

From: [Olivia Stirling](#)
To: [Olivia Stirling](#)
Subject: FW: RC230325 - Traffic assessment comment
Date: Wednesday, 3 April 2024 5:22:00 pm
Attachments: [image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.jpg](#)
[image010.jpg](#)

From: Engineering <Engineering@codc.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 28 March 2024 5:20 pm
To: Olivia Stirling <OliviaS@barker.co.nz>
Subject: RE: RC230325 - Traffic assessment comment

Hi,

I have carefully considered the Abley Traffic report, and related services to the propose mining activity, and have made the following comments.

Engineering Advice:

Roading/Transport:

The applicant has provided an updated version of the Abley Transport Assessment Report, dated 25th October 2023, as compared to the original under RC220350.

The report provides an assessment of traffic generated by the development, and proposes entranceway treatments.

The report assesses the traffic generation to be 52 vehicle movements or trips per day.

The report recommends that the entrances be constructed to Roding Policy / CODC DP Figure 12.2 standard.

Councils Roding Policies 2015 place the cutoff between Figure 12.2 and Figure 12.3 at 30 'vehicles per day' (vpd), which, if strictly interpreted as written rather than as shorthand for vehicle-movements-per-day (vmpd) (the unit typically used in traffic engineering, also called 'trips-per-day'), does mean that the report's figure would be translated from 52 vmpd to about 26 vpd, which is below the threshold (30vpd) of Figure 12.3 and figure 12.2 would apply, as per the report.

Another Table in the Roding Policies uses vpd, and another table uses vmpd. Section 12 of the District Plan exclusively uses vmpd (actually it uses vehicle-movements-equivalent-per-day).

I argue that that the Roding Policies should be interpreted as having a cutoff at 30 vmpd, therefore requiring that the entranceway to the proposed mine (52vmpd) be built in accordance with Figure 12.3 from section 12 of CODC's District Plan.

However, when interpreted explicitly as written, the report's proposed entranceway standard (Figure 12.2) is correct.

The Abley Report states that only one of the access/entranceways is to be used at one time, and if so then I consider that each would have to be upgraded to Figure 12.3 standard. However, if both entrances are to be used concurrently, then the traffic would be split between them and Figure 12.2 standard would be suitable.

The Abley Report recommends that the entranceways be sealed to not less than 5m from the edge of the road seal (Teviot Road).

I concur, as this complies with the our standards and policies.

I concur with the Abley Report that the sight distances and access-spacing are safe and adequate.

The Abley Report recommends that the northern entranceway/access be permitted to not comply with District Plan rule 12.7.1.(iii).(d).iii).

This is on account of it not having sufficient legal width to construct an adequate access short of

subdivision, and there is more than sufficient sight-distance along the roads for oncoming traffic to react to manoeuvring heavy vehicle. I recommend allowing this non-compliant access/entranceway.

The Abley Report recommends that the southern entranceway be permitted to not comply with District Plan rule 12.7.1.(iii).(d).iii).

The Report's reasoning is similar as for the northern entrance, except that the road reserve is wide enough to construct a complaint access, therefore I recommend a compliant access southern entranceway/access instead.

Water:

Under RC220350, the applicant proposed (and got an agreement from) to connect to the Millers Flat Water Company Ltd's scheme to supply up to 2000L/day (1000L/day + 5 x 200L/person/day) to the proposed mine. The same agreement is used to support this consent application.

This will be considered acceptable for 20 persons for domestic supply as none are expected to live on site, only work.

Wastewater:

I consider that on-site wastewater disposal is inappropriate on account of the earthworks involved in mining, and the scope of the earthworks across the site.

The applicant has proposed to manage wastewater by providing two portaloos for the 20 staff, and to have these emptied weekly.

I request that a wastewater management plan be provided, but I do consider that the applicant's portaloos contractor would probably be able to provide a suitable plan as part of a quote for their service, so I consider it low-risk.

Stormwater:

Stormwater from buildings and other impervious surfaces within the proposed land-use area shall be of by soak-pit, or other water containment and soakage construction, designed by a suitably qualified and experienced person within the area of the proposed land-use activity.

Development Contributions:

I have assessed Development Contributions for RC230325, using the assessed traffic generation as a measure of the roading/transport demand.

I have saved the DC Assessment (as a word document) to MAGIQ / CentralDocs.

Due to the number of titles the proposal is spread across, the required DCs are \$Nil.

Additionally, on a non-Engineering subject, I note that the title OT4C/1031 consisting of SEC 115,116, and 117 BLK VIII BENDER SD, has been shown on the various plans as being part of the subject area, but has not been included in the list of titles.

Either it is erroneously excluded from the list of titles, or erroneously included in the mapped subject area.

I have saved this email to MAGIQ/Central Docs.

I wish you a pleasant and happy easter!

Yours sincerely,

Dominic Haanen

Environmental Engineer

+64 22 008 6472

Dominic.Haanen@codc.govt.nz

1 Dunorling Street, Alexandra 9320

www.codc.govt.nz

