



Re: Invite to comment under s70 on draft conditions of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 - Pound Road Industrial Development

From Cass Jones [REDACTED]
Date Tue 2026-03-31 1:26 PM
To Substantive <Substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>

Response to draft conditions of Pound Road Industrial Development:

We still have specific concerns about safety aspects and loss of amenity due to the proposed alterations to Barbers Rd, and are disappointed that these concerns have been dismissed as not an issue or not required to be addressed by the applicant.

New southern intersection on Barbers Rd

In particular we remain concerned about the safety aspects of the new southern intersection on Barbers Rd.

We are currently looking forward to using the new southern express cycle way section currently under construction between barbers road and Kirk road to be able to get our children safely to kindergarten and school in Templeton township on foot / bicycle,

A primary concern though, is how we can get them safely from our road access on Barbers Rd to the new cycle way segment given the expected increase in traffic the new development will bring around school commute hours, especially as the development is likely to continue the increase in traffic as it progresses over the next decade and as that happens the children will get older and eventually be making the commute unsupervised.

The modelling from the integrated traffic assessment shows a significant increase in traffic at peak hours flowing down Waterloo Rd from Main South via Kirk road, up Barbers Rd and into the intersection in question.

The proposed location of this intersection overlaps our vehicle access way, making it effectively part of what is predicted by modelling to become a busy intersection.

The applicants response to our submission notes that left turning out of the site will be unaffected, however we turn right at peak traffic hours every day with children, this right turn exit will be directly into what will become the busy intersection.

The applicant's response mentions a 16 metre separation, referring to the available subdivision plan diagrams, this measurement appears to be the centreline offset between the new road and Barbers Rd vehicle crossing, however due to the width and radii of these they will overlap

The statement by the applicant that there is no minimum distance between a vehicle crossing and

[REDACTED]

intersection as per the council plan is not complete, district plan "7.4.4.15 Minimum distance between vehicle crossings and intersections" leaves this as a matter of discretion for the council, specifically on matters of "potential confusion between vehicles turning at the crossing or the intersection" and "The effects on the safety of users of all transport modes"

If the intersection already existed at the current location and we applied to have a vehicle crossing on our property at it's current location when an alternative location exists, it's highly unlikely the application would be granted, we would be told to put the vehicle crossing in a different location, the reverse should apply for the subdivision access intersection, there is no functional necessity for it to be in the proposed location, whereas our vehicle access is pre-existing.

- We request at the very least the location of new southern barthers intersection be required to be moved from the northern boundary edge of proposed lot 1 to it's southern boundary,

We assume it is already the case, but as we don't see it stated anywhere, the intersection should also be required to have a give way or stop sign for traffic exiting the subdivision.

This would make no difference to traffic access to, and internal traffic flow within the subdivision while making it substantially safer for us and in particular our children to exit our property turning right onto Barthers Rd, the cost to making these changes is negligible while no ground has been broken or land parcels yet divided.

Foot paths and pedestrian crossings

The correspondence between the CCC and the applicant states there will be widening Barthers Rd to accommodate the increased traffic.

We note that although there is to be a separated shared use path along pound road, there does not appear to be one planned along Barthers Rd,

We are concerned that the widening of the road will consume the grass verge without providing a shared use path leaving no safe space for children (or adults) to walk down Barthers Road

The applicant has also stated that no pedestrian crossings are necessary at the intersection of barthers / Waterloo Rd as there will be one at the intersection of Waterloo and pound road, accessible via cycleways / footpaths internal to the subdivision.

This doesn't solve the issue of getting children safely to school in Templeton township, as this way one must first cross a now busy road to get to the subdivision to access a pedestrian crossing that is a significant detour in the wrong direction, pedestrians, especially younger ones will inevitably take the shortest path available, so will likely end up crossing Waterloo Rd at the intersection of Barthers Rd, regardless of whether there is a pedestrian crossing there or not

- We request that if Barthers Road is to be widened, a separated shared use path be required to be installed down the residential side of the road to allow residents safe pedestrian cycle access without having to share space with heavy traffic

- We request a pedestrian crossing be required across Waterloo Rd on the western side of it's

intersection with Barthers to facilitate safe crossing for Barthers Rd residents to the new section of the Southern Express Cycleway towards Templeton township,

- We also request a pedestrian crossing be required across Barthers road to allow safe access to the proposed reserve.

Both cases would require a bare minimum of an unsignalled / painted crossing, this would provide substantial improvements to pedestrian safety at next to no cost and would not create significant impediment to traffic flow due to low pedestrian volume

Loss of Rural Character

The applicant intends to remove the existing hedging along the eastern side of Barthers / Haskets Rds and plant a 5 metre nature strip,

The existing hedging is well established, and it may take 10 to 20 years for the new plantings to provide similar amenity to maintaining the rural character.

Even a modestly sized 2m tall bund would go a long way towards quickly restoring the rural character that removing the existing hedging would destroy, as well as help reduce noise disruption.

We request that a bund requirement be considered.

We are also concerned with who will maintain the nature strip, the subdivision plan diagram does not show a reserve area for it, so is the nature strip to be planted on the subdivided land parcels or public land?

- If it's going to be on the subdivided land parcels, then we request that a covenant be put in place mandating the nature strip be maintained in perpetuity, otherwise we request the nature strip be vested as a reserve

Regards,

Cass Jones & Gemma McLaughlin

On 3/17/26 14:40, Substantive wrote:

Tēnā koe

You are receiving this email as you provided invited comments on the Pound Road Industrial Development application by NTP Development Holdings Limited (the Applicant).

Release of Draft Conditions

On 17 March 2026, the Pound Road Industrial Development Expert Panel (the Panel) issued draft conditions. In accordance with section 70 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, (the Act), an Expert Panel must invite comments on the proposed draft conditions from:

- the applicant,