

22 May 2013

Orchard Road Holdings Ltd
PO Box 170
DUNEDIN 9054

Attention: Alison Devlin

Dear Alison,

FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST – PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 46

Further to our phone conversation on 6 May, please find below a request for further information in relation to Plan Change 46 – Ballantyne Road Industrial and Residential Extension. As we discussed, many of these matters are relatively minor, and many will be easy to reply to, however the application will benefit from these matters being addressed.

The following further information is requested pursuant to Clause 23(1) in order to better understand the nature of the plan change request; how the effects are being mitigated; the costs; benefits; efficiencies and effectiveness; and what consultation has been undertaken:

General Matters

1. Section 1.2.1 states the site is approximately 17 hectares. However the totals referred to in paragraphs 2.1.3, 2.1.5 and 2.1.7 add up to 19.1 hectares. The BDG report states the site is 19.3 hectares. It is assumed the discrepancy arises because some of the open space land is already provided for as part of the Ballantyne Precinct structure plan, however please clarify the areas for each type of land use.
2. The Low Density Residential and Industrial B provisions that are proposed to replace the existing Rural General zoning need to be included as part of the plan change application (probably as appendices). A track changed version of these provisions is required, showing any changes to the plan text and planning map. I am able to email you Microsoft Word documents of the District Plan text so that you can show the proposed changes. For example, with reference to paragraph 2.1.3 of the plan change application, the existing Ballantyne Road Structure Plan should be shown as being struck out, and a new structure plan proposed in its place. The Council GIS team is able to provide you with an amended District Plan map if that is of assistance.
3. The plan change request currently includes three plans that are broadly similar, the BDG Structure Plan, the BDG Scheme Plan, and the Scheme 5 plan, which is also referred to as a structure plan. All references to a structure plan throughout the plan change application need to be to a single structure plan which is to be inserted into the District Plan. A new rule requiring development be in accordance with this structure plan will also be required (if that is what you intend to do – it is unclear). Scheme Plan 5 also shows a 'possible future road extension' from Road 1 through to Frederick Street, however this is not shown on the BDG Structure Plan or Scheme Plan and it is unclear what the mechanism is to protect the possibility of this link. Please provide an amended structure plan more in the style of the existing Ballantyne Road Precinct Structure Plan, using black with shading rather than colours.

4. To better understand the proposed change, it would be helpful to have the final proposed structure plan overlaid on an aerial photograph, that also includes the Ballantyne Road Precinct Structure Plan. Please provide such an image, or alternatively I can ask our GIS team to prepare the image.
5. Section 4.1 of the application describes the change in zoning. As the proposal is to change from Rural General to Low Density Residential and Industrial B, please provide an assessment of the proposal against the District Wide objectives and policies.
6. Section 4.2.3 of the application does not refer to Objective 2 of the Low Density Residential zone. This objective is probably relevant and consideration should be given to whether it needs to be included in this section.

Appendix D – MWH letter in relation to Plan Change 36

7. It would be of assistance to readers of the plan change request if the plan to which Appendix D relates is included at the end of the letter, so that comparisons can be made between the comments made in Appendix D and the amended plan in Appendix E. Please provide a copy of the relevant plan.

Appendix F – Baxter Design Group landscape report

8. Section B.2 lists eight locations and refers the reader to Attachment B, but only four viewpoints are shown on Attachment B, and only four viewpoints are assessed. Please update Attachment B. There does not appear to be any assessment of visibility from Riverbank Road or Orchard Road. A visit to the plan change area confirmed the site is visible from both roads in several locations. Please provide an assessment of visibility from Riverbank Road and Orchard Road.
9. Heading B.2.1 states Riverbank Road but this is not Riverbank Road, it is Ballantyne Road. Similarly in Attachment B, the arrow for View 1 on the map has been placed on Ballantyne Road, but in the text of the report it states View 1 is from Riverbank Road. Please update Attachment B.
10. Attachment B, the red arrow for View 2 is in the wrong place. It should be placed on the bend in Ballantyne Road to match up with the photograph. It is currently shown about where Enterprise Drive is. The red arrow for View 4 is shown opposite the oxidation ponds, which is where Frederick Street is, not Enterprise Drive. The topographic plan used as a background to show the viewpoints is out of date and it may be more helpful to show the view points on an aerial photograph rather than a topographic plan. Please update Attachment B.
11. Attachment F contains a green dotted line called 'Reserve and Pedestrian linkage' but this green dotted line does not appear on the plan. It appears on the plan as a yellow dotted line. Please update Attachment F.

Urban Design

12. The author of the Baxter Design Group report is not stated. The title of the report states it is an 'urban design and landscape analysis', but there does not appear to be any specific urban design analysis. Please provide an urban design assessment of the proposed layout, that considers the following matters:

- a. Analysis should be provided to illustrate why zone boundaries, road alignments, access points etc are being promoted as shown in the various plans along with assessment of these to illustrate how they have been tested to ensure they can promote a good pattern of development within the plan change area. Please provide this analysis.
- b. Was consideration given to providing some sort of setback or buffer from the existing rural residential development along Riverbank Road.

Appendix G – Abley Consultants Report

13. I have attached as **Appendix A** a copy of the memorandum received from MWH who have provided advice on this plan change to Council. Please respond to the matters raised. Please contact Iain Banks at MWH directly if there are any questions in relation to these matters: Iain.K.Banks@nz.mwhglobal.com
14. In addition to the MWH comments, I comment as follows:
 - a. To create the new road will require a subdivision of the open space area shown on the Ballantyne Road Structure Plan. This is currently a non-complying activity under the operative provisions. Consideration needs to be given to how the subdivision provisions may need to be altered to facilitate the construction of this new road.
 - b. Paragraph 3.9 of Abley report refers to the provision of off-road walking and cycling routes. What is the mechanism to actually provide these facilities, i.e. a new rule in the subdivision chapter, an assessment matter or other mechanism?
 - c. Has any assessment of the effects of the new road on the residents of Riverbank Road been undertaken?

Reverse Sensitivity

15. The owners of land at 246 Riverbank Road hold a resource consent for a frost fighting fan. There is no assessment of the risk of reverse sensitivity effects arising from the use of this fan in accordance with the conditions of RM100294.

I have also attached as **Appendix B** the comments received from the Council's 3 Waters manager. These matters can be addressed at the time of subdivision and are provided for you at this time for your information.

This information is requested to be provided to the Council by 31 July 2013 or any earlier date in order to avoid unreasonable delay in the processing of your plan change request. It is noted that the Council may chose not to further consider your plan change request until this report is received.

Once we have received this further information, it may be necessary to require additional information (as per Clause 23(2) of the First Schedule) or to commission a report. If this is the case you will receive a further letter from us explaining those steps.

Whilst you may decline to provide the above information (pursuant to clause 23(6)) you need to be aware that the Council may reject the plan change request on this basis.

Once the Council is satisfied that it has adequate information, I will make a recommendation to the Strategy Committee (and, in turn, the full Council) as to how to deal with the plan change request. Every attempt will be made to provide this decision to you within 30 days of receiving all the necessary information. If you have any queries or have any concerns regarding this request for information, please contact me directly on (03) 450 1738 or blair.devlin@qldc.govt.nz.

Yours sincerely,



Blair Devlin
SENIOR POLICY ANALYST

Attachments:

- A** Memorandum from MWH dated 9 May 2013.
- B** Copy of comments received from 3 Waters manager (for information only)

TO: Denis Mander - QLDC
DATE: 09 May 2013
CC: Iain Banks, Oliver Brown
REF: 80501290 cc 0107
FROM: Mike Smith
MWH New Zealand Ltd
SUBJECT: PC 46: Ballantyne Road Industrial and Residential Extension

Information was received by QLDC from Orchard Road Holdings Limited regarding the request for a Private Plan Change for the property situated on Ballantyne Road, Wanaka (Referred to as Plan Change 46 – Ballantyne Road Industrial and Residential Extension). The area is generally bound by Fredrick Street, Enterprise Drive and within the Structure Plan Inner Growth Boundary.

The information received was:

1. Section 32 Report; Private Plan Change, Rural Land Rezoning: Residential Land and Wanaka Industrial Zone Extension, Ballantyne Road Precinct. Prepared by Orchard Road Holdings; dated April 2013.
2. Infrastructure Report; Ballantyne Ridge – Phase 2. Prepared by Patterson Pitts Group; Dated 2 October 2012.
3. Urban Design and Landscape Analysis, Ballantyne Ridge. Prepared by Baxter Design Group; Dated 16 April 2013
4. Traffic Report; Orchard Road Holdings Limited, Industrial & Residential Land Plan Change Request. Prepared by Abley Transportation Consultants; Dated March 2013.
5. Letter: MWH assessment of PC 36; Ballantyne Industrial B Zone; Dated 4 February 2011.

No additional information was supplied.

This file note considers the information presented and provides guidance on the suitability and safety for the proposed plan change.

It is noted that this application seeks an addition to the Plan Change presented in PC 36: Ballantyne Industrial B Zone. It is presented that PC 36, having been granted, is currently under appeal. A review of the appeal would indicate that the applicant objects to the boundaries of the Plan Change based upon previous agreements between adjacent land owners, and considers the land north of this Plan Change application, in an area known as the “Connell Terrace Precinct”.

This assessment has been undertaken on the basis that the appeal will not significantly change the nature of the application lodged in PC 46.

1 Transportation Assessment

1.1 Capacity and effects on the road network

The Traffic Report undertakes an analysis of the road network capacity based upon this development and explores the overall effect of all the surrounding developments. This is considered a good approach.

In this analysis it is presented that the total future traffic flows would approach 1,200 vehicles in the peak hour. The report further presents that the capacity of a single traffic lane is considered to be around 1,400 vehicles per hour. AUSTRROADS Guide to Traffic Management Part 3: Traffic Studies and Analysis, Section 5.2 details that 1400 vehicles per hour is at the very top of the range and is considered applicable only under ideal conditions. Ideal conditions would not be met with a nominal lane of 3.3m and minimal sealed road shoulder widths.

The AUSTRROAD document suggests that the value is more likely 1,200. The report has not presented any sensitivity testing around the figure of 1,400 utilised.

- *The applicant is to undertake a review of the capacity analysis and provide a sensitivity analysis of the range of values presented in AUSTRROADS Guide to Traffic Management Part 3: Traffic Studies and Analysis*

1.2 Linkage – Fredrick Street

The application indicates the facility for a future link to Fredrick Street (Patterson Pitts Ltd, Drawing W3455 Scheme 5, dated 12/02/2013). The application does not demonstrate the definition of this link, so it is unclear how this link could be protected for future development. This could result in the inability to construct the link due to the corner lot being developed.

Plan Change 36 presented the link between the two developments, and presented that there would not be a link between Fredrick Street and the proposed Road 4 for the residential zones.

- *QLDC should utilise planning consent conditions to restrict the direct link for traffic between Fredrick Street / Road 1 and Road 4.*
- *The applicant shall provide a road designation across to facilitate the future connection of Road 1 to Fredrick Street.*

1.3 Trip Generation

The application presents that the proposed Plan Change area will incorporate 96 residential dwelling units. The Urban Design and Landscape Analysis report indicates the Industrial area to incorporate 8 – 12 industrial lots. An analysis of the trip generation has been presented by Abley Transportation Consultants for this scale of development.

In the Traffic Report supplied by Abley Transport it is stated that traffic generation rates have been drawn from published sources, yet no evidence of that source, or the range of values as a comparison is given. Therefore the basis of this assumption cannot be checked.

A review of the calculations would indicate that a value of 10 trips per residential dwelling has been used. This is considered appropriate.

- *The applicant is to provide the source, and range of values considered for the traffic generation for the development, especially for the industrial area.*

A distribution analysis has been presented stating that 67% of traffic will turn left from the new intersection onto Ballantyne Road, and the remaining 33% will turn right. The traffic report has not detailed the basis of this assumption, nor has it presented any sensitivity to other ratios (i.e. 70 / 30 , 80 / 20). Any change in ratios could have a significant impact on the traffic model utilised for the new intersection.

A review of the greater roading network fails to indicate the destinations that would generate 33% of movements towards Riverbank Road and onwards.

- *The applicant is to demonstrate that the distribution analysis is appropriate, and is to undertake a sensitivity analysis for other scenarios.*

1.4 Intersection Levels of Service

Section 4.6 of the traffic report details the assessment of the Level of Service (LOS) utilising the ratio split for turning traffic (67/33). The report presents that the morning peak is the period where the greatest queues are likely to arise due to residents leaving to travel to work.

This analysis indicates that the Level of service is generally acceptable, with the exception of the right turn out (minor road), where the Level of Service falls to LOS: E.

It is considered that the evening peak, with a high ratio of traffic returning from Wanaka, and undertaking a right turn / through movement may produce high delays for traffic turning right out of the new intersection, especially where 1 in every 3 drivers would undertake a right turn out as presented in the assumptions utilised in the traffic report.

The report fails to demonstrate that this is the worst condition, and fails to explore the sensitivity based upon the range of distributions highlighted in Section 1.3 above.

No traffic modelling has been undertaken for operation of the intersection in future years with an indication of when a roundabout at Road 3 / Ballantyne Road would be required.

- *The applicant is to undertake an analysis of the evening peak to demonstrate the worst condition, and is to undertake a sensitivity analysis of the range of likely movement splits.*
- *The applicant shall determine when a roundabout at Road 3 / Ballantyne Road would be required.*

1.5 Road Reserves – New Development

The Traffic Report details the provision of a 20m road corridor on the main road (Road 4) within the industrial area. It further details that the residential road reserve is proposed to be 18m wide. No details of the typical road layout have been supplied. Care should be taken to demonstrate that the required cycle and pedestrian facilities, along with any proposed surface storm water features and roadside parking, can be installed within the proposed road reserve.

Review of Councils amendments to NZS4404:2004 Table 3.1 Road Design Standards – Urban (speed limit less than 70km/h) indicates the residential road reserve width should be a minimum of 20m. This is further supported via the Wanaka Transport Strategy (2008) indicating the links from Ballantyne Road to Cardrona Valley Road or Orchard Road being Tertiary or Primary in hierarchy status.

- *Typical proposed road layout should be supplied to demonstrate that the desired road configuration can be achieved within the proposed road reserves.*
- *The link road reserve be widened to 20m.*

1.6 Intersection Form

The applicant has detailed access to the proposed development via two points – Enterprise Drive (constructed) and a new access location at or near the curve on Ballantyne Road. Both access point's junction with Ballantyne Road.

The applicant is non-specific about the details of the new road junction, but acknowledges that with development of the greater area it is accepted that a roundabout would be required. No supporting information is provided demonstrating the proposed junction will operate efficiently and safely in future years without development in the greater area.

The location of the proposed new road junction is on the outside of the curve. A review of the location in Google Earth Pro™ indicates that there are service utility poles on the inside of the curve, with a stay pole on the outside of the curve in close proximity to the proposed junction.

The intersection location is close to a change in both horizontal and vertical alignment, resulting in poor sight lines for a right turn into the new road due to the topography on the inside of the curve.

- *The applicant is to undertake further assessments of the location and suitability of the proposed new road junction, and detail the mitigation measures proposed to maximise sight lines, and eliminate roadside hazards at the proposed intersection.*

The scheme plan (Urban Design and Landscape Plan; Attachment F & G) details an area of land that appears to be for the provision of a roundabout at a future stage. No details are given as to the indicated effective diameter of the roundabout. A 30m central island diameter would be appropriate for this location and would retain consistency with other future roundabouts on Ballantyne Road. It is not clear if the area of land indicated is sufficient for the provision of an appropriate roundabout in this rural / industrial environment. It is understood that the construction of this roundabout could occur at some time in the future, based upon the development of adjacent consented developments.

- *The applicant is to ensure that the land parcel available is sufficient for the construction of an appropriately sized roundabout.*

1.7 Pedestrian and Cyclist

It is presented that off road cycle and pedestrian paths can be developed within the road corridor and green space of the development. Final design can be approved at the engineering design approval stage. For consideration of the Plan Change; however the applicant should provide details of the proposed typical cross sections and width of facilities to demonstrate that the facilities are applicable, and that they can safely connect to the surrounding road network. This is especially important where the road reserve is proposed to be 18m wide. The cross section should include the provision of an off-road shared path parallel to Roads 3 and 4.

- *The applicant should provide details of the proposed typical cross sections and width of facilities to demonstrate that the facilities are applicable, and that they can safely connect to the surrounding road network.*

Memo

PLAN CHANGE 46 – BALLANTYNE ROAD INDUSTRIAL AND RESIDENTIAL EXTENSION

MEMO TO: Gerry Essenberg (3 Waters)
Paul Wilson (Parks & Reserves)
Denis Mander (Transport)
Marion Read (Landscape)
Tim Williams (Urban Design)

FROM: Blair Devlin (Planning Policy)

DATE: 2 May 2013

RE: PLAN CHANGE 46 – BALLANTYNE ROAD INDUSTRIAL AND RESIDENTIAL EXTENSION

ASSESSMENT OF THE ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION PROVIDED AND CONSISTENCY WITH COUNCIL POLICY AND PROJECTS

DUE DATE FOR COMPLETION: 10 May 2013

Description of Proposed Plan Change

The Council has received a Request for a private Plan Change to:

Rezone land from Rural General to Industrial B and Low Density Residential off Ballantyne road in Wanaka. The site subject to the plan change comprises approximately 17ha of land to the south and west of the existing Ballantyne Road industrial area, Wanaka. The land is legally described as Lot 99 DP445766 and part of Lot 3 DP374697. [A copy of the relevant Certificate of Title is contained as Appendix A to the plan change request.]

The site is flat land currently used for casual sheep grazing and pastoral grass production. It has a cover of pastoral grasses with a small group of trees in the northern corner. The open cover of pastoral grass continues to the south and west. The southeast boundary of the site is bordered by an established shelter belt.

The area of the residential extension is shown in the figure below in blue. The area of the industrial extension is shown below in dark yellow. The two areas are separated by an open space area shown in green. This plan comes from Appendix B of the Plan Change request.

The plan change contains the following appendices:

APPENDIX A: CERTIFICATE OF TITLE
APPENDIX B: SCHEME PLAN
APPENDIX C: PLAN CHANGE 36 SUBMISSION CONCEPT PLAN
APPENDIX D: MWH ROAD LAYOUT ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX E: REVISED CONCEPT PRESENTED AT PLAN CHANGE 36 HEARING
APPENDIX F: BAXTER DESIGN GROUP LANDSCAPE REPORT

Matters raised by this Request for a Plan Change

This Request for a Plan Change raises the following matters/ potential effects:

Issues	Who/ Department	Relevant to this Plan Change (✓/x)
Urban Design	Strategy & Planning team (Urban Design Panel)	Tim
Landscape and visual impact	Lakes Environmental landscape architects	Marion
3 Waters	Gerry Essenberg	Gerry
Roading/ traffic / public transport	Denis Mander	Denis
Parks, reserves, and walkways	Paul Wilson	Paul

Please consider the attached Plan Change Request and supporting material in respect of those matters stated above which are ticked and have your name alongside.

Questionnaire – fill out a separate questionnaire for each of the above matters that your name is alongside

In relation to the following issue: *[E.g. Waste water services]*

Part A – Is the information provided adequate?

1. Is the information the Requestor has provided adequate to enable the Council to consider the effects/ matter thoroughly?

NB: Council can only request further information that is necessary (and appropriate to the scale/ significance of the effects of the Change) to better understand the effects on the environment, how they will be mitigated, the costs, benefits, effectiveness, and efficiency of the Change, and the consultation undertaken.

There will be additional information required at Resource Consent stage on the position and size of pipes for water, wastewater and stormwater

The following requirements are to be included in the Plan Change:
The size and position of pipes in the road reserve will be required at the time of Resource Consent.

Additional pipes required to provide a satisfactory level of service may be required outside the area covered by the Plan Change and shall be detailed at Resource Consent Stage.
This will include any services required for future adjacent properties

Any areas unable to be serviced by gravity wastewater at Resource Consent Stage will not

be developed until gravity services for those properties are available from adjoining areas. It is noted that some of these areas can be raised to provide gravity systems from future building platforms.

All properties will require water meters and backflow protection placed at the legal road boundary. In particular all industrial properties will require backflow protection at a higher level than that required for residential properties in accordance with The Backflow Prevention for Drinking Water Suppliers Code of Practice 2006.

The Council will require a bulk meter(s) for the water supply this will be connected to the council SCADA network as required.

Fire hydrants shall be spaced to supply FW4 to the industrial zones and FW2 in the residential zones

All landscaping shall be as per the landscaping plan which shall be designed to use minimal water for irrigation. The water supply for irrigation shall be removed within 5 years of 224c.

2. What further information is required?

3. Is there information in the Request (e.g. in the supporting technical reports) that requires a further report/ peer review to be commissioned?

Not at this point in time, QLDC is undertaking further water modelling that will include this area.

If the stormwater is to be disposed of on-site at identified in this Plan Change then a further report identifying how and where this will occur as well as overland flow paths for flows greater than that designed for will be required. Stormwater overland flow paths/swales/detention may be required within the open green space adjacent to the south west end of Road 3. The position of the road shall have flexibility to accommodate this.

Part B – Is the Plan Change consistent with the Council's strategies and work programme?

4. Is this Plan Change consistent/ inconsistent with any of your strategies or current or planned projects relating to this matter (specify which ones)?

Yes

5. Would this Plan Change help or hinder any current or planned projects you're working on?

No effect

6. Are there other issues that would arise from this Plan Change that have not been thought of?

7. Could the Plan Change be modified to offer any further benefits in respect of this matter/ your area of responsibility (e.g. amend the masterplan to link x walkway).