

QUESTIONNAIRE – PLAN CHANGE 49 – Tai Tapu

NAME: Andrew Mazey

POSITION: Asset Manager Transportation

PART A – IS THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ADEQUATE?

1. Is the information the Requestor has provided appropriate in identifying all of the relevant infrastructure and transportation issues?

Generally yes. Annexure 9 Possible Subdivision Concept is the most pertinent identifier on how the Plan Change would be given effect to and reflects mostly my discussions with The Applicant in that regard.

NB: Council can only request further information that is necessary (and appropriate to the scale/ significance of the effects of the Change) to better understand the effects on the environment, how they will be mitigated, the costs, benefits, effectiveness, and efficiency of the Change, and the consultation undertaken.

2. Is further information required to determine the rezoning will not give rise to inefficiencies in the network or give rise to potentially adverse effects?

As above the more relevant specific detail will come forward through subdivision consent. I had raised minor concerns about the formed width of the proposed future Right of Ways which had been acknowledged by the Applicant. The original Request for Further Information in Annexure 15 included concerns related to the Hauschilds and Lincoln Tai Tapu Rd intersection.

PART B – IS THE PLAN CHANGE CONSISTENT WITH THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIES AND WORK PROGRAMME?

4. Is this Plan Change consistent/ inconsistent with any of your strategies or current or planned projects relating to this matter (specify which ones)?

Roading – The proposed plan change is expected to create 16 new lots which has a low impact on the roading network in this area and doesn't create any issues with current or proposed transportation plans. However the lack of a footpath connection along Hauschilds Rd to Lincoln Tai Tapu Rd is not consistent with Councils Walking and Cycling Strategy.

5. Would this Plan Change help or hinder any current or planned projects you're working on?

Roading – In acknowledgement of the adjoining Ardrossan subdivision and that expected from this proposed plan change/future subdivision, recent upgrade works have occurred to improve road alignment and footpath connections at or near the School/ Hauschilds Rd intersection.

6. Are there other issues that would arise from this Plan Change that have not been thought of?

Roading – No, it's quite simple in its nature

7. Could the Plan Change be modified to offer any further benefits in respect of this matter/ your area of responsibility

Roading – I request that the ODP shows an indicative footpath/pathway connection along the west side of Hauschids Rd from the Southernmost indicative access point to Lincoln Tai Tapu Rd. The road reserve along here is only 10m wide and is nearly all occupied by existing formed carriageway/side drains. Therefore to create a footpath along here additional land is needed from the Applicants property by either vesting or via easement to achieve this.



Comments on Submissions

The roading and transportation comments made by submitters fall into the 3 main categories

1. The ability of the local network to cope
2. Roading upgrades
3. The Indicative details of the proposed plan change/resulting future subdivision.

In regards to the first point the proposed plan change area is only creating 16 low density “rural residential” type lots so traffic generation will be small. Even on the basis Hauschids Rd is viewed by Submitters as relatively narrow at 6m wide, it is not inconsistent with other situations within a 50 km/hr area and other subdivision enclaves in the area which have a larger number of contributing lots e.g. Riverside and Ardrossan (when fully developed).

Submitters raised concerns with the formed width of Hauschields Rd, lack of a footpath and the adequacy of the Hauschields/Lincoln Tai Tapu Rd intersection. As indicated above the existing road reserve along Hauschields Rd is only 10m wide which is an unexplained anomaly compared to the usual 20m found elsewhere in the township. The formed width of Hauschields Rd is around 6m wide.

This constraint has always precluded anything further being done to upgrade Hauschields Rd as private property would have been needed. If there is a view that the road should be upgraded then land from the proposed Plan Change area would be needed to achieve it. It would be my opinion that a "Local – Intermediate" classification would suffice requiring a 13-15m road reserve and 7-8m wide carriageway and footpath on one side (Table E13.8 of the District Plan). Widening the carriageway further is not likely necessary as there will be little likelihood of parked vehicles along here relating to the expected ample opportunity for parking in the relatively large rural residential lots being created alongside. "No Parking" yellow lines could be installed along the length of Hauschields Rd to reinforce this.

While the widening of the carriageway would be beneficial I see most of the advantage in being able to create a footpath to Lincoln Tai Tapu Rd, as also identified in the submissions. As advised above I believe the ODP should also include the provision for a footpath connection along the west side of Hauschields Rd. To do this land or an easement would be needed which could be facilitated at subdivision stage. At least this would be signalled as to this intent through the final ODP.

It is noted however that half of the expected traffic generation (8 lots) is via a roading link to School Road (via a short upgraded section of Hauschields Rd) to the south. School Rd is expected to cater for the majority of the main roading and pedestrian access to and from the town centre, school etc. The other two access points (combined 4 lots each) indicated on Hauschields Rd to the north are for the proposed private Right of Ways. These will be at a standard not much more than a private vehicle entranceway and therefore of limited impact along this section of Hauschields Rd. The final form of these access points will be established through subdivision consenting and I would expect in this situation to be similar to Diagram E10.C2 of the District Plan considering the relative narrowness of the existing carriageway.

Submitters have also expressed concern with right turning vehicles from Lincoln Tapu Rd into Hauschields Rd and the lack of specific right hand turn facilities. This was first identified as a potential issue by Council and formed the basis of an RFI to the Applicant. This was answered by the Applicants traffic consultant as detailed in Annexure 15 which considered this was not necessary relating to the small numbers of traffic making this manoeuvre. I agree with this however in addition there are practical problems in being able to widen the Lincoln Tai Tapu carriageway in this area due to the relatively steep road side fall back to the river plus the proximity of a large concrete tank structure 2.5m from the existing edge of the road. Moreover the area is within a 50km/hr speed limit area so not having specific turning facilities is not inconsistent with most urban networks. No such facility exists at the Riverside Lane further towards Tai Tapu without issue.

One submitter did raise the issue of the left turn from Lincoln Tai Tapu Rd into Hauschields Rd and the lack of visibility. A large hedge juts out 2-3m from the boundary line along Lincoln Tai Tapu Rd that could be trimmed back at the intersection which could improve visibility for both vehicles entering and exiting Hauschields Rd that Council could request the property owner to undertake. In addition reasonable seal tapers exist at the intersection for this type of environment. A monitoring condition could be applied to any subdivision consent to look at further options if there was the unlikely event of any safety issues occurring at the intersection as a result of its additional use by the proposed development. I would consider this unlikely to be the case in amongst the general growth in this area of Tai Tapu.



On one further point, a submitter expressed concerns on the impact of any new street lighting. For a low density development of this nature street lighting, if warranted at all, would be at a minimal level. In addition new LED technology required by Council to be used for street lights minimises light spill and light pollution. I would expect if any lighting was to be installed it would be in conjunction with the proposed new section of road in from the southern access point for the 8 lots proposed in this area. Any requirements would be assessed as part of any subdivision consent and would be required to meet Councils Engineering standards.

Andrew Mazey
Asset Manager Transportation

23 May 2017