestrian and cycle access, the structure plan includes a path between 571 and 577 Ruahine Street that would replace an existing vehicle accessway. I do not support removing the pedestrian and cycle path from the structure plan, as it would discourage active modes by making routes less direct.

Removal of local street B

- [9] I do not support the proposed replacement of local street B with rights-of-way as contained in the indicative subdivision plan provided by the submitter. The long right-of-ways shown within the indicative layout plan also raise safety concerns, particularly with respect to an increased risk of low-speed run-over fatalities (i.e. when a child is run over whilst playing on a driveway). I am not opposed to the proposal for a laneway to be used instead of right of ways for the northern section of road B because it avoids reversing manoeuvres. However, there are limitations with the laneway such as no parking areas and confusion around public access. I prefer road B to remain.

Width of Roxburgh Crescent

- [10] The structure plan retains the current width of Roxburgh Crescent of 13m and applies the same width for cross sections A and B. This would allow for two footpaths, two traffic lanes, a berm and parking on one side of the street. It has been proposed by the submitter that

Roxburgh Crescent be widened to 15m to allow parking to be provided on both sides of the street. In my opinion, the proposed carriageway width is suitable for residential purposes because narrower streets encourage slower vehicle operating speeds and visitor parking can be accommodated on one side of the street. I have calculated the potential parking in my reply at para 4 and supporting appendices. I do not consider the plan change prevents the landowner constructing a wider road if that is something they wish to do.

19 May 2025

Christopher William Groom