

3 April 2019

vivian+espie Ltd

Novo Group Limited
Level 1, 279 Montreal Street
PO Box 365, Christchurch 8140
0 - 03 365 5570
info@novogroup.co.nz

Attention: Blair Devlin

Dear Blair,

FLINT'S PARK AND GLENPANEL SPECIAL HOUSING AREAS, LADIES MILE, QUEENSTOWN TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT REVIEW

1. This letter sets out our review of the Transport Assessments provided for the Flint's Park Special Housing Area (SHA) in Queenstown. In preparing this letter, we have reviewed the following information:
 - i. *Transport Assessment Report* prepared by Candor³ dated 05 March 2019. This also includes reviewing the masterplan prepared for the development, which was included as Appendix A of the application;
 - ii. *Addendum to Transport Assessment Report* for the Flint's Park Mixed Use Precinct SHA prepared by Candor³ dated 19 March 2019. This review also included the Expression of Interest document for this Addendum to the Flint's Park SHA; and
 - iii. *Transport Assessment Letter* prepared by Bartlett Consulting for the Glenpanel SHA, which sits between the Flint's Park SHA and the Flint's Park Mixed Use Precinct.
2. This review groups together the Flint's Park SHA and Flint's Park Mixed Use Precinct SHA assessments as they were both prepared by Candor³ and include a similar level of detail regarding the internal road arrangements. The Glenpanel SHA report is commented on separately because it is more high level and less detail is provided regarding the internal road network.

Assessment Context

3. It is noted from the outset of this review that the effects on the State highway network are outside the scope of our work and not part of our terms of reference. The WSP / Opus *Ladies Mile HIF Integrated Transport Assessment* and subsequent memorandum set out a programme of works and development to remedy adverse effects on the State highway network, with Programme 3 being adopted. That programme accounts for greater development than is proposed with this SHA.
4. It is understood that this programme has been adopted by the relevant authorities (including the NZ Transport Agency, Queenstown Lakes District Council and Otago Regional Council). We consider that the effects of the proposed development traffic on the State highway network have been satisfactorily covered by that report and assume that suitable

infrastructure and travel management measures will be implemented by the appropriate authorities to mitigate the transport effects of this development.

5. The proposed road network for the Flint's Park and Glenpanel areas will be significantly different to the existing roads as the proposed network has not been constructed as yet. As such, the scope of review for transport effects is limited to the acceptability of the proposed transport network within the subdivision. The effects on the State highway network and further afield are encompassed by the *Ladies Mile HIF Integrated Transport Assessment* and no further assessment of those effects is considered necessary.

Flint's Park SHA and Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct

6. The following sets out our review of the Flint's Park SHA and Mixed-Use Precinct SHA Transport Assessments. It should be noted that the majority of the matters raised are more likely to be addressed at sub-division stage. That said, they may affect the yield of the proposal.

Flint's Park SHA East-West Link

7. The overall indicative Ladies Mile master plan (Appendix D of the application) indicated a central east-west link through the application site and to the Local Centre Plaza. This central east-west link is not included on the proposed layout for Flint's Park SHA, although it is included for the Glenpanel SHA and partly within the Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct SHA plans.
8. It is accepted that a trafficable east-west link has the potential to route traffic through what would desirably be a pedestrian area in the Local Centre Plaza. That said, the Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct Plans appear to indicate the east-west link would connect to the centralised car parking area for the Local Centre, so this would remain a well trafficked route anyway. In addition, the provision of a central transport link would have reduced walking and cycling distances to the Local Centre Plaza, as well as enabling a visual connection to that area for people walking there.
9. Council may wish to consider (at the EOI or resource consent stage) the block length proposed in the EOIs, which is longer than the block length anticipated in the Indicative Master Plan, plus the consequent reduction in connectivity and increased distances to the Local Centre Plaza for pedestrians and cyclists.

Flint's Park SHA Development Content

10. Section 5.1 of the TAR states the development content is up to 207 dwellings, whereas section 5.3 states it is 151. The master plan also indicates there will be 151 dwellings. Given no traffic modelling of assessment of traffic is undertaken, it is assumed that the discrepancy between these numbers does not have flow on effects. Please could this be confirmed.

Flint's Park SHA and Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct Road 1 Footpath

11. The footpath through the park adjacent to Road 1 is separated from the road alignment and has a meandering alignment. We note that the QLDC Land Development Code of Practice (LDGP) requires 2.0m wide footpaths on both sides of Connector / Collector roads. It is

considered there would be benefit in locating a footpath adjacent to the indented car parking on the southern side of Road 1 to provide a more direct route and to enable people to exit the passenger side of vehicles, particularly if the grass in the park is wet after heavy rainfall.

12. Please consider the potential for a footpath along the southern side of Road 1 and increasing the footpath width provided to 2.0m (currently proposed to be 1.8m wide) to align with the QLDC LDCP.

Flint's Park SHA and Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct Road 1 Carriageway Width

13. The carriageway of Road 1 is proposed to be 7.0m wide (i.e. two lanes of 3.5m). This does not comply with the QLDC LDCP, which requires lane widths of 4.2m (i.e. a carriageway of 8.4m). It is also noted that AustRoads recommends a lane width of 4.2m where cycles are mixed with buses. The off-road cycleway alignment through the park is such that commuter cyclists may choose to use Road 1 as this is the most direct route. Road 1 has been identified as having the potential to accommodate buses.
14. Please review the proposed width of Road 1 in this context and consider widening to comply with the QLDC LDCP. This is considered particularly important in light of the recommendations in the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) Business Case, which sets some challenging targets regarding the use of passenger transport and cycling.

Flint's Park SHA and Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct Road 1 Corridor Width

15. The corridor width of Road 1 is proposed to be 15m compared to a minimum requirement for 20m. The requests above (regarding the lack of footpath, footpath width and narrow carriageway) would lead to a corridor requirement of greater than 15m, if adopted. Equally, there is no ability to undertake widening at a later date should the need arise.
16. Given that Council will be taking ownership of the road corridor, it appears that the 15m width limits the ability to undertake future improvement works if desired. It also appears to not satisfactorily accommodate buses and cycles from the outset, which is a key component of achieving the outcomes of the HIF Business Case. Please provide further justification regarding the 5.0m reduction in corridor width, particularly with regard to the ability to accommodate alternate modes of transport and Council's ability to undertake roading improvements in the future.

Flint's Park SHA and Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct Road 2 Corridor Width

17. The corridor width of Road 2 is proposed to be 18m, compared to a minimum requirement for 20m in the QLDC LDCP. Similar to Road 1, this road has been identified as potentially accommodating buses and cycles. Please review the carriageway and corridor width of Road 2 in the context of the above and the ability for Council to undertake improvements if required.

Flint's Park SHA Road 2 & Site Boundaries

18. The corridor for Road 2 appears to be outside of the application site boundaries for the spur in the north-west corner of the Flint's Park SHA site. Please confirm that the road can be constructed within the site boundaries, or provide an explanation of how this segment will be constructed and operate until the whole corridor width is available.



Flint's Park SHA Road 6

19. We note that the cross-section for Road 6 only includes car parking on the western side of the road. This means that any visitors approaching from the north would need to u-turn to access the on-street car parking. Please consider providing on-street car parking on the western side of this road, which would also assist in lessening the 26 space on-street car parking shortfall.

Flint's Park SHA Number of Units accessed via JOALs

20. The District Plan (at Rule 14.2.4.1.vi) states that no private way or shared access shall serve sites with a potential to accommodate more than 12 units on the site and adjoining sites. A similar rule is included in the proposed District Plan. The JOALs in the Flint's Park SHA appear to serve greater than 12 dwellings. Please provide additional commentary with regards to compliance and/or acceptability for this rule.

Flint's Park SHA South-Eastern JOAL

21. The south eastern JOAL appears to serve approximately 27 dwellings, where the QLDC LDCP has a maximum of 20 dwellings accessed via this standard of road. Please provide additional justification of this road design.

Flint's Park SHA Northern JOAL Turning Head

22. The northern JOAL is a dead-end and no turning head has been provided. Please provide a turning arrangement that accommodates a refuse vehicle (on the assumption that these vehicles will travel here) and a 99th percentile car as an absolute minimum. Alternately, please provide justification as to why this is not required, even on a temporary basis.

Flint's Park SHA and Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct Intersection Sight Distance

23. Please confirm that street trees in the vicinity of the intersections and JOAL accesses will be located such that they will not interfere with appropriate sight lines at these intersections (as set out in AustRoads and the District Plan).

Glenpanel SHA

24. The Transport Assessment for the Glenpanel SHA is high level. It correctly relies on the *Ladies Mile HIF Integrated Transport Assessment* for the assessment of off-site transport effects.
25. The discussion of the internal transport network notes that the road network will either meet, or generally meet the requirements of the QLDC LDCP. This appears to be at odds with the proposal for the Flint's Park SHA and Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct SHA, which both have notably non-compliant corridor widths. A consistent approach needs to be provided to the proposed road hierarchy, corridor widths and design elements within those corridors.
26. The remainder of the Glenpanel Transport Assessment sets out the need for public transport, walking and cycling connectivity. A series of recommendations are made with regards to the next steps. We agree that continued liaison will be required to ensure that



a consistent and connected approach is undertaken with regards to all transport elements throughout the Flint's Park, Glenpanel and Flint's Park Mixed-Use Precinct SHAs.

27. We trust that this letter satisfactorily sets out our review of these SHA Transport Assessments. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if you have any queries regarding these matters.

Yours sincerely,

Novo Group Limited

Nick Fuller

Senior Transport Engineer

D: 03 972 5714 | **M:** 021 997 419 | **O:** 03 365 5570

E: Nick@novogroup.co.nz | **W:** www.novogroup.co.nz

[013-006]