

## Julia Chalmers

---

**From:** Julia Chalmers  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 17 March 2015 9:51 AM  
**To:** Julia Chalmers  
**Subject:** FW: Transportation Response - Plan Change 46

**From:** Nigel Bryce <[n.bryce@ryderconsulting.co.nz](mailto:n.bryce@ryderconsulting.co.nz)>  
**Date:** 4 February 2015 4:16:47 PM NZDT  
**To:** Allan Dippie <[allan@NICHOLSGROUP.CO.NZ](mailto:allan@NICHOLSGROUP.CO.NZ)>  
**Cc:** Marc Bretherton <[Marc.Bretherton@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:Marc.Bretherton@qldc.govt.nz)>, Alison Devlin <[alison@willowridge.co.nz](mailto:alison@willowridge.co.nz)>  
**Subject: Transportation Response - Plan Change 46**

Hi Allan,

We have now received feedback from MWH, which I have attached for your consideration.

In broad terms, and subject to changes to the concept design to improve operation and safety, the T-intersection is considered to address the short-term traffic volumes i.e. the T-intersection can cater for proposed PC46 traffic volumes and existing Ballantyne Road traffic volumes.

The T-intersection, cannot, however, cater for traffic volumes associated with the wider development area. Abley's earlier report had indicated (via Sidra traffic modelling) that a T-intersection could not cater for the expected future year traffic volumes (due to delays associated with the right turn out of Road 3) and identified that a roundabout design for future traffic volumes would be required. We note that the Bartlett Consulting report, while purporting to have considered the future traffic flow increase on Ballantyne Road (created by PC16, 32 and 36), provides no analysis showing future year operation of the T-intersection with development of this wider area. As a consequence, it is not possible to determine how a conclusion can be reached stating that "*[a] T-intersection will cater for current and future traffic flow in Ballantyne Road*".

As a consequence, Bartlett Consulting's response fails to address this longer term traffic response and is not supported by MWH.

### Moving Forward from Here

We acknowledge here that any increase in future traffic volumes associated with the development of wider plan changes is subject to the development of these areas, which may take many years to be implemented. It is therefore important that the Council is able to consider an 'indicative design response' to address these potential longer term traffic volumes, hence the reason why the Council has been so focussed on an indicative roundabout design (given Abley's previous assessment). The only way to demonstrate the extent of land that should be set aside is by the submission of a concept roundabout design.

### Roundabout Designs

You have submitted two roundabout designs to date.

1. Roundabout design (on drawing dated 31/1/14 prepared by Paterson Pitts Group) that falls below Austroad standards and which is your preferred option (or was up to the receipt of Bartlett Consulting's report).
2. An Austroad compliant roundabout design to demonstrate that this is feasible on paper, however (i) is not practicable due to land ownership issues and (ii) that any transport issues can be addressed by your smaller proposed roundabout design (on drawing dated 31/1/14 prepared by Paterson Pitts Group). We

note, for completeness, that Bartlett Consulting also notes that significant earthworks may be required to give effect to a roundabout in this location.

To move this issue forward, the Applicant needs to address the roundabout design issue and not seek to advance further justification for a T-intersection that only addresses short term transport issues. Having spoken to MWH, it is likely that they will sign off on a roundabout design that sits somewhere between these two earlier submitted plans (as long as there is a sound technical reasoning for the design (this was reinforced in my earlier email dated 29th September 2014, which is attached)). I reinforce here that we are not anticipating that you need to build this roundabout (although there may be a need to look at some form of contribution), only that you are able to demonstrate a design that can then be linked to an instrument which protects the land for this future purpose.

I think it would be most constructive, if Bartlett Consulting (now that Abley's are no longer involved with this project) discusses this matter directly with Oliver Brown at MWH.

The Plan Change will continue to remain on hold until such time as you have appropriately responded to the long term transportation issues. If the Applicant chooses not to address the longer term transportation issues, the plan change will be put back to Full Council with a recommendation that it be withdrawn.

Regards Nigel Bryce

Nigel Bryce  
Associate Director / Environmental Planner

C 027 482 9190

T 03 477 2119

F 03 477 3119

Email [n.bryce@ryderconsulting.co.nz](mailto:n.bryce@ryderconsulting.co.nz)

<http://ryderconsulting.co.nz/>

Ryder Consulting Limited  
195 Rattray Street  
PO Box 1023  
Dunedin 9054



Nigel Bryce  
Associate Director / Environmental Planner

C 027 482 9190

T 03 477 2119

F 03 477 3119

Email [n.bryce@ryderconsulting.co.nz](mailto:n.bryce@ryderconsulting.co.nz)

<http://ryderconsulting.co.nz/>

Ryder Consulting Limited

195 Rattray Street

PO Box 1023

Dunedin 9054

