

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: an application by Ryman Healthcare Limited for resource consent to establish and operate a comprehensive care retirement village at 100-104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street, and 78 Park Terrace, Christchurch

between: **Ryman Healthcare Limited**
Applicant

and: **Christchurch City Council**
Consent Authority

Summary of evidence of **Michael Grant Calvert** on behalf of Christchurch City Council

Dated: 28 January 2021

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL GRANT CALVERT ON BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

1. My name is Michael Grant Calvert. I am a Transport Network Planner at Christchurch City Council and have provided Council's traffic advice on this application. My qualifications and experience are set out in my memo to the Planner dated 30 November 2020.
2. This statement summarises my memo and includes comments and responses to evidence presented during this hearing.

Access

3. Mr Facey raised an issue during his presentation regarding the width of the Park Terrace access and the ability for trucks to enter the site safely through this entrance. In response, it is my understanding that the trucks will only enter the site from the Dorset Street, other than emergency access for fire appliances. I am therefore satisfied that the access width is sufficient for the anticipated use. I would also make the comment that unnecessary widening of a vehicle access would generally lead to higher vehicle speeds for drivers entering the site potentially reducing the safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
4. In terms of the issue raised by the Commissioners regarding the lack of a right turn bay on Park Terrace, I am confident that in the short and the long term the space available for drivers to manoeuvre around a vehicle waiting to turn right will be adequate to provide a safe turning environment. As with most roads in the city the capacity of Park Terrace during off-peak periods is far in excess of that required. This results in lane under-utilisation and large gaps in traffic flows to provide for manoeuvring across lanes if required. Given that the majority of the traffic movements associated with retirement villages I consider that there will not be a safety issue associated with the access.
5. The Dorset Street access has been discussed in some detail by Mr Hill and Mr Facey. In my opinion, if on-site turning for a truck cannot be achieved then the reversing of trucks off the site with a traffic controller would achieve a safe alternative. I understand from discussion with Council Traffic Operations staff that it is likely a generic traffic management plan would be required for a spotter to work on the road.
6. The residents of 18 Salisbury Street have expressed concern that there will be a safety issue for them through conflicts with traffic exiting from the Ryman's site. Typically, traffic volumes generated from retirement facilities are low and the peaks differ from the residential peak. Therefore, I consider that the potential for conflicts will be low but Ryman's may wish to discuss the detailed design of the driveway with the residents at 18 Salisbury Street to ensure they maximise the inter-visibility between the driveways.

Parking

7. There is no District Plan requirement for car parking for developments within the Central City. Rymans have chosen to provide car parking which meets the District Plan requirements for a development of this size if it were to develop outside the Central City.
8. Mr Facey raised a number of issues regarding the layout of the car parking. Again, the District Plan does not require compliance with the parking standards, however Mr Hill has addressed Mr Facey's concerns with a number of swept path analyses and I consider that the layout is appropriate.
9. A complying number of cycle parking spaces is proposed to be provided in the basements on both sites on the premise that most of the cycle parking will be used by staff. Whilst I agree that few visitors ride to retirement homes it is not unknown and consider visitor cycle parking should be provided on each site.

Salisbury Street Pedestrian Crossing Facility

10. I agree with Mr Hills that given the reduction in anticipated pedestrian movements across Salisbury Street kerb build-outs will provide an appropriate level of safe crossing facilities. This would also require some accompanying works at the intersection with Park Terrace to slow drivers turning into Salisbury Street to address concerns raised through the safety review undertaken by Stantec.
11. I am also aware that the residents at 15 Salisbury Street have some concerns regarding the loss of car parking and general safety of a crossing at this location. However, as the crossing would require physical works on legal road and some loss of car parking the proposal would need separate consultation with adjacent neighbours, a safety audit and Community Board approval. The concerns of residents could be addressed through this process when a detailed design has been completed.

Traffic Generation

12. I agree with Mr Hills assessment of the traffic generated and the distribution of the trips. In my opinion the traffic generated by the development can be safely distributed onto the surrounding transport network with less than minor effects on the safety and efficiency of the network.

Westward Terrace

13. There is general agreement that Westward Terrace is not suitable for use as a construction access and the applicant has volunteered a condition to that effect.
14. The reviewed pedestrian numbers anticipated to use Westward Terrace are well below those originally discussed in the application. Given this reduction in numbers and the likely off-peak

nature of the trips I agree with Mr Hill that a shared environment would be safely accommodated without requiring physical works to provide separate pedestrian facilities.

Construction Traffic

15. In my opinion the potential effects of construction on the safety and efficiency of the transport network can be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Any works on, or occupation of, the legal road will require separate Council consent through a temporary traffic management plan.

Conclusion

16. I am not aware of any outstanding traffic issues regarding the proposed Rymans development and in my opinion there are no traffic or transport issues that would adversely affect the safety or efficiency of the transport network.