

**APPENDIX D**

**COUNCIL'S CONSULTANT TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S RESPONSE TO  
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO TRAFFIC AND ROADING**

DATE 7 June 2012  
JOB No. \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT PC 4 - North Three Parks
SUBJECT Evidence relating to submissions

FOR INFORMATION OF			
FOR ACTION BY			

**THIS NOTE RECORDS:**

- |                                       |   |  |                             |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> MEETING      | <input type="checkbox"/> WITH               | <input type="checkbox"/> CLIENT                | BETWEEN <u>Oliver Brown</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHONECALL    | <input type="checkbox"/> ABOUT              | <input type="checkbox"/> CONTRACTOR            | AND <u>Sue Mavor</u>        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> THOUGHT/IDEA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SUMMARY | <input type="checkbox"/> SUPPLIER              | TIME _____                  |
|                                       |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SUBMISSION |                             |

**Detail:**

This file note summarises MWH's response to the transportation issues raised by submitters to Plan Change 4 – North Three Parks.

The information considered in forming this response was sent to Oliver from Sue via email. This note responds to issues raised in the four submissions received from Willowridge Developments Ltd, New Zealand Transport Agency, Susan Robertson (for the Robertson Family Trust) and Roger Moseby/Marilyn Gordon.

The issues raised to be considered are:

1. Access for the northern part of North Three Parks from SH84
2. Arterial Road within PC4

**Access for the northern part of North Three Parks from SH84**

1. In the submission by Willowridge Developments they acknowledge that the current proposal of one intersection with SH84 is consistent with the Structure Plan and Transportation Strategy. However, they suggest that further analysis of the design and functionality of that intersection is required to confirm its adequacy. It is considered that a suitable intersection can be designed for this location, although matters of cost sharing, timing and staging are a separate matter which may be of interest between the parties. They also have suggested that an additional access to SH84 may need to be considered to cater for PC4 (Section 4.14).
2. The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) submission in its second point supports the retention of the single intersection with SH84 from both developments due to the potential to "*adversely affect the functionality and efficiency of the State highway.*" Additionally, there is little literature providing specific guidance on the spacing of intersections, however NZTA's superseded "Highway Planning under the Resource Management Act 1991" provided guidance that was widely adopted in other district plans but has since been withdrawn from NZTA's current Planning Policy Manual. That guidance recommended that spacing for intersections on the same side of the road with a speed limit of 80km/h is at least 550 metres. It is noted that the distance from the proposed Three Parks roundabout to the northern boundary of North Three Parks is about 220 metres, less than the recommended minimum spacing.
3. Provision of an additional access onto SH84 is not supported based on it not being consistent with the Structure Plan and Transportation Strategy, reducing the functionality and efficiency of the State highway and not meeting the minimum recommended intersection separation requirements.

4. It is recommended that the proposed roundabout is designed to cater for traffic from both Three Parks and North Three Parks.
5. Two landowners from the northern PC4 area, properties 110 and 124 State Highway 84, currently have access directly onto the highway, which is a Limited Access Road, and have requested that access be provided through Three Parks directly onto the proposed roundabout, or onto the proposed Three Parks arterial road leading to the roundabout.
6. Provision of a fourth leg onto the roundabout (resulting in a “K” layout) cannot be supported based on the likely negative impacts on operation, safety and the road hierarchy. It is likely the currently proposed roundabout will have dual circulating lanes linking the two arterial roads. The suggested fourth leg would be a local access road, which good planning would link to a local connector at a minimum safe distance from the roundabout, as is proposed.
7. A direct link from the northern PC4 area to the proposed Three Parks arterial road is not supported based on the resultant road hierarchy that would link a local road / home zone to an arterial. The proposed PC4 hierarchy provides access to this area via a local connector, which is considered appropriate. It is likely that a direct link would be used as a ‘rat-run’ by other residents, due to the route being shorter than the proposed local connector route, resulting in complaints from the northern area residents it was intended to serve.
8. There was suggestion that the proposed northern PC4 area layout would be inconvenient or dangerous for residents in an emergency situation. This is considered unlikely, there are two alternative vehicle accesses to the area, via the proposed internal roads, linking to the North Three Parks network, as well as a range of pedestrian/cycle routes.

### **Arterial Road within PC4**

9. The Willowridge Developments submission considers that an additional road linkage from the north western corner of PC4, near Golf Course Road, linking to the Three Parks commercial core should be considered as the main arterial route through the PC4 area. They also claim that the arterial road shown is incompatible with Three Parks (Section 4.13)
10. The proposed PC4 collector road (the arterial road noted above) provides a connection from Ballantyne Road to the Three Parks commercial core, and is considered to provide a functional layout that achieves a sound framework for the PC4 area network as well as integration with the Three Parks network and land uses. The proposed hierarchy will be further reinforced through design standards that make the class of the road easily understood by road users.
11. Based on the information supplied, the proposed location of the PC4 intersection, about 300 metres south of Golf Course Road, and the relocated intersection position as proposed by Willowridge, at Golf Course Road, both have geometric deficiencies that will require detailed design to resolve. This is likely to include some realignment of Ballantyne Road with associated land acquisition.
12. If both parties consider that the proposed hierarchy and layout can be further improved it would be beneficial for them to discuss and come back to Council with the proposed improvements.

Oliver Brown  
Traffic Engineer