Te Ahu a Turanga: Manawatū Gorge Replacement Route Project

Hearing Panel Questions and Responses

Notices of Requirement for Designations under section 168 of the RMA 1991 Act.

Expert Witness	**Harriet Fraser**
Date/version	**14 March 2019 Version 1**

Panel Questions to NZTA

Questions to NZTA regarding Executive Summary			
Page	**Para**	**Question**	**Harriet Fraser additional comment**
11		In light of the safety concerns expressed by David Dunlop (his para 166), why is a dedicated path for pedestrians and cyclists over the existing SH3 Ashhurst Bridge not being considered and/or implemented a part of this project?	My understanding is that the clip on or similar is to be constructed in 2020. As such it would be in place prior to opening and possibly also for much of the construction period. Would be useful to understand the timeframe for the construction of the shared path between the existing Ashhurst Bridge and the Manawatu Gorge Scenic Reserve carpark.

Questions to NZTA regarding Volume 2			
Page	**Para**	**Question**	**Harriet Fraser additional comment**
30		Please outline why the Ashhurst roundabout is required to have two circulating lanes yet the Woodville roundabout only has one. Why does the central median need to be between 4.0 and 6.0 metres wide? Is it feasible to reduce the width of the central median in order to facilitate the provision of a shared pedestrian/cyclist pathway along the route?	Andrew Whaley responds at his paras 200 and 203 and I agree with this response. David Dunlop replies at his paras 106 and 107 and is consistent with Andrew Whaley. Andrew Whaley responds at para 204 and response seems reasonable.
33		What are the implications in terms of travel time and distance for wind turbine access roads only being accessible as left in/left out from the	David Dunlop responds at his paras 108 and 109. He rightly points out that accesses off the Project road will only be used for oversize infrequent loads. I

		proposed road?	consider his response to be reasonable.
109		Why does the CTMP not also propose to minimise night time construction traffic through Woodville? Please confirm that the CTMP will specify construction traffic routes which will be enforced.	David Dunlop responds at his paras 110 to 113. I consider his response to be reasonable.
	Condition 22	The CTMP does not include restrictions on traffic in Woodville. Please provide an explanation as to why this is.	Commented on above.

Volume 3A Technical Assessments			
Questions to NZTA regarding Transport - David Dunlop			
Page	**Para**	**Question**	**Harriet Fraser additional comment**
7	21	How might use of the bridge differ during the summer holiday period?	David Dunlop responds at his paras 114 and 115. He says that summer activity 'may' be higher. I would say that it 'will' be higher and that with the clip on or similar it will be considerably higher .
7	21	Can you please explain what your recommendation (last sentence) means in practice?	David Dunlop responds at his paras 116 and 118. He says that his recommendation is that safe walking and cycling facilities between the Ashhurst Bridge and the Manawatu Gorge Scenic Reserve carpark are provided. He does not explain what the form of these facilities would be and refers to a proposed condition being included in Ms McLeod's evidence. The proposed condition 26 b)iii at pages 35 and 36 of Ms McLeod's evidence reads 'pedestrian and cycling facilities must be provided between the Manawatu Gorge Scenic Reserve car park and the State Highway 3 Ashhurst Bridge'. This condition does not provide any certainty with regard to the form of the proposed facilities and I therefore prefer the condition proposed in the s 42A evidence .At para 118 David Dunlop implies that cycling and pedestrian facilities are not needed between Ashhurst and the existing Bridge along the SH3 route as there are existing facilities through the Ashhurst Domain and alongside the river. I **disagree** with this as per my paras 103 g), 110 and 141 Operational Phase c).

7	24	Please clarify why a largely qualitative assessment has been undertaken rather than a quantative one, and why this was an appropriate basis, in your view, for assessing the traffic effects of the NOR.	David Dunlop responds at his paras 119 and 120. I agree that travel patterns with the Project can be expected to be similar to the pre-closure situation. Some qualitative assessment was inevitable; **my concern** has been around the balancing of adverse traffic effects between different parts of the network, in particular with regard to safety.
10	38, 39	Please explain the effects of limiting right turns in relation to individual access roads affected by this means of operation. Please also provide more information on how frequent the emergency vehicle crossover points will be provided and how they will be managed to avoid use by the general public.	David Dunlop responds at his paras 121 and 122. I am comfortable with his responses. The detail of accesses to individual properties in particular in the vicinity of the roundabouts should be considered as the design progresses and with the next stage of road safety auditing.
21	Figure 1.12	Please add, even if indicatively, the vertical alignment of Pahiatua track to the figure.	Provided at David Dunlop para 123.
21	63	It is stated that there are fundamental operational issues in relation to terrain for both Saddle Road and Pahiatua Track. Please provide clarification of how, in your view, these routes are suitable for cyclists given those terrain constraints.	David Dunlop responds at his paras 124 to 126. He considers that the terrain constraints are not as relevant for cyclists. **I disagree** and consider the Project route with a reduced overall climb, less steep and smoother grades and shorter length will be an attractive alternative to both Saddle Road and the Pahiatua Track. At para 126 he considers that traffic volumes are a key operational constraint for cyclists. I agree that vehicle traffic volumes are one of the factors which is likely to affect route choice by cyclists but consider that terrain, and directness of the route will also be as if not more important. Johnathan Kennett adds at his para 39 that the climb is significantly less on the new highway compared with Saddle Road and the Pahiatua Track. I agree with this.
31, 70	86, 208	It is stated that the Palmerston North Ring Road Route may lead to changes in active mode travel patterns accessing Manawatu Gorge. If this is expected to increase accessibility, and in general terms increased pedestrian and cyclists demand in anticipated anyway, please explain	David Dunlop responds at his paras 127 to 130. It is noted that NZTA have now committed to a clip-on or similar on the existing Ashhurst Bridge. Andrew Whaley at paras 216 to 220 describes the possible form and cost of a separated path. I generally agree with his assessment regarding the likely cross-

		the rationale behind making no provision within the existing SH3 bridge for these modes. Please also explain how this may change the need for a cycle/walking track, how might a combined cycle, walking and equestrian track be incorporated within the NOR, what would be the cost implications and the design constraints and opportunities and what might a typical cross section look like.	section of such a facility. Given that 1.5m wide shoulders have previously been shown it would seem likely that some 0.5m could be gained from each shoulder if there was a separated path.
34	Table 1-3	Please confirm whether the 2012 and 2017/28 crash records are indeed the same or if this is an error.	David Dunlop responds at para 131 that they are the same and this is not an error.
34	Tables 1-3 and 1-5	For 2016 and 2017/18, please providing information on the types of crashes occurring and an assessment of how they may have changed over time as a result the closure of SH3 through Manawatu Gorge.	David Dunlop responds at paras 132 to 134. I consider his response to be reasonable.
46	133	Please provide a summary of the SIDRA output for all intersections analysed.	David Dunlop responds at para 135 and in Appendix A. The proposed roundabouts are shown performing well. The summary provided is simplistic with no traffic volumes, queuing included in the summary and the time period and year for the analysis is not stated. Would also be useful understand the assumed geometry and whether any of the program defaults were changed. **This should be confirmed.** My comments on the Sidra outputs included in Appendix A are similar to those above for the roundabouts. In particular it would be useful to know the assumed geometry and to see a more detailed breakdown of the performance including individual turns and queuing. For instance I would expect the right turn traffic from SH3 (W) to SH2 (S) to interfere with the through traffic flows. I consider the inclusion of the roundabout at SH3/SH2 not helpful as I am of the view that it is very unlikely that this would be an appropriate or workable intersection form in this location.
47	134	Please explain the rationale for excluding the SH2/Sh3	David Dunlop responds at his paras 136 and 137. **I disagree** that the capacity

		intersection from the NOR if capacity issues with and without the project are expected.	issues are solely the result of traffic growth and that they should be addressed as part of NZTA's network management. An increase in delay on the SH2(S) approach from 2.5 minutes to more than 14 minutes is not acceptable. This will result in traffic bypassing through the local streets and increased crashes as a result of driver frustration and risk taking. I am not aware of other intersections where such delays are considered normal or acceptable.
49	151	Please provide information as to the crash rate per million vehicle kilometres travelled rather than just the crash number on Saddle Road and Pahiatua Track pre and post closure of SH3 through Manawatu Gorge.	David Dunlop replies at his paras 138 to 141. I consider his response to be satisfactory.
51	162	Has your opinion on the likely use of the new route by cyclists changed in light of the number of submitters requesting the provision of a shared pathway for cycling and walking along the new route?	Johnathan Kennett responds at his paras 40 to 45. I consider that a separated path is preferred on safety grounds, regardless of the level of demand, in line with best practice, safe system design and the One Network Road Classification of the route. The level of interest through the submissions does indicate that there is demand for such a facility.
51	163	Have you consulted with the NZ Cycle Trial administrators regarding their preference for the national trail – namely reinstating the Pahiatua Track or instead routing the trial over the new route?	Johnathan Kennett responds at his para 46. Johnathan considers that the most likely route would be Saddle Road. **I agree** that Saddle Road will be preferable to the Pahiatua Track. However a track through the Gorge is likely to be safer and provide better amenity for cyclists than any of the on road options.
52	164	Please expand on why use of the existing Pahiatua Track or Saddle Road as a cycle connection between east and west sides of the Ruahine Ranges is a 'more convenient and parallel to the Project route with similar distance' when one of the justifications for the proposed route is travel time saving for motorised vehicles.	David Dunlop replies at his paras 145 and 146. **I disagree** with David, I consider that cycle speeds on the Project route will be higher than on Saddle Road or the Pahiatua Track given the lesser climb and the reduced and smoothed grades. The Project route is also the shortest and most direct connection between Ashhurst and Woodville.
55-62, 71	172-179,	Which, if any, of the affected property owners have given consent to the proposed changes	Lonnie Dalzell answers at his paras 104 and 105. No consent has been provided

	211	to their means of access?	by any affected landowners.
62	179	Can you please clarify why you consider the access effects to be neutral given the submissions received from a number of directly affected property owners?	David Dunlop replies at his para 147. I consider that any access matters for properties close to the roundabouts can be addressed through detailed design and the road safety audit process.
63	186-189	How do the estimates of construction traffic demands reflect recommendations in the noise and vibration report (paragraph 32) that construction traffic should primarily access Saddle Road from the east end and traffic through Ashhurst should be kept to a minimum? How practical would such an approach?	David Dunlop responds at his paras 148 and 149. His response is reasonable. The CTMP will need to balance a number of factors.
65	193	Is there sufficient space to address your suggested construction traffic mitigations within the existing road corridor? If not, what are the effects on the extents of the NOR?	David Dunlop replies at his paras 150 and 151. David is confident that safe access can be provided. Without seeing possible layouts and how these interact with the existing passing lanes on Saddle Road it is not in my mind certain that this can be achieved.
66	202	Can you please explain what "provisions for safe facilities for vulnerable users at these locations" (last sentence) means in practice?	David Dunlop responds at his paras 152 and 153. I consider his response reasonable.
70	210	Given the NOR does not include the Cambridge Road / SH3 intersection, what mechanism do you consider appropriate to ensure that this intersection upgrade is undertaken in sufficient time to address the identified effects of the Project?	David Dunlop responds at his para 154. He recommends that is conditioned. The proposed condition 26 b)i at pages 35 and 36 of Ms McLeod's evidence includes that prior to the opening of the new road 'the intersections of SH3 with York Street and Cambridge Avenue must be improved to redirect traffic onto the new road'. I agree that a condition to this effect is needed.
74	223(d)	In your opinion, are the proposed shoulders wide enough to ensure the safety of cyclists?	David Dunlop replies at his para 155. He considers that the shoulder width is 'appropriate' and 'significantly better than other facilities on the wider network in the area'. **I disagree**, no reference has been made to why the One Network Road Classification/ best practice / safety audit recommendations are not relevant. I **agree** that the proposed provision will be safer than on Saddle Road and the Pahiatua track but will still not be safe

			and not safe system. David Dunlop replies at his paras 156 and 157. This is also my understanding. Johnathan Kennett responds to both questions at his para 47. He is of the view that with rumble strips and a shy space to the barrier that the provision is safer than on the old Manawatu Gorge road. I **agree** that it is safer but I do not agree that is the appropriate standard for the new road, which is still not safe and not safe system. I also note that comparisons with the old Manawatu Gorge Road are not relevant given that the Do Minimum is the existing roading arrangement.
Appendix 1A	1.1	Please provide information on the limitations of Blip Track as a data course and how much reliance has been placed on it in relation to the development of the directional distribution.	David Dunlop replies at his paras 158 to 162. I consider his response to be reasonable.
Appendix 1A	1.2	Why, in your view, would people travelling from Palmerston North to SH2 south route via the Project route? What are the comparative travel times of the Project compared to Pahiatua Track for this trip?	David Dunlop replies at his para 163. David responds that it will be 3 to 4 minutes quicker for both cars and trucks to use the Project route. I **disagree** given the delays that are forecast in Woodville and consider that the Pahiatua Track will likely be quicker and have a more reliable travel time than using the Project Route for those travelling between the Wairarapa and Palmerston North.
Appendix 1A	3.1	The five busiest routes equate to approximately 50% of demand only. How sensitive is the travel distance and time saving analysis to inclusion of additional routes to sample a greater percentage of overall demands?	David Dunlop responds at his paras 164 and 165. **I agree** with his response.
		In relation to the sub-options A-F for the western end of the NOR considered in the DBC, please provide an assessment of traffic and engineering design effects of these options.	David Dunlop responds at his paras 166 and 167 and refers to Scott Wickman's response. Scott Wickman responds at his paras 62 to 66 and 89 to 93 and attaches a copy of the DBC Ashhurst Sub-option Assessment.
		Are your conclusions/recommendations set out in paragraphs 193, 196, 207, 209, 210, 214, 215, 216, 217 and 218 all addressed in the NOR	David Dunlop replies at his paras 168 to 170. With regard to para 193 which is the site access points, he says that they aren't conditioned as they lie outside the designation and states that they will need to comply with the District Plan access

		conditions offered by NZTA?	standards. At para 215 of his main evidence he refers to the accesses being constructed in accordance with the Accessway Standards and Guidelines attached as Appendix 5B to the NZTA Planning and Policy Manual. I then included this as a suggested condition at para 206 iv. of my evidence. David responds that the mitigation in para 196 has not been conditioned as it relates to a separate project that is being undertaken currently or imminently by NZTA. I consider that a condition is appropriate as the details and certainty of the works are not fully understood.

Te Ahu a Turanga: Manawatū Gorge Replacement Route Project

Hearing Panel Questions and Responses

Notices of Requirement for Designations under section 168 of the RMA 1991 Act.

Expert Witness	**Kirsty Austin**
Date/version	**14 March 2019 Version 1**

Panel Questions to NZTA - additional comments by Kirsty Austin for the Territorial Authorities

Social Impact – Questions to Amelia Linzey		
Para	**Question**	**Kirsty Austin additional comment**
13	Given we are concerned with effects of the designation on the environment, how can we determine those effects if impacts experienced at an individual household level have not been the focus of your social impact assessment?	The SIA defined three geographic scales and considered the effects on each of those scales: region, local, project. The individual household level is essentially the 'project' scale – it included properties adjacent to the proposed roundabout and approximately 20 along the proposed route (referred to in paragraphs 31–33 of s 42A Technical Evidence: social impact).
14	Is it usual or standard practice to rely on the data you have referenced in this paragraph?	The data referred to in that paragraph is necessary information to describe the project. That is, those aspects of the project that may have social affects. Section 42A Technical Evidence: social impacts reiterates those project details, but also includes information on the processes for finalising the design, such as the Outline Plan and ECDF (paragraph 25).
16	Can you be more specific as to the specific management measures, design and implementation details you refer to in this paragraph and how do you consider we can provide for an opportunity for community input on the assumption this designation is approved?	Section 42A technical evidence (social impact) recommends the development of an Engagement Plan to provide clarity and certainty about how and when the community will have an opportunity to feed into mitigation measures (paragraphs 147-150 and 191).
55	Please provide an example of the feedback form used within the public consultation.	I note that Ms Linzey attaches this to her Statement of Evidence (attachment 2, 8 March).

143	Have you considered the 'social impacts' of the possible cessation of the Ballantrae Hill Country Research Station fertiliser trials, particularly in light of concerns raised by submitters including AgResearch, Fertiliser NZ, Balance, Beef and Lamb and various individuals?	The SIA considered this matter briefly and concluded there was of a low scale and indirect nature (paragraph 146e). The Section 42A Technical Evidence: social impact did not refer to this matter because it was considered more of an economic issue. In my opinion, it is too much of a stretch at this stage to say that an effect on fertiliser trials will have an effect on community values (our farming culture) or peoples' ability to earn an income (profitability/viability of farming).
152(b)	Can you explain why you have singled out childcare facilities for particular attention?	Childcare centres attract vulnerable users, such as parents walking pre-schoolers to the facility and pre-schoolers playing outdoors at the facility. An SIA will therefore consider the amenity and safety of these users if a project may increase/change the road environment and noise levels. For this reason the s 42A Technical Evidence: social impact refers to childcare centres in Ashhurst and Woodville in various paragraphs about potential effects and draft conditions.
	Are your conclusions/recommendations set out in paragraphs 149 to 161 addressed in the NOR conditions offered by NZTA?	Section 42A Technical Evidence: social impact recommends amendments and additions to the draft conditions to better address potential social effects through mitigation (section 9).