

29 June 2018

Marlborough District Council

PO Box 443

Blenheim 7240

Attention: Louise Walker

By email only: louise.walker@marlborough.govt.nz
mep@marlborough.govt.nz

RE: RESPONSE TO MINUTE 28

TOPIC 17 Transportation and Signage

1. Introduction

1.1. Thank you for the opportunity to provide clarity on some of the technical requirements of the Marlborough Environment Plan (MEP).

1.2. **This response addresses paragraphs 57 to 59 of Kate Searle's evidence for Topic 17.**

1.3. In order to respond appropriately to the minute, I have sought confirmation and agreement from Marlborough Roads about the errors (or incorrectly transposed) in the following areas:

- Table 2.7
- Table 2.9
- Figures 2.6 and 2.7
- Standard 2.32.4.2

1.4. I haven't addressed the points of our submission that related to the consequential amendments required by the inclusion of the One Network Road Classification (ONRC). I consider this will happen as a consequential amendment of our submission on ONRC being accepted.

2. Amendments

2.1. Table 2.7 has the figures in columns **“Min. Width”** and **“Min. Formation Width”** around the wrong way. In the table below, I have marked up the correct way this should be shown (in red).

Table 2.7 Vehicle Crossing Widths

No. Units Served	Min. Width	Min. Formation Width	Qualification
1	3.5m NA	NA 3.5m	
2-4	3.5m 3m	3m 3.5m	Sealed
5-6	6m 5m	5m 6m	Sealed. Width allows passing

2.2. Table 2.9 has an incorrect figure in the row **“National & Arterial, <100”** and the **corresponding column “0-20”**. I have made the appropriate amendment in the table below (in red).

Table 2.9 Maximum Number of Vehicle Crossings

Road Hierarchy (as identified in Appendix 17)	Legal Speed Limit for Road (km/hr)	Frontage Length			
		0-20m	21-60m	61-100m	101 +m
Local & Collector	Any	1	2	2	3
National & Arterial	<100	2 1	1	2	2
National & Arterial	100	1	1	1	2

2.3. The amendment makes the correction to allow only 1 vehicle crossing per road frontage of the identified length.

2.4. Figure 2.6 as presently drafted indicates a ‘6.0m radius’; this should be 9.0m radius.

2.5. Figure 2.7 should also be able to apply for some non-residential activities. Noting that there will be instances where a unique design is required (this is accounted for in 2.32.4.3, 2.32.4.6, 2.32.4.10). **The caption should include the following words after “[...] Rural Users [...]”: ‘or appropriate non-residential use’.**

2.6. There is no diagram or clear direction for activities that are not residential. Acknowledging that 2.32.4.3 states that for activities other than residential must be constructed to a commercial standard, in accordance with Table 2.6; this can be strengthened by also adding **“and agreed by the Road Controlling Authority.”**

2.7. Standard 2.32.4.2 has the sentence *“This Standard does not apply if a Corridor Access Request has been approved by the Roding Authority”*. **This sentence is not entirely accurate. The following changes are proposed: “This Standard does not apply if an Corridor Access Plan Request has been approved by the Roding Controlling Authority”.**

2.8. The above changes are made for the following reasons:

- A Corridor Access Request is to grant approval to work within the road corridor. It isn't approval of plans. Therefore, the change to “Access Plan” is more appropriate.
- Road Controlling Authority is the correct term, Roding Authority, while it may convey a similar purpose, it is considered that the actual term is more appropriate.

3. Concluding remarks

3.1. The Transport Agency has written this response in conjunction with Marlborough Roads, accordingly it is signed by both parties.

3.2. If the Council, or the Panel have any questions or would like clarification on any matter, please get in touch with Kathryn Barrett.



Kathryn Barrett
NZ Transport Agency



Frank Porter
Marlborough Roads