



MEMORANDUM

To: Liz White, Processing Planner

From: Andrew Mazey, Asset Manager Transportation

Date: 7 July 2021

Subject: Transport Comments on Plan Change 66, Maddisons Road Rolleston

Introduction

1. My name is Andrew McDonald Mazey. I have worked for Selwyn District Council since 1991 in a number of roading related roles over this time. I currently hold the position of Asset Manager Transportation and have been in this and an equivalent earlier position for 20 years. Part of my role is to provide strategic asset management and planning advice to Council across its roading and transport systems. A key component of this is to ensure the appropriate integration of both transport and land use planning for activities that depend on both.
2. Because of the relatively non-contentious nature of this Plan Change 66 Application (PC) from a transport perspective, my comments are provided in memo form. I have been involved in the PC process to date and have provided transport advice on behalf of Council to the Processing Planner and/or Applicant. This has included an assessment of the Application and the Request for Further Information (RFI) processes.
3. I have read in particular the October 2020 Integrated Transportation Assessment (ITA) by Novo Group included in the PC Application and the further information supplied through the RFI and submission processes. I am generally supportive of the proposed Application from a transport perspective, based on

this information and also the recent engagement by the Applicant with Submitters to proactively address concerns that would have relevance to Council and its areas of interest.

4. Apart from any general discussion or comments, others are on an “exception” basis to discuss any specific aspects of interest or note. This includes roading and transport submission points directed to me by the Processing Planner to consider.

General Comments

5. From a local roading and traffic perspective I have no significant concerns with the increase in traffic generated by the PC, assessed as up to 180 vehicle movements per hour and 2,885 vehicle movements per day from the 27.3Ha site proposed to be zoned to Business 2A land.
6. This is because the proposed new roading connections to service the PC area are to an existing main roading network that has been already provided or upgraded to cater for this type of use as part of the adjoining IPort development, and its integration into the overall Rolleston Industrial Zone (RIZ) transport network.
7. Existing roads like Hoskyns Road and Jones Road in the area, including related local intersections, have already been upgraded to cater for this use by the wider RIZ area. Jones Road connects to the new Southern Motorway Weedons Interchange on State Highway 1, and is assigned as the primary arterial heavy vehicle road route to cater for the RIZ.
8. The exception is Maddisons Road and Weedons Ross Road that can also provide a secondary link to the Weedons Interchange from the more northern areas of the RIZ if vehicles wish to use it. Maddisons Road provides a level of service that is more typical of a standard rural road in the district. Weedons Ross Road is proposed to be upgraded by Council, but this reflects its increasing use as the arterial local roading link between SH73 at West Melton and the Weedons SH1 Interchange, and the motorway to Christchurch.

9. Over the years the Council has received various submissions and representations from local Weedons residents and the Weedons School about their concerns on possible traffic increases and effects, particularly from heavy vehicles, on both these roads if used by the RIZ for access.
10. To assist in addressing these types of concerns and effects, any additional use of Maddisons Rd has sought to be mitigated by Council requesting that developments prevent or limit direct roading or site access to this road, especially from the IPort area. This aim has been also identified by this PC, and measures are promoted as described through Paragraphs 25 – 29 of the ITA. Relevant aspects are discussed further as follows.
 - a. Paragraph 25 states *“No new road connections to Maddisons Road are proposed”* while Paragraph 28 refers to amending the District Plan to *“make access (be it road access, accessway or vehicle crossing) Restricted Activity”* in relation to Maddisons Road, and identifies those matters for discretion for considering this.
 - b. In Appendix 1, Proposed Outline Development Plan (ODP) there is a reference to *“No vehicle entrance off Maddisons Road”* on the ODP. It is my opinion that this ODP reference to “vehicle entrance” only does not capture the requirement that in the first instance there will be no vehicular access of any kind to Maddisons Road. I recommend that the ODP reference be amended to *“No roading or vehicle access to Maddisons Road”* which better represents the requirement sought by Council to prevent all access.
 - c. I also question why the ODP shows no specific roads within the Application site (only connections to it) and could surmise this is to provide flexibility to make roading connections to Maddisons Road “easier” within the bounds of the matters for discretion suggested, which again is not aligned to the outcomes sought by Council to prevent all access. The basis of the ITA and its traffic assessments rely mostly on the two parallel roads running east – west through the site referred to as Roads K and D. On that basis it is reasonably expected that these roads would be shown on the ODP.
 - d. It is understood the intentions behind the Restricted Activity proposal which would allow access to Maddisons Rd to be further considered, based on the

effects of an actual activity and the traffic assessment matters that are set out in Paragraph 29 i. The traffic assessment matters detailed in the ITA, which I understand are existing matters within the District Plan, are generally supported that would form the basis of a consent application. In my view, considering public interest/feedback to date on any additional use of Maddisons Road related to the RIZ, I would expect such an application to be fully or limited notified.

- e. In Paragraph 29 ii it identifies a process to understand and identify the costs of the road and intersection upgrades that maybe necessary, but is silent on who would be responsible for any upgrading costs. It would be Council's expectation that these are referenced as the responsibility of the Applicant.
11. It is noted that Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency are planning to upgrade SH1 through Rolleston to improve safety and access, which includes the proposal to close the intersections of Hoskyns Road and Rolleston Drive on SH1. This is part of the NZ Upgrade Programme (NZUP). The current Hoskyns Road intersection provides another main roading connection to the RIZ from SH1. Local connectivity is proposed to be replaced by a multi modal road "flyover" over SH1 and the railway line that will connect Rolleston Drive to Jones Road. Current details on NZUP and these intentions can be found at the link below¹. The Transport Agency will be publically consulting on the proposed plans from the 20th July 2021 onwards.
 12. The Weedons Interchange would then provide the sole northern primary arterial roading connection to RIZ from SH1 using Jones Road. The existing and planned main roads in the IZone and IPort areas provide the further connectivity and transport permeability across the overall RIZ area from Jones Road.
 13. These types of upgrades by the Transport Agency have been anticipated for some time by Council, and the previous planning of the current IPort roading network has accounted for this possible eventuality and any additional traffic use. I consider there are no specific direct effects from the proposed NZUP upgrades that would influence a decision on this PC, that are not already

¹ <https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/news-And-events/news/archived/rolleston-transport-improvements-project-community-update-2020>

accounted for as part of the wider effects on the RIZ, however it is noted some submitters have had some concerns on this which is discussed further below.

Submission Responses

14. Waka Kotahi Transport Agency (001)

It is acknowledged that in discussions with the Applicant the Transport Agency has withdrawn its neutral submission related to the timing of the development of the site and potential effects on the Hoskyns Road and SH1 intersection and its closure relating to the NZUP upgrades. This is on the basis of amending Rule 22.9 Development within the Business 2A Zone to include the following

Non-complying Activities – Development within the Business 2A Zone, Rolleston

22.9.8 Within the Appendix E43A Rolleston Business 2A Zone Maddisons Road ODP area, no building shall be occupied until such time as the overbridge of State Highway 1 between Rolleston Drive and Jones Road is operational.

While I understand the submitter's point and accept the proposed rule amendment as beneficial, I believe the main roading connections already constructed such as IPort Drive that this PC will link to, are more than capable to cater for traffic in the area utilising their connection to Jones Road and the Weedons Interchange. From Council's perspective this is the preferred route for heavy vehicles to access SH1 north rather than using the proposed flyover/overbridge, which is more to provide a localised roading connection to the town centre and the local urban roading network beyond.

15. Lyttleton Port Company 002

This submitter also raised concerns about any adverse traffic effects related to the PC and the operations of the Midland Port, including local road use and connectivity aspects. I acknowledge that the Applicant has agreed with the submitter to include a further provision (Rule 22.9.8 b.) to proposed Rule 22.9 above to address their specific access concerns. As such it is considered the submitter's concerns have been addressed. The full proposed rule is as follows:

Non-complying Activities – Development within the Business 2A Zone, Rolleston

22.9.8 Within the Appendix E43A Rolleston Business 2A Zone Maddisons Road ODP area, no building shall be occupied until such time as:

a. the over bridge of State Highway 1 between Rolleston Drive and Jones Road is operational; and

b. vehicular access is provided between the Midland Port site (Lot 2 DP 475847) and a legal road within the Appendix E43A Rolleston Business 2A Zone Maddisons Road ODP area. Such access shall be secured via a right of way easement in favour of Lot 2 DP 475847 and/or a direct connection from Lot 2 DP 475847 to a legal road vested in Council.

It is noted that the layout and design and construction of the PC roading network will then need to take account of how this vehicle access will be made, and the additional traffic use generated from having this connection through to the Midland Port operations. As such it will be expected that through subsequent consenting and/or engineering approval processes this is taken into account by the Applicant through further transport assessments as to any effects that are required to be mitigated. Subject to these assessments being carried out and the effects catered for, I recommend that the ODP is amended to show this required vehicle access connection from the LPC site.

16. Canterbury Regional Council (001)

I consider the submitters concerns relating to the timing of possible intersection issues, presumably relating to the NZUP proposals, have also been addressed by proposed Rule 22.9.8 a. and b. as in Section 15. As stated previously in Sections 6 and 7 the existing local roading network has been provided or upgraded to cater for the reasonably expected additional traffic use of from a wider RIZ area.

17. Ministry of Education (002)

This submission is reflective of those generally provided by the MoE throughout the development of the RIZ about the potential for adverse safety and access effects of increased traffic along Weedons Ross Road and the School. The role of Weedons Ross Road in context to this PC is discussed in

Sections 8 and 9. As Weedons Ross Road is classified as an arterial road it is expected it will have to accommodate additional traffic use over time. It is my opinion that there will be significantly more traffic growth relating to the arterial link it provides between SH73 at West Melton and the Weedons Interchange at SH1, to whatever could be considered attributable to the traffic effects of this PC.

Council has a Road Safety School Coordinator that works across the District to engage with schools and work through issues with adjoining road safety and access, which has included the Weedons School.

18. Simon Frazer Thomas (001)

The concerns raised by this submitter relate to (vehicular) access to Maddisons Road. I consider this will be addressed by preventing this in the first instance, through the correct notation being made on the ODP, as discussed in Section 10, and the application of rules making any access a restricted discretionary activity. Council expects there will be increasing maintenance requirements to be budgeted for in the future relating to the wider RIZ roading network and the increasing industrial activity expected in the area.

19. Carole Greenfield (001)

The submitter's concerns about the increase use of local roads is noted, however this is to be expected relating to the existing wider RIZ area of which this PC will have a relatively small contribution to in broader terms. As discussed the existing RIZ roading network has been provided to cater for this type of use with the close proximity of primary arterial roading connections to SH1. This will assist in reducing the need to use other surrounding rural roads that provide a lower level of service.

20. Pinedale and Kintyre Enterprises (001)

It is acknowledged this submitter has withdrawn their submission. However, I consider that it is still prudent to consider the reference to understanding the cumulative effects on the roading network from this PC and other developments. The Applicant has utilised the outputs from Council's Rolleston

Paramics Traffic Model that has accounted for such effects. However these relate to an earlier 2016 version rather than the more recent 2018 and 2021 model versions. While I do not expect there will be any material difference to the traffic effects detailed in the ITA by using the 2016 version, I would recommend that the most up to date version of Councils traffic model is used when undertaking any further traffic assessments relating to this PC and any subsequent requirements, including and the planning and designing of its roading network and required connections as likely applicable.

Conclusions

From a roading and transport perspective I generally support Plan Change 66 as presented subject to the following being undertaken or included;

- I. The Outline Development Plan is amended to provide the correct notation that there will be no roading or other vehicular access to Maddisons Road.
- II. Proposed Rule 22.9.8 a. and b. is included in the Plan Change
- III. The Outline Development Plan is amended to show Roads K and D, and the requirement for a vehicle access from the adjoining Lyttleton Port Company Midland Port site to be incorporated into the roading design of the Plan Change area, as intended by Proposed Rule 22.9.8 b., to Council's approval.
- IV. Any further traffic assessments relating to this Plan Change and any related requirements, including and the planning and designing of its roading network and required connections, shall use the latest version of Council's Rolleston Paramics Transport Model as likely applicable.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Mazey', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Andrew Mazey

Asset Manager Transportation