

Our Ref: 240813 devlin MWH response

24 August 2013

**Alison Devlin**  
**Orchard Road Holdings Ltd**  
**PO Box 170**  
**Dunedin 9054**

TRANSMITTAL: **EMAIL**  
Alison@willowridge.co.nz

Dear Alison

### **PLAN CHANGE 46 (BALANTYNE INDUSTRIAL ZONE): RESPONSE TO MWH**

Further to the memorandum dated 6 August 2013 to Queenstown Lake District Council from MWH, I met with Mike Smith and Oliver Brown of MWH to discuss the contents and develop an appropriate way forwards. This letter sets out the results of the meeting and the agreed actions. For ease of reference the various matters are addressed in the same order as the MWH memo.

#### **Item 1.1: Sensitivity Test**

The purpose of this part of the memo is to discuss the ability of Ballantyne Road to accommodate the expected traffic generation of development within the plan change area. Ultimately MWH agrees that the midblock capacity of the road will not be exceeded and thus this matter does not need further consideration.

#### **Item 1.3: Traffic Generation of the Development**

We agreed that as this is a plan change, there is some degree of uncertainty about the ultimate traffic generation of the site as this depends on the end users and development density. Should the traffic generation be lower than previously assessed, then it is unlikely that the suggested roundabout will be needed for some considerable time but conversely higher traffic generation means that the timing of the roundabout will be brought forwards. Regardless however, it is important that sufficient land remains undeveloped in the immediate vicinity of the access intersection in order to avoid a situation where a roundabout is required but can no longer physically be provided. Accordingly we agreed that the Structure Plan should be amended to identify (indicatively) an appropriate area of land. This area of land can be refined when the land use / subdivision application is made.

#### **Item 1.3: Sensitivity Testing of Traffic Distribution**

To a large extent, detailed sensitivity testing of the traffic distribution is unhelpful given the issues associated with traffic generation (above). However MWH noted that their concern in this regard related to the utilities, in that if a greater proportion of vehicles associated with development of the plan change area was to arrive from the north, there may be a night for an extended right-turn lane at the access which would affect the power lines presently running along the eastern side of Ballantyne Road. We agreed that this was a matter for resolution when the land use / subdivision application was made.

#### **Item 1.4: Intersection Levels of Service / Determination of Timing of Improvement**

We discussed at some length the issue of the timing of the possible intersection upgrading and the form of the intersection. One concern for MWH was the pedestrian and cyclist connectivity between the residential area and the amenities within Three Parks, and ensuring that appropriate provision was made for crossing Ballantyne Road. We agreed that the Structure Plan would be amended to show the presence of the pedestrian / cyclist desire line in this location which would ensure that the issue was addressed at land use / subdivision stage. In turn, accommodating such a desire line would influence the design of the access intersection. MWH also requested that desire lines were shown within the site, and also towards the north towards future development areas.

We also agreed that it would be appropriate to recognise the connectivity issue through a proposed Rule within the plan change request, while also appreciating that any severance created by Ballantyne Road was heavily dependent upon traffic generated by other developments (rather than Plan Change 46 per se). We considered that an appropriate rule would be of the form "*Development of more than 'xxx' residential lots shall be a non-complying activity until an appropriate pedestrian and cyclist crossing facility of Ballantyne Road is provided*". We differed on the value of 'xxx' with my view being 50% of the residential development and MWH considering that 10% was a more appropriate threshold (around 50 and 10 residential properties respectively). However we agreed that this was a matter for discussion at the plan change hearing and did not need resolving at this stage.

In terms of the timing of the access intersection improvement scheme, MWH highlighted that this should not only be dependent upon capacity but should also recognise safety matters also. At the moment there is no Rule proposed in respect of the timing of the upgrade and we agreed that further consideration should be provided at the hearing of why there is the case.

#### **Item 1.6: Intersection Form**

We agreed that the matters raised within this item had been satisfactorily addressed through our discussions about other matters.

#### **Item 1.2: Frederick Street Link**

MWH highlighted that at present, the Structure Plan means that it would be possible to develop the area in a way which precluded a direct link to Frederick Street and asked for clarification of this issue. If it is intended to provide a link in future, then this should be shown on the Structure Plan.

#### **Item 1.5: Road Reserves**

MWH noted that the width of Road 5 (through the residential area) might not be sufficient if it also served the area towards the southwest. We agreed that the provision made in the plan change request means that the road widths will need to comply with Council's requirements and that accordingly, an appropriate provision for the road reserve will need to be made at subdivision.

#### **Item 1.7: Pedestrians and Cyclists**

We agreed that the matters raised within this item had been satisfactorily addressed through our discussions noted above.

#### **Summary**

Overall, we agreed that a number of the matters raised related to the merits of the plan change and should therefore be considered at the hearing, or were more appropriately left for when land use / subdivision consent is sought. In order to address MWH's concerns, I

suggest that a letter is provided to Council which sets out that prior to the hearing the Structure Plan will be amended to show:

- indicative areas of land at the access intersection which will be protected from development and reserved to enable future provision of a roundabout;
- a pedestrian/cyclist desire line across Ballantyne Road at the site access intersection;
- a pedestrian/cyclist desire lines between the proposed residential areas, through the open space, and towards Ballantyne Road;
- a pedestrian/cyclist desire line between the proposed residential areas and areas towards the north;
- clarification of whether a future link is proposed between the site and Frederick Street

The letter should also propose an additional Rule such that development of more than 50 residential lots shall be a non-complying activity until an appropriate pedestrian and cyclist crossing facility of Ballantyne Road is provided, and contain a comment that further consideration of the timing of the access intersection upgrade (and the potential for a Rule for this) will be provided at the hearing. Based on the discussions, I consider that this letter will meet MWH's concerns and enable the plan change request to be accepted for notification.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like any further information regarding the matters set out above.

Regards  
**Abley Transportation Consultants Limited**



*Andy Carr*  
Associate Principal

Direct 03 367 9009  
Mobile 027 561 1967  
Email andy.carr@abley.com