



In reply please quote  
File Ref: Plan Change 46

13<sup>th</sup> January 2014

Orchard Road Holdings Ltd  
PO Box 170  
DUNEDIN 9054

Attention: Alison Devlin

Dear Alison

## **PLAN CHANGE 46 – BALLANTYNE ROAD INDUSTRIAL AND RESIDENTIAL EXTENSION**

### **FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST – OUTSTANDING INFORMATION**

We write further to your response (dated 17<sup>th</sup> July 2013) to the Queenstown Lakes District Council's further information request (dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2013) to Plan Change 46 ('**PC46**') and subsequent engineering responses to the same.

Ryder Consulting Limited ('**Ryder**') has now taken over the processing of PC46 on behalf of the Council. We have undertaken a comprehensive review of all relevant information associated with the Council's further information request and associated responses provided by the Applicant. For completeness, this includes the following information:

- The Council's further information request dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2013 (including MWH memo dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2013 and attached as Attachment A to the Council's request);
- The Applicant's response dated 17<sup>th</sup> July 2013 (including Abley's response to matters raised by MWH and dated 29<sup>th</sup> May 2013);
- MWH's memo dated 6<sup>th</sup> August 2013 addressing those outstanding transportation issues;
- Abley Transport Consultants ('**Abley**') Response to MWH (dated 24<sup>th</sup> August 2013) setting out meeting notes between Abley and MWH staff;
- MWH's correspondence dated 26<sup>th</sup> August 2013 addressing Abley's Response and identifying outstanding transportation issues;

Following our consideration of the above information, it is concluded that there remains several transportation issues that have not been adequately addressed to the Council's satisfaction. We expand upon these outstanding matters in more detail below.

#### **Intersection Form**

MWH in their memo dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2013 raised issues under clause 1.6 (Intersection Form) relating to the need for (i) further assessment of the location and suitability of the proposed new road junction and associated mitigation measures proposed for maximum sight lines and elimination of roadside hazards and (ii) that the applicant is to ensure that the land parcel available is sufficient for construction of an appropriately sized roundabout.

The Applicant's response dated 17<sup>th</sup> July 2013 included a report from Abley (dated 29<sup>th</sup> May 2013) addressing the issues raised within MWH's 9<sup>th</sup> May 2013 memo. Abley's response to clause 1.6 sets out that the issues raised are of detailed design and that the Council has adopted various overarching standards which can give certainty to the Council that an appropriate design response can be achieved at the subdivision and land use stage.

We understand that both Abley's and MWH further advanced engineering considerations at a meeting attended by Mr Andy Carr of Abley's and Mr Mike Smith and Mr Ollie Brown of MWH and which held on 6<sup>th</sup> August 2013. Subsequent correspondence prepared by Abley's and dated 24<sup>th</sup> August 2013

(‘Ableys Meeting Response Letter’) sets out the conclusions reached at this meeting. At Item 1.3 (Traffic Generation of the Development) Abley’s states:

*“...[r]egardless 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.”*

Given the foregoing, subject to the resolution of issues raised under Item 1.6, set out below, we request that the Structure Plan is further amended to accommodate this agreed outcome.

At Item 1.6 (Intersection Form) in Abley’s Meeting Response Letter it is stated that Abley and MWH agreed that the matters raised within this item had been satisfactorily addressed through discussions about other matters. However, further email exchange from MWH on this point (dated 26<sup>th</sup> August 2013) states that no agreement was reached on this point and that MWH still have outstanding concerns relating to this intersection form.

In addressing part of clause 1.6, MWH agree that the indicative land should be shown (as per Item 1.3 of the Abley Meeting Response Letter) and that this be based on achieving a compliant roundabout design. MWH have reinforced that a preliminary/concept design is still required so as to confirm that required sight distances can be achieved. As discussed at the meeting, MWH consider that it is not clear that a roundabout is actually a feasible mitigation measure. It is evident that any preliminary/concept design of this intersection will largely dictate that land area that is required to be identified on the amended Structure Plan. Therefore, we request that a preliminary/concept intersection design is provided so as to confirm required sight distances can be achieved and be prepared in accordance with MWH’s earlier correspondence on this matter.

With respect to Item 1.4 set out in Abley’s Meeting Response Letter, MWH considers that the pedestrian /cycle crossing facilities off Ballantyne Road be required when 10 lots have been developed (this relates to safety concerns whereby children from the 10 lots could play together and move as a group without adult supervision). This is a matter that can be addressed through any future amendments to the proposed rule framework support PC46. Consequently, it is not a matter that we are seeking further information on at this stage.

In all other respects, MWH considers that the Applicant has adequately addressed all those other matters raised in its memo dated (dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2013). We also record, for completeness, that the Applicant has adequately addressed those other matters raised in the Council’s Further Information Request dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2013.

In August 2013, the Council’s Strategy Committee agreed to proceed to notification with PC46, on the condition that further information in relation to traffic impacts is provided to the Council’s satisfaction. Presently, PC46 cannot proceed to notification until such time as the Applicant has adequately addressed the outstanding issue raised in clause 1.6 (Intersection Form), as set out in MWH’s original memorandum (dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2013). Subject to the preliminary/concept design for the proposed intersection design, we also request that the Structure Plan is further amended to accommodate an appropriate land area sufficient to accommodate any proposed mitigation options.

If you have any queries please contact me on (03) 477 2119.

Yours faithfully



Nigel Bryce  
**CONSULTANT PLANNER**