

Julia Chalmers

From: Allan Dippie <allan@NICHOLSGROUP.CO.NZ>
Sent: Wednesday, 11 February 2015 3:08 PM
To: Nigel Bryce
Cc: Marc Bretherton; Alison Devlin
Subject: FW: Transportation Response - Plan Change 46

Hi Nigel , we haven't heard back from you regarding the email below . This was sent to you a week ago which is very unacceptable . In future we need a 24hour turn around as agreed.

It has occurred to me that a way forward is quite simple.

In terms of council future proofing a possible future intersection upgrade in this location additional land may be or may not be required from Willowridge whom own the Three parks site directly across the road .

Whilst Willowridge is not involved in the plan change 46 it would be prepared to enter into a future side agreement with council.

This agreement could facilitate a possible future intersection upgrade along with other matters as part of the wider roading study council is doing in this area particularly in relation to the present intersection of Ballantyne and Riverbank roads and also cover other land ownership issues .

At present council occupies some of Willowridges land and Willowridge occupies some of councils land and council and Willowridge have had past discussions to rectify this . The reason for this is that Ballantyne road is not constructed entirely within the road reserve and Willowridge occupies some of this reserve .

None of the above affects PC 46 directly as the new Tee intersection doesn't require any further land than we have shown on the design and whilst it's unlikely it would need to be a round about in the future , a side agreement with Willowridge to allow that possibility is easily done .

Please therefore now proceed to notification and one of the conditions ,should the PC be successful , can be the facilitation of an agreement to allow for the possibility of an extended intersection .

Allan Dippie

Director

027 433 4128

www.willowridge.co.nz | www.threeparks.co.nz



From: Allan Dippie
Sent: Wednesday, 4 February 2015 5:20 p.m.
To: 'Nigel Bryce'
Cc: Marc Bretherton; Alison Devlin
Subject: RE: Transportation Response - Plan Change 46

Hi Nigel , a very interesting email and request but in a legal sense ORH is only obliged to design a compliant intersection for the purposes of this complete plan change which it has done and now we absolutely insist that it moves to notification .

We note the design is fully complying and exceeds the minimum design criteria in terms of sight lines even at the existing speed limits . It caters for this plan change and also an undefined amount of development that could occur in the future beyond it . In other words the intersection exceeds the standards required and caters for the full development possible within this plan change .

In terms of development beyond the long term time frames that is not the responsibility of ORH and we are not required to second guess future traffic flows and possible future long term road layouts that have not been determined or any design changes that QLDC may want to consider in the very far future . Those matters would of course be able to be considered at the time that long term future development may trigger a future upgrade and of course at that time the intersection would be functioning and traffic flows able to be measured . (We very much doubt that the intersection would ever become a roundabout and cannot fathom the council consultant fixation on this especially given the specialist advice as to a roundabout in this location) .

To give council extra comfort it will have acquired extra land vested as road reserve from Three Parks in terms of the construction of this Tee intersection and of course that would enable the construction of a roundabout in this location at some future time however doubtful that eventuality may be .

In terms of funding a future round about that may or may not ever occur because of long term traffic generation , again that is not the responsibility of ORH in terms of this plan change and to suggest this is very odd given that ORH will have to bear the majority of costs to construct the intersection for this plan change .

Kind regards

Allan Dippie

Director

027 433 4128

www.willowridge.co.nz | www.threeparks.co.nz



From: Nigel Bryce [<mailto:n.bryce@ryderconsulting.co.nz>]

Sent: Wednesday, 4 February 2015 4:17 p.m.

To: Allan Dippie

Cc: Marc Bretherton; Alison Devlin

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