

Memo



To:	Karen Page
From:	Denis Mander
Date:	Thursday, 22 April 2010
cc:	
Subject:	Arrowtown South Plan Change

Karen

Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Arrowtown South Plan change. Last year I provided you with initial comments on the plan change proposal. The queries around transport addressed

- Desired outcomes in terms of use of different modes, and how this will be achieved through the design and management of the transport network (including destination facilities).
- Linkages to existing bus routes – in terms of legibility, safety and convenience
- Principles relating to the quality of the various transport networks

I have read the Traffic Design Group traffic assessment and note its conclusions regarding the impact of the development on traffic capacity at key intersections adjacent/in the vicinity of the area directly affected by the Private Plan Change. I have also read the letter from John Edmonds and Associates of 8 November 2010.

Intersection Analysis

I am satisfied with the analysis and the conclusions in respect of the specific impacts of the plan change on specific intersections.

Outstanding concerns

The plan change does not go far enough in seeking to integrate land use and transport. The plans change leaves considerable doubt as to the quality of the public transport, cycling and walking networks that will be required. In particular:

- Analysis of potential bus routes needs to be presented. It is acknowledged that the provision of services is not under the control of the applicant; however the applicant has considerable influence over the feasibility of services through the design of the road and pathway network. It is one thing to say that a route can be extended, but the practicality of such a measures will be measured in terms of
 - the additional costs to the ORC or operator of providing such services,
 - the impact on other bus users in terms of longer routes or reductions in service elsewhere
- The continued reference to “informal pathways” is an area that needs to be clarified. The JEA response to the QLEDC request for information from JEA states that “The officer prefers that all pedestrian pathways are formed to a consistent engineering standard...” This is not what was written. What was stated was as follows:

From a transport perspective, use of “informal footpaths” is completely unacceptable. A clear focus must be on providing safe, convenient and

legible footpaths that cater for the full cross-section of Arrowtown residents and visitors. The combination of narrow slow speed streets and on-street cycle paths usable by mountain bikes leave us unclear as to provision for urban cycling, where the street network may provide the most direct cycle routes for many journeys. Further information is likely to address this point – if slow speeds are the desired outcome some forethought needs to be given as to how street design will deliver this outcome.

The request for clarification remains unanswered.

- Information was requested on parking provisions to establish that the generic provisions in the district plan are indeed appropriate to this particular proposal.

The request for clarification remains unanswered.

Denis Mander
Infrastructure Strategy Manager