

Attachment 1

Takitimu North Link - Stage 2

NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA) response to comments – 16 December 2025

NZTA acknowledges and appreciates the several statements made by commenters that agree with NZTA's proposed approach on various matters, and / or provide support for the Project, the bulk of which are not specifically addressed in this response table.

NZTA's response to comments in the table below are supported by the Statement of Evidence of Mr John Olliver (Attachment 1A). This table should be read concurrently with that Statement of Evidence.

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Commenter 1 – Kerstin Krueger – 11 November | | | | |
| 1.1 | Page 1 | Cycleway | <p><i>"To my knowledge the cycleway that was supposed to run along the whole length of TNL has been quietly scrapped for stage 2. This is not acceptable as the community strongly favoured a cycle path during all the pre construction consultations. It also seems a bit senseless to only have it run half-way.</i></p> <p><i>A dedicated cycle lane would provide a mode of alternative transport for people out this way as there is currently not even a regular bus service. Cycling on the current state highway is not a safe option.</i></p> <p><i>Please re-instate the cycle lane as per the original plans"</i></p> | <p>The provision of new walking and cycling facilities adjacent to the proposed highway is not part of the Project scope and is not necessary to mitigate the effects of the Project. A shared walking/cycling path adjacent to the proposed state highway was removed from the Project scope in 2024 as a result of Government direction (ie Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2024-2034 priorities).</p> <p>The Ōmokoroa grade separated interchange will include a shared use path and a footpath from Youngson Road across the new highway to Ōmokoroa Road. The shared use path will connect to walking and cycling facilities on Ōmokoroa Road being constructed by WBOPDC. The shared walking and cycling path will be on the western side of the interchange overbridge, continuing along the western side of the realigned Ōmokoroa Road to the Francis Road/Ōmokoroa Road roundabout. Note also that NZTA has been working alongside WBOPDC on securing sections of 'Greenlane' walking/cycling paths as an outcome of land acquisition in the Minden Lifestyle Zone area.</p> |
| Commenter 2 – Stephen and Fleur Bos – 12 November | | | | |
| NZTA acknowledges that the Bos' are in favour of the Project, subject to their concerns raised in their comment, and values the time and effort taken to provide feedback. NZTA understands the interest and concerns of local residents in this major infrastructure Project. As with most major construction projects, there will be some disruption to residents during the construction period. NZTA recognises the need to plan, communicate and implement mitigation measures to address Project effects. The specific matters raised by the Bos' are responded to below. | | | | |
| 1.2 | Page 1-2 | Noise, Traffic | <p><i>"In general we are in favour of the new road project but have the following reservations / concerns which still need to be addressed through the fasttrack consenting process."</i></p> <p><i>"The decrease in distance of the new road profile and effects associated with lighting, traffic, noise and visual impact of the widened and speed increased highway do not appear to have been suitably addressed in relation to our property, based on the information provided in the current drawing and documentation set."</i></p> <p><i>"We would look for mitigation measures such as a physical noise control and visual barrier... to ensure no adverse effects result from the proposed road construction."</i></p> | <p>NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of effects of operational traffic noise. The Bos' property is not predicted to experience noise levels above Category A (ie the lowest noise category) of the relevant standard (NZS 6806:2010), noting the property is located more than 200m from the indicative road alignment. Accordingly, mitigation measures such as physical noise barriers are not considered necessary (and would not be effective), as no adverse noise effects are predicted for the Bos' property.</p> <p>NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of potential traffic effects of the Project, including detailed modelling of future traffic volumes, speeds, local road access, and road user patterns based on the indicative alignment. The operational traffic effects of the Project are significantly positive, and there are no specific traffic mitigation measures considered necessary near the Bos' property.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.3 Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects, sections 4.2 and 6.3; and • Appendix 9.4.1 Integrated Transport Assessment, section 6.1. |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1.3 | Page 1-2 | Visual and lighting | <p>"A number of areas within our property, including the portions noted above have a view shaft to the east with the current northern extent of Munro Road visible"</p> <p>"We would look for mitigation measures such as a ...visual barrier to be installed along the crest of the fill batter for the noted western section of roading alignment to ensure no adverse effects result from the proposed road construction. This would also include suitable landscaping on the fill batter to ensure suitable blending into the adjacent environment."</p> <p>See also the second and third paragraphs quoted in the row above.</p> | <p>NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of potential landscape and visual effects for the Project, including a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis based on detailed topographical and vegetation data and verified with site visits. Due to the presence of existing vegetation surrounding the property and the separation distance of approximately 300m from the property to the alignment, the Bos' property is situated outside the ZTV. Even if there were adjustments to the design, the effects on the Bos property (being less than minor) will remain less than minor due to the distance noted above, and the extent of screen planting. Accordingly, the indicative road alignment is not expected to be visible from their property.</p> <p>Lighting along the alignment will provide suitable levels of lighting at interchanges, local road intersections and bridges to create a safe environment. Excessive light spill will be minimised through the use of modern lighting technology. Cut and fill batters will be revegetated as described in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Appendix 9.4.5) and required under the Proposed Conditions (see LV3). Once established, these will provide visual amenity along the western aspect of the alignment to screen any residual effects.</p> <p>Accordingly, mitigation measures such as a visual barrier or additional landscaping are not considered necessary, as no adverse visual effects are predicted for the Bos' property. Where effects are anticipated along the corridor, NZTA has proposed a suite of conditions¹ that will ensure landscape and visual effects of the Project are appropriately managed, including a requirement to prepare a Landscape and Visual Management Plan (see Proposed Conditions LV1-LV5).</p> <p>Further, we note that while this Application is being decided under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, the Resource Management Act 1991 does not protect views (<i>Re Meridian Energy Ltd</i> [2013] NZEnvC 59 at [112]).</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.5 Landscape Visual Impact Assessment at section 3.3, 4.3.3, 6.3, 6.4.8 and Appendix D; and • Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, LV1-LV5. |
| 1.4 | Page 2 | Public access and ownership of wetland restoration area | <p>"We are seeking clarity on the future use of the wetland and the likely users of the wetland. Will there be any ability for the area to be used by the public, which raises potential security concerns for our property being adjacent a 'remote' public reserve."</p> <p>"In addition confirmation of ownership and on going maintenance requirements of the wetland area is sought to ensure that the area is suitably maintained on a permanent basis."</p> | <p>The wetland restoration areas will be established, controlled and managed by NZTA until they are self-sustaining (10-15 years). The wetland restoration areas will be maintained in accordance with the Proposed Conditions, including a Wetland Management Plan to ensure the establishment and restoration of self-sustaining wetland ecology and hydrology (See Proposed Condition 23). NZTA's technical expert, Mr Andrew Blayney does not consider that ongoing maintenance is required beyond the establishment period to mitigate the effects of the Project on the environment. After the establishment period, no decision has been made regarding long-term ownership of the wetland restoration areas.</p> <p>At this stage, NZTA (while it owns the relevant land) does not intend to allow general public access to the wetland restoration area.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.4 Ecological Effects Assessment at Sections 3.1.2 and 5.3; and • Appendix 9.1.2 Proposed Resource Consent Conditions 15, 23 and 30. |
| Commenter 3 – Mark Simpson – 17 November | | | | |
| Comment with landowner details lodged, but no comments made on the Application. | | | | |

¹ Note that all Proposed Conditions referred to in this table are the 'October 2025' versions, unless otherwise stated.

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| Commenter 4 – Giselle Brosnahan – 19 November | | | | |
| NZTA acknowledges Ms Brosnahan's concerns about potential traffic delays during construction, including for Youngson Road and Whakamārama communities, and understands how important it is to keep the community moving and connected, as well as informed about what to expect. As with most major construction projects, there will be a certain amount of disruption as the project progresses. NZTA recognises the need to plan, communicate and implement mitigation measures to minimise disruptions to people, and has proposed conditions to address these matters. | | | | |
| 4.1 | Page 1 | Trip time | <p><i>"As a resident of Youngson Rd, I am writing to raise concerns about the current proposal, particularly the planned closure of Youngson Rd access to SH2 during the works of Stage 2. The timescale for this closure is not clearly stated in the document, but during the recent closure for the roundabout build, residents experienced significant disruption.</i></p> <p><i>A trip to Omokoroa, the nearest amenities (e.g., FreshChoice supermarket), increases from roughly 8 minutes each way to around 20 minutes each way due to the detour or a round trip of 40 mins to the local shop. If such a closure were in place for the duration of the build (2 years? 5 years?), it would have a major negative impact on residents accessing Omokoroa. Many people in Whakamarama rely on the close proximity of Omokoroa for everyday amenities, friend visits, library, sports etc, and a prolonged closure would be extremely disruptive.</i></p> <p><i>I would appreciate clarification on the expected duration of the closure and any measures being considered to minimise the impact on residents"</i></p> | <p>NZTA notes that the Project is currently at the specimen design stage. This means that key timings and specific details regarding construction sequencing, temporary closures, and detours have not yet been finalised and will depend on the contractor's methodology and programme. The requirement to prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) forms part of NZTA's Proposed Conditions. These details will be developed as part of the CTMP. The purpose of the CTMP is to manage any adverse traffic safety and efficiency impacts caused by the Project Works and must include (amongst other things) methods to maintain vehicle access to affected properties where practicable, or to provide alternative access arrangements including proposed plans to communicate with property owners where access is affected (see Proposed Conditions CT1-CT2). The CTMP will also include location-specific temporary traffic management performance standards, including in relation to maximum acceptable delays and queue lengths during peak and interpeak flow periods (Proposed Condition CT2(h)(i)).</p> <p>While there will be periods of temporary disruption and delay relating to the realignment of Youngson Road and construction of the new Ōmokoroa Road interchange, temporary traffic management measures will be designed and put in place to safely maintain access through or around the work site, and to manage disruption as efficiently as possible without compromising the safety of road users and construction workers. These measures will include location-specific temporary traffic management performance standards for disruption to road users including maximum acceptable travel time increase throughout the entire Project and methods to communicate delays, detours and hazards to public road users (see Proposed Condition CT2). Site Specific Traffic Management Plans (SSTMPs) will also be prepared and implemented as required (see Proposed Conditions CT3 – CT6). NZTA's expert acknowledges construction of the interchange and realignment of Youngson Road to connect with Omokoroa Road is a significant undertaking and that residents may experience travel disruption and delays. However, NZTA's expert, Mr Cameron Inder considers it unlikely that such delays would occur for the entirety of the construction period and anticipates the effects of construction traffic in the Youngson Rd area can be sufficiently mitigated by implementing and adhering to traffic management requirements in the approved CTMP.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.1 Integrated Transport Assessment, section 6.2. |
| Commenter 5 – Norm and Maureen Bruning – 25 November | | | | |
| NZTA appreciates the Brunings' acknowledgment of the strategic importance of this Project. As affected landowners, NZTA acknowledges the concerns raised by the Brunings and sincerely appreciates their ongoing engagement and understanding over recent years as this Project has progressed. NZTA recognises the need to address the effects of this major infrastructure Project, noting that. once operational, the Project will have significantly positive effects. Input from landowners in how the Project interacts with their properties is important, and NZTA remains committed to working with landowners as needed as the Project moves forward. | | | | |
| 5.1 | Page 2 | Noise | <p><i>"The agency argues that a Noise Assessment has found that the noise effects on the Bruning property will be insignificant and don't require any specific mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>Our experience of past works undertaken on this highway lead us to very strongly dispute this finding. The road will be in closer proximity to our residence and that alone will add to the</i></p> | <p>NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of effects of operational traffic noise (within the Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects - Appendix 9.4.3). Ms Wilkening has confirmed that the noise modelling undertaken as part of the assessment considered the anticipated noise effects for this landowner's property, which took into account the property's elevation, topography and the proposed road alignment.</p> |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>noise factor. We live uphill from the road and with the new batters, our property will be opened up to much higher noise levels.</p> <p>The agency argues that road usage will drop on the free route by nearly 50% but again our experience of the driving habits of locals leads us to dispute this. Witness the congestion that occurs on a daily basis in Te Puke as locals snub the tolled highway adjacent to take the free route through that town.</p> <p>To address these matters, we request the following mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site-specific noise assessment. • Installation of noise barriers, bunds, or acoustic fencing for a distance in front of the residence. • Retention or replacement of vegetation screening, extending the planting to adequately screen the residence. • Application of low-noise road surfacing for the length of the property boundary." | <p>The Brunings' property is not predicted to experience noise levels above Category A (ie the lowest noise category) of the relevant national standard (NZS 6806:2010), noting the property is located approximately 115m from the indicative highway alignment (compared with about 80m from the existing SH2). Accordingly, mitigation measures such as physical noise barriers, bunds or acoustic fencing are not considered necessary to mitigate traffic noise effects, as the noise effects on the property will remain within NZS 6806:2010. Ms Wilkening notes that vegetation does not provide acoustic screening and is therefore not a suitable noise mitigation measure. The proposed highway surface material in the vicinity of the Bruning dwelling is Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA). This is required by Proposed Condition TN2. However, in accordance with Proposed Conditions TN3 and TN4, if post-construction acoustic surveys identify that noise levels on the property exceed the Noise Criteria Category specified in Schedule 1 (of the Proposed Conditions), NZTA must reconsider mitigation options and implement the Best Practicable Option for road-traffic noise mitigation. If determined to be necessary at that stage, noise mitigation options for the Brunings' property could include the use of lower noise road surface material such as LN5 (an epoxy-modified porous asphalt surface). Barriers are not an effective mitigation measure for the property due to the terrain sloping away towards the road.</p> <p>The existing SH2 is proposed to be realigned north of the Brunings' property. As noted, NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of effects of operational traffic noise. The SH2 realignment has been included in the assessment, and its effects form part of the predicted noise levels. The results of that assessment conclude that low-noise road surface treatment along the existing SH2 is not necessary to mitigate an effect of the Project (noting the existing SH2 does not have low-road noise surfacing at present). Accordingly, NZTA does not propose any special surface treatment of the section of the realigned SH2 along the boundary of the Brunings' property. Modelling undertaken by NZTA's traffic expert anticipates that after the existing SH2 becomes a local road, it will carry approximately less than half the current traffic by 2048, and well below the typical capacity of a two-way rural road.² This reduction in vehicles per day (vpd) is predicted to result in the realigned SH2 having less noise effects on the Brunings' property than the existing SH2, and no noise impact in addition to the Project, which will carry ~6 times as much traffic (about 26,500 vpd).</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.3 Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects, sections 4.2, 5.5 and 6.3; and • Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, CNV1-CNV9, TN1-TN5 and LV1-LV4. |
| 5.2 | Page 3 | Construction impacts | <p>"Noise, vibration and dust from construction activities are very disruptive to productive dairying. We understand that there will be requirements placed on the construction operations to manage these nuisances through the consenting process. Our concern is to ensure that these measures are fully cognisant of the dairying activities.</p> <p>Construction will inevitably lead to a marked increase in heavy vehicle movements on local roads. These roads are generally not scaled for such volumes of heavy traffic, being mainly limited to local traffic, school buses, farm vehicle access etc. The health and safety of our community is our key consideration here...</p> <p>To address these matters, we request the following mitigations:</p> | <p>NZTA has proposed a comprehensive suite of conditions, which require the preparation and implementation of a suite of Management Plans, including a Construction Management Plan (CMP), Construction Air Quality Management Plan (CAQMP), a CTMP and CNVMP. These management plans are designed to address and mitigate the effects of noise, vibration, dust, and construction traffic, and must be prepared by suitably qualified and experienced professionals. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Conditions CT1-CT2 require a CTMP to be prepared which will manage any adverse traffic safety and efficiency impacts caused by Project Works. This is explained in more detail in the response to 5.3 below. • Proposed Condition 16.1 requires a CAQMP to be prepared. The CAQMP shall include methods and procedures to manage dust as a result of Construction Works, identification of a community engagement and liaison team to consult with potentially affected property owners as well as a complaint recording and response system supported by appropriate mitigation measures as necessary. • Construction noise will be managed in accordance with the relevant national standard (NZS 6803:1999) and Proposed Conditions CNV1-CNV9. CNVMP will be prepared, which will |

² Integrated Transport Assessment (Appendix 9.4.1 of the Application), page 40, in a tolled/untolled scenario.

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A clear construction management plan demonstrating how noise, dust, vibration, and traffic will be controlled.</i> <i>Advance notification of construction stages affecting property access.</i> <i>Guaranteed safe access around our property for the farming operations and the service vehicles.</i> <i>Rapid reinstatement of any damaged fences, driveways, farm structures or services.</i> <i>A dedicated community liaison contact and a commitment to resolving complaints promptly."</i> | <p>include identification of potentially affected receivers, engagement processes, noise and vibration control measures, monitoring, and complaints procedures. The CNVMP will identify any properties or activities potentially affected by construction noise and vibration. It will set out processes for engaging with affected parties, specify noise and vibration control measures, and include a formal complaints procedure. If any construction activity is predicted or measured to exceed the relevant criteria (in NZS 6083:1999 and Proposed Conditions CNV1 or CNV2), a site-specific Schedule will be prepared in consultation with affected landowners to identify the best practicable mitigation options. If determined to be necessary at this stage, noise mitigation options for the Brunings' property could include careful choice of equipment and construction methodology, timing of high noise activities, communication prior to works and individual screening of plant on site should this be effective. Noise and vibration will be managed through a CNVMP as required by Proposed Conditions CNV3-CNV4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Condition CC1 (and Proposed Condition 13) requires a CMP to be prepared, with a purpose to provide information relating to construction management, and to manage certain construction activities and their effects. The CMP will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> methods for providing for the health and safety of the general public; the anticipated construction timeframes, including information on the likely date for start of Construction works; methods to communicate key Construction Works milestones and proposed hours of construction with owners and occupiers of properties who will potentially be affected by the Project (Proposed Condition CC2 and Condition 13.2). <p>NZTA notes that reinstatement works of any damaged fences, driveways, farm structures or services are dealt with under the Public Works Act 1981, and are not relevant to the fast-track consenting process under the FTAA.</p> <p>Accordingly, NZTA considers that the 'mitigations' proposed by the commenter are either already incorporated in and required by the proposed conditions, or are not relevant to this Application.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, CT1-CT2, CC2 and CNV3-CNV4. Appendix 9.1.2 Proposed Resource Consent Conditions, condition 16. |
| 5.3 | Page 4 | Access and safety | <p><i>"Access on to a state highway has always raised safety issues, and access to our property in particular has always been of concern...</i></p> <p><i>...we would expect that changes to road alignment and elevation will impact sight distances, affecting our ability to maintain safe entrance and exit. Returning traffic speeds to open road levels after completion will further compromise the long-term safety of our entrance.</i></p> <p><i>In the shorter term, construction activities themselves will add to the hazardous conditions, slow-moving construction machinery, temporary barriers and road narrowing could all compromise safety.</i></p> <p><i>To address these matters, we request the following mitigations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A formal sight-visibility assessment for our entrance and any other nearby access points.</i> | <p>Following completion of the Project, the SH2 corridor adjacent to the Brunings' property is intended to be revoked to local road status and managed by WBOPDC. Further, and as set out above, the amount of traffic on this section of existing SH2 is expected to significantly reduce as a result of the Project (from approximately 16,000 vpd including 1100 heavy commercial vehicles (HCV) to 9,300 vpd including approximately 450 HCV), meaning entering and exiting from the Brunings' driveway will be easier and safer due to the reduced traffic volume. Speed limits on this section may also be reviewed and set in line with the new road environment and purpose, which could result in further safety improvement for accessing the property driveway.</p> <p>The design of the property driveway connection with SH2 is not yet finalised, and will be subject to a detailed design process. The Brunings' driveway connection to SH2 will need to be designed and built in accordance with the relevant WBOPDC standards, being the Development Code 2009.³ Section DS4.11.2 of the Code covers rural entrances and for lots larger than 10ha the design must allow for semi-trailer manoeuvring. The principles to be adopted for rural entrances also include safe passage for vehicles entering or leaving the Brunings' property, including compliance with sight distance requirements and separation distances from other property accesses. The minimum sight distance from the entrance is covered in the Development Code Drawing No W415⁴ and the entrance to the Brunings' property must be designed to comply with it. Accordingly, NZTA does</p> |

³ Available [here](#).

⁴ Available [here](#).

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design modifications or safety treatments where needed. Clear. Logical traffic management measures that maintain safe access at all times during construction. | <p>not consider that a formal sight-visibility assessment for the Brunings' property entrance is required to mitigate effects of the Project. NZTA anticipates that the Brunings will be involved in conversations regarding the property entrance detailed design when this is undertaken.</p> <p>NZTA acknowledges the Brunings' concerns regarding construction activities and temporary hazards. As required by the Proposed Conditions CT1-CT3, a CTMP will be developed by the construction contractor, reviewed and approved by NZTA and WBOPDC prior to the commencement of works. The CTMP will (as per Condition CT2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify site-specific hazards and appropriate controls to manage traffic-related safety risks road users where the Project connects with roads; and Set out methods to communicate any temporary changes affecting delays, detours or hazards to public road users. <p>In addition, SSTMPs are required to be prepared where any Project Works will vary the normal traffic conditions of any public road (Proposed Condition CT3).</p> <p>Accordingly, NZTA considers that clear, logical traffic management measures that maintain safe access to and from the Brunings' property at all times during construction is already provided for in NZTA's Proposed Conditions.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, CT1-CT6; and Appendix 9.4.1 Integrated Transport Assessment, sections 5.4 and 6.1. |
| 5.4 | Pages 1, 3 and 4. | Land acquisition | <p>"Any land take or alteration to access, environmental conditions, or amenity has long-term consequences for both our farming operations and our connection to the property...</p> <p>The following matters are of particular concern to us, and we do not believe they are being dealt with in a satisfactory manner, in either the project plan itself, or the compensation negotiation that we are actively engaging in. "</p> <p>...</p> <p>"Access will be a critical matter for both construction and farming operations...potential for farm services to be disrupted as construction progresses. Farm services such as water, power and telecommunications, need to be maintained in working order, fences need to remain stockproof, and health and safety requirements fully observed."</p> <p>...</p> <p>"The title excluded, Lot 1 DPSA 80612, is a small title of 7,190 square metres and will be completely cut off from the remaining land. Further, the land that currently is in the requirement is very likely to change significantly in character through the construction works. In our view it will not be viable or practical to retain this title once works have been completed.</p> <p>To address this matter, we request the following mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lot 1 DPSA 80612, be included in the requirement and added to the Land Plan for this project. " | <p>The matters raised relate to land acquisition and compensation which are subject to a separate statutory process under the Public Works Act 1981. These matters are not relevant to the consenting process under the FTAA. That said, NZTA confirms that it intends to progress discussions with the Brunings with a view to acquiring the land identified.</p> |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Comment 6 – Minister for Infrastructure – 2 December | | | | |
| 6.1 | Page 1 | Support for the project | <i>"I wish to take this opportunity to express my broad support for projects which deliver positive outcomes for New Zealand, including the Takitimu North Link - Stage 2 project. Please take this letter of support as a reflection of the Government's economic growth and infrastructure priorities"</i> | NZTA acknowledges and appreciates the support expressed for the Project by the Minister for Infrastructure. |
| Comment 7 – Xiaotong (Susanna) Lin – 2 December | | | | |
| NZTA acknowledges the concerns raised by Ms Lin. NZTA understands the interest of adjacent parties in this major infrastructure Project, including on matters such as traffic, access, noise and visual effects. The specific matters raised by Ms Lin are responded to below, and NZTA is committed to continuing to keep the community informed as the Project progresses. | | | | |
| 7.1 | Page 1 – 7b. | Traffic and access | <i>"I am an adjacent party to this project, I am concerned about the road closure, re-direction of the traffic, difficult access, increased noise and visually affected view brought by this project. I am also concerned about vehicle speeding down my stretch of the road. I request chip seal surface to be replaced with asphalt and plants to be added to reduce noise."</i> | NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of potential traffic effects of the Project, including detailed modelling of future traffic volumes, speeds, local road access, and road user patterns based on the indicative alignment. NZTA notes that access from Munro Road (including Munro Road East) will be altered as a result of the Project due to the permanent closure of the SH2/ Munro Road intersection. All affected properties will retain access to the Project once operational via local roads, and any minor increases in travel time are expected to be negligible compared to the safety and accessibility benefits. As noted above, potential traffic effects during construction will be managed via the CTMP, in order to minimise disruption to businesses and residents during construction. Munro Road East is a local road under the control of WBOPDC and the setting of speed limits on that road is outside the scope of the Project. However, NZTA notes that the road has a current posted speed limit of 70 km/h which has been proposed by WBOPDC to reduce to 60 km/h in the WBOPDC Speed Limit Bylaw Review 2020. ⁵ For more detail, please refer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.1 Integrated Transport Assessment, sections 5.2, 5.4 and 6.1.8. |
| 7.2 | | Noise | As above in Section 7.1. | NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of effects of operational traffic noise. Ms Lin's property was not specifically included in the noise assessment as it is a new dwelling constructed after the PPFs had been identified. Ms Wilkening has subsequently calculated the noise levels at Ms Lin's house and confirms that the noise levels will be within Category A (ie the lowest noise category) of the relevant standards (NZS 6806:2010). Accordingly, Ms Wilkening considers Ms Lin's property will not experience any adverse noise effects as a result of the Project. For more detail, please refer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.3 Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects, sections 6.1, 6.3.6 and Appendix G. • Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, TN1-TN5. |
| 7.3 | | Visual | As above in Section 7.1. | NZTA has undertaken a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which includes consideration of visual effects on properties along Munro Road East. Temporary visual impacts will occur during the construction upgrade to Munro Road East due to earthworks and machinery, which is likely to be noticeable to the Lin property, but those effects will be short-term. Once complete, Munro Road East will be consistent with the local road standards. In relation to the indicative alignment, the distance (over 200m) of the Lin property from the main alignment and the screening effects of the existing hedges, trees and neighbouring housing, means that the |

⁵ <https://wbopdc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=21d879040732488a9c55880026b8b4b3>, February 2025.

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>potential visual effects will be less than minor. However, following construction, extensive landscape mitigation planting is proposed along the indicative alignment corridor to mitigate the visual effects, including any potential effects on the Lin property. As this planting establishes over three to five years, visual effects will progressively reduce with the visual amenity of the area being improved, resulting in a very low adverse effect.</p> <p>For further detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 9.4.5 Landscape Visual Impact Assessment, section 6.4 and Appendix A-2(18.0). |
| Comment 8 –Craig Lemon – 2 December | | | | |
| <p>NZTA acknowledges Mr Lemon’s concerns about potential delays during construction, particularly for accessing local schools, and understands how important it is to keep the community moving and connected, as well as informed about what to expect. As with most major construction projects, there will be a certain amount of disruption as the project progresses. NZTA recognises the need to plan, communicate and implement mitigation measures to minimise disruptions to people.</p> | | | | |
| 8.1 | Page 1 | Temporary traffic delays | <p><i>"Omokoroa No1 School (corner Plummers Pt Rd & Emeny Rd) appears to have most students residing outside of Plummers Pt, travelling by motor vehicle (before and after school) through the area identified where traffic delays are likely to be substantial. It is my understanding that this schools roll has increased substantially in recent years due to residential development in nearby Omokoroa, coupled with a proposed new school in Omokoroa being deferred indefinitely. This has seen Plummers Pt Rd/SH2 intersection become increasingly busy especially during school drop-off/pick up times.</i></p> <p><i>Unless plans are implemented to mitigate the impact of the proposed "Temporary Phase" (e.g.</i></p> <p><i>carry out this "Temporary Phase" during summer school holiday period (depends on duration of Temporary?)) this area of construction has the potential to become problematic.</i></p> <p><i>Alternately, consideration should be given to proceeding with the proposed new school at Omokoroa, as this would certainly reduce the traffic burden"</i></p> | <p>NZTA has undertaken a detailed Integrated Transport Assessment which includes consideration of construction traffic effects on local roads, including Plummers Point Road and its intersection with SH2. To mitigate construction traffic effects, NZTA shall prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The CTMP will be prepared in alignment with the relevant standard New Zealand Guide to Temporary Traffic Management (NZGTTM) and shall include appropriate controls (supported by traffic modelling, where necessary) to manage traffic congestion effects (including safety) of TTM activities on public road users, location-specific temporary traffic management (TTM) performance standards for disruption to road users and methods to communicate TTM delays, detours and hazards to public road users. Where Project Works will vary the normal traffic conditions on any public road NZTA shall prepare a Site Specific Traffic Management Plan in alignment with the NZGTTM risk-based approach.</p> <p>The Project is expected to improve travel time reliability and safety for all transport modes, including school-related traffic, through a combination of increased road capacity, improved intersection safety, and reduced congestion on the local road network.</p> <p>For further detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 9.4.1 Integrated Transport Assessment, sections 6.1.6 and 6.2; Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, CT1–CT6. |
| Comment 9 –Powerco – 8 December | | | | |
| 9.1 | Page 1 | Relocation of substation | <p><i>"Powerco is neutral on the application...Powerco acknowledges that NZTA have updated the conditions associated with the existing designation, which have been replaced with conditions CC3-CC5 (repeated below) as part of its application...Powerco agrees that these conditions are necessary to address potential adverse effects on the Powerco networks and seeks that the Panel impose these conditions in full, without modification, within its decision"</i></p> | <p>NZTA acknowledges Powerco’s neutral position on the application and notes its support for conditions CC3–CC5. NZTA confirms these conditions are part of the suite of Proposed Conditions included in the Substantive Application, see Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, CC3–CC5.</p> |
| Comment 10 – Director-General of Conservation – 8 December | | | | |
| See Attachment 5. | | | | |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <u>Comment 11 – Western Bay of Plenty District Council – 8 December</u> | | | | |
| See Attachment 3. | | | | |
| <u>Commenter 12 – Minister for the Environment – 8 December</u> | | | | |
| 12.1 | Page 1 | Biodiversity management plans | <i>"I wish to draw the Panel's attention to whether the timing and sequencing of these plans provides an appropriate level of certainty at the point of decision-making. In particular, it may be beneficial to consider whether requiring key biodiversity management plans prior to any approval may better support clarity around implementation, monitoring requirements and improve alignment with relevant national direction."</i> | <p>In NZTA's view, the approach not to supply draft management plans at this stage of the Project is aligned with best practice by ensuring effects management requirements (or performance standards) are set out in "stand-alone conditions" and not reliant on extraneous documentation that may be difficult to locate when the conditions are being implemented.⁶ NZTA's proposed conditions have been drafted to adhere to case law requirements by identifying what outcomes need to be achieved, with management plans required to develop in detail the actions to be taken to achieve those outcomes.⁷</p> <p>NZTA note that the use of management plans as a tool for detailing how prescribed outcomes will be achieved is both common and lawful, provided that the conditions themselves clearly state the required outcomes and performance standards.⁸ At this stage, preparation of draft ecological management plans would be of limited utility. As the Environment Court has observed, draft management plans submitted prior to detailed design and construction often have little value, noting <i>"in many instances the draft management plans may do very little other than provide a list of (possible) contents for a management plan that is yet to be prepared"</i>.⁹</p> <p>For projects of this nature, it is standard practice for NZTA not to provide draft management plans at the application stage, nor is it usual for decision-makers to require them. Instead, the focus should be on ensuring that the conditions provide sufficient clarity regarding the outcomes that must be achieved. Once the detailed design and construction methodology are sufficiently progressed, management plans can then be prepared to set out, in detail, the actions required to achieve those outcomes.</p> <p>Therefore, NZTA considers that it is not necessary for the Panel to review draft management plans at this stage in order to be satisfied that the ecological effects of the Project will be appropriately managed. The Proposed Conditions provide the necessary certainty by specifying the outcomes to be achieved. The subsequent preparation of management plans, once further detail is available, is an appropriate and established mechanism for detailing the actions needed to achieve those outcomes, and ensures alignment with national direction and best practice.</p> |
| <u>Commenter 13 – Penny Hicks – 9 December</u> | | | | |
| NZTA acknowledges Ms Hick's concerns with the impacts of the Project on her property and values the time and effort she has put in to providing feedback. Input from landowners in how the Project interacts with their properties is important, and NZTA remains committed to working with landowners as needed as the Project moves forward. | | | | |
| 13.1 | Page 3 | Designation extent | <i>"I am concerned at the extent of this designation and resultant waste of medium density residential (MDR) zoned land which will become a large area of 1 in 3 planted batter, with my driveway traversing it."</i> | <p>The extent of the designation has been carefully determined to ensure it is sufficient to construct, operate and maintain the Project. As set out in the Application, the designation boundary has been designed to accommodate contemporary safety, environmental, and engineering requirements. NZTA undertook a thorough and careful iterative process of design, including a robust and comprehensive assessment of multiple alternatives for the Project (see Substantive Application for</p> |

⁶ *Summerset Villages (Lower Hutt) Limited v Hutt City Council* [2020] NZEnvC 114 at [13]

⁷ *Summerset Villages (Lower Hutt) Limited v Hutt City Council* [2020] NZEnvC 31 at [156].

⁸ *Re Canterbury Cricket Association Inc* [2013] NZEnvC 184 at [125].

⁹ *Summerset Villages (Lower Hutt) Limited v Hutt City Council* [2020] NZEnvC 114 at [50].

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | | <i>Alternative options have not been considered e.g. alternative alignments, retaining etc. There is also the potential that road noise from the interchange & roading in that area will flow further down Francis Rd with the removal of part of the hill."</i> | <p>Approvals, section 3.4.14). This process is addressed further in the Statement of Evidence of John Olliver at paragraphs [8]-[22] (Attachment 1A).</p> <p>The Application acknowledges that some private driveways will need to be realigned or regraded as a result of the Project. The indicative design demonstrates that the realignment of Ms Hicks driveway is feasible and will be constructed to meet relevant standards, ensuring continued safe and practical access for affected properties, but it also does not exclude a different driveway alignment at the detailed design stage. NZTA intends to continue engagement in relation to the driveway at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>For more information, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantive Application for Approvals, sections 2.6.3 and 3.4.14. |
| 13.2 | Page 3 | Urban interface | <p><i>"There has not been due consideration given or assessment of the impact of the planned roading on the MDR area on my property and properties in the vicinity.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer to Matthew Kerr-Ridge's statement of evidence on my behalf."</i></p> | NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive and detailed assessment of the effects of the Project, including the realignment of local roads, as outlined in the Substantive Application, sections 2.2.1 and 4.3.14. This process is addressed further in the Statement of Evidence of John Olliver at paragraphs [8]-[22] (Attachment 1A). |
| 13.3 | Page 4 | Alternative alignment | <p><i>"We identified an alternative realignment for Francis Rd which would require significantly less land to achieve a similar outcome and minimise loss of valuable residential zoned land at ■ Francis Road.</i></p> <p><i>This shown on the following plan which was provided to NZTA's representatives... We haven't had any formal feedback on this.</i></p> <p><i>If road alignment had been considered as part of a greenfield development it would likely have skirted around the hill rather than straight through it.</i></p> <p><i>The likely reason for the current proposed route is that it has largely just maintained the existing direction and proper consideration hasn't been given to an alternative as it was outside the given assumed parameters.</i></p> <p><i>Redirection should be considered as this currently rural road and surrounds have now been rezoned to residential so the area is now a greenfield development and all options should be on the table to achieve the best ultimate outcome for its future residential usage."</i></p> | <p>NZTA appreciates Ms Hicks has identified an alternative realignment that is better from her perspective as an individual landowner with potential development aspirations for her property. However, NZTA undertook a thorough and careful iterative process of design, including a robust and comprehensive assessment of multiple alternatives for the Project (see Substantive Application for Approvals, section 3.4.14). This process included detailed consideration of options for the design and positioning of the Ōmokoroa interchange which is the driver for the position of the Francis Road alignment adjacent to Ms Hicks property. This process is addressed further in the Statement of Evidence of John Olliver at paragraphs [16]-[22] (Attachment 1A).</p> <p>NZTA is not required to consider all non-suppositious alternative options/alignments, nor is it required to choose the 'best' option.¹⁰ NZTA considers its assessment of alternatives for the Project was more than adequate and comfortably satisfies the statutory requirements.</p> |
| 13.4 | Page 4 | Operational noise | <p><i>"Marshall Day Acoustics did not visit my property during the licence to occupy period.</i></p> <p><i>The Francis Rd extension now exiting Omokoroa Rd further north than originally planned and the location of the interchange will be very visible from my property along the southern & eastern borders. My house and MDR land in the vicinity is elevated so will look down over the roading.</i></p> <p><i>Per Marshall Day Acoustics report where land is zoned or is in the process of being zoned for residential use, but no</i></p> | NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of operational traffic noise and vibration effects, as set out in the Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects (Appendix 9.4.3). Ms Wilkening, has confirmed that the noise modelling undertaken as part of the assessment considered the anticipated noise effects for the Hicks' property (identified as 'Cluster 10 Eastbound' in the report), specifically taking into account the property's elevation, intervening topography, and the proposed road alignment. The assessment confirms that it is standard and appropriate practice to undertake noise surveys at selected representative locations along the project corridor, rather than at every individual property, hence why the Hicks' property was not visited. |

¹⁰ *New Zealand Transport Agency v Architectural Centre Inc* [2015] NZHC 1991 at [399].

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p><i>development has taken place, NZS 6806 does not require any assessment as there are no 'protected premises and facilities' (PPFs) to assess. This is the situation at Ōmokoroa where land is in the process of being rezoned by Plan Change 92 to the District Plan.</i></p> <p><i>This seems completely inadequate and not conducive to good urban planning given this land will be developed for future housing & will be impacted by both the new highway & Francis Rd extension in this area</i></p> <p><i>They also state road traffic noise is affected by multiple factors, amongst them being terrain elevations, including shielding from intervening terrain and exposure due to elevation. As mentioned earlier my property and property in the vicinity is elevated with rolling contour.</i></p> <p><i>They also state atmospheric conditions, including wind or temperature inversions can impact road noise. The prevailing wind is South/South West which will potentially carry the road noise over the residential area."</i></p> | <p>The Hicks' property is predicted to experience noise levels within Category A (ie the lowest noise category) as defined by the relevant national standard, NZS 6806:2010. Accordingly, mitigation measures such as physical noise barriers, bunds, or acoustic fencing are not considered necessary to mitigate traffic noise effects. In accordance with Proposed Conditions TN3 and TN4, if post-construction acoustic surveys identify that noise levels at the Hicks' property exceed the Noise Criteria Category specified in Schedule 1 of the Proposed Conditions, NZTA must reconsider mitigation options and implement the Best Practicable Option for road-traffic noise mitigation. This would likely involve the use of lower noise road surface such as LN3 or LN5 surface.</p> <p>With respect to the existing SH2 corridor, any changes to the alignment have been included in the noise assessment, in relation to the change in noise level assessment, and predicted effects at the Hicks' property remain as discussed in the Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects.</p> <p>It is correct that under NZS 6806:2010, assessments and mitigation requirements are focused on existing PPFs, such as dwellings, educational facilities, and similar noise-sensitive uses because these are the locations where people would be exposed to road-traffic noise at the time the project is assessed. The standard does not require the same assessment or mitigation for undeveloped, but residentially zoned land. This approach is in line with the RMA/FTAA requirement to assess the effects on the 'existing environment', which is limited to existing activities and activities which are permitted or consented in circumstances where those consents are likely to be implemented. Accordingly, NZTA's assessment has not taken account of the anticipated urban development pattern in Ōmokoroa under Plan Change 92 to the District Plan. Irrespective, the use of the low noise road surface (SMA) proposed for the Project will also benefit any future development in the area.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.3 Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects, sections 4.1, 4.2, and 6.1.1. • Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, TN1-TN5. |
| 13.5 | Pages 5-6 | WBOPDC roundabout | <p><i>"Currently WBOPDC are building a temporary roundabout at the intersection of Omokoroa Rd/SH2...With these works and the removal of the knoll with the house on that corner, plus the lowering of the bank along the SH north of Omokoroa Rd, I have noticed a significant increase in road noise especially with truck gear changes & engine braking.</i></p> <p><i>Per council noise testing was not undertaken prior to commencement and there will be no bunding.</i></p> <p><i>In my recent experience if you can see it you can certainly hear it, even with asphalt used in part.</i></p> <p><i>Included in the district plan after PC92 WBOPDC included a typical road layout for Francis Rd to provide a buffer between the industrial land and the medium density residential over the road, to continue the extent of Francis Rd... Per NZTA's Francis road layout plan in the Fast-track documents there is no buffer included.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst it is positive that the new highway will largely be constructed with asphalt, I would hope that further consideration can be given to mitigate traffic noise, especially given the future development in this area."</i></p> | <p>The recent works at the Ōmokoroa Road/SH2 intersection, including the temporary roundabout, knoll removal, and bank lowering, are local road projects undertaken by WBOPDC and are not part of the Project. As such, noise effects and mitigation for these works fall outside the scope of the Project and are not a matter for the Panel's consideration of the Project under the FTAA.</p> <p>NZTA's design for the Francis Road realignment pre-dated Plan Change 92 and was the subject of detailed engagement and agreement with WBOPDC at that time. The Francis Road cross-section showing a bund to mitigate the effects of industrial activities was introduced as a result of decisions by WBOPDC's Independent Hearing Panel on submissions on Plan Change 92 in 2024. NZTA and WBOPDC will work together on detailed design of the Francis Road realignment in the future, including in relation to a buffer.</p> |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| 13.6 | Page 7 | Construction noise | <p><i>"Per NZTA's construction staging and traffic management outline it is likely that the Francis Rd extension will go ahead earlier, so they can build the interchange off line. This will involve the State Highway being diverted down Francis Rd for some years while the interchange is built.</i></p> <p><i>As noted above this will be very visible from my property along the southern & eastern borders.</i></p> <p><i>I consider this to be significantly more than moderate adverse during construction & low adverse post construction.</i></p> <p><i>The Francis Rd extension needs to have an asphalt surface to help mitigate noise during & post construction, but I haven't been able to find any information on this in the Fast track documents"</i></p> | <p>The Application includes reference to an option of the Francis Road realignment being used for temporary traffic diversions during construction of the Omokoroa interchange, but that is ultimately dependent on the future contractor's preferred construction methodology. Any such diversions would likely be for short periods when other routes are not available. This option is one of many to manage construction traffic that may be considered at the detailed construction management phase and would be subject to the requirements of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The requirement to prepare and implement a CTMP forms part of NZTA's Proposed Conditions. The purpose of the CTMP is to manage any adverse traffic safety and efficiency impacts caused by the Project Works and must include (amongst other things) methods to maintain vehicle access to affected properties where practicable, or to provide alternative access arrangements including proposed plans to communicate with property owners where access is affected (see Proposed Conditions CT1 and CT2). The CTMP will also include location-specific temporary traffic management performance standards, which would apply to Francis Road if that is to be used as a temporary traffic diversion route. Standards documented in the CTMP would include assessments and specification of the expected traffic loading, the surfacing type to withstand the temporary traffic volume loads, maximum acceptable delays and queue lengths during peak and interpeak flow periods (Proposed Condition CT2(h)(i)).</p> <p>NZTA has undertaken a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which includes consideration of visual effects on properties along Francis Road. The house is surrounded by vegetation that contains and screens views to the south, but it is likely that temporary visual impacts will occur during construction due to earthworks and machinery, which is likely to be noticeable from the Hicks' property (discernible from the house mainly in winter), but those effects will be short-term. Once realigned, Francis Road will be consistent with the local road standards. NZTA's expert Mr Adrian Morton considers that in relation to the indicative alignment, the distance of the Hicks' property from the main alignment and the screening effects of the existing hedges, trees and neighbouring housing, means that the potential visual effects will be less than minor. However, following construction, extensive landscape mitigation planting is proposed along the indicative alignment corridor to mitigate the visual effects, including any potential effects on the Hicks' property. Mr Morton considers that as this planting establishes over three to five years, visual effects will progressively reduce with the visual amenity of the area being improved, resulting in a very low adverse effect.</p> <p>NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of construction traffic noise and vibration effects, as set out in the Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects. The Hicks' property is not expected to experience exceedances of the daytime construction noise criteria under the relevant NZ Standard. Nonetheless, construction noise will be managed in accordance with the relevant national standards (NZS 6803:1999) and Proposed Conditions CNV1-CNV9. A Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) will be prepared, which will include identification of potentially affected receivers, engagement processes, noise and vibration control measures, monitoring, and complaints procedures. If any construction activity is predicted or measured to exceed the relevant criteria (in NZS 6803:1999 and Proposed Conditions CNV1 or CNV2), a site-specific Schedule will be prepared in consultation with affected landowners to identify the best practicable mitigation options. If determined to be necessary at this stage, noise mitigation options for the Hicks' property could include careful choice of equipment and construction methodology, timing of high noise activities, communication prior to works and individual screening of plant on site should this be effective.</p> <p>Regarding Ms Hicks' request for an asphalt surface on the Francis Road extension to mitigate noise during and after construction, the assessment does not recommend additional mitigation such as asphalt surfacing for Francis Road. This is because the predicted construction noise levels at the Hicks property are not expected to exceed the relevant criteria, and the use of asphalt is generally reserved for operational traffic noise mitigation as has been proposed for the Project main alignment as recommended in the Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects. Francis Road does</p> |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>not carry sufficient traffic volumes to warrant an asphalt surface as traffic noise levels will comply with the requirements of NZS6806:2010 as set out in 13.4 above.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.3 Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects, sections 5.3 and 5.5. • Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, CNV1-CNV9. |
| Commenter 14 – Mike and Sandy Smith – 9 December | | | | |
| <p>NZTA acknowledges the Smiths' concerns about the impact of the Project on amenity values and development potential of their property. NZTA recognises the need to mitigate effects of this major infrastructure Project (noting that, once operational, the Project will have significant positive effects). The issues raised by the Smiths' are responded to below. Landowner input in how the Project interacts with their property is important, and NZTA remains committed to working with landowners as needed as the Project moves forward.</p> | | | | |
| 14.1 | Pages 1-2 and 4 | Operational noise and vibration | <p><i>"We acknowledge that the designation and resource consent conditions seek to manage acoustic and vibration effects, primarily through requirements for management plans such as the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP). These plans are yet to be drafted, and therefore detailed arrangements for scheduling, monitoring, and mitigation remain unclear..."</i></p> <p><i>We seek greater clarity and assurance about ongoing operational noise effects. A suitable way to ensure mitigated ongoing highway operating noise impacts is to construct and maintain a 2 m acoustic fence along the shared boundary. This measure would provide certainty of amenity protection beyond reliance on surfacing alone."</i></p> <p><i>...To ensure adverse effects are appropriately managed and the development potential of 467E Ōmokoroa Road is maintained, we request the following conditions be imposed:</i></p> <p>4. <i>Post-Construction Noise Monitoring and Acoustic Fence Condition: Undertake post-construction noise monitoring at 467E Ōmokoroa Road. If noise levels exceed rural residential amenity thresholds, install and maintain a 2 m acoustic fence along the shared boundary at Waka Kotahi's cost. Rationale: This provides a practical and enforceable measure to mitigate ongoing operational noise impacts.</i></p> | <p>NZTA does not accept this proposed condition and does not consider it is necessary to mitigate an effect of the Project. NZTA has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of effects of operational traffic noise. The Smith dwelling is located more than 200m from the designation boundary and therefore outside the assessment area. In any event, the dwelling is predicted to experience noise levels within Category A (ie the lowest noise category) of the relevant standards (NZS 6806:2010).¹¹ Accordingly, mitigation measures such as physical noise barriers are not considered necessary (and would not be effective due to the distance of the dwelling to the project), as no adverse noise effects are predicted for the Smith property. NZTA is not required under NZS 6806:2010, to assess or mitigate the potential noise and vibration effects of the Project on undeveloped, but residentially zoned land. This approach is in line with the RMA/FTAA requirement to assess the effects on the 'existing environment', which is limited to existing activities and activities which are permitted or consented in circumstances where those consents are likely to be implemented. Accordingly, NZTA's assessment has not taken account of the anticipated urban development pattern in Ōmokoroa under Plan Change 92 to the District Plan. Irrespective, the use of the low noise road surface (SMA) proposed for the Project will also benefit any future development in the area.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.4.3 Assessment of Acoustic and Vibration Effects, sections 4.2 and 6.3. |
| 14.2 | Pages 2 and 4 | Wetlands | <p><i>"We support the restoration of the wetland area proposed within the designation footprint..."</i></p> <p><i>However, to ensure these benefits are fully realised and protected over time, we consider that a robust physical boundary between the restored wetland and 467E Ōmokoroa Road is essential. This will:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Prevent stock access from adjoining land, which could otherwise damage planting and compromise ecological integrity.</i> | <p>NZTA does not accept the proposed condition requiring a 7-wire stock-proof fence at its cost and does not consider it is necessary to mitigate an effect of the Project. Requirements for the fencing and long-term protection of restored wetlands are already addressed through Proposed Resource Consent Condition 23.1(a)(5)(vi), which requires the Wetland Management Plan to specify appropriate fencing and ongoing protection measures. The location, type and specification of fencing will be determined through the management plan process, which will be prepared by a suitably qualified expert and subject to certification by BOPRC. A separate, prescriptive consent condition is not necessary.</p> |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a clear demarcation between the designated land and private property, reducing uncertainty and potential conflict over land use. • Enhance restoration success by minimising edge effects and reinforcing the ecological buffer. <p>We therefore recommend that Waka Kotahi construct and maintain a 7-wire stock-proof fence along the wetland boundary. This measure should be included as a consent condition, with responsibility for cost and ongoing maintenance resting with Waka Kotahi, as it directly relates to mitigation and enhancement obligations under the project.</p> <p>...To ensure adverse effects are appropriately managed and the development potential of 467E Ōmokoroa Road is maintained, we request the following conditions be imposed:</p> <p>5. Wetland Boundary Fencing Condition: Construct and maintain a 7-wire stock-proof fence along the wetland edge adjacent to 467E Ōmokoroa Road, at Waka Kotahi's cost. Rationale: This will protect ecological restoration works, prevent stock access, and create a clear demarcation between designated land and private property</p> | <p>Fencing required for farming operations on the property is a matter that can be dealt with as part of the property acquisition negotiations for 467E Ōmokoroa Road under the PWA, if needed.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.1.2 Proposed Resource Consent Conditions, condition 23. |
| 14.3 | Page 2 and 4 | Geotechnical | <p>"...geotechnical stability and interface design are critical to maintaining the usability and safety of adjoining land.</p> <p>Key considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Batter Slopes: The batter slope east of 467E should not create additional geotechnical restrictions that could affect the suitability of the land for building. We seek assurance that slope design will maintain stability and avoid imposing constraints on adjoining property. • Finished Ground Levels: Where earthworks alter ground levels near the property boundary, there is potential for retaining structures to be required. We request clarity that these works will not result in obligations for the landowner to construct or maintain retaining walls. • Erosion and Drainage: Earthworks can increase erosion risk and alter drainage patterns. Monitoring and appropriate erosion control measures should be implemented during construction to prevent adverse effects on adjoining land. • Landscaping for Stability: To maintain slope integrity and reduce erosion risk, landscaping of batter slopes should be completed within one year of earthworks. This should include indigenous planting consistent with the Landscape and Visual Management Plan. <p>Including these measures as consent conditions will ensure that geotechnical risks are managed proactively, protecting both the project and the development potential of 467E Ōmokoroa Road."</p> | <p>NZTA does not accept the proposed condition to confirm that batter slopes east of 467E Ōmokoroa Road will not create additional geotechnical restrictions that affect the suitability of the land for building. NZTA does not consider such a condition is necessary to manage an effect of the Project.</p> <p>NZTA agrees that geotechnical stability and interface design are critical to maintaining the usability and safety of adjoining land. This is addressed through Proposed Conditions 19.1–19.3, refer Appendix 9.1.2 Proposed Resource Consent Conditions.</p> <p>Those conditions require that earthworks are undertaken in a manner that does not adversely affect the stability of land within or adjoining the Designation Boundary, and that all relevant designs and construction methodologies are reviewed and approved by a Chartered Professional Geotechnical Engineer. Ongoing construction observations by a suitably qualified expert are also required to ensure compliance.</p> <p>On this basis, NZTA considers that the requested additional consent condition has already been adequately addressed by the currently proposed conditions. A separate, prescriptive condition is therefore not considered necessary.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.1.2 Proposed Resource Consent Conditions, conditions 19.1-19.3. |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>...To ensure adverse effects are appropriately managed and the development potential of 467E Ōmokoroa Road is maintained, we request the following conditions be imposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Batter Slopes and Stability Condition: Confirm that batter slopes east of 467E will not create additional geotechnical restrictions that affect the suitability of the land for building. Rationale: This provides certainty that slope design will maintain stability and avoid imposing constraints on adjoining property.</i> | |
| 14.4 | Pages 3-4 | Landscaping for Erosion Control Condition | <p>"We acknowledge that the designation and resource consent conditions include requirements for a Landscape and Visual Management Plan (LVMP), which will guide mitigation measures. However, these plans are yet to be finalized, and therefore the detailed arrangements for managing visual and amenity effects remain uncertain.</p> <p>...To ensure adverse effects are appropriately managed and the development potential of 467E Ōmokoroa Road is maintained, we request the following conditions be imposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>Landscaping for Erosion Control Condition: Require landscaping of batter slopes within one year of earthworks completion, using indigenous planting consistent with the Landscape and Visual Management Plan. Rationale: Timely planting will stabilize slopes, reduce erosion risk, and improve visual amenity.</i> | <p>NZTA does not accept the need for a separate condition requiring landscape planting of batter slopes within one year of earthworks completion. Such a condition is not necessary to manage the effects of the Project. Erosion and sediment control is already comprehensively addressed through the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) required by Proposed Conditions 9 and 10. These conditions require that all exposed areas are stabilised as soon as practicable following completion of each stage of work. Accordingly, robust measures to manage erosion, stabilise slopes are already secured through the existing the Proposed Conditions.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.1.2 Proposed Resource Consent Conditions, conditions 9-10. |
| 14.5 | Page 4 | Access condition | <p>...To ensure adverse effects are appropriately managed and the development potential of 467E Ōmokoroa Road is maintained, we request the following conditions be imposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. <i>Access Protocols Condition: Provide six weeks' written notice and an agreed access arrangement for any works requiring entry onto 467E Ōmokoroa Road. Rationale: This ensures property rights are respected, and landowner consent is obtained for any temporary access.</i> | <p>A condition requiring six weeks' written notice prior to any works necessitating entry onto private property is not necessary or appropriate. Access to private property will always be subject to obtaining the landowner's written consent following appropriate notice. In addition, NZTA will comply with its usual process before any access is undertaken and will endeavour to provide as much notice as practicable to landowners regarding any required access.</p> |
| 14.6 | Page 4 | Management plan condition | <p>...To ensure adverse effects are appropriately managed and the development potential of 467E Ōmokoroa Road is maintained, we request the following conditions be imposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>Transparency of Construction Management Plans Condition: Provide draft Construction Management Plans (Noise, Dust, Vibration) for review prior to works commencing. Rationale: These plans are critical for managing temporary effects, yet they are currently not available. Early review ensures clarity and accountability.</i> | <p>NZTA's approach is to set clear and stand-alone conditions which specify the outcomes and performance standards to be achieved via management plans.</p> <p>Under the proposed conditions for the Project, all management plans must be prepared by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person in accordance with the requirements of the conditions. Proposed Condition CC2 requires the CMP to include methods of communication with affected landowners, which will include the Smiths. These plans are then submitted for certification or information to the relevant authority. This approach provides certainty that the project's effects will be appropriately managed, while allowing for flexibility to incorporate detailed design information and site-specific methodologies at a more appropriate stage. It would be unduly onerous and unnecessary in terms of effects management, to require landowner review of these management plans.</p> <p>For more detail, please refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.1.1 Proposed Designation Conditions, CG2-CG10. |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 9.1.2 Proposed Resource Consent Conditions, conditions 5-7. • Paragraph 12.1 above. |
| <u>Comment 15 – Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - 9 December</u> | | | | |
| See Attachment 4. | | | | |
| <u>Comment 16 – Bay of Plenty Regional Council - 9 December</u> | | | | |
| See Attachment 2. | | | | |
| <u>Comment 17 – Ngāti Taka - 9 December</u> | | | | |
| See Attachment 7. | | | | |
| <u>Comment 18 – Pirirākau - 9 December</u> | | | | |
| See Attachment 6. | | | | |
| <u>Comment 19 – Robert Hicks - 9 December</u> | | | | |
| 19.1 | Page 1-2 | Alternative alignment | <p>"My concerns regarding the project are largely centred around the proposed future alignment of Francis Road where it passes ■ Francis Road (my sister's property).</p> <p>I don't think full consideration has been given to this section of Francis Road in the context of urban development...</p> <p>This land will be purchased at residential land values and then effectively be used to create a 1 in 3 planted slope. No serious consideration seems to have been given to saving it and utilizing retaining walls. No consideration seems to have been given to the lost yield of residential land...</p> <p>... There is however a simpler and substantially less costly alternative to redirect the road and to skirt around the hillside, utilising the existing flat contour land to the south west through the neighbouring kiwifruit orchard (21 Francis Road).</p> <p>This land has already been identified and included as part of the roading corridor..."</p> | See responses at 13.1 to 13.3 above. |
| <u>Comment 20 – Robin Hicks - 9 December</u> | | | | |
| 20.1 | Page 1 | Urban design interface | <p>"I would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a good urban design interface is achieved • efficiencies in urban land taken for roading i.e. no wastage • good future urban outcomes & connections ... | See responses at 13.2 above. |

| Assigned comment number | Comment section or page reference | Topic | Extracts (or summary, where specified) | NZTA response to comment |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 20.2 | Page 1 | Alternative alignment and designation | <p>"I would like to see:</p> <p>...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> alternative route investigated for Francis Rd, skirting the hill and not wasting medium density residential land <p>...</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> extent of land designated at ■ Francis Road & extent of earthworks | See responses at 13.1 and 13.3 above. |
| 20.3 | Page 1 | Cut and removal resulting in traffic noise | <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> level of cut required in Francis Road cut and removal of land to create large 1 in 3 batter at ■ Francis Road may result in ongoing traffic noise to properties further down Francis Road. The hill is currently protecting them." | See response to 13.4 and 13.6 above. |
| <u>Comment 21– Associate Minister for Transport - 4 December</u> | | | | |
| 21.1 | Page 1 | Support for the Project | "As a Road of National Significance, this project is important to achieving the Government's priorities for transport and economic growth. I would like to express my support for the Takitimu North Link - Stage 2 project to receive the substantive approvals it requires." | NZTA acknowledges and appreciates the support expressed for the Project by the Associate Minister for Transport and recognition of the importance of the Project for transport and economic growth. |
| <u>Comment 22– Minister for Regional Development - 4 December</u> | | | | |
| 22.1 | Page 2 | Support for the Project | <p>"I consider that the Takitimu North Link Project Stage 2 is regionally and nationally significant infrastructure, as its identification as a Road of National Significance reflects, and is likely to have significant regional economic benefits. In particular, I note that the assessment provided by the applicant estimates that the Takitimu North Link Project Stage 2 will generate a total of \$610 million net present value over a seven-year development period, and create employment of around 1300 full-time equivalent roles at its peak, along with improved productivity and agglomeration benefits of an estimated \$19 million per year.</p> <p>I also note that once completed, the overall Takitimu North Link Project is expected to improve freight movement efficiency to and from the Port of Tauranga, which would have regional and national benefits. It is expected to benefit the region by unlocking access to new commercial and industrial development opportunities in the area through increased road capacity and reduced congestion, although the analysis does not specifically quantify the economic impact of this."</p> | NZTA acknowledges and appreciates the support expressed for the Project by the Minister for Regional Development and recognition of the Project's significant national and regional benefits. |