

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Item	Description	Source	Reference	Action	Resolution/Action Description	Owner	Status
1	Glenpanel Development Ltd & Maryhill Ltd are partners in the proposed Glenpanel SHA. Glenpanel development ltd will be responsible for developing the Tylden land which forms part of the proposed Glenpanel SHA. So mention Glenpanel development Ltd alongside Maryhill Ltd in the following sections: 6.1 Stakeholders: Bullet point 5 6.1.1 Recent Engagement: Table 14, first row 10.2.2 Implementing Organisations: Bullet point 5 10.3 Developer Strategy: First paragraph, paragraph 3 and first bullet point 10.3.2 Discussions with Other Landowners: First paragraph 10.4.1 Market Capability: Third paragraph (for info: Glenpanel Development Ltd has 25 years development experience behind it) 10.5 Consenting Strategy: Paragraph one.	Glenpanel	Email from Mark Tylden to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Text amended as requested.	David	CLOSED
2	We have some concerns about the reliance on Public Transport and how it is proposed to be achieved within the DBC. - The integrated transport assessment appears through 6.1 and table 12, to apply some key intervention triggers with regard to frequency that may or may not be viable especially the frequency referred to in table 12. - In addition table 22 in the DBC it is unclear where the Targets are set from with regard to item 3, 5, 7, and 9. It is also noted that the DBC appears to be silent on the necessary funding for PT and it is unclear what the implications are if these are not achieved.	ORC	Email from Stephen Patience to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Added requirement to establish MOU between ORC, NZTA and QLDC to develop an Action Plan for development of the wider transport network and systems.	David	CLOSED
3	We would like the strategic case to be more specific on the three waters infrastructure (noting the lack of stormwater provision and runoff from the hillside behind) that currently services the Ladies Mile area and what is missing for urban development. This will then connect well with the infrastructure proposed.	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion of stormwater risk included in Section 8.1	David	CLOSED
4	We note that the cost estimate is similar to BondCM's estimate (less about \$200K). BondCMs report (attached) to us noted that the WTP estimate included about \$600K for a bus stop which seems somewhat high. Is this still included. We understand that the costs are close about \$2M difference, with BondCM being the lower. It appears close enough not to require further reconciliation. Can you confirm the basis for the total cost amount used in the DBC.	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Description of the basis of the cost estimate, with clarification of the \$600k for bus stops (actually bus shelter/s) included in Section 9.2.2	David	CLOSED
5	We also note that we are now at the limit of the Fund and, while we have not finalised the final allocations for the last three projects (incl Ladies Mile), our current expectation is that Ladies Mile may be only able to be allocated approx. \$20M-21M. We note that the project seeks approx. \$26M financing (covering both QLDC and NZTA). We would like to discuss with you further the financing sought prior to finalising the DBC. There may be some adjustments such as netting drawdown and repayments in 2021-22 or developer contributing an upfront amount towards the roundabout for example that can help address this issue.	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Added bullet points to Section 9.5	David	CLOSED
6	We expected some further analysis on the underlying reasons for the background traffic growth on SH6. Is this still to be included?	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion on background growth added to Section 5.1.	David	CLOSED
7	The DBC needs to be more explicit that HIF is not financing the wider transport interventions as they are part of a wider strategy along with some further information about how this will be progressed with NZTA and ORC.	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion of funding wider infrastructure initiatives added to Section 8.5, requiring MOU between QLDC, NZTA and ORC.	David	CLOSED
8	We noted that in the consent strategy there was no discussion about the complexity (or not) of the Notice of Requirement for the roundabout, including timeframes for it. Neither was there a consenting (NOR or resource consents) milestone or task in the programme. Can you please include this information.	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Added discussion on Consenting and Notice of Requirement in Section 10.5	David	CLOSED
9	Please note that MBIE is unlikely to be a formal part of the governance or project management teams/process for the implementation of the project. Can you please update the business case accordingly.	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Tables in Sections 11.2.1 and 11.2.2 revised to suit.	David	CLOSED
10	We note that in the strategic alignment analysis in the Strategic Case, that: a. A full tick has been given for the growth strategy even though Ladies Mile is not within the urban boundary. Please address this issue in the business case. b. A full tick was given to the QITPBC. Can you address the issues of whether any of the 10 sequence interventions are not in the QITPBC and if so how it will be updated with regard to Ladies Mile and those interventions	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion on Alignment in Table 1 revised to address both issues: a. Recognising that Ladies Mile is outside the existing urban area but provides an opportunity to concentrate development in a favourable location in terms of proximity and terrain; b. The Ladies Mile development corridor is considered a good strategic fit with the overall network improvements planned in the PBC. Agreement will be required between QLDC, NZTA and ORC to align interventions.	David	CLOSED
11	In regard to risk issues for the 3 waters, while we are waiting for the final draft report from Stantec, we are aware that it has concerns over the stormwater design and in particular issues related to a 'Cut-off' drain at the base of the hillside behind. We note this as a risk in the Risk Schedule, but would like this issue clarified because if retention is required this may reduce the housing yield.	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion of stormwater risk included in Section 8.1	David	CLOSED
12	5.3 Interfaces and Interdependencies Table 11 shows percentage PT mode share required for each development threshold. The required mode share for the 450 and 750 thresholds are aspirational, but the required mode share for the 1100 and 2185 thresholds are unrealistic.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion included in Section 8.5.	David	CLOSED
13	5.4.1 Uncertainty Log There is no mention of uptake of public transport patronage as being a key uncertainty for transport.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Factors affecting success of PT interventions added to Uncertainty Log (Section 5.4.1)	David	CLOSED
14	Risk Register There is no identified risk regarding the PT patronage uptake or the feasibility to increase the PT service to facilitate the necessary PT mode share. This is the most significant transport risk for the Ladies Mile HIF area.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Included as Risk No.50 in the Risk Register.	David	CLOSED
15	6.1.1 Recent engagement activities Table 14 states that NZTA were involved in meetings seeking clarification of Public Transport requirements. NZTA staff have no record of being involved in any discussions with ORC regarding specific public transport service requirements.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Noted and revised. But Council reasserts the importance of ongoing close discussions between ORC and NZTA.	David	CLOSED
16							

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	Item	Description	Source	Reference	Action	Resolution/Action Description	Owner	Status
16		8.5 Transport Interventions to Achieve Benefit Table 22 discusses triggers prior to development. The trigger of a percentage of mode share on public transport is difficult to measure. A possible better trigger would be a defined public transport patronage number from each of the areas as referred to in Table 7 of the ITA. This should relate to the am peak period and be an average over at least 1 month outside of the peak summer season. This patronage thresholds should be reached prior to approval being given for development to the next stage. I.e. Start of development, 450 and 750 up to a maximum of 1100. These PT patronage thresholds being met could be a condition of funding approval. This condition should be included in 9.5.2 NZTA Contribution.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Narrative included in Section 8.5.	David	CLOSED
17		11 Management Case There is no mention in the management case of how the improved public transport services required to achieve the target PT patronage levels are to be implemented. As this is so critical to the viability of the entire business case it would NOT be unreasonable to expect to have a detailed implementation plan that had been agreed in principal with ORC.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Statement included in Section 11.1.	David	CLOSED
18		The summary (and document) has a heavy emphasis on the state highway as if that's the only transport matter they need to satisfy. The language needs to be more encompassing referring to a transport network and system as a key constraint to the development.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Section 5.1 (Constraints) revised to suit.	David	CLOSED
19		Only discusses Shotover Bridge as the constraint – no recognition of the upstream or downstream network impacts (should at least acknowledge – but not much opportunity for this development to mitigate other than to slow rate of development).	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Included additional text in Section 5.1 (Constraints), second paragraph and Table 11.	David	CLOSED
20		There is no assessment of the PM peak. There is anecdotal evidence to suggest this is a current problem upstream of the Shotover Bridge which has been exacerbated by the addition of the Remarkables ski traffic.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Included additional text in Section 5.1 (Constraints), second paragraph and Table 11.	David	CLOSED
21		There is a fundamental disconnect in the land use development logic. The focus is on the steps to get from to 450 and then to 750 households as being the two early 'hold points' on the development. However there are a number of statements stating 1100 is a starting point for a economically viable development. The issue is the pressure to get to 1100 (or beyond) regardless once development is committed. The disconnect is: - that this is the appropriate threshold for investment and - that (using bigger is better) the minimum agglomeration for significant transport investment i.e. MRT. This therefore assumes that getting beyond 450 and 750 will be achievable which is at odds with the next point - No further analysis has been done on 1100 households – see top of page 56 (section 8.4.1) in the main housing infrastructure fund document.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Statement included in paragraph 1 of Section 8.1	David	CLOSED
22		We should expect significant detail on how these thresholds will be measured, monitored and enforced.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Paragraph included in Section 11.1.	David	CLOSED
23		It's not clear on what happens if we are not successful in reaching the required PT mode share. For example will putting on more buses and providing park and ride provide the mode share required – or is more needed – eg behaviour and marketing programme. It is assuming the PT thresholds are supported by the transport analysis in keeping the network operating at a defined level of service – but this is not clear.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion of MOU included in Section 8.5	David	CLOSED
24		There is no information on the mechanism for enforcing the thresholds and their suitability. i.e. will it be a rule in the plan, will it be a subdivision consent condition (or constraint on title), is it an MOU? There needs to be recognition of the planning and legal framework including the SHA policy and the ability to hold thresholds in this environment. This will be a fundamental requirement to provide assurance to the board.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion of MOU included in Section 8.5	David	CLOSED
25		Ideally we would want a good monitoring regime that reinforces the impact of PT mode share on the network.	NZTA	Email from Tony Sizemore to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	As per Item 22.	David	CLOSED
26		Is it intended for QLDC to pursue a covenant on the titles for the houses to be built within 2 years of land purchase?	MBIE	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Tuesday 10 July 2018	Resolve	Added the following text to Section 10.3.1: To gain confidence that houses will be built on the completed sections as soon as practicable, QLDC will negotiate with the developers to include a covenant on the titles that will require the purchaser to construct a house within 2 years of land purchase.	David	CLOSED
27		Roading accounts for 48% of WTP's base estimate with a value of \$9.43M. BondCM's base estimate value is \$8.10M which represents a variance of 16%. The majority of the variance is attributed to an allowance of \$600k for an 'iconic' 50m long bus shelter where we have made what we consider to be a more appropriate allowance for two bus shelters.	BondCM	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	The need for an iconic glass bus shelter to attract people to public transport is described in Section 9.2.2.	David	CLOSED
28		We (BondCM) also found that the costs for the bus shelter and underpass were carried over to the transport summary sheet with P&G allowances which were effectively applied a second time within the overall P&G allowance	BondCM	Email from Steven Kerr to David Somerville, Friday 6 July 2018	Resolve	The double-up of the P&G was an error in calculation. However, the impact is imaterial on the total cost. If the P&G amount of \$110,000 is deducted, the total project cost reduces from \$19.83M to \$19.62M. Given the time constraint for submission of this Business Case, we have not corrected this error in our calcuoations.	David	CLOSED
29		Our analysis confirms that attenuation or diversion of the stormwater will be necessary within or adjacent to the development site to prevent overwhelming the existing pipeline in Howards Drive and to prevent flooding in the development and adjoining areas and/or additional stormwater infrastructure will be needed for the new development other than that proposed. We consider that the assessment of stormwater is not sufficiently covered, and recommend that further assessment is made of the requirements for stormwater management and disposal.	Stantec	Stantec Peer Review report dated 9 July 2018	Resolve	Discussion of stormwater risk included in Section 8.1	David	CLOSED