

Topic 4: Roading connections, placement and traffic effects

Submitter 5: Dugald and Janette Ley

Oppose

Submission Point #5.2: Increase in vehicle movements on Enner Glynn Valley Road and at the Waimea Road / The Ridgeway intersection potentially causing traffic issues.

Decision Sought: I ask that evidence be produced to explain road upgrades proposed at this intersection (The Ridgeway / Waimea Road). The Plan Change needs to address road widening issues via designations or Notices of Requirement. The Plan Change needs a traffic assessment on the implications (for the Plan Change area) of increased traffic on Waimea Road and Southern Link and to resolve these issues before it contemplates rezoning any further land. It needs a traffic assessment on roads leading from The Ridgeway to the subject zoned area.

Overall decision requested: Delay this application until the above issues have been debated and resolved.

Oppose

Submission Point #5.3: Existing roads are deemed by us to be substandard for the proposed rezoned land and it is alluded to that some form of cost share with the owners of the rezoned land be entered into, but we see no details of this.

Decision Sought: I ask that details of, and cost shares from developers are addressed at this stage such that financial effects are known and can be factored into Long Term Council plans and budgets and the subsequent effects on ratepayers is advised.

Overall decision requested: Delay this application until the above issues have been debated and resolved.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT #18

Dugald and Janette Ley

Submission point #5.2, and #5.3

The submitter is concerned about the potential for traffic issues caused by increased traffic movements on Enner Glynn Valley Road and at the Waimea Road / The Ridgeway intersection. The potential traffic issues raised by the submitter have been considered by Andrew James, Nelson City Council's Principle Adviser – Transport. Mr James' report is included as Part B, Appendix 5. Mr James agrees with the submitter that the current roading and intersection configuration requires improvement to accommodate any increase in traffic volumes. Furthermore he states that the Waimea Road / The Ridgeway intersection is one of 15 which require improvements based on current volumes. Mr James also agrees that detailed investigation will be required to determine the nature of these improvements. Where the submitter and Mr James' view differ is the timing of these detailed investigations. The submitter seeks that upgrade information, including a traffic assessment considering increased traffic from the Plan Change area, Waimea Road, and the possible 'Southern Link', be sought and considered prior to the Plan Change proceeding. Mr James considers that *'...given the likely pace of development it is considered the environment is likely to change considerably before any substantial growth is seen in the Enner Glynn valley, rendering any in-depth study at this time of little merit'*. He also notes that the growth projections from proposed Plan Change 17 have been included in the Arterial Traffic Study (ATS). It can therefore be assumed that the outcome of the ATS has taken this into account and any mitigation required in relation to the ATS will be undertaken by the time development occurs.

In relation to the Waimea Road / The Ridgeway intersection, design improvements have been scheduled for the last few years but had been deferred awaiting the outcomes of the ATS, this Plan Change and the effects of The Ridgeway link on traffic flows. Funding is allocated in the Long Term Plan for the 2011/2012 financial year to carry out the design and construction of improvements to this intersection.

It is acknowledged that The Ridgeway / Enner Glynn Road intersection will also require an upgrade based on the likely increase in traffic along the Ridgeway (following safety improvements to the Waimea Road intersection and growth in Marsden Valley) and as a result of this proposed Plan Change increasing traffic volumes along Enner Glynn Road.

Mr James also considers Enner Glynn Valley Road itself would require upgrading particularly around the

bend 170m east of the intersection with Newman Drive and Enner Glynn Road. In his view this would be the costliest section and involve earthworks, retaining and possibly land purchase.

As Mr James states it is seen to be more appropriate to consider any outstanding specific mitigation issues as part of future resource consent applications rather than attempt to determine these at this point. In my view the pattern of land holdings, the proposed zoning patterns, and the likely timing of the proposed connecting road from Marsden Valley to Enner Glynn Valley means it will be some time before there is any significant increase in traffic using Enner Glynn Valley Road. This correlates with Mr James' view that a traffic study or any detailed design would be of little merit at this stage as the environment is likely to change considerably over that time. It is more efficient to design and carry out any improvements required at the time the need is generated. This view is supported by the fact the land proposed for rezoning is also proposed to be located within the Services Overlay requiring that any servicing requirements, including roading, shall be addressed at the time of planning for a subdivision.

Works to facilitate the future road upgrade (Enner Glynn Road as per this submission, but applicable to any extension or increase of service capacity to address the Services Overlay requirements) can either be funded through the Long Term Plan (LTP) or by the developer. For works to be funded through the LTP developers can either:

1. Wait for the project to be programmed into the capital works programme and included in the LTP as part of Council's prioritisation process, or
2. Make a submission to the LTP / Annual Plan to get works scheduled earlier to match their intended development timetable, or
3. Fund the work themselves.

This leads into the submitter's final point that the details of any cost sharing arrangements between developers and the Council are determined now and the impact on ratepayers is advised. In my view the level of detail requested by the submitter goes far beyond that which can be reasonably expected to be gained through this proposed Plan Change process to rezone land. The proposed Plan Change has been developed to provide a high level planned and integrated development pattern in the area. The appropriate time to consider detailed future development planning, including cost sharing, is at the time planning for the development is being undertaken. This is when the timing, yield and costs of development are better known, and is the time when developers are sufficiently informed to enable a submission to the LTP to seek that a project to fund that growth (road upgrade in the case of this submission) is included. This allows for an informed discussion to be carried out once a specific development is proposed. By waiting until this stage traffic movements can be more accurately predicted and the current environment can be considered.

Overall I consider that development of the area, resulting in increased traffic movements, will be appropriately mitigated prior to the effect being generated. In my view it is not appropriate to attempt to determine this at this Plan Change stage and should be carried out at the time of detailed future development planning when the impacts can be more accurately predicted. The Long Term Plan process allows the opportunity for developers to seek funding for this and it to be considered by Council and the public.

RECOMMENDATION

Submission Point #5.2: Reject

Submission Point #5.3: Reject

AMENDMENT TO PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE:

Nil

Submitter 7: Rosalie Barbara Higgins

Oppose

Submission Point #7.1: I am opposed to the above provisions (AD11.4A viii, AD11.4A ix, Proposed Structure Plan Map 3, Meaning of Words 'Generally Accord') and any other matters within the Proposed Plan Change 17 that will require me to provide a linking road between land in Plan Change 13 and

Part B

APPENDIX 5

Andrew James – Proposed Plan Change 17, 13 July 2011

File Ref:

1125077

When calling
please ask for:

Andrew James

Direct Dial Phone:

546 0263

Email:

andrew.james@ncc.govt.nz

13 July 2011

Memo To: Reuben Peterson

Memo From: Andrew James

Subject: **PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 17**

My name is Andrew Keith James. I am employed by Nelson City Council as a Principal Adviser – Transport and Roding in the Strategy and Planning Division. I have been employed by Council for nine years; four years as Engineer – Stormwater and Waste Management, then two years as Engineer – Transport and Waste Management, then two years as Transport Manager for the Asset Management Division, the remainder in my current role.

I obtained Chartered Engineer status with the Institution of Engineers of Ireland in 2000, a Post-graduate Diploma in Project Management from Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland in 2000 and a Civil and Structural Engineering degree from the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology in the UK in 1988.

I have over 19 years experience in transport, solid waste and utilities asset management and civil, structural and petroleum design and construction; with a civil engineering contractor, as a resident engineer, and with engineering design consultancies, including Engineering Manager of a structural engineering consultancy and Managing Director of a petroleum consultancy in Ireland.

I have been a member of the Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand (IPENZ) since 2003 and a member of the IPENZ Transportation Group since 2005. I have attended several transport specific courses and conferences and regularly attend the Road Controlling Authorities Forum. I regularly present at public meetings, local IPENZ meetings, resource management hearings and Council meetings.

I have been involved in this plan change from the beginning of the drafting process.

My comments on submitter No. 5, Dugald and Janette Ley follow:-

1. I am not aware of any traffic assessment or specific traffic modelling having been undertaken on this Plan Change. I do not consider a comprehensive traffic assessment necessary as the traffic impacts are minor and the roading connections proposed are based on connectivity and access, rather than detailed measures to address specific impacts. Detailed future traffic volumes and detailed investigations will be required to consider the downstream intersection improvements in detail. These are not considered necessary at this plan change stage for the linking transport routes as they do not drive the road classifications identified in the Land

Development Manual 2010 (LDM), like they used to in the previous Engineering Standards. Furthermore, given the likely pace of development it is considered the environment is likely to change considerably before any substantial growth is seen in the Enner Glynn valley, rendering any in-depth study at this time of little merit. It is considered more appropriate to consider any outstanding specific mitigation issues as part of individual resource consents later. Therefore my comments are directed on ensuring there are options available to mitigate issues, rather than directly proposing specific measures.

2. The Arterial Traffic Study considers the impact of this proposed Plan Change 17 in its modelling of the options. The input data is provided here: - <http://www.nelsoncitycouncil.co.nz/reference-materials-for-traffic-study/>. It can therefore be assumed that the outcome of the ATS has considered the affects of the Plan Change 17 and the impacts from the Plan Change are therefore likely to be mitigated by the time development occurs.
3. Based on existing traffic volumes, The Ridgeway / Waimea Rd intersection is one of 15 intersections that require safety improvements in the city. Design improvements for this intersection have been scheduled for the last couple of years but have been deferred awaiting the outcomes of the Arterial Traffic Study(ATS), this Plan Change, and the effects of The Ridgeway Link on traffic flows along the Ridgeway (between Songer St and Kauri St, opened mid 2010). Council has funding allocated to design and construct intersection improvements, and will be taking into account the outcomes from the ATS and proposed Plan Change 17. The impacts from the proposed Plan Change are therefore likely to be mitigated by the time development occurs.
4. It is acknowledged that The Ridgeway / Enner Glynn intersection will require upgrading given the likely increase in traffic along The Ridgeway (following safety improvements to the Waimea Rd intersection, and growth in Marsden Valley) and as a result of this Plan Change increasing traffic volumes along Enner Glynn Rd.
5. The road reserve width varies along Enner Glynn Rd:-
 - between No. 1 to 7 it is 17m wide,
 - between 9 to 23 it is 15m wide, and
 - for the remainder of the valley 20m wide.

Interpretation of the definitions of the road classifications in the LDM, section 4.2.3 would suggest the Enner Glynn road would be classified as either local or sub-collector. Section 4.3 identifies that the target speed environment of the road as being 10km/hr less than the speed limit and for a sub-collector road, Table 4-3 suggests:-

- for the rural zone - a 6m traffic lane, with a 1.5m shoulder each side, and indicates a total road reserve width of 20m.
- for the residential zone – a 5m traffic lane, 2 x2m parking lanes, 2 x1.5m berms, 2 x 1.5m footpaths and 2 x1.6m service strips and indicates a total road reserve width of 18m.

Between No. 1 and No. 23 Enner Glynn Rd the existing sealed road width is over 8m so as a minimum a 5m traffic lane and 1 lane of parking could be provided, and additional footpaths could be added within the road reserve if deemed necessary because the LDM allows for a reduction in parking provision where it will assist in creating the required speed environment (refer 4.3.1 and 4.3.17.1). Parking supply is currently in excess of demand and is likely to remain that way along this section of road so the effects of this reduction would be minimal and would contribute to additional mitigation measures that may be necessary to ensure the speed environment complied with the LDM.

Between No. 23 and the Newman Dr intersection, where there is no residential development along the roadside the 8m carriageway is more than adequate considering there is currently no parking demand, and unlikely to be any in the future.

From the Newman Drive intersection the Enner Glynn road would need to be upgraded in accordance with the LDM to mitigate the effects of the residential and rural zone changes. The costliest section is a bend, some 170m east of the intersection, between the side of a steep hill and the stream. Some earthworks, retaining and possibly some land purchases are likely to be necessary.

Currently local roads cannot be included as a Development Contributions project so the upgrade would be required by the applicant unless Council deemed the upgrade a priority for the city and allocated funding in the Long Term Plan.

My comments on submitter No. 7, Rosalie Higgins follow:-

1. The link from Panorama Dr down to the Enner Glyn/Marsden Valley link road saddle aligns with Council's desire to increase connectivity. The reasons why increased transport connectivity is desired is explained in sections 4.2.1 d and 4.2.5 of LDM. In addition to the points raised in the LDM, increased connectivity also improves the efficiency and flow of the network by distributing traffic and diluting traffic volumes, provides increased passenger transport options, reduces fuel use, especially for service vehicles such as postal and waste services, improves connectivity between neighbourhoods and increases neighbourhood CPTED safety through the reduction of cul-de-sacs.
2. It is likely this road would be classified as local road or a residential lane in accordance with the LDM definitions. The LDM provides for variability to the carriageway cross-section where this is deemed appropriate (refer sections 4.3.3.d and j of the LDM). The subdivision consent process is also the time when the nature, extent and design to provide for the connection can be carefully considered based on the subdivision design and the more detailed investigations carried out in relation to this. I undertook a site visit with the submitter and their consultants to consider the viability of this road and did not see any major impediment to it, although it is acknowledged that it is likely to impact on any subdivision layout. I understand the road is located indicatively only on the structure plan to provide flexibility to any subdivision applicant.
3. The alternative proposal suggested by the submitter, namely:-
 - Construction of a right of way standard access from the top of the turning circle to the first saddle with limited gradient,
 - That this access be vested in Council and that
 - The costs of the footpath along the proposed access be met by Council
 - That, at a future date, the access is upgraded to a residential lane standard when the neighbouring land is developed

This does not appear unreasonable, given the likely timeframes for development in this area. Detailed analysis and design would be carried out through the resource consent process for any future subdivision.

My comments on submitters No. 10:Tamika Simpson and No.14:Richard Sullivan follow:-

1. The proposed connection between Brook St and Market Rd makes good network planning sense as well as providing local network improvements similar to the other connections

proposed in this plan change. A transport link behind the back of the Grampians Hill would prove attractive to residents of The Brook accessing Stoke and Tahunanui, thereby alleviating traffic pressures on the local network of Van Diemen, Brougham, Scotland and Seymour and Selwyn Place to through traffic in the future. It is likely if this link was formed it would be classified as a collector road in accordance with LDM definitions.

2. A preliminary assessment of the alternative route suggested (extending Blick Terrace over Couch saddle and through the existing quarry onto Market Rd) has been undertaken which shows that this route would be approximately 800m longer and rise an additional 85m higher (at a steep gradient with some switchbacks required) than that proposed in the Plan Change. The financial and environmental effects of this route would be considerable greater than that proposed and would not service as many residential properties along the way.
3. The Arterial Traffic Study considered an arterial roading option from Champion Rd in Richmond across the Stoke valleys and down the Brook (refer section 4.3 of the ATS Stage 2 report). This option was dismissed largely due to expense, and because it would place a significant volume of traffic into the residential areas to the east of and through the city to ensure a connection to the existing state highway at Haven Rd or Atawhai Drive. The route proposed in this plan change is different and would carry significantly less traffic so it is not considered realistic to draw comparisons between the two.
4. Clearly this route would provide significant transport benefits to the existing community by improving the level of service on the network, especially access benefits along The Brook and traffic reductions immediately south of Nelson City. My view is that Council would recognise this and when the time was right, incentivise its construction.