

From: peter Mackenzie
Sent: 11 Oct 2020 08:46:15 +0000
To: Planning @ Meander Valley Council
Subject: ATTENTION JOHN JORDAN - SUBMISSION RE REZONING William, Waterloo, Lyttelton, Taylor Sts land
Attachments: WILLIAM,WATERLOO,LYTTLETON, TAYLOR STS.rtf

Please find attached, submission against the rezoning.

Thank You
Peter Mackenzie

Mr John Jordan

General Manager

Meander Valley Council

26 Lyall Street, Westbury Tas 7303

SUBMISSION RE REZONING OF PROPERTY BOUND BY WILLIAM, WATERLOO, LYTTLETON AND TAYLOR
STS, WESTBURY

Attention Mr John Jordan, General Manager, Meander Valley Council.

My submission against this rezoning, is based on traffic impacts, and relates to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) that was carried out in regard to this proposal.

The TIA was conducted by Traffic and Civil Services, of which Richard Burk, traffic engineer is principal.

Richard has conducted the assessment, based on Department of State Growth guidelines, utilising tools from Austroads.

My concern relates specifically to the aspects of safety.

TCS have used conventional approaches to safety assessment, and from that have drawn the overall conclusion that the traffic movements consequent to the rezoning and eventual housing developments on the site, will be basically safe. Though there were some issues raised about inadequacies of the Waterloo & William St intersection.

Several key points about this are:

1. The data/methodology that has been used is incomplete, flawed and inadequate.
2. Any conclusions made using that approach, are therefore invalid.
3. Traffic impacts based on this proposed development in isolation from other proposed and possible developments and from a whole of Westbury assessment, will also draw incorrect conclusions.

Further explanation on key points 1, 2 and 3 above

1. Traffic Engineer Richard Burk has used data/methodology and assessment that has been accepted nationally and even internationally for decades, so it is not surprising that he has used that method, and I make no criticism of Richard as an engineer, or of him for utilising that method.
2. Unfortunately, that does not change the fact that the method is not adequate.

3. The overarching problem is the inordinate delays in convincing the national “system” to update approaches. Changes of this type and level- a step-change or paradigm change- typically is incredibly slow across domains, not just in the transport arena.

There are a number of inter-linked reasons why that is so, and in separate correspondence to the General Manager and Councillors of Meander Valley Council, I have offered, and would be more than pleased to provide as much detail as is needed to explain.

4. Using crash data alone, ignores the significant numbers of unreported crashes, and unsafe incidents that occur everyday in road-use, including necessary use of crash avoidance and evasion by road users, other than the erring road users- and of future such events caused or contributed to by additional traffic movements that would be generated by this proposed development bounded by William, Waterloo, Lyttelton and Taylor Sts, Westbury.

Traffic from this development will flow from Waterloo & Lyttelton Sts onto William St. It will also flow onto Taylor St and across the Railway line, to junction at Meander Valley Rd. It is likely that some, probably a lesser amount of traffic will utilise Emu Plain Rd, and cross the railway line there.

There are too many unsafe traffic incidents already, along those routes. Ove the past twenty years, I have witnessed many unsafe acts at the road junctions, and the railway level crossings.

At the railway crossings, I have seen numerous vehicles that fail to stop at the stops signs, and in a smaller number of cases, fail to slow. The fact that these are not monitored or recorded officially, nor used in safety assessments, does not make them safe- and is not part of the “Safe System” approach to road safety.

5. Developments around Australia, typically do not consider “downstream consequences” of traffic generation, and this plan unsurprisingly falls into the same trap. Just to give one example is the impacts of the additional and total traffic flows on the junction of William St and Meander Valley Rd (old highway). That would need to consider the total impact of not just this one development, but the other existing and planned/proposed developments that will increase traffic flows into the junction.

There are already significant safety problems at the junction of William Street and Meander Valley Rd. Once again, an assessment of that situation cannot be adequately assessed using crash numbers, even if any traffic law violations from Tas Police data are added.

I note a mention in MVC documents about mitigating issues with Waterloo St by encouraging/compelling traffic to exit (and enter) the development area via Lyttelton St. The item I read did not describe how that would be made to happen. It would indicate that the traffic on Waterloo St might be forced to flow in one direction, and all traffic from the development are be forced to turn left onto Lyttelton St when exiting?

I’m not sure if that also meant existing residents in Waterloo St will need to stop making their traditional exits from there onto William St, or via Taylor an onto Marriot or Emu Plains Rd?

Unless there is signage/traffic flow control/physical barriers, it would be optimistic in the extreme to expect drivers to not use the exits other than Lyttelton Sts.

Even if the new traffic found “no right turn signs” trying to stop them exiting in an easterly direction, rather than left along Lyttleton Sts towards William St, I have to say that human nature, and attitudes/confidence towards the driving task, would result in a relatively high percentage of drivers ignoring those signs.

The problem will be similar for inbound traffic. So for example, someone who has just shopped at IGA is highly likely, on the balance of probabilities, to use Marriott St to find their way home. They would be highly unlikely to travel by a longer route.

Similarly, if one way streets were used to funnel outbound traffic to the Lyttleton & William Sts intersection, then inbound traffic would need to travel via Waterloo Sts, creating problems at the Waterloo & William Sts intersection, with greater possibility of rear-end crashes, and backing up onto the railway line- never a good thing.

Traffic issues will be divided into two stage (with overlaps) construction vehicle traffic, and resident traffic. Extra road risks will flow from the “going home exit syndrome” whereby tradies try to emulate Formula One Driving style*, which will add to risks.

*That description is using colourful descriptive to highlight a problem that is too much under the radar, and certainly is not taken into account with developments, including this proposed development.

This proposal does not seem to consider pedestrian access to the housing that will be built there. All services, sports and other activities will be across the railway lines. There is no existing footpaths and I am not sure if any are planned? Primary school children en masse crossing the railway line alone will add unacceptable risk. I may have missed reading where that is considered, and what mitigation steps are proposed to be taken.

A related question is: The rates from new housing at this site will go into general budget of Council with no hypothecation towards this development? If that is correct, and existing ratepayers in some areas are still waiting for footpaths and road upgrades, then how can Council justify allocating scarce ratepayer funds to this development, leapfrogging those already waiting? Lyttleton St needs widening, Taylor St is just a muddy laneway and would need almost rebuilding, Waterloo St needs some works, and then there is those footpaths. Or are those things to be paid for upfront by any developer of the land prior to building commencing? I am not sure how that works.

At the very minimum, this rezoning needs to be reconsidered, with a new TIA utilised, that considers the issues I have raised.

The issues around TIA and related concerns for this development, will also relate to other proposed developments within the Meander Valley, and in that regard I have written to The General Manager and Councillors separately.

I submit this for your consideration

Thank you

Peter Mackenzie

From: peter Mackenzie
Sent: 12 Oct 2020 04:55:36 +0000
To: Planning @ Meander Valley Council
Subject: RE: Your email has been received

Hello

Yesterday I sent a submission which as written was addressing the William/Waterloo/Lyttelton/Taylor St rezoning.

I have previously made a submission addressing the proposed unit development on Dexter St.

Could you please add a note to my submission of yesterday to the tune that yesterday's submission was meant to actually address

Both rezoning issues ie Dexter St and the William/Waterloo/Lyttelton/Taylor St rezoning proposals.

In both cases, I referred to the TIA that was made for each, and how that was fundamentally flawed, and the negative consequences that the evidence I have, suggests will follow if the developments proceed.

I would like to add that if the two locations were later subject to a smaller minimum lot size when the new LPS comes into play – ie current minimum 700m sq, reduced to 450m sq under a new LPS, it would make the TIA for both sites, even more invalid.

If it is not possible to insert this email message with my submission of yesterday, could you please advise me ASAP if I would need to submit a new submission, with this additional information.

If it is possible, could you confirm that by return email, please.

Thank you,
Peter Mackenzie

From: [Planning @ Meander Valley Council](mailto:Planning@meandervalleycouncil.govt.nz)
Sent: Sunday, 11 October 2020 7:46 PM
To:
Subject: Your email has been received

Thank you for your representation in response to the notification of a development application. Your representation will be forwarded to the town planner assessing the application and will be considered in that assessment. You will be contacted in due course and be provided with a copy of the assessment and notified of the date of the Council meeting that will determine the application.

Please note that if your email is a request for information in response to a notified application, we will respond to your enquiry as soon as possible.

Meander Valley Council