

District Health Board

Te Poari Hauora ō Waitaha

# **CORPORATE OFFICE**

Level 1 32 Oxford Terrace Christchurch Central CHRI STCHURCH 8011

Telephone: 0064 3 364 4160 Fax: 0064 3 364 4165 <u>carolyn.qullery@cdhb.health.nz</u>

#### 5 December 2019

9(2)(a)		

#### **RE Official Information Act (Act) request CDHB 10199**

I refer to your email dated 16 October 2019 requesting the following information under the Official Information Act from Canterbury DHB.

1. Any correspondence between March and October regarding Christchurch Hospital parking between the CDHB/Ministry of Health/HRPG/and agencies comprising the working group on parking.

## 2. Any reports received or produced by the working group on parking, including traffic modelling.

Please find **attached** the requested information with some permitted redactions under the Act relating to privacy of individuals s9(2)(a) and commercial prejudice s9(2)(b)(ii) of the Official Information Act.

The information released includes a QTP report that looks at demand scenarios and traffic impact assessments of potential new car parking buildings within the South Frame between Tuam and St Asaph.

These are theoretical assessments only, and involve third party privately held land that is not currently available for a car parking development. None of the modelled scenarios have been put to the various landowners for consideration. If they were to become available for parking, it would require a private developer to assess the commercial viability and if economic, undertake the development.

The Canterbury DHB is not funded to acquire land, own or operate a car parking building.

I trust that this satisfies your interest in this matter.

You may, under section 28(3) of the Official Information Act, seek a review of our decision to withhold information by the Ombudsman. Information about how to make a complaint is available at <u>www.ombudsman.parliament.nz</u>; or Freephone 0800 802 602.

Please note that this response, or an edited version of this response, may be published on the Canterbury DHB website after your receipt of this response.

Yours sincerely

Carolyn Gullery Executive Director Planning, Funding & Decision Support

#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	Susan Fitzmaurice	
Sent:	Monday, 10 June 2019 10:31 a.m.	
To:	9(2)(a) Tim Lester; 9(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz'; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
	9(2)(a) Rachel Cadle	and the second
Cc:	Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)	
Subject:	Representative for Car Parking Group	/

Following the meeting held on 29 May between Ara, CCC, Otakaro, University of Otago and the DHB, I have been asked to arrange for you all to meet as representatives on the Car Parking technical group.

reti-Please find below a link to a doodle poll. Can you please complete your availability. The meeting would be held here at 32 Oxford Terrace and be for one hour.

https://doodle.com/poll/imw9drgm6bqi7zqq

Thanks for your help

Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

Canterbury



Values - A Mātou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - Hāpai i ā mātou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i nga hua FIFASEDU

Kath	leen	Smit	heram

From:	9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>
Sent:	Thursday, 27 June 2019 10:50 a.m.
To:	9(2)(a) Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester;
	9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz'; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
	Nursing)
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Thank you<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> and hello fellow Technical Group members. I'm very sorry I didn't make it on Tuesday, I look forward to meeting you all at the next meeting and finding good solutions to the issues,

Kind regards,

9	(2	)(	а	)	

9(2)(a)

Ōtākaro Limited

Level 8, Anthony Harper Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013

## otakaroltd.co.nz | Building places for people

			9	(2)	(a)
F	ro	m	:		

@ccc.govt.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 PM

 To: Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Bachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim

 Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
 @otago.ac.nz'

 9(2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz'

 (2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz'

Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>

Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz<

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those
  informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports
  Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;

- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street - and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with? CIALMEORMATION

Any queries - please just get in touch.

9(2)(a) Kind regards,

### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]

Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

@otago.ac.nz';<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; 9(2)(a)

(2)(a) David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll

Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susanifitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.healtb.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz



#### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### \*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

# 004

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

经递收收益

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. Otakaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Otakaro. For further information about Otakaro Limited, please visit www.otakaroltd.co.nz

3

#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	Tim Lester
Sent:	Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.
То:	9(2)(a) Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz';
	9(2)(a) Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
Cc:	David Meates
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Attachments:	Maps.pdf

Hi All

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor

Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz]

 Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.

 To: Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim

 Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>;

 9(2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz' 9(2)(a)

 @otago.ac.nz' 9(2)(a)

 @otago.ac.nz' 9(2)(a)

 @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of

Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>

Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;

- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street – and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with? CIALMEORMATION

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154

9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]

Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz'; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.

Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice / EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz



Values - 7 M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). 2

Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated. 

\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL

\*\*\*\*\*

sender and delete.

Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

# 007

ATIONAC

\*\*\*\*

3









### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Tim Lester Monday, 1 July 2019 5:45 p.m. Rachel Cadle FW: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion Maps.pdf

Hi Rachel

Was it our (CDHB's) action to arrange the next meeting? Perhaps Susan can use the doodle poll again?

Regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

 To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
 @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice

 <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;
 @(2)(a)

 9(2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz>;

 9(2)(a)
 @ara.ac.nz>;

 9(2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz>;

Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz> Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Øxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: David Meates <<u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those
  informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports
  Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west
  of Antigua Street and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards, 9(2)(a)

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

# Canterbury



#### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

nde nde nde nde nde nde

\*\*\*\*\* This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended

solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*\*









#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From: Rachel Cadle Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 6:03 p.m. To: Tim Lester RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion Subject:

I believe<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> was going to come back to us with some "reading" material and that we would catch up MFORMATIONA again in 2 weeks.

I think it would be good to get Susan to "doodle poll" if she wouldn't mind.

We probably need an "admin" person to scribe .....

0

achel

From: Tim Lester Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:45 p.m. To: Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: FW: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

**Hi Rachel** 

Was it our (CDHB's) action to arrange the next meeting? Perhaps Susan can use the doodle poll again?

Regards

**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor** Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600	Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <<u>Susan Eitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; @otago.ac.nz' @otago.ac.nz><sup>9(2)(a)</sup> (2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]	4
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.	2, 1498 (10 PC - 10 PC - 12 PC	
To: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.l< th=""><th>nealth.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle &lt;</th><th>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Tim</th></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.l<>	nealth.nz>; Rachel Cadle <	Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim
Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otago.ac.nz <sup>(9(2)(a)</sup>	@otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>,9(2)(a)	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; N	Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >		

Cc: David Meates <<u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as fam aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west
  of Antigua Street and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards, 9(2)(a

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services

9(2)(a)

web: <u>www.ccc.govt.nz</u> (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz';<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) Subject: Car Parking Technical Group When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board 🕻 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz Canterbury District Health Board oast. To Pean Hauora o Watana

Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

# \*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

### http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	Tim Lester
Sent:	Monday, 1 July 2019 7:30 p.m.
To:	Rachel Cadle
Subject:	Re: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

9(2)(a) Yep, sent that through

ATIONAC I'll talk to Susan tomorrow about whether she's happy to organise the next meeting.

Regards Tim

Sent from my iPhone

On 1/07/2019, at 6:03 PM, Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz> wrote:

9(2)(a) I believe was going to come back to us with some "reading" material and that we would catch up again in 2 weeks.

I think it would be good to get Susan to "doodle poll" if she wouldn't mind.

We probably need an "admin" person to scribe .....

0

<image003.png>

From: Tim Lester Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:45 p.m. To: Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Subject: FW: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi Rachel

Was it our (CDHB's) action to arrange the next meeting? Perhaps Susan can use the doodle poll again?

Regards

**Tim Lester** Corporate Solicitor **Canterbury District Health Board** 

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester		
Sent: Monday, 1 July 201	9 5:43 p.m.	
To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzm	aurice
<susan.fitzmaurice@cdh< td=""><td>b.health.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle &lt;<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdh</u></td><td>b.health.nz&gt;;</td></susan.fitzmaurice@cdh<>	b.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdh</u>	b.health.nz>;
9(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ara.ac.nz>;

9(Z)(a)	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
< <u>Mary.Gordon@</u>	cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: David Meate	s < <u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u> >
Subject: RE: Car	Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
HI All	
For ease of refer meeting	ence, please find <b>attached</b> electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the
Kind regards	
Tim Lester	
Corporate Solicit	or
Canterbury Distri	ict Health Board
T: 03 364 4128 (I	nternal ext; 62128)   M: (2)(a) E: tim lester@cdbb.bealth.p.
Level 1, 32 Oxfor	d Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.
9(2)(a)	
From:	@ccc.govt.nz]
Sent: wednesday	/, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.
<rachel cadle@c<="" td=""><td>ance &lt;<u>susan.ritzmaunce@conb.neatn.nz</u>&gt;; RacherCadle</td></rachel>	ance < <u>susan.ritzmaunce@conb.neatn.nz</u> >; RacherCadle
(2)(a)	(9(2)(a))
2)(a)	@otakaroltd.co.nz>: Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
<mary.gordon@< td=""><td>cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></mary.gordon@<>	cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: David Meates	<pre>&gt;</pre>
Subject: Car Park	ing Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
e <mark>e</mark> ntenes	
Dear Technical G	roup Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for
you two previous	studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct,
South Frame and	Sw central city area.
As I mentioned	come of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please
As I mentioned, s	discussing patential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just
especially where	t in mind if you need to share any of this information with other solleagues. That
ask you keep that	this mind if you need to share any of this mormation with other colleagues. That
said, i think it is n	explained you to see that were are not starting from a blank sneet with our Group's
2017 reports this	some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and
opportunities.	s is noperally aseral background for us to focus on as to the apcoming
A rew extra point	s ro raise about what's attached:

024

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);

2

The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street – and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us - and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic MFORMATIONAC network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards,<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]

Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> 9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz

9(2)(a) David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

<image004.jpg><image005.jpg>

Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the

original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL MORNING and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the

026

ONAC

4

From:       2010       @ccc.govt.nz>         Sent:       Tuesday, 2 July 2019 8:24 a.m.       Tuesday, 2 July 2019 8:24 a.m.         Subject:       Tim Lester         Subject:       RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion         Thank you Tim – very helpful.       Image: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion         Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Carle Asset Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Carle Asset Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Carle Asset Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Planning Team – State Carle Carle Asset Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Planning Team – City Services       State Planning Team – City Services         State Planning T		
Sent: Tuesday, 2 July 2019 8:24 a.m. To: Tim Lester Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion Thank you Tim – very helpful. (1) Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 300 Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 300 300 300 300 300 300 300 30	From:	9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>
To: Tim Lester Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion Thank you Tim – very helpful. (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	Sent:	Tuesday, 2 July 2019 8:24 a.m.
Subject:       RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion         Thank you Tim – very helpful.       Image: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion         Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services       Image: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion         Www.ccc.govt.nz       Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)         Prom: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]       Image: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion         Parking (Carlo Carle Card Carle Card Carle Carle Carle Card Carle Card Card Car	To:	Tim Lester
Thank you Tim – very helpful. (3) Fransport Asset Planning Team – City Services (3) www.ccc.govt.nz Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays) from: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] ient: Monday. 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. (3) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4	Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Q(a)         Gransport Asset Planning Team – City Services         Z(b)         Www.ccc.govt.nz         Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)         From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]         ent: Monday. 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.         ro:       @ccc.govt.nz;         Ways.ccc.govt.nz;         ways.ccc.govt.nz;         ways.ccc.govt.nz;         ways.ccc.govt.nz;         ways.ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         Ways.ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         Ways.ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         @cocc.govt.nz;         Ways.ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         ways.ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         @ccc.govt.nz;         @ccccc.govt.nz;	Thank you Tim – very	/ helpful.
Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 2(a) WWW.CCC BOVI. NZ Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays) From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] ient: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. active locale <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; @200 @ara.ac.nz&gt; <sup>9200</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director Jursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz> 2c: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz> 2c: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz> 2: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: 2: 04 0 deata.nz; 2: 04 0 deatas ext: 62 0 death.nz; 2: 04 0 deatas ext: 62 0 death.health.nz; 2: 04 0 deatas ext: 62 0 death.health.nz;</david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>	(2)(a)	
216) WWW.CCC.BOVT.NZ Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays) From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] ient: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. Provide the context of the co	Transport Asset Plan	ning Team – City Services
www.ccc.govt.nz         Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)         From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]         ient: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.         10: 2019         10: 2019         10: 2019         10: 2019         10: 2019         10: 2019         10: 2019         20: 2019 <td>(2)(a)</td> <td></td>	(2)(a)	
Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)	www.ccc.govt.nz	
From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]         ient: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.         ior       [20]         @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz< td="">         @ccc.govt.nz&gt;; Susan Fitzmaurice         @cotakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director         Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>         : David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz>         :: David Meates <classing -="" background="" discussion<="" earlier="" for="" group="" studies="" td="" technical="">         : if All         : or ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting         : ind regards         : im Lester         : orgorate Solicitor         : anterbury District Health Board         : 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M:         : @2(6)       E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz         : evel 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.         : rom:       @2(6)       @ccc.govt.nz]         : ent: Wedpesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.       @ccc.govt.nz]</classing></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz<>	Normal office hours:	Mondays to Thursdays)
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. (a) 2019 (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (b) (a) (b) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	From: Tim Lester [ma	uilto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]
Control       (2)       <	Sent: Monday, 1 July <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	2019 5:43 p.m.
2(6)       @ara.ac.nz>;       2(1/2)       @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>         2:: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz>       Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion         4i All      </david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>	Rachel Cadle <rachel< td=""><td>.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; 9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz&gt; 9(2)(a)</td></rachel<>	.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; 9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz> 9(2)(a)
Aursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz> Cc: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion If All For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting C: David Meates <david.meates discussion<br="" for="">If All For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting C: David Meates Solicitor C: David Meates Solicitor C: David Meates (Internal ext: 62128)   M: Signature = Solicitor C: David Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz. PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.</david.meates></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>	2)(a) @ara	a.ac.nz>;9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director
C: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion II All For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting Sind regards <i>Tim Lester</i> Scorporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board C: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>92/0</sup> C: 04 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00</david.meates@cdhb.health.nz>	Nursing) <mary.gord< td=""><td>on@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></mary.gord<>	on@cdhb.health.nz>
Bubject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion         di All         for ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting         find regards <i>Tim Lester</i> Corporate Solicitor         Canterbury District Health Board         2: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M:         9(2)(a)         evel 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.         rom:         9(2)(a)         ent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.         o: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan. fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz="">; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim         ester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>;         9(2)(a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Iursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>         (c) David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz>         ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion</david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></susan.>	Cc: David Meates <da< td=""><td>avid.Meates@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></da<>	avid.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>
di All for ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting tind regards <i>Tim Lester</i> corporate Solicitor canterbury District Health Board : 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> : 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> : evel 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz. rom: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> ent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m. o: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim ester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of fursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz> c: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz> ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion</david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>	Subject: RE: Car Parki	ing Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
di All for ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting find regards <i>Tim Lester</i> corporate Solicitor canterbury District Health Board : 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> : 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> : tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz evel 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz. rom: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> ent: Wedpesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m. o: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan, fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz="">; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim ester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of fursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz> c: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz> ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion</david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></susan,>		
for ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting Clind regards Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board C: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> C: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> C: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> evel 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz. rom: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> ent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m. o: Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ; Tim ester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> (a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Tursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ; c) David Meates < <u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	Hi All	<u>A</u>
Sind regards <i>Tim Lester</i> Corporate Solicitor         Canterbury District Health Board         C: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz         evel 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.         rom: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @cccc.govt.nz]         ent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.         o: Susan Fitzmaurice < Susan.Fitzmaurice@ccdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim         ester &lt; Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of lutsing) &lt;<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u>;         (a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of lutsing) &lt;<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u>;         ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>	or ease of reference	, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting
Tim Lester         Corporate Solicitor         Canterbury District Health Board         *: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M:         *: 04 0.000 Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.         *: 05 0.000 Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.         *: 06 0.000 Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.         *: 07 0.0000 Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.         *: 08 usan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim         *: 05 Usan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;         *: 00 Gara.ac.nz&gt;;         *: 00 Gara.ac.n</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>	(ind regards	
Structure Solicitor Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board C: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext; 62128)   M: Sector 2019 4:128 (Internal ext; 62128)   M: Sector 2019 4:12 p.m.	'im Lester	R
Canterbury District Health Board Contended and Contended	Corporate Solicitor	
C: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz evel 1, 32 Oxford Tertace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz. rom: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @cccc.govt.nz] ent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m. o: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim ester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of lufsing) &lt;<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u>; ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion</tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>	Canterbury District He	ealth Board
evel 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u> . evel 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u> . ent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m. io: Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ; Tim ester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> (a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of lorsing) < <u>Mary Gordon@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ic: David Meates < <u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	02 264 4128 (Inter	
9(2)(a)       @ccc.govt.nz]         ent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.	evel 1, 32 Oxford Te	race, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u> .
int: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.         io: Susan Fitzmaurice < Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim         ester &lt; Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz&gt;;         (a)       @otago.ac.nz&gt;;         (a)       @otago.ac.nz&gt;;         (a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         (a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         (a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         (a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         (a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         (a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         (b)       @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         (c)       David Meates &lt; David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz&gt;         (c)       David Meates &lt; Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>	9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz]
io: Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Tim         ester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</u> ;         (a)       @otago.ac.nz>;         (a)       @otago.ac.nz>;         (a)       @otago.ac.nz>;         (a)       @otakaroltd.co.nz>;         (b)       @otakaroltd.co.nz>;         (c)       David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>         (c)       David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>         (c)       David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>         (c)       David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>         (c)       David.Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	ent: Wednesday, 26	June 2019 4:12 p.m.
ester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of lotsing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> > ic: David Meates < <u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u> > ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	o: Susan Fitzmaurice	< <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></u>
(a) @ara.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Rusing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> > :c: David Meates < <u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u> > ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	ester < <u>Tim.Lester@c</u>	:dhb.health.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
latsing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> > ic: David Meates < <u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u> > ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	(a) @ara.ac.n	<u>e</u> (2)(a) <u>e</u>
<b>c:</b> David Meates < <u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u> > <b>ubject:</b> Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	lursing) < <u>Mary.Gord</u>	on@cdhb.health.nz>
ubject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	c: David Meates < Da	vid.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>
	ubject: Car Parking 1	echnical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
The second structure structure is the second structure		The second

studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west
  of Antigua Street and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards, <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> 9(2)(a) Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a) web: www.ccc.govt.nz

(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; (2010) @otago.ac.nz'; (2010) (2010) David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) Subject: Car Parking Technical Group When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz



#### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono-Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

wher where w 11.16 11.16 11.16 11.16

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* ste ste ste ste

\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for	Discussion
Hello Tim,	2	
Just in case it's useful,	this site's imagery (i.e. Manawa is on it) is more recent than google:	, P
https://propertysearch church%20Central,%20	.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua% Christchurch%20City	20Street,%20Christ
Cheers,		
9(2)(a)	CRIM	
From: Tim Lester <tim. Sent: Monday, 1 July 20 To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup></tim. 	Lester@cdhb.health.nz> 019 5:43 PM @ccc.govt.nz>: Susan Fitzmaurice	
<susan.fitzmaurice@co 9(2)(a) @otago.</susan.fitzmaurice@co 	dhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> ac.nz&gt;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz&gt;;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>	@otago.ac.nz' otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon (Executiv	e Director of Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>	
Subject: RE: Car Parking	g Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	
Hi All		
For ease of reference, p	please find <b>attached</b> electronic copies of the plans that were presented in	the meeting
Kind regards	ALL .	
Tim Lester		
Corporate Solicitor	In the second	
Canterbury District Hea	uth Beard	
T: 03 364 4128 (Interna	I ext: 62128)   M: 9(2)(a) E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>	
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terra	ace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u> .	
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]	
Sent: Wednesday, 26 Ju	une 2019 4:12 p.m. Susan Elementrica Ocdbb bealth arts: Pachal Cadle (Pachal Cadle Ocdbb b	aalth arts Tim
Lester <tim.lester@cd< td=""><td>hb.health.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle &lt;<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdnb.r</u></td><td>(2)(a)</td></tim.lester@cd<>	hb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdnb.r</u>	(2)(a)
9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>	, <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executi	ve Director of
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordor</u>	n@cdhb.health.nz>	
Cc: David Meates < Dav	id.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>	
Subject: Car Parking Te	chnical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	

@ara.ac.nz>

Wednesday, 3 July 2019 8:57 a.m.

**Kathleen Smitheram** 

From:

Sent: To:

9(2)(a)

**Tim Lester** 

Dear Technical Group Members - as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west
  of Antigua Street and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards, 9(2)(a)

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: <u>www.ccc.govf.nz</u> (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

Original Appointment---- From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]
 Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.
 To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz'; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
 David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
 Subject: Car Parking Technical Group
 When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.
 Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll

#### Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz

P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

# Canterbury

District Health Board To Peon Haura o Wataha



#### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

#### \*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

FLEASE

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

sk sk sk sk sk sk sk

Sent:	Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m.	
то:	9(2)(a) Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.n:	z';
	9(2)(a) Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)	639
Cc:	Sue Imrie	
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	

Colin has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City

Thanks

From:

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim Lester

Kathleen Smitheram

Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.

 To:
 9(2)(a)
 @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice

 <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;
 9(2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz'

 9(2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz>
 9(2)(a)
 @otakaroltd.co.nz>;

 Many Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <Many Gordon@cdbb.bealth.nz>;
 @otakaroltd.co.nz>;

Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz> Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.healtb.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

 From:
 @ccc.govt.nz]

 Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.
 To: Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim

 Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>;
 @otago.ac.nz>;

 Q(2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz>;

 Q(2)(a)
 @otakaroltd.co.nz>;

 Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>
 @otakaroltd.co.nz>;

 Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>
 Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west
  of Antigua Street and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group
Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive

Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

### Canterbury



#### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute I te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahikatoa I runga I te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

#### ple ple ple ple ple ple

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\* ide ide ide ide ide ide This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Kathleen	Smitheram
----------	-----------

From:	9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>
Sent:	Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:50 a.m.
To:	Tim Lester; Susan Fitzmaurice
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Thank you Tim. Just c would be helpful?	hecking, but is there another meeting in the pipeline for the next week or two as we agreed
2)(a)	2 P
)(2)(a)	
Transport Asset Plann	ning Team – City Services
(2)(a)	
	P.N.
www.ccc.govt.nz	

9(2)(a)

From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m.

To:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>

Cc: Sue Imrie <Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

9(2)(a) has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?	propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ
church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City	

Thanks

**Tim Lester** 

**Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.

To: @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice 9(2)(a) <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</u> Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz></u>;

9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz><sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@otago.ac.nz' @otakaroltd.co.nz>;

Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) < Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz> Cc: David Meates <<u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Kind regards

9(2)(a)

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.

 To: Susan Fitzmaurice <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Tim

 Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>;

 9(2)(a)

 @otago.ac.nz>;

 9(2)(a)

 @otago.ac.nz>;

 (a)

 @otago.ac.nz>;

 (b)

 (c)

 (c)

@ccc.govt.nz]

Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>

Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);



So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

# Kind regards 9(2)(a)

### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: <u>www.ccc.govt.nz</u> (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]

Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>@otago.ac.nz';<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

(2)(a) David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.

Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz

P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

## Canterbury

District Health Board Te Poar Haucra & Wataha

Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

\*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. 038

1012

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

9(2)(a) Susan Fitzmaurice; Sue Imrie RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion MATIONAC

#### 9(2)(a) Hi

Yes, a doodlepoll will be sent around shortly for a follow up meeting

Tim Lester

Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:52 a.m.

Kind regards

**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

9(2)(a) T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

#### 9(2)(a) From

Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:50 a.m.

@ccc.govt.nz]

To: Tim Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Thank you Tim. Just checking, but is there another meeting in the pipeline for the next week or two as we agreed would be helpful?

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services

9(2)(a)

9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m.

To: @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Ə(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz><sup>9(2)(a)</sup> Rachel/Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz> (2)(a) 9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of @ara.ac.nz> Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: Sue Imrie <<u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City

### Thanks

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim Lester		Ġ
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. $T_{a}$ $g(2)(a)$	Gees cout est: Susan Eitemausica	
Sucan Eitzmaurice@cdbb bealth prac	Pachel Cadle Chachel Cadle@cdbb health pact	a) Wotago ac pz'
Q(2)(a) $Q(2)(a)$	(Mara ac pz>: 9(2)(a)	@otakaroltd.co.nz>:
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nu	ursing) <mary gordon@cdhb.health.nz=""></mary>	goldine charconin- ;
Cc: David Meates <david meates@cdh<="" td=""><td>b.health.nz&gt;</td><td></td></david>	b.health.nz>	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Grou	up - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	
ender unter en reining resulter erei		6.
HIAI	<sup>o</sup> <sup>×</sup>	
For ease of reference, please find attac	ched electronic copies of the plans that were pres	ented in the meeting
Kind regards		
Tim Lester	CAL	
Corporate Solicitor		
Canterbury District Health Board		
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   f	M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz	
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurc	h   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.	nz.
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]	
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p	um.	
To: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaur< td=""><td>rice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle &lt;<u>Rachel.Cadle</u></td><td>@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Tim</td></susan.fitzmaur<>	rice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle</u>	@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim
Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.mz>9(2</tim.lester@cdhb.health.mz>	2)(a) @otago	9(2)(a)
@ara.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	<pre>@otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon</pre>	(Executive Director of
Nursing) < Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.	<u>nz</u> >	
Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdh	<u>b,health.nz</u> >	
Subject: Car Parking Technical Group -	Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	
Dear Technical Group Members - as w	e discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attac	ching for you two previous
studies looking into the car parking nee	eds of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South F	rame and SW central city
area.		

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

 The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions – for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);

- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the . recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street - and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

FICIALINFOR Kind regards 9(2)(a) Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a) web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays -----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan/Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester;9(2)(a) 9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz'; David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) 9(2)(a) Subject: Car Parking Technical Group When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz Canterbury

District Health Board To Poort Hauora & Watana



Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

#### alle alle alle alle alle alle

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

FIFASE

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*

From:	9(2)(a)
Sent:	Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:53 a.m.
To:	Tim Lester
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
That's great – thank ye	ou.
2)(a)	
Transport Asset Plann	ing Team – City Services
(2)(a)	
www.ccc.govt.nz	
(Normal office hours: I	Mondays to Thursdays)
From: Tim Lester [mai	Ito:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 Ju	ıly 2019 11:52 a.m.
To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>
Cc: Susan Fitzmaurice	<susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Sue Imrie <sue.imrie@cdhb.health.nz></sue.imrie@cdhb.health.nz></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Parkin	ig Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies to Discussion
9(2)(a)	
Yes, a doodlepoll will b	be sent around shortly for a follow up meeting
Kind regards	

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

# From:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:50 a.m.

To: Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Susan Fitzmaurice <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Thank you Tim. Just checking, but is there another meeting in the pipeline for the next week or two as we agreed would be helpful?

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services

9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cd	hb.health.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m	
To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.healtl</u>	n.nz> <sup>5(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
@ara.ac.nz>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>	>
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.n</u>	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group	- Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> has kindly provided the below ink t	hat has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:
https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.	govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ
church%20Central,%20Christchurch%200	
Thanks	
Tim Lester	0
Corporate Solicitor	
Canterbury District Health Board	
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M:	9(2)(a) E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch	PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.
From: Tim Lester	
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.	
To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice
< <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;: Ra</u>	ichel Cadle < <u>Bachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>;5(2)(a)	@ara.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nurs	ing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >
Cc: David Meates < <u>David.Meates@cdhb.</u>	health.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group	- Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
HiAll	
For ease of reference, please find attache	ad electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting
Kind regards	
Tim Lester	
Corporate Solicitor	
Canterbury District Health Board	
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M:	9(2)(a) E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch	PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.
Q	
From 9(2)(a)	@ccc sovt nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m	
To: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan fitzmaurice<="" td=""><td>e@cdhb.health.nz&gt;: Rachel Cadle <rachel cadle@cdhb.health.nz="">: Tim</rachel></td></susan>	e@cdhb.health.nz>: Rachel Cadle <rachel cadle@cdhb.health.nz="">: Tim</rachel>
Lester <tim_lester@cdbb.health.nz>9(2)(a</tim_lester@cdbb.health.nz>	) @otago.ac.nz>: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz> 9(2)(a)	@otakaroltd.co.nz>: Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz< td=""><td>&gt;</td></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz<>	>
Cc: David Meates < David Meates@cdhb.	health.nz>
Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Ea	arlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members - as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the . third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the ٠ recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street – and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries – please just get in touch.

Kind regards,

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154

9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester;9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz'

9(2)(a)

(2)(a) David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

### Canterbury

District Health Board To Poori Hauora o Watana



\*

Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahikatoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

#### \*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*\* This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended

solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*

મેર તેર તેમ તેર તેમ તેમ તેમ તેમ તેમ તેમ તેમ તેમ તેમ

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*

REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFFICIALINFORMATIONACT The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	Sue Imrie	
Sent:	Wednesday, 3 July 2019 3:14 p.m.	
То:	Ma	ry Gordon (Executive Director of
Subject:	Car Parking Technical Group - Meeting Options	Thin Lester
Importance:	High	Ċ
Good afternoon		AP
Thank you for completing	the doodle poll below.	
Mary Gordon is on leave	v/c 15 <sup>th</sup> July, hence no options for that week.	
https://doodle.com/poll/j	pxzf8crcw94z4a9k	onth
Kind regards		Or
Sue		
Sue Imrie		
Executive Assistant to:		
Mary Gordon - Executive Direct	or of Nursing	
Hector Matthews - Executive Di	rector of Māori & Pacific Health	
Canterbury District Health Boar		
F: 03 364-4107   Ext. 62107   E	nail <u>sue.imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u>	
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace   PO	Box 1600   Christchurch   New Zealand 8140   <u>www.cdhb.health.nz</u>	
Values – Ă Mātou Uara	.0	
Care and respect for others - Manaa	ki me te whakaute i te tangata 🗍 Integrity in all we do - Hāpai i ā mātou mal	i katoa i runga i te pono   Responsibility for
outcomes - Te Takohanga i ngā hua.		
Canterbury		
District Health Board		
To Poan Hauora o Waitaha		
•		
~ S.		
0-V		
Υ_		

#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	Tim Lester
Sent:	Wednesday, 10 July 2019 11:25 a.m.
то:	9(2)(a) Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle, <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz'; 9(2)(a) Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
Cc:	Sue Imrie
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

#### Hi All

Thanks for your time yesterday.

Thought I'd circulate a brief summary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for absence). If there's any additions or corrections please reply to the group.

- Thanks to<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> for sharing Council's previous parking/network impact reports;
- CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site;

•	9(2)(b)(ii)
•	

- Ability to use Miles North and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings. Judge's decision awaited and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
- Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;
- No party has the ability to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;
- Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;
- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;
- · Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc

#### Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate

### Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

Dear Technical Group Members - as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the ٠ third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the ٠ recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street – and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154

9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]

Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz'

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

9(2)(a)

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

🕻 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

### Canterbury

District Health Board To Poort Havora & Watona



Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahikatoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

#### ale ale ale ale ale ale

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*\*\*

From:	9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>	
Sent:	Wednesday, 10 July 2019 4:28 p.m.	_
То:	Tim Lester; Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz'; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)	
Cc:	Sue Imrie	
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	

Thank you Tim. So everyone is aware, I have had an initial word with QTP (our key traffic modelling consultants) re their likely resource availability to undertake this work. They are hoping to have capacity towards the end of the month. That will give us a couple of weeks to refine the brief as a group, which I'll get onto a first cut of in the coming days to share with you all.

Kind regards,
9(2)(a)
Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services
9(2)(a)
www.ccc.govt.nz
(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)
From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 2019 11:25 a.m.
To: <sup>5(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; 9(2)(a) 9(2)(a)</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; *** @otago.ac.nz&gt;;</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>
@ara.ac.nz> where a contract of a contract o
Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue.imrie@cdnb.nealtn.nz></sue.imrie@cdnb.nealtn.nz>
subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group-Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
HIAI
Thanks for your time yesterday.
9(2)(a)
Thought I'd circulate a brief summary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for benefit- in her
absence). If there's any additions or corrections please reply to the group.
9(2)(a)
<ul> <li>Thanks to for sharing Council's previous parking/network impact reports;</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site;</li> </ul>
•

- Ability to use Miles North and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings. Judge's decision awaited and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
- Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;

- No party has the ability to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;
- Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;
- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;
- Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc

#### Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate

Kind regards

Tim Lester

Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m. To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice

<susan.fitzma< th=""><th>urice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;;</th><th>Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;9(2)(a)</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></th><th>@otago.ac.nz'</th></susan.fitzma<>	urice@cdhb.health.nz>;	Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;9(2)(a)</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>	@otago.ac.nz'
9(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ara.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon	Executive Director of N	Irsing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>	a statistical and a substantial statistical statistical statistical statistical statistical statistical statist

Cc: Sue Imrie <<u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group-Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

9(2)(a) has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City

Thanks

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Ti	m Lester		
Sent: Mo	onday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.		
To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	itematics Godbb boolth past P	@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice	@otago ac pz'
(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz>,9(2)(a)	@ara.ac.nz>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Go	rdon (Executive Director of Nur	sing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	and should be a state

NAĆ

Cc: David Meates <<u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.

 To: Susan Fitzmaurice <</td>
 Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <</td>
 Rachel,Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim

 Lester 
 Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>;
 9(2)(a)
 @otago.ac.nz>;
 9(2)(a)

 9(2)(a)
 @otakaroltd.co.nz>;
 Mary Gordon (Executive Director of

Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>

Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those
  informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports
  Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west
  of Antigua Street and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

Kind regards	
9(2)(a)	
Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services	
Christohurch City Council	
53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011	
PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154	
9(2)(a)	
web: www.ccc.govt.nz	
(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)	
Original Appointment	
From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdnb.nealtn.nz]	
Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. Sent: Senter Siteman and Sector Se	
10: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; gotago.ac.nz; 9(2)(a) David Meater: Many Corden (Executive Director of Nursing)	
Subject: Car Parking Technical Group	
When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a m -10:30 a m (UTC+12:00) Auckland Wellington	
Where: Corporate 112 DHB Offices Level 1 32 Oxford Terrace Chch	
Where: corporate 112, bits offices, cever 1, 52 oxiona renade, citeti	
Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll	
Regards	
Susan Fitzmaurice LEA to David Meates, Chief Executive	
Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board	
C 03 364 4110   susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz	
P O Box 1600, Christchurch	
www.cdhb.health.nz   www.westcoastdhb.org.nz	
Canterbury	
District Health Board -West Coast-	
To Poort Placera o Wateria	
Values -? M?tou Uara	
Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata   Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono	
Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua	

\*\*\*\*

RMATIONACT

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council <u>http://www.ccc.govt.nz</u>

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. RELEASEDUNDER Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz ske ske ske ske ske ske ske ske ske

From:	9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>
Sent:	Thursday 11 July 2019 10:49 a.m.
To:	Tim Lester; Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle;
	9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz'; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
	Nursing)
Cc:	Sue Imrie
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Great, thanks <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	poking forward to seeing the draft scope when you've had a chance to draft
(2)(a)	Ōtākaro Limited
Level 8, Anthony Harper	Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
otakaroltd.co.nz   Bu	uilding places for people
9(2)(a)	(Decc sout pz)
Sent: Wednesday, 101	uly 2019 4:28 PM
To: Tim Lester < Tim Le	star@cdhh health nz>: Susan Eitzmaurice <susan eitzmaurice@cdhh="" health="" nz="">: Rachel Cadl</susan>
<rachel cadle@cdbh="" j<="" td=""><td>pealth <math>n_{22}</math> (a)</td></rachel>	pealth $n_{22}$ (a)
(2)(a) @ara.ac.pz	@otakarolfd.co.nz>: Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) < Mary Gordo	n@cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue imr<="" td=""><td>ie@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></sue>	ie@cdhb.health.nz>
Subject: RF: Car Parkin	g Technical Group - Farlier Background Studies for Discussion
subject her car rankin	B recimical croup - camer backBroarie studies for biscussion
Thank you Tim. So eve their likely resource av month. That will give u coming days to share v	yone is aware, I have had an initial word with QTP (our key traffic modelling consultants) re ailability to undertake this work. They are hoping to have capacity towards the end of the s a couple of weeks to refine the brief as a group, which I'll get onto a first cut of in the vith you all.
(2)(a)	NDE
Transport Asset Planni	ng Team – City Services
(2)(a)	
www.ccc.govt.nz	
(Normal office hours: N	Aondays to Thursdays)
	An an a Market and Andreas and Andreas
From: Tim Lester [mail	to:Tim Lester@cdbb.bealth.nz]
Sent: Wednesday 101	ulv 2019 11:25 a m
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan bealth.nz="" fitzmaurice@cdbb=""></susan>
Rachel Cadle < Rachel (	adle@cdbb bealth $nz^{9(2)(a)}$
(2)(a)	ac.nz>9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>: Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
09010.	erotakatoratedate, wary Goldon (Executive Director of
Nursing) (Many Gordo	a@cdbb_bealtb_pz>
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordo</u>	n@cdhb.health.nz>
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordo</u> Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imr</u> Subject: BE: Car Parkin	n@cdhb.health.nz> ie@cdhb.health.nz> g Technical Group - Farlier Background Studies for Discussion

Thanks for your time yesterday.

Thought I'd circulate a brief summary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> benefit- in her absence). If there's any additions or corrections please reply to the group.

- Thanks to Tim C for sharing Council's previous parking/network impact reports;
- CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site;

 9(2)(b)(ii)	
•	
0	
 *	

- Ability to use Miles North and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings. Judge's decision awaited and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
- Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;
- No party has the ability to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;
- Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;
- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;
- Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc

#### Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate

Kind regards

#### **Tim Lester**

Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Th	Mastar		
Sent: We	dnesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m.		
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	ancsady, 5 July 2015 11.14 u.m.	@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice	
<susan.f< th=""><th>itzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Rach</th><th>el Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;9</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></th><th>2)(a) @otago.ac.nz'</th></susan.f<>	itzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rach	el Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;9</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>	2)(a) @otago.ac.nz'
∋(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a)	@ara.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Go	rdon (Executive Director of Nursing	<pre>&gt;<mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></pre>	
Cc: Sue Ir	mrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	<ol> <li>Benefits Questioner Constraints (Constraints Constraints)</li> </ol>	
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - E	arlier Background Studies for Discussion	

has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City

Thanks

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Mo	nday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.			
To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>		<pre>@ccc.govt.nz&gt;; Susan Fitzmaurice</pre>	O(2)(z)	
<susan.f< td=""><td>itzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Rache</td><td>el Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.< td=""><td>nz&gt;;</td><td>@otago.ac.nz'</td></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.<></td></susan.f<>	itzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rache	el Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.< td=""><td>nz&gt;;</td><td>@otago.ac.nz'</td></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.<>	nz>;	@otago.ac.nz'
9(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz>, <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ara.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>		@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Go	rdon (Executive Director of Nursing)	< <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	24	

Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4	12 p.m.
To: Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzm< th=""><th>naurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></th></susan.fitzm<>	naurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; Tim</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>
Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.n< th=""><th>2&gt;9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz&gt;;9(2)(a)</th></tim.lester@cdhb.health.n<>	2>9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a)
9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>9(2)(a)	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of

Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- ٠ The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions – for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- . Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St / Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west ٠ of Antigua Street – and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

FFICIALIN

Any queries - please just get in touch.

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; 9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz';<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) Subject: Car Parking Technical Group When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

Canterbury District Health Board To Poart Hauora & Wataha



#### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

#### \*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. Ōtăkaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Ōtākaro. For further information about Ōtākaro Limited, please visit www.otakaroltd.co.nz

\*

Kathleen Smitheram	
From:	9(2)(a)
Sent:	Thursday, 11 July 2019 10:49 a m
To:	9(2)(a) Tim Lester: Susan Fitzmaurice: Rachel Cadle:
	9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz'; 9(2)(a) Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
	Nursing)
Cc:	Sue Imrie
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
3	
9(2)(a)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Great, thanks look	ing forward to seeing the draft scope when you've had a chance to draft 😔
(2)(a)	ÖtSkave Limited
	Otakaro Limited
Level 8, Anthony Harper Tow	ver, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
otakaroltd.co.nz   Build	ing places for people
From 9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 July	2019 4:28 PM
To: Tim Lester <tim.lester< td=""><td>@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan fitzmaurice@cdhb.<u="">health.nz&gt;: Rachel Cadle</susan></td></tim.lester<>	@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan fitzmaurice@cdhb.<u="">health.nz&gt;: Rachel Cadle</susan>
<rachel.cadle@cdhb.heal< td=""><td>th.nz&gt;;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz&gt;;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup></td></rachel.cadle@cdhb.heal<>	th.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
<sup>(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>, <sup>9(2</sup>	(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) <mary.gordon@< td=""><td>cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></mary.gordon@<>	cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue.imrie@< td=""><td>vcdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></sue.imrie@<>	vcdhb.health.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Parking Te	echnical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Thank you Tim. So everyor	ne is aware. I have had an initial word with OTP (our key traffic modelling consultants) re
their likely resource availa	bility to undertake this work. They are hoping to have capacity towards the end of the
month. That will give us a	couple of weeks to refine the brief as a group, which I'll get onto a first cut of in the
coming days to share with	you all.
2)(a)	
z)(a)	
Transport Asset Planning 1	'eam – City Services
Z)(a)	
www.ccc.govt.nz	
Internet Aller Lawrence	dave to Thursdavel
(Normal office hours: Mon	udys to maisudys)
(Normal office hours: Mon	udys to marsaays,
(Normal office hours: Mon From: Tim Lester [mailto:T	<u>im.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]</u>
(Normal office hours: Mon From: Tim Lester [mailto:T Sent: Wednesday, 10 July	<u>"m.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]</u> 2019 11:25 a.m.
(Normal office hours: Mon From: Tim Lester [mailto:T Sent: Wednesday, 10 July To	<u>"im.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]</u> 2019 11:25 a.m. @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
(Normal office hours: Mon From: Tim Lester [mailto:T Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 9(2)(a) Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadl</u> 2)(a)	<u>'im.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]</u> 2019 11:25 a.m. <u>@ccc.govt.nz&gt;;</u> Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <u>e@cdhb.health.nz&gt;;</u> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> <u>@otago.ac.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
(Normal office hours: Mon From: Tim Lester [mailto:T Sent: Wednesday, 10 July ) (2)(a) Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadl (2)(a) @ara.ac.n</rachel.cadl 	'im.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]         2019 11:25 a.m.         @cccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;         e@cdhb.health.nz&gt;;         ge(2)(a)         iz&gt;;         ge(2)(a)         @otakaroltd.co.nz}&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of addb health nz&gt;;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
(Normal office hours: Mon From: Tim Lester [mailto:T Sent: Wednesday, 10 July To Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle 2)(a) @ara.ac.r Nursing) &lt;<u>Mary.Gordon@c</u> Cc: Sue Imrie <sue imrie@<="" td=""><td>'im.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]         2019 11:25 a.m.         @cccc.govt.nz&gt;; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;         e@cdhb.health.nz&gt;;         ge(2)(a)         @otago.ac.nz&gt;;         @dotago.ac.nz&gt;;         ge(2)(a)         @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         Mary Gordon (Executive Director of :dhb.health.nz&gt;;         cdhb.health.nz&gt;;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz></td></sue></rachel.cadle 	'im.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]         2019 11:25 a.m.         @cccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;         e@cdhb.health.nz&gt;;         ge(2)(a)         @otago.ac.nz&gt;;         @dotago.ac.nz&gt;;         ge(2)(a)         @otakaroltd.co.nz&gt;;         Mary Gordon (Executive Director of :dhb.health.nz&gt;;         cdhb.health.nz&gt;;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>

Thanks for your time yesterday.

Thought I'd circulate a brief summary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for benefit- in her absence). If there's any additions or corrections please reply to the group.

- Thanks to (2)(a) for sharing Council's previous parking/network impact reports;
- CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site:

	s(2)(0)(11)		
10	S1		
•	•		

- Ability to use Miles North and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings. Judge's decision awaited and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
- Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;
- No party has the ability to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;
- Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;
- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;
- Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc

#### Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate

Kind regards

#### **Tim Lester**

Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim	Lester		
Sent: Wed	nesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m.		
To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>		@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice	
<susan.fitz< td=""><td>zmaurice@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Rach</td><td>el Cadle &lt;<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.n</u></td><td>9(2)(a)</td></susan.fitz<>	zmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rach	el Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.n</u>	9(2)(a)
9(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ara.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gord	on (Executive Director of Nursing	z) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	
Cc: Sue Imi	rie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u> >		
Subject: BI	Car Parking Technical Crown	added Deplemented Chieffor few Discussion	

has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City

Thanks

Tim Lester
Corporate Solicitor
Canterbury District Health Board
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u> .
From: Tim Lester
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice
< <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>D(2)(a)</sup>
@otago.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>; <sup>(AK)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >
Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Hi All
For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting
Kind regards
Tim Lester
Corporate Solicitor
Canterbury District Health Board
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.
From: @ccc.govt.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.
To: Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Tim
Lester <tim.lester@cdhb:beaith.nz><sup>9(2)(a)</sup></tim.lester@cdhb:beaith.nz>
@ara.ac.nz>; (2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >
Cc: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.nz></david.meates@cdhb.health.nz>
Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Dear Technical Group Members - as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous
studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the . third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the ٠ recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St </ Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west ٠ of Antigua Street - and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with? FFICIALIN

Any queries - please just get in touch.

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment--From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. 9(2)(a) o: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz' David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) Subject: Car Packing Technical Group When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

Canterbury District Health Board To Poort Hauora o Wataha



#### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

#### \*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

-----

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. Ōtākaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Ōtākaro. For further information about Ōtākaro Limited, please visit www.otakaroltd.co.nz


# Kathleen Smitheram

From:	9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz	> .
Sent:	Tuesday, 16 July 2019	12:02 p.m.	025
то:	Tim Lester; Susan Fitz 9(2)(a)	naurice; Rachel Cadle; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> Mary Gordon (Executive Directo	@otago.ac.nz'; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> or of Nursing)
Cc:	Sue Imrie, <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>		
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Techn	cal Group - Draft Network Asse	essment Consultancy Brief
Attachments:	Draft scope for QTP S Draft v1(TC).doc	W Parking Options and Impacts	Analysis (2019) Consultation

Dear all – following last week's meeting and the action sitting with me, I have now drafted a provisional scope brief to our transport modelling consultancy (QTP) to explore the options we discussed. I've also spoken in the meantime with  $\frac{9(2)(a)}{2}$  who I understand is dealing on CDHB's behalf with some of the consenting issues around the staff parking building extension. We've provisionally agreed that a good outcome would be for the traffic impact assessments for that to be largely compatible with the wider transport assessments we are considering as a group. As we all know that development is an early priority, so I have suggested in the attached it would be useful for those site specific assessments to be a "Stage A" of the upcoming work.

As you'll note in the attached, I'm hoping to get QTP started on this work as soon as possible - so we can have some comprehensive answers to the Technical Group by the end of August (*which I'm hoping is feasible*). Therefore, if you could get back to me with any comments / changes / corrections to the attached as soon as possible please I'll take it from there.

9(2)(a)	
Transport Asset Plannin	g Team – City Services
9(2)(a)	
www.ccc.govt.nz	
(Normal office hours: M	ondays to Thursdays)
From: Tim Lester [mailte	o:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 10 Ju	ly 2019 11:25 a.m.
= -9(2)(a)	Deep gout pay, Sugar Eltymouries - Sugar Eltymouries Dedish health p

To: 5(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz	?>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
Rachel C	adle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup></rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>	@otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
9(2)(a)	@ara.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Minum lange)	Alam Condan Gadlah haalkh ann	

Nursing) <Mary Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>

Cc: Sue Imrie Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

HLAIN

Thanks for your time yesterday.

Thought I'd circulate a brief summary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for absence). If there's any additions or corrections please reply to the group.

benefit- in her

- Thanks to <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> for sharing Council's previous parking/network impact reports;
- CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site;

•	9(2)(b)(ii)
•	

072

- Ability to use Miles North and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings. Judge's decision awaited and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
- Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;
- No party has the ability to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;
- Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;
- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;
- Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc

# Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m. To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice

<<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdbb.health.nz>;</u> Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;</u><sup>9(2)(a)</sup> (2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: Sue Imrie <<u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City

Thanks

9(2)(a)

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim Lester Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; 9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> ə(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>; @otakaroltd.co.nz Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Cc: David Meates <<u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion Hi All For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting Kind regards **Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** (2)(a) E: tim.lester@cdbb.health.nz T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz. From @ccc.govt.nz] Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of 9(2)(a) Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>/ Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those
  informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports
  Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;

- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St ٠ Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street - and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with? CIAL INFORMATION

Any queries - please just get in touch.

9(2)(a)	

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]

Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

@otago.ac.nz'; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; 9(2)(a) David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) 9(2)(a)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group <

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m. 10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz



### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

\*

ide ale ale ale ide ide

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*\*

2FLFFASED UNDER

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz TIONA

she she she sh

\*\*\*\*



# CONSULTANCY SERVICES PROJECT STATEMENT OF WORK

PROJECT TITLE	Central Christchurch South West Quadrant (Health Precinct) Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis			nt (Health pacts Analysis		
BUSINESS UNIT	City	City Services				
SOW NUMBER:	1	ŀ			•	AA
PO NUMBER:	450	00	-	WBS/Cost	Code	
PROJECT TIME LINE			ST. CO	ART DATE	DATE	01/08/2019 31/08/2019
CONSULTANCY		QTP ((	Quality	/ Transport Plai	nning)	M
PRC	DJEC	T REF	RE	SENTATIVE	s	
CLIENT'S CONTRACT REPRESENTATIVE	reater)		9(2)(a)			
CLIENT'S TECHNICAL REPRESENTATIVE			9(2)(a)			
CONSULTANT'S TECH REPRESENTATIVE	NICA	Ŀ	9(2)(a)			ĺ
	-	RFQ I	DET	AILS		
RFQ CLOSING DATE			Dat	e: 25/07/201	9	
DELIVER QUOTE TO: Note: For Projects \$50k or great quotation must be delivered to th Contract Representative	er the ne Clier	nt's	Em	ail: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	,	@ccc.govt.nz
For assistance ar Tel. 94	nd help 11 5234	in comp or ema	oleting il <u>purc</u>	this form, please <u>hasingsupport@</u>	contact P ccc.govt.n.	rocurement Z

\*\*Please insert rows as required\*\*

	DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES
0.1	Project Background, Purpose & Scope of Services
1.95	(Please describe any relevant background and the purpose of what is to be achieved in this Project)
	In 2016, Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) assisted Christchurch City Council,
	Otakaro Ltd and the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) with a joint,
	comprehensive review of parking needs and opportunities within the south western
	area of the central city. The review was focussed on identifying a unified plan
	(business case) to provide an appropriate level of parking supply in the area,
	principally in support of the following key developments proposed at that time under
	the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan:
	<ul> <li>The new Health Precinct, encompassing developments including the re- development of the Heapitel and construction of the new Acute Services.</li> </ul>
	development of the Hospital and construction of the new Acute Services
	The construction of a new Outpatients building. Health Research and
	<ul> <li>The construction of a new outpatients building, health research and Education Eacility (HREE) and other local health estate developments</li> </ul>
	(including the then planned re – development of the site of the former public
	(including the then planned te – development of the site of the public
	<ul> <li>Barking bailding (blde bailding),</li> <li>Barking peads associated with CDHB management services re – located to the</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Failing needs associated with ophib management services re – located to the new facility between Oxford Terrace and Tuam Street;</li> </ul>
	The proposed Metro Sports Eacility - on a site to the immediate south of the
	Health Precinct, between St Asanh Street and Moorhouse Avenue:
	Other expected developments and future and uses within the western and of
	the South Frame / Health Precinct
	Quality Transport Planning (QTP) were appointed at that time jointly by the City
	Council and DCL to undertake a supporting South West Quadrant Vehicle Parking
	Options analysis - into the likely network effects of some of the key new parking facility
	options being considered by DCL. That report was published in October 2016 and
	formed a technical appendix to the resulting DCL report "Car Parking in the South -
	West Central City" – January 2017.
	Prior transport studies (themselves also supported by QTP) had also assessed the
	transport network impacts of parking provision for the new Metro Sports Facility
	(Aurecon / QTP for Otakaro Ltd, 2016), and options for the replacement of the "Blue"
	public parking building north of St Asaph Street (GHD / QTP for CERA, 2015). Each
	had assessed their effects against An Accessible City (the transport chapter of the
	Christchurch Central Recovery Plan) comprehensive street works changes around
	Hospital Corner, which are currently approaching final completion (July 2019).
	TRANSPORT OF THE COMPLEXITY IS TO PROPER / undete the findings of the OTP
	Depurpose of this commission is to re-assess / update the findings of the QTP
	October 2016 Network impact Analysis report findings, again at an nonzon year of
	Azus I – and specifically assess the impacts of a number of subsequent development
	decisions and parking supply options.
	The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital staff
	parking building (located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street)
	by some two floors – and with an expected 270 additional spaces:
	<ul> <li>The implications of the decision to not now replace the former Hospital public</li> </ul>
	parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua
	Street (and for there to be now no significant parking supply on that block):
	<ul> <li>Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of</li> </ul>
	parking planned for the Metro Sporte facility, from the currently planned 550
	parking planned for the metro oports raciity, norm the currently planned opo

	impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as
	previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and
	engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF)
	Bo wight the key findings of the OTP October 2016 Network Impact Analysis
	• Re - visit the key infutings of the actantial far a new parking building or
	report – which had identified the potential for a new parking building or
	buildings to be located within the South Frame development, between St
	Asaph, Tuam, Antigua and Montreal Streets.
	Specifically, this refreshed site specific analysis will further explore the
	following options as to their network and access effects:
	The potential benefits / implications of physically linking any new
	norking building or buildings to the currently planned extension of the
	parking building of buildings, to the currently planned extension of the
	Hospital stall parking building (east of Antigua Street) – and therefore
	permitting its phased extension to the immediate east for public casual
	or further staff parking;
	<ul> <li>Optional parking building sites to the north and south of the proposed</li> </ul>
	east – west greenway running west from Montreal Street;
	<ul> <li>The potential benefits/ implications of any new parking building or</li> </ul>
	buildings accessed from both Tuam and St Asaph Streets (and
	therefore spanning the greenway in some form)
	The optimum access arrangements for any of these combinations in
	terms of minimising local network traffic impacts and offering flevibility
	terms of minimusing local network traine impacts and offering neurointy
	around the management of public and CDHB stan parking operations,
	<ul> <li>Local network sensitivity testing of those options at overall <u>additional</u></li> </ul>
	parking quantums (ie beyond the planned staff parking expansion of
	270 spaces) - of 800, 1000, 1200 or 1400 spaces – and the local
	network levels of service of each.
	Commission Outputs
	The key anticipated outputs of this study will be:
	Stage A
	<ul> <li>A short initial report (ideally by mid-August) exploring the local network</li> </ul>
	implications of the planned extension of the current Hospital staff parking
	huilding by 270 spaces particularly exploring the impacts of:
	building by 270 spaces – particularly exploring the impacts of.
	o alternative all of restricted movements at the main access from Antigua
	Street;
	<ul> <li>any merits of permitting entry as well as exit from the St Asaph Street</li> </ul>
	access point;
	<ul> <li>the potential implications of any later extension of the building to its</li> </ul>
	immediate east, as associated with the options assessment in Stage B
	of the study work (below);
	o any alternative access and operational arrangements that may benefit
	local network levels of service
	Note: this report shall use the same CAST v.2018a model as deployed for Stage B of the study
	work and pay reference to potential parking supply and access options to be tested in that, in
	order the partners can be confident of its consistency with any later Stage B outputs.
a	
	Stage B
	A short report containing appropriate summary network effects diagrams (using
	the latest appropriate iteration of the CAST model, v.2018a) in order to
	highlight the likely network effects of the main parking supply options outlined
	above - and their likely network levels of service at 2031:
	advice as to the ontimal quantums and "hest for network" access
	- auvice as to the optimal quantums and best for hetwork access
	balanced network autoemon against An Accessible City and the Recovery
	paranced network outcomes against An Accessible City and the Recovery

	<ul> <li>A short brie (CDHB, Co delivery, in review rep</li> </ul>	fing (up to CC, Otaka order to l ort they a	o 2 hours) for a H hero Ltd, Ara, Unive help inform the ov re preparing for th	ealth Precir ersity of Ota rerall parkin ne partner o	nct Parking ago) on or s ig needs ar irganisation	Technical Group shortly after report nd supply analysis is	
2.0	Methodology (The Consultant is to p	rovide a full	explanation of the m	ethodology pr	oposed in the	execution of 1.0)	
3.0	Deliverables, Mi	lestones	and Program	ne			
	Deliverable or Mile	stone		Completio	on Date	Cost	
1						A	
2							
3				-			
1						1 N	
5						NY	
0				W			
	Complete delivery of the k	adiuidual dalls	wrable/milestone to the	entiefaction of I	the Client will e	ntille the Consultant to	
	payment of the Services.	The Consulta	nt may invoice the Clier	t for the comple	eted Services in	accordance with Claus	
	5 of the Panel Agreement		7.		X		
4.0	PRICE			5			
	Consultants per	sonnel a	ssigned to Pro	ject and F	Price Deta	il	
	Name		Expert / Experienced / Technical	(allocated per person)	Hourly Rate (as per agreement)	Total Cost per Resource	
				YA-			
	Disbursements (Must be directly related to the project and approved in writing in advance. Admin, office overheads and travel and parking within Christchurch are not reimbursable. Service provider's itemised invoice or receipt must accompany claim)						
	Description	Cost					
4	Subconsultants - Consultant to complete this section (if applicable)						
	Company Name	Service	provided			Cost	
						\$	
	The total cost of this project is capped at TARGET or LUMP SUM price (including disbursements, if any) (delete Target or Lump Sum whichever is not applicable)						
	RFQ TERMS & CONDITIONS						
	Evaluation Responses						
	<ul> <li>(a) The Client reserves the right to accept or reject any quotation submitted.</li> <li>(b) The lowest, or highest scoring, or any quotation will not necessarily be accepted.</li> <li>(c) On award of this request for Quotation, no further correspondence will be entered into with the unsuccessful parties.</li> </ul>						
	General						
	<ul> <li>a) No legal or other obligations shall arise between the Prospective Consultant and the Client in relation to the conduct or outcome of the RFQ process unless and until both Parties have signed this SOW.</li> <li>b) Terms of supply will be those set out in Panel Agreement for Consultancy Services for Transport Planning</li> </ul>						

	SIGN OFF	
	SIGNED for the Consultant:	SIGNED for the Council:
	Signature of authorised signatory	Signature of authorised signatory
	Date	Date:
RELE	ASED	official

081 RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL MEDRIMATION ACT

# **Kathleen Smitheram**

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Attachments:

Tim Lester Tuesday, 16 July 2019 12:16 p.m. Mike Wheeler Rachel Cadle FW: Car Parking Technical Group - Draft Network Assessment Consultancy Brief Draft scope for QTP SW Parking Options and Impacts Analysis (2019) Consultation RMATIONAC Draft v1(TC).doc

Hi Mike

Fyi. I'll call to discuss relative to your project

Regards

### **Tim Lester**

**Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

9(2)(a) E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: 9(2)(a)

@ccc.govt.nz

Sent: Tuesday, 16 July 2019 12:02 p.m. To: Tim Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz> 9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

Cc: Sue Imrie <Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz>

9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group Draft Network Assessment Consultancy Brief

Dear all - following last week's meeting and the action sitting with me, I have now drafted a provisional scope brief to our transport modelling consultancy (QTP) to explore the options we discussed. I've also spoken in the meantime with<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> who I understand is dealing on CDHB's behalf with some of the consenting issues around the staff parking building extension. We've provisionally agreed that a good outcome would be for the traffic impact assessments for that to be largely compatible with the wider transport assessments we are considering as a group. As we all know that development is an early priority, so I have suggested in the attached it would be useful for those site specific assessments to be a "Stage A" of the upcoming work.

As you'll note in the attached, I'm hoping to get QTP started on this work as soon as possible - so we can have some comprehensive answers to the Technical Group by the end of August (which I'm hoping is feasible). Therefore, if you could get back to me with any comments / changes / corrections to the attached as soon as possible please I'll take it from there.

9(2)(a)		
Transport Asset	Planning Team – City Services	
www.ccc.govt.pz	7	

Fo <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	cc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
achel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>9</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>	(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
lursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	
c: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	
ubject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earli	ier Background Studies for Discussion
li All	
hanks for your time yesterday.	
bought I'd circulate a brief summany based on	my recollection of the meeting (and for $9(2)(a)$ benefit, in her
hsence) If there's any additions or correction	s please reply to the group
bsence). If there's any additions of correction	s please reply to the group.
<ul> <li>Thanks to <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> for sharing Council's p</li> </ul>	revious parking/network impact reports
CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpa	rk will not be replaced on its former site:
9(2)(b)(ii)	in winner be replaced on its former site;
•	
Ability to use Miles North and /or Miles	South remains subject to outcome of judicial raview proceedings
<ul> <li>Ability to use Miles North and parties py ludge's desision awaited and parties py</li> </ul>	south remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings.
documentation/REP so as not to pre-er	nnt/prejudice those proceedings:
Note the designation for the laneway h	between the Miles North and South narcels:
<ul> <li>Note the designation for the laneway is</li> <li>No party has the shility to fund, therefy</li> </ul>	ore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on
a DBOOT (design build own operate a	and transfer back) model:
Need to have requirements fixed (avail	able land, parks required etc) before going to market.
All reports/analysis we hold will be use	ful to provide to respondents for their due diligence:
<ul> <li>All reports/allarysis we note will be use</li> <li>planning matters: discretionany activity</li> </ul>	the beight restrictions atc. to be confirmed for REP:
<ul> <li>planning matters, discretionary activity</li> <li>Continue to look at complementary set</li> </ul>	alises park and ride, shuttle convices etc.
<ul> <li>Continue to look at complementary ser</li> </ul>	vices; park and ride, shuttle services etc
stione	
9(2)(a) be proposed by left for OTB to und	ate the packing (network impact reports)
<ul> <li>to prepare a brief for QTP to upd</li> </ul>	ate the parking/network impact reports;
A Other and late food into OTh balafaa	required to ensure essurentions are essured.
Other parties to feed into QTP brief as	required to ensure assumptions are accurate.
Other parties to feed into QTP brief as     s a collective we aim to agree some options (	required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim Lester	
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m.	
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	cc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice
< <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Rachel Ca	idle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>2(2)(3)</sup>
@otago.ac.nz> 9(2)(a)	@ara.ac.nz>,(exa) @otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <m< td=""><td>ary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></m<>	ary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlie	r Background Studies for Discussion
<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> has kindly provided the below ink that has	some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:
https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City	/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ
Thanks	
Tim Lostor	Alt -
Corporate Solicitor	0_11
Canterbury District Health Board	
9(2)(3)	
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M	E: tim.lester@cdhb.bealth.nz
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Bo	x 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.
From: Tim Lester	C
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.	
To	cc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice
< <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Rachel Ca	dle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >
@otago.ac.nz>	@ara.ac.nz>;(2)@ @otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <m< td=""><td>ary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></m<>	ary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdnb.nealtn.n	a Background Studies for Discussion
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier	r Background Studies for Discussion
HIAI	
For ease of reference, please find attached elect	ronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting
Kind regards	
Tim Lester	
Corporate Solicitor	
Canterbury District Health Board	
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M	E: tim lester@cdbb bealth nz
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Bo	x 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.
9(2)(a)	Øsse sout pz]
Sent: Wednesday, 26 lune 2019 4:12 n m	BOCCC. BOV(III2)
To: Susan Eitzmaurice <susan eitzmaurice@cdbb<="" td=""><td>health nz&gt;: Rachel Cadle <rachel cadle@cdbb.health.nz="">: Tim</rachel></td></susan>	health nz>: Rachel Cadle <rachel cadle@cdbb.health.nz="">: Tim</rachel>
Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>9(2)(a)</tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>	@otago.ac.nz> 9(2)(a)
9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>	
Cc: David Meates <david.meates@cdhb.health.n< td=""><td>12&gt;</td></david.meates@cdhb.health.n<>	12>
Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Ba	ckground Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members - as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street – and as we heard yesterday, that is no-longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

# 9(2)(a)

(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; 9(2)(a)

@otago.ac.nz David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz

P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz



To Poor Haucra & Watsha



Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

### \*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

086

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*



# CONSULTANCY SERVICES PROJECT STATEMENT OF WORK

BUSINESS UNIT	City Se	City Services				
SOW NUMBER:	] ]			1An		
PO NUMBER:	4500		WBS/Cost Code			
PROJECT TIME LINE		S	TART DATE	01/08/2019		
CONSULTANCY	Q	TP (Qua	lity Transport Planning)			
PRO	JECT	REPR	ESENTATIVES			
CLIENT'S CONTRACT REPRESENTATIVE (in the event of work \$50k and gree	eater)	9(2	)(a)			
REPRESENTATIVE	.4	9(2)	(a)			
CONSULTANT'S TECHN REPRESENTATIVE	VICAL	9(2	)(a)			
R	RF	Q DE	TAILS			
RFQ CLOSING DATE		D	ate: 25/07/2019			
DELIVER QUOTE TO: Note: For Projects \$50k or greate quotation must be delivered to the Contract Representative	r the client's	E	9(2)(a) mail:			
For assistance and	d help in	completin	ng this form, please contact P	rocurement		
Tel. 941	1 5234 or	email <u>pr</u>	irchasingsupport@ccc.govt.n	z		

\*\*Please insert rows as required\*\*

	DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES
1.0	Project Background, Purpose & Scope of Services
_	(Please describe any relevant background and the purpose of what is to be achieved in this Project)
	In 2016, Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) assisted Christchurch City Council,
	Otakaro Ltd and the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) with a joint,
	comprehensive review of parking needs and opportunities within the south western
	area of the central city. The review was focussed on identifying a unified plan
	(business case) to provide an appropriate level of parking supply in the area,
	principally in support of the following key developments proposed at that time under
	the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan:
	<ul> <li>The new Health Precinct, encompassing developments including the re-</li> </ul>
	development of the Hospital and construction of the new Acute Services
	building:
	<ul> <li>The construction of a new Outpatients building. Health Research and</li> </ul>
	Education Facility (HREF), and other local health estate developments
	(including the then planned re – development of the site of the former public
	parking building ("Blue" building):
	<ul> <li>Parking peeds associated with CDHR management services re – located to the</li> </ul>
	new facility between Oxford Terrace and Tuam Street
	The proposed Metro Sports Easility , on a site to the immediate south of the
	<ul> <li>The proposed metro oports Facility - on a site to the infinediate south of the Health Precipict, between St Asach Streat and Mearbours, Avenue;</li> </ul>
	Other expected developments and future 2nd uses within the western and of
	Other expected developments and future land uses within the western end of the South Freme / Health Presidet
	the South Frame / Health Precinct.
	Quality Transport Dispring (QTD) were emploted at that time isinth, by the City
	Quality Transport Planning (QTP) were appointed at that time jointly by the City
	Council and DCL to undertake a supporting South west Quadrant vehicle Parking
	Options analysis - into the likely network effects of some of the key new parking facility
	options being considered by DCL. That report was published in October 2016 and
	formed a technical appendix to the resulting DCL report "Car Parking in the South -
	West Central City" – January 2017.
	Distance of the second se
	Prior transport studies (themselves also supported by QTP) had also assessed the
	transport network impacts of parking provision for the new Metro Sports Facility
	(Aurecon / QTP for Qtakaro Ltd, 2016), and options for the replacement of the "Blue"
	public parking building north of St Asaph Street (GHD / QTP for CERA, 2015). Each
	had assessed their effects against An Accessible City (the transport chapter of the
	Christchurch Central Recovery Plan) comprehensive street works changes around
	Hospital Corner, which are currently approaching final completion (July 2019).
	The purpose of this commission is to re-assess / update the findings of the QTP
2	October 2016 Network Impact Analysis report findings, again at an horizon year of
6	(2031 – and specifically assess the impacts of a number of subsequent development
	decisions and parking supply options:
	<ul> <li>The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital staff</li> </ul>
	parking building (located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street)
	by some two floors – and with an expected 270 additional spaces;
	<ul> <li>The implications of the decision to <u>not</u> now replace the former Hospital public</li> </ul>
	parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua
	Street (and for there to be now no significant parking supply on that block);
	<ul> <li>Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of</li> </ul>
	parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550
	parking planned for the metro oports racinty, norm the currently planned oco

impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF); Re – visit the key findings of the QTP October 2016 Network Impact Analysis report - which had identified the potential for a new parking building or buildings to be located within the South Frame development, between St Asaph, Tuam, Antigua and Montreal Streets. Specifically, this refreshed site specific analysis will further explore the following options as to their network and access effects: The potential benefits / implications of physically linking any new 0 parking building or buildings, to the currently planned extension of the Hospital staff parking building (east of Antigua Street) - and therefore permitting its phased extension to the immediate east for public casual or further staff parking; Optional parking building sites to the north and south of the proposed 0 east - west greenway running west from Montreal Street; The potential benefits/ implications of any new parking building or 0 buildings accessed from both Tuam and St Asaph Streets (and therefore spanning the greenway in some form); The optimum access arrangements for any of these combinations in 0 terms of minimising local network traffic impacts and offering flexibility around the management of public and CDHB staff parking operations; Local network sensitivity testing of those options at overall additional 0 parking quantums (ie beyond the planned staff parking expansion of 270 spaces) - of 800, 1000, 1200 or 1400 spaces - and the local network levels of service of each. **Commission Outputs** The key anticipated outputs of this study will be: Stage A • A short, initial report (ideally by mid-August) exploring the local network implications of the planned extension of the current Hospital staff parking building by 270 spaces - particularly exploring the impacts of: o alternative all or restricted movements at the main access from Antigua Street; o any merits of permitting entry as well as exit from the St Asaph Street access point; the potential implications of any later extension of the building to its immediate east, as associated with the options assessment in Stage B of the study work (below); any alternative access and operational arrangements that may benefit 0 local network levels of service. Note: this report shall use the same CAST v.2018a model as deployed for Stage B of the study work and pay reference to potential parking supply and access options to be tested in that, in order the partners can be confident of its consistency with any later Stage B outputs. Stage B A short report containing appropriate summary network effects diagrams (using the latest appropriate iteration of the CAST model, v.2018a) in order to highlight the likely network effects of the main parking supply options outlined above - and their likely network levels of service at 2031; advice as to the optimal guantums and "best for network" access configurations across the above optional site supply configurations, to achieve balanced network outcomes against An Accessible City and the Recovery

	Plan; A short brie ( <i>CDHB</i> , <i>C</i> ( delivery, in review rep	fing (up t CC, Otaka order to ort they a	o 2 hours) for a H aro Ltd, Ara, Unive help inform the ov re preparing for th	ealth Preci ersity of Ota verall parkir ne partner c	nct Parking ago) on or s ng needs ar organisation	Technical Group shortly after report nd supply analysis is	
2.0	Methodology (The Consultant is to p	rovide a fuli	explanation of the m	ethodology pr	oposed in the	execution of 1.0)	
3.0	Deliverables, Mi	lestones	and Program	ne			
	Deliverable or Mile	stone	stone Completion Date				
1						2	
2							
3							
4							
5							
					0		
	Complete delivery of the in payment of the Services. 5 of the Panel Agreement.	ndividual deli The Consulta	verable/milestone to the ant may invoice the Clier	satisfaction of t for the complete	the Client will e ated Services in	ntitle the Consultant to accordance with Clause	
4.0	PRICE				7		
and the second second	Consultants per	sonnel a	assigned to Pro	ject and I	Price Deta	il	
	Name		Expert / Experienced / Technical	Hours (allocated per person)	Hourly Rate (as per agreement)	Total Cost per Resource	
			A CAN				
	Disbursements ( overheads and travel and receipt must accompany of	Must be dire parking withi laim)	ctly related to the projec n Christchurch are not n	t and approved eimbursable. S	in writing in ad ervice provider'	vance. Admin, office s itemised invoice or	
	Description	2				Cost	
	Subconsultants	- Consul	tant to complete thi	s section (if	applicable)		
	Company Name	Service	provided		difficiency and the	Cost	
	C	1		and an and the second		\$	
4	The total cost of this (including disbursements,	project is if any) (delet	capped at TARGE te Target or Lump Sum	T or LUMP S whichever is n	UM price of applicable)		
	REQ TERMS 8	CONE	DITIONS				
	Evaluation Resp	onses					
	<ul> <li>(a) The Client reser</li> <li>(b) The lowest, or h</li> <li>(c) On award of this parties.</li> </ul>	ves the right lighest scorin s request for	to accept or reject any o ig, or any quotation will i Quotation, no further co	quotation subm not necessarily rrespondence v	itted. be accepted. vill be entered in	nto with the unsuccessful	
	General						
	<ul> <li>a) No legal or other oblig conduct or outcome of th b) Terms of supply will b Consultancy Services - F</li> </ul>	ations shall the RFQ proc those set Panel Agree	arise between the Pro ress unless and until be out in Panel Agreemen ment	spective Cons oth Parties hav it for Consultar	ultant and the re signed this S ncy Services fo	Client in relation to the SOW. r Transport Planning	

	SIGN OFF		
	SIGNED for the Consultant:	SIGNED for the Council:	
	 Signature of authorised signatory	Signature of authorised signatory	
	Date	Date	1
G			
		SMA.	
		LOK.	
	JAN L		
	R		
K.			

Kathleen Smitheram	
From:	Mike Wheeler
Sent:	Thursday, 25 July 2019 1:11 p.m.
To:	Tim Lester
Cc:	
Subject:	FW: Car Parking Technical Group - Draft Network Assessment Consultancy Brief
Attachments:	Draft v1(TC).doc; Re: CDHB Antigua Street Carpark
Importance:	High
Hi Tim,	
Please see the attached	email chain regarding feedback from 9(2)(a) on the CCC proposal for the QTP report.
Are you able to pass thi	s on to <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> on our behalf. Cut and paste may be required.
I am happy for contact t	to be made with 9(2)(a) directly if there is any queries arise from this.
Regards	
Mike	
From: Tim Lester	
Sent: Tuesday, 16 July 2	019 12:16 p.m.
To: Mike Wheeler <mike< td=""><td>e.Wheeler@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></mike<>	e.Wheeler@cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: Rachel Cadle <rache< td=""><td>l.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></rache<>	l.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>
Subject: FW: Car Parking	g Technical Group - Draft Network Assessment Consultancy Brief
Hi Mike	
Fyi. I'll call to discuss rel	ative to your project
Regards	OF
Tim Lester	
<b>Corporate Solicitor</b>	
Canterbury District Heal	th Board
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal	ext: 62128)   M <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terra	ce, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 16 July 2	019 12:02 p.m. ter@cdbb.bealth.paty Suran Eitzmaurice <suran @cdbb.bealth.paty="" bachel="" cadle<="" eitzmaurice="" td=""></suran>
Rachel Cadle @cdbb ba	alth pz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
2)(a) @ara ac pz>	9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.pz>: Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) <mary gordon<="" td=""><td>@cdbb.health.nz&gt;</td></mary>	@cdbb.health.nz>
c: Sue Imrie <sue.imrie< td=""><td>@cdhb.health.nz&gt;; 9(2)(a)</td></sue.imrie<>	@cdhb.health.nz>; 9(2)(a)
2)(a) @ccc.go	vt.nz>
California DE Care Da Li	Technical Course Desta Material Assessment Coursilian and Dalat

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Draft Network Assessment Consultancy Brief

Dear all - following last week's meeting and the action sitting with me, I have now drafted a provisional scope brief to our transport modelling consultancy (QTP) to explore the options we discussed. I've also spoken in the meantime who I understand is dealing on CDHB's behalf with some of the consenting issues around the with staff parking building extension. We've provisionally agreed that a good outcome would be for the traffic impact assessments for that to be largely compatible with the wider transport assessments we are considering as a group. As we all know that development is an early priority, so I have suggested in the attached it would be useful for those site specific assessments to be a "Stage A" of the upcoming work.

As you'll note in the attached, I'm hoping to get QTP started on this work as soon as possible - so we can have some comprehensive answers to the Technical Group by the end of August (which I'm hoping is feasible). Therefore, if you could get back to me with any comments / changes / corrections to the attached as soon as possible please I'll take INFORMATION it from there.

Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 2019 11:25 a.m.

To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>;	Susan Fitzmaurice	< <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >;
Rachel Cadle < Rachel.Cadle@cdhb	health.nz>;9(2)(a)		@otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>		@otakaroltd.co.nz	>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.hea< td=""><td>alth.nz&gt;</td><td></td><td></td></mary.gordon@cdhb.hea<>	alth.nz>		

Cc: Sue Imrie <Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

Thanks for your time yesterday.

Thought I'd circulate a brief summary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for 9(2)(a) benefit- in her absence). If there's any additions or corrections please reply to the group.

- Thanks to 9(2)(a) for sharing Council's previous parking/network impact reports;
- CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site; .



- Ability to use Miles North and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings. Judge's decision awaited and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
- Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;
- No party has the ability to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;

2

- Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;

- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP; ٠
- Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc ٠

Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate. ٠

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate NATION

Kind regards

**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

9(2)(a) T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester	
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m.	
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice	
<susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>	9(2)(a)
9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	
has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery t	than the plans:
https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%2 church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City	20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ
Thanks	
Tim Lester	
Corporate Solicitor	
Canterbury District Health Board	
9(2)(a)	
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz	A REAL PROPERTY OF A READ PROPERTY OF A REAL PROPER
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.go	ovt.nz.
From: Tim Lester	
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.	
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice	
<susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>	9(2)(a)
9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	10
Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

9(2)(a) T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of

@ccc.govt.nz]

Ə(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>9(2)(a)

Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: David Meates <<u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members - as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, 1 am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the ٠ third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DQL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street – and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries – please just get in touch.

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154

9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]

Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz';<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.

Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll OFFICIA Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive

Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz

P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

Canterbury District Health Board



Values -? M?tou Uara

To Pearl Housea & Wataba

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute I te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa I runga I te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng2 hua

6

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* ale ale ale ale ale ale

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz ste ste ste ste ste ste ste ste

REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL MEDRINAL



# CONSULTANCY SERVICES PROJECT STATEMENT OF WORK

BUSINESS UNIT	City Se	rvices				
SOW NUMBER:	I I			AA.		
PO NUMBER:	4500		WBS/Cost Code			
PROJECT TIME LINE		ST	ART DATE	01/08/2019		
CONSULTANCY	QT	P (Qualit	y Transport Planning)	31/08/2019		
PRO	JECTI	REPRE	SENTATIVES			
CLIENT'S CONTRACT REPRESENTATIVE (in the event of work \$50k and gro	eater)	9(2)(a)				
CLIENT'S TECHNICAL REPRESENTATIVE		9(2)(a)				
CONSULTANT'S TECHI REPRESENTATIVE	NICAL	9(2)(a	)			
K	RF	Q DET	AILS			
RFQ CLOSING DATE		Dat	te: 25/07/2019			
DELIVER QUOTE TO: Note: For Projects \$50k or greate quotation must be delivered to the Contract Representative	er the e Client's	Em	9(2)(a) ail:			
For assistance an Tel. 94	d help in c 1 5234 or	ompleting email <u>purc</u>	this form, please contact P hasingsupport@ccc.govt.n	rocurement Z		

\*\*Please insert rows as required\*\*

	DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES							
1.0	Project Background, Purpose & Scope of Services							
1000	(Please describe any relevant background and the purpose of what is to be achieved in this Project)							
	In 2016, Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) assisted Christchurch City Council,							
	Otakaro Ltd and the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) with a joint,							
	comprehensive review of parking needs and opportunities within the south western							
	area of the central city. The review was focussed on identifying a unified plan							
	(business case) to provide an appropriate level of parking supply in the area,							
	principally in support of the following key developments proposed at that time under the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan:							
	<ul> <li>The new Health Precinct, encompassing developments including the re- development of the Hospital and construction of the new Acute Services</li> </ul>							
	building;							
	<ul> <li>The construction of a new Outpatients building, Health Research and</li> </ul>							
	Education Facility (HREF), and other local health estate developments							
	(including the then planned re – development of the site of the former public							
	parking building ("Blue" building);							
	<ul> <li>Parking needs associated with CDHB management services re – located to the new facility between Oxford Terrace and Tuam Street:</li> </ul>							
	<ul> <li>The proposed Metro Sports Facility - on a site to the immediate south of the</li> </ul>							
	Health Precinct, between St Asaph Street and Moorhouse Avenue:							
	Other expected developments and future land uses within the western end of							
	the South Frame / Health Precinct.							
	Quality Transport Planning (OTP) were appointed at that time jointly by the City							
	Gounail and DCL to undertake a supporting South West Quadrant Vehicle Parking							
	Council and DCL to undertake a supporting South West Quadrant Vehicle Parking							
	Options analysis - into the likely network effects of some of the key new parking facility							
	options being considered by DCL. That report was published in October 2010 and							
	West Central City" January 2017							
	west Central City - January 2017.							
	Delet transport studies (the meables also supported by OTD) had also appared the							
	Prior transport studies (themselves also supported by QTP) had also assessed the							
	transport network impacts of parking provision for the new Metro Sports Facility							
	(Aurecon / QTP for Otakaro Ltd, 2016), and options for the replacement of the "Blue"							
	public parking building north of St Asaph Street (GHD / QTP for CERA, 2015). Each							
	had assessed their effects against An Accessible City (the transport chapter of the							
	Christchurch Central Recovery Plan) comprehensive street works changes around							
	Hospital Corner, which are currently approaching final completion (July 2019).							
	The purpose of this commission is to re-assess / update the findings of the OTP							
	October 2016 Network Impact Analysis report findings, again at an horizon year of							
	2031 – and specifically assess the impacts of a number of subsequent development							
Ś	decisions and parking supply options:							
	The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital staff							
	parking building (located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street)							
	by some two floors - and with an expected 270 additional spaces;							
	The implications of the decision to not now replace the former Hospital public							
	parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antiqua							
	Street (and for there to be now no significant parking supply on that block):							
	alleel tahu lui mere lu ve huw nu alumbani varking aubur un mai mucki.							
	<ul> <li>Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of</li> </ul>							
	<ul> <li>Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550.</li> </ul>							

impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF); Re - visit the key findings of the QTP October 2016 Network Impact Analysis report - which had identified the potential for a new parking building or buildings to be located within the South Frame development, between St Asaph, Tuam, Antigua and Montreal Streets. Specifically, this refreshed site specific analysis will further explore the following options as to their network and access effects: The potential benefits / implications of physically linking any new 0 parking building or buildings, to the currently planned extension of the Hospital staff parking building (east of Antigua Street) - and therefore permitting its phased extension to the immediate east for public casual or further staff parking; Optional parking building sites to the north and south of the proposed east - west greenway running west from Montreal Street; The potential benefits/ implications of any new parking building or 0 buildings accessed from both Tuam and St Asaph Streets (and therefore spanning the greenway in some form); The optimum access arrangements for any of these combinations in 0 terms of minimising local network traffic impacts and offering flexibility around the management of public and CDHB staff parking operations; Local network sensitivity testing of those options at overall additional 0 parking quantums (ie beyond the planned staff parking expansion of 270 spaces) - of 800, 1000, 1200 or 1400 spaces - and the local network levels of service of each. **Commission Outputs** The key anticipated outputs of this study will be: Stage A • A short, initial report (ideally by mid-August) exploring the local network implications of the planned extension of the current Hospital staff parking building by 270 spaces - particularly exploring the impacts of: alternative all or restricted movements at the main access from Antigua Street; o any merits of permitting entry as well as exit from the St Asaph Street access point; the potential implications of any later extension of the building to its immediate east, as associated with the options assessment in Stage B of the study work (below); any alternative access and operational arrangements that may benefit 0 local network levels of service. Note: this report shall use the same CAST v.2018a model as deployed for Stage B of the study work and pay reference to potential parking supply and access options to be tested in that, in order the partners can be confident of its consistency with any later Stage B outputs. Stage B A short report containing appropriate summary network effects diagrams (using the latest appropriate iteration of the CAST model, v.2018a) in order to highlight the likely network effects of the main parking supply options outlined above - and their likely network levels of service at 2031; advice as to the optimal guantums and "best for network" access configurations across the above optional site supply configurations, to achieve balanced network outcomes against An Accessible City and the Recovery

	Plan; • A short bri ( <i>CDHB, C</i> delivery, in review rep	efing (up to CC, Otake n order to l port they a	o 2 hours) for a H hro <i>Ltd, Ara, Univ</i> help inform the o re preparing for t	lealth Preci ersity of Ota verall parkir he partner o	nct Parking ago) on or s ng needs ar organisatior	Technical Group shortly after reported and supply analysi		
2.0	Methodology (The <u>Consultant</u> is to p	oposed in the	execution of 1.0)					
3.0	Deliverables, M	ilestones	and Program	me				
0.0	Deliverable or Milestone Completion Date					Cost		
1				- eenipien	on botto			
2						C C		
3						$\rightarrow$		
4				-				
5						1 A		
			_	1				
	Complete delivery of the	Induidual dalls	erable/milestone to the	antisfaction of		Mills the Consultant to		
	payment of the Services. 5 of the Panel Agreemen	The Consulta t.	nt may invoice the Clie	a satisfaction of nt for the comple	the Client will e ated Services in	accordance with Claus		
4.0	PRICE				X			
	Consultants per	rsonnel a	ssigned to Pro	ject and I	Price Deta	il		
	Name		Expert / Experienced / Technical	Hours (allocated per person)	Hourly Rate (as per agreement)	Total Cost per Resource		
		~	XV OX					
	Disbursements (Must be directly related to the project and approved in writing in advance. Admin, office overheads and travel and parking within Christchurch are not reimbursable. Service provider's itemised invoice or receipt must accompany claim?							
	Description					Cost		
	19.							
	Subconsultante							
	Company Name Service provided					Cost		
-		0011100	promoto			\$		
1	The total cost of this project is capped at TARGET or LUMP SUM price (including disbursements, if any) (delete Target or Lump Sum whichever is not applicable)							
X	RFQ TERMS & CONDITIONS							
1	Evaluation Responses							
	<ul> <li>(a) The Client reserves the right to accept or reject any quotation submitted.</li> <li>(b) The lowest, or highest scoring, or any quotation will not necessarily be accepted.</li> <li>(c) On award of this request for Quotation, no further correspondence will be entered into with the unsuccessful parties.</li> </ul>							
	General							
	<ul> <li>a) No legal or other obligations shall arise between the Prospective Consultant and the Client in relation to the conduct or outcome of the RFQ process unless and until both Parties have signed this SOW.</li> <li>b) Terms of supply will be those set out in Panel Agreement for Consultancy Services for Transport Planning Consultancy Services - Panel Agreement</li> </ul>							

	SIGN OFF		
-	SIGNED for the Consultant:	SIGNED for the Council:	
	Signature of authorised signatory	Signature of authorised signatory	
	Date	Date:	
		RN	
		, AF	
		Chr	
	4		
	Str		
4			
261			



# **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	
Sent:	
To:	
Subject:	

9(2)(a)	@planningmatters.co.nz>
Thursday, 25 July	2019 1:00 p.m.
Re: CDHB Antigua	vheeler i Street Carpark

Thanks all. This needs to be provided  $t_{c}^{9(2)(a)}$ asap if it hasn't already. I understand the cdhb / ccc transport group have already met. Was it discussed there then?

Mike <u>- the response</u> to  $\binom{9(2)}{(a)}$ needs to come from you or from someone on the transport group. I suggest you in as tim may have questions / suggestions. copy

Sorry if this is telling you what you already know / has been auctioned.

# Get Outlook for Android

### 9(2)(a) From

@carriageway.co.nz> Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2019 8:52:07 AM 9(2)(a) To: Mike Wheeler < Mike. Wheeler@cdhb.health.nz>; Subject: RE: CDHB Antigua Street Carpark

@planningmatters.co.nz>

Thanks Mike

In which case the scope of works reduces even further:

# Stage A

A short, initial report (ideally by mid-August) exploring the local network implications of the planned extension of the current Hospital staff parking building by 270 spaces. This is to be carried out for an assessment year of 2020. The following tasks are required.

- Confirmation that the CAST v2018a model includes the current extent of car parking undertaken by CBHB staff at the Metro Sports site. If not included, then it should be added into the model to form the base year scenario.
- An assessment of removing all Metro Sports parking associated with the CDHB staff plus increasing the capacity of the Antigua Street car park by 270 spaces ("Scenario 1"). For clarity, this will result in a net overall reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces available to the CDHB staff.

In the event that significant adverse effects are observed in Scenario 1 when compared to the base year scenario, then the following should be considered:

- Alternative all or restricted movements at the main access from Antigua Street;
- Any merits of permitting entry as well as exit from the St Asaph Street access point;
- Any alternative access and operational arrangements that may benefit local network levels of service.

# Cheers



	From: Mike Wheeler <mike.wheeler@cdhb.health.nz></mike.wheeler@cdhb.health.nz>
	Sent: Thursday, 25 July 2019 8:49 AM
	To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @carriageway.co.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @planningmatters.co.nz>
	Subject: RE: CDHB Antigua Street Carpark
	March 2020 is the date the last of or licences/leases expire over that site.
	9(2)(a)
	From: <u>@carriageway.co.nz</u> ]
	Sent: Thursday, 25 July 2019 8:42 a.m. 9(2)(a)
	To: Mike wheeler < <u>Mike.wheeler@cdnb.nealth.nz</u> >;
	Subject: KE: CDHB Antigua Street Carpark
	Hi Mike
	In our discussions you've mentioned that there is a possibility that CDHB might be able to continue to park at the
	site in the very short term.
	Since QTP are doing the modelling of the effects, I thought it made sense to cover off this possibilityit might not
	ultimately be needed, but if it is, we would have it to hand immediately rather than have additional delays while we
	wait for more modelling.
	If you can rule out any potential for CDHB vehicles to park at the Metro Sports complex over the next couple of years then no problem to eliminate this part of the assessment.
	Cheers
9(	2)(a)
ŀ	
	From: Mike Wheeler < Mike Wheeler@edbb health nz>
	Sent: Thursday, 25 July 2019 8:36 AM
	To $\frac{9(2)(a)}{2}$ @planningmatters co. pz>
	Subject: RE: CDHB Antigua Street Carpark
	Sustaine some surger part
	Morning
	Pardon my ignorance - what is the reason for the 2 <sup>nd</sup> question regarding effects of partial removal of Metro Sport parking? This is due to be removed completely, I don't believe there is a partial removal option.
	Or - is it referring to the potential for parking on residual spaces on the site post completion?
	Regards
	Wike_
	9(2)(a)
	From: @carriageway.co.nz]
	Sent: Thursday, 25 July 2019 8:10 a.m.
	To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @planningmatters.co.nz>
	Cc: Mike Wheeler < <u>Mike.Wheeler@cdhb.health.nz</u> >
	Subject: KE: CDHB Antigua Street Carpark
	Hi both
	2

I've read through the scope of works. In terms of our commission, there are two questions that need to be answered:

- What are the effects of completely removing the Metro Sports parking for the DHB and providing extra parking at Antigua Street, such that there is a net loss? And
- What are the effects of partially removing the Metro Sports parking for the DHB and providing extra parking at Antigua Street, such that there is no overall change in parking?

These questions needs to be answered in isolation from any other changes.

The scope of works:

- Requests an assessment at 2031. This is too late for the assessment that we need (which needs to be at 2020). A further effect is that the extent of development in the city at 2031 will be different to what is in place in 2020.
- The Stage A specification has four bullet points. It's not clear whether the third bullet point (the potential expansion of the car park to the east) is a separate task rather than being bundled with the proposed expansion
- There is no mention of the removal or reduction in Metro Sport parking
- They are assessing the merits of changes to the car park access arrangements even if there's no adverse effect created (that is, they will be seeking optimum solutions even if they find that the current proposals will be adequate).
- It is not clear whether the model specified to be used (CAST v2018a) models the existing situation with Metro Sports or not.

The scope of works looks good for a wider-view assessment of parking into the future, but it won't do what we need for the resource consent.

I have cut out the text for the Stage A part, and edited it do to what we need.

# Stage A

A short, initial report (ideally by mid-August) exploring the local network implications of the planned extension of the current Hospital staff parking building by 270 spaces. This is to be carried out for an assessment year of 2020. The following tasks are required.

- Confirmation that the CAST v2018a model includes the current extent of car parking undertaken by CBHB staff at the Metro Sports site. If not included, then it should be added into the model to form the base year scenario.
- An assessment of reducing the extent of Metro Sports parking by 270 spaces plus increasing the capacity of the Antigua Street car park by 270 spaces ("Scenario 1"). For clarity, this will ne net neutral in terms of the number of spaces.
- An assessment of removing all Metro Sports parking plus increasing the capacity of the Antigua Street car park by 270 spaces ("Scenario 2"). For clarity, this will result in an overall reduction in the number of spaces provided.

In the event that significant adverse effects are observed in either Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 when compared to the base year scenario, then the following should be considered:

- Alternative all or restricted movements at the main access from Antigua Street;
- Any merits of permitting entry as well as exit from the St Asaph Street access point;
- Any alternative access and operational arrangements that may benefit local network levels of service.

This should help narrow down the scope, which will make their task a little faster – it also means we are simply assessing the effects of the proposal rather than wider effects into the future.

Cheers

9(2)(a)


#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From: Sent: To: Subject: Tim Lester Thursday, 1 August 2019 10:42 a.m. 9(2)(a) CDHB; Carparking technical advisory group

### 9(2)(a)

Regarding the existing CDHB staff carpark- it has just come to light that there will be more engineering required than first envisaged (by the engineer) and therefore significant additional costs. It is therefore not a given that we will be able to progress with the additional 2 floors on the existing staff carpark on Antigua Street. This may have an effect on the QTP assumptions/ modelling. Brad and his team are investigating further. Do we need to advise QTP?

Regards

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

RMA

Kathleen Smitheran	n
From	9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.pz>
Sent:	Thursday, 1 August 2019 12:37 p.m.
To:	9(2)(a) Tim Lester; Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle;
0.772	9(2)(a) Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
	Nursing)
Cc:	Sue Imrie
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Helle all - are we me	paties again coop 2
Hello all – are we me	eeting again soon r
(2)(a)	Ōtākaro Limited
Level 8, Anthony Harpe	er Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
stakaroltd co na L	Building places for people
otakaroitu.co.nz [ ]	building places for people
9(2)(a)	
From:	1. 2010 10:40 414
Sent: Thursday, 11 Ju 9(2)(a)	JIV 2019 10:49 AM
Fitzmaurice <susan f<="" td=""><td>itzmaurice@cdbb bealth nz&gt;: Bachel Cadle <bachel bealth="" cadle@cdbb="" nz="">:</bachel></td></susan>	itzmaurice@cdbb bealth nz>: Bachel Cadle <bachel bealth="" cadle@cdbb="" nz="">:</bachel>
(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz>: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>: Mary Gordon
(Executive Director o	f Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz< td=""></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz<>
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue.in< td=""><td>nrie@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></sue.in<>	nrie@cdhb.health.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Park	ing Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
19/10/10/10/10/10/10/10	
Great, thanks <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	looking forward to seeing the draft scope when you've had a chance to draft 🔘
(2)(a)	Ōtākaro Limited
Level 8, Anthony Harpe	er Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
otakaroltd co.pz. L	Building places for people
otakaroitu.co.nz   i	building places for people
9(2)(a)	
From:	@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 10	Duly 2019 4:28 PM
To: Tim Lester < Lim	Lester@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle 9(2)(a)</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
(2)(a)	p.nealth.nz>; @otakaroltd.co.nz>: Many Gordon (Everythyn Director of
Nursing) Mary Gord	top@cdbb.bealtb.pz>
Cc: Site Imrie <sue in<="" td=""><td>nrie@cdhb.health.nz&gt;</td></sue>	nrie@cdhb.health.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Park	ing Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
K	
Thank you Tim. So ev	veryone is aware, I have had an initial word with QTP (our key traffic modelling consultants) re
their likely resource	availability to undertake this work. They are hoping to have capacity towards the end of the
month. That will give	us a couple of weeks to refine the brief as a group, which I'll get onto a first cut of in the
coming days to share	e with you all.
(2)(a)	

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services

1	2	V	a١	
1	4	Л	a,	

www.ccc.govt	.nz		
(Normal office	hours: Mondays	s to	Thursdays)

To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	<pre>@ccc.govt.nz&gt;; Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz></pre>
Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cd</u>	hb.health.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
@ara.ac.nz>;9(2	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.</u>	health.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.</u>	health.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technic	al Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
11 All	
hanks for your time vesterday.	
nanks for your time yesterday.	2
'hought I'd circulate a brief sum	mary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for $9^{(2)(a)}$ benefit- in her
bsence). If there's any addition	s or corrections please reply to the group.
issence). In there is any dualition	sol concertains prease reply to the Brouph
<ul> <li>Thanks to<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> for share</li> </ul>	ing Council's previous parking/network impact reports:
CDHB re-confirmed that	the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site:
9(2)(b)(ii)	the blue carpark will not be replaced office former site,
•	
•	
<ul> <li>Ability to use Miles Nort</li> </ul>	in and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome or judicial review proceedings.
Judge's decision awaited	and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our
documentation/RFP so a	is not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
<ul> <li>Note the designation for</li> </ul>	r the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;
<ul> <li>No party has the ability</li> </ul>	to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on
a DBOOT (design, build,	own, operate and transfer back) model;

- · Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- · All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;
- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;
- Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc.

#### Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate

Kind regards

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: 9(2)(a)	E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600	Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester		
Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m.		
то: <sup>9(2)(а)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice	0
<susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rache</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>	I Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	
9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ara.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)	< <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u> >		
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Ea	rlier Background Studies for Discussion	2
Colin has kindly provided the below ink that I	nas some more recent satellite imagery than t	he plans:
https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt	.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Ant	igua%20Street,%20Christ
church%20Central.%20Christchurch%20City		A CONTRACTOR OF A STATE OF A
Thanks		
Tim Lester	<i>,C</i> <sup><i>i</i></sup>	
Corporate Solicitor		
Canterbury District Health Board		
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M: 9(2)	E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz	
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO	Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz	
	X	
From: Tim Lester		
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m.		
	@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice	
< <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Rache	I Gadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; 9(2)(a)	
9(z)(a) @otago.ac.nz>	@ara.ac.nz>;	@otakaroitd.co.nz>
Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)	< <u>Mary.Gordon@cdnb.nealtn.nz</u> >	
Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdnb.near	th.nz>	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Ea	rlier Background Studies for Discussion	
HIAI		
For ease of reference please find attached a	lectronic conies of the plans that were presen	ted in the meeting
For ease of reference, please find attached e	lectronic copies of the plans that were presen	ted in the meeting
Kind regards		
Kind regards		
Tim Lester		
Corporate Solicitor		
Canterbury District Health Board		
with the particular and the part	The Aller of the second s	
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M	E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz	
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PC	Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz	<u>(</u> ,
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]	
Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.	THE STATE OF A STATE O	
To: Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@c</u>	<u>;dhb.health.nz</u> >; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@</u>	ocdhb.health.nz>; Tim
Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otago.a	<u>c.nz</u> >;9(2)(a)
9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (E	xecutive Director of

#### Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

#### Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital, Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west
  of Antigua Street and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

#### Any queries - please just get in touch.

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: <u>www.ccc.govt.nz</u> (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

113	;
-----	---

ATIONAC

\*\*\*\*

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; 9(2)(a)

@otago.ac.nz';<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

(2)(a) David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington.

Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive

Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

Canterbury District Health Board



\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

#### http://www.ccc.govt.nz

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### 

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and otistare . erase all copies of the email and attachments. Ōtākaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Ötäkaro. For further information about Ötäkaro

#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent:	Monday, 5 August 2019 10:55 a	.m.
To:	Tim Lester	
Subject:	RE: CDHB; Carparking technical	advisory group
Attachments:	Parking Element Combinations	/00.pdf; Health Precinct Parking Impact Scenario
	Tabulation.pdf	

Hello Tim – thanks for the update. As I'm only asking QTP to assess the traffic implications of various parking quantums and access arrangements anyway (of which there are quite a few now they have given it some thought), I believe the Technical Group could just simply be aware of the difficulties with the staff building extension once QTP return with the results?

In other words, I'd suggest we get QTP to press on assess all the various traffic + access effects anyway (much as they are outlining in the attached), as if I tell them to rule out that staff building extension option now, we still won't know how it might have worked if Brad believes the engineering issues can be resolved and so it returns to being feasible in engineering terms?

I've attached for you QTP's initial response on the options they are proposing to assess (locations / accesses / quantums of parking), so in practical terms under their brief, dropping this out completely won't likely have much effect on the amount of work we ask them to do for us (or costs) and therefore offers no great benefit to the Technical Group? Instead, I could simply ask them to model some of the scenarios to the east without the extra 270 spaces?

That said, happy to catch up and discuss further if you wish?

Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Thursday, 1 August 2019 10:42 a.m. To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: CDHB; Carparking technical advisory group

9(2)(a)

Regarding the existing CDHB staff carpark- it has just come to light that there will be more engineering required than first envisaged (by the engineer) and therefore significant additional costs. It is therefore not a given that we will be able to progress with the additional 2 floors on the existing staff carpark on Antigua Street. This may have an effect on the QTP assumptions/ modelling. Brad and his team are investigating further. Do we need to advise QTP?

Regards

Tim Lester **Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board**  T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

# \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

# 

solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

FIFASEDUNDER







Identifying Parking Building Scenarios to be Modelled

31<sup>th</sup> July 2019









Identifying Parking Building Scenarios to be Modelled

31<sup>th</sup> July 2019



























Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Modelling Scenarios

HSPB No Antigua Access									1		1		r			
NBP Linked to HSPB							×	>	>	>	>	>	>	×	×	×
NPB							Wns	Wns	Wns	Ws	Ws	Wn	Mn	En	Es	Ens
HSPB w. full St Asaph Access						1	1	>	>	1	>	1	11			5
HSPB	~	1	1	1	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270
MSF CPs	550	550	800	1000	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800
Blue Building CP	1	×	×	×	x	x	×	x	×	ж	×	ж	ж	×	ж	×
No.	0	1	2	е	4	5	9	7	~	6	10	11	12	13	14	
	v18a	0a	0b	0c	1a	1b	2a	2b	2c	2d	2e	2f	2g	3a	3b	3c=2a
Scenario	v18a Base Model		MSF Parking Testing		Stage A HSPB	Extension Testing			Western New	Parking Building	Testing				Eastern New Parking	Building Testing

- m
- 2
- σ
- 41
- ASF 'Base' Scenarios Stage A HSPB Scenarios NPB Configurations x 4 Car Park Sizes (800,1000,1200,1400 spaces)

31 Jul 2019

Health Precinct Parking Impact Project Budget Tracking dsm

Kathleen Smitheram		
From:	9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent:	Monday, 5 August 2019 12:08 p.m.	
To:	9(2)(a) Tim Lester; Susan Fitzr	maurice; Rachel Cadle;
	9(2)(a)	Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
	Nursing)	
Cc:	Sue Imrie, <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	
Subject:	Car Parking Technical Group - QTP T	raffic Modelling Proposal
Attachments:	SOW Health Precinct Parking Building statement).docx; Parking Element Co	g Options Impact Modelling v00 (Methodol mbinations v00.pdf; Health Precinct Parking

Dear<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> — as I think we agreed last time, it would probably be best if we next meet once OTP have delivered their analysis report so we can begin to focus on some leading options?

Impact Scenario Tabulation.pdf

On that, I have attached their methodology and an outline of the notional sites and access arrangements they plan to test for us. As you can see, this starts to get complex fairly quickly as we have quite a few options for them to analyse. That's why it will probably be good for us to start with this "long list" of tested options and quickly refine them as a group to some leading options going forward? I have asked them to include a briefing to the group on a future date to accompany their report.

As you will see, the plan is for early reporting on the effects of the staff building extension – and then the second phase being to look at other supplementary supply options, consistent with that.

Unless anyone has any problems with the attached, I'm hoping to ask QTP to make a start later this week?

5(2)(3)	
Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services	
9(2)(a)	
www.ccc.govt.nz	
(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)	
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz]	
Sent: Thursday, 1 August 2019 12:37 p.m.	
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Tim Lester <tim.lester@< th=""><th>cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Susan</th></tim.lester@<>	cdhb.health.nz>; Susan
Fitzmaurice <\$psan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdh< th=""><th>ib.health.nz&gt;;</th></rachel.cadle@cdh<>	ib.health.nz>;
9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @	ara.ac.nz>; Mary Gordon
(Executive Director of Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>	
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue.imrie@cdhb.health.nz></sue.imrie@cdhb.health.nz>	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	
Hello all – are we meeting again soon ?	
9(2)(a) Ötākaro Limited	

1

Level 8, Anthony Harper Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013

otakaroltd.co.nz | Building places for people

From	9(Z)(a)
Sont:	Thurs

ursday, 11 July 2019 10:49 AM 9(2)(a)

@ccc.govt.nz>; Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Susan То Fitzmaurice <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; (2)(a)

@otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: Sue Imrie <Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

2MATION A looking forward to seeing the draft scope when you've had a chance to draft 💭 Great, thanks

9(2)(a)

Õtäkaro Limited

Level 8, Anthony Harper Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013

# otakaroltd.co.nz | Building places for people

From:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 2019 4:28 PM

To: Tim Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a) <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz><sup>9(2)(a)</sup></u>

@ara.ac.nz>9(2)(a) €(2)(a)

@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of

Nursing) <Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz> Cc: Sue Imrie <Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Thank you Tim. So everyone is aware, I have had an initial word with QTP (our key traffic modelling consultants) re their likely resource availability to undertake this work. They are hoping to have capacity towards the end of the month. That will give us a couple of weeks to refine the brief as a group, which I'll get onto a first cut of in the coming days to share with you all.

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz

(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 2019 11:25 a.m.

@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; To: Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a) (2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: Sue Imrie <Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

Thanks for your time yesterday.

Thought I'd circulate a brief summary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> penefit- in her absence). If there's any additions or corrections please reply to the group.

- Thanks to <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> for sharing Council's previous parking/network impact reports;
- CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site;
- 9(2)(b)(ii)
- •
- Ability to use Miles North and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings. Judge's decision awaited and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
- Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;
- No party has the ability to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;
- Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;
- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;
- Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc

# Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated OTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate

Kind regards

Tim Lester

Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m. To:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice

<<u>Sušan Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</u> Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;</u> (2)(a) 9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz><sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; (2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>;

Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Cc: Sue Imrie <<u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

### 9(2)(a)

has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City Thanks

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. To:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice

<<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Cc: David Meates <<u>David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz</u>> potakaroltd.co.nz>;

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

9(2)(a) From:

@ccc.govt.nz]

 Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.

 To: Susan Fitzmaurice <</td>

 Susan Fitzmaurice 

 Susan Fitzmaurice 

Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: David Meates < David:Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As Imentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

 The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions – for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);

- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- ٠ Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street - and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with? FICIALMEORA

Any queries - please just get in touch.

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----

(2)(a)

From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; 9(2)(a)

@otago.ac.nz';

9(2)(a)

David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz

P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz



Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

# 

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council

http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. Ōtākaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Ōtākaro. For further information about Ōtākaro Limited, please visit www.otakaroltd.co.nz

ale also also also also

\*\*\*\*

------

\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the

REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFFICIALINGORMATIONAGE



## CONSULTANCY SERVICES PROJECT STATEMENT OF WORK

DUCINE CO UNIT	City	Condese		7
BUSINESS UNIT	City	City Services		
SOW NUMBER:	1	1		A
PO NUMBER:	450	00	WBS/Cost Code	
PROJECT TIME LINE				01/08/2019
CONSULTANCY		QTP (Qu	ality Transport Planning)	An
PR	OJEC	T REPP	RESENTATIVES	
CLIENT'S CONTRACT REPRESENTATIVE	reater)	9	(2)(a)	
CLIENT'S TECHNICAL REPRESENTATIVE		0	(2)(a)	
CONSULTANT'S TECH	INICA	<b>L</b> 9	2)(a)	
R	-	RFQ DI	TAILS	
RFQ CLOSING DATE			Date: 02/08/2019	
DELIVER QUOTE TO: Note: For Projects \$50k or grea quotation must be delivered to t Contract Representative	ter the the Clier	nt's	Email: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	
For assistance an	nd help i	n completi	ng this form, please contact Pr	rocurement
Tel. 94	1 5234	or email p	ircnasingsuppon(@ccc.govi.nz	

\*\*Please insert rows as required\*\*

10	Project Background Purpose & Scope of Services
1	(Please describe any relevant background and the purpose of what is to be achieved in this Project) In 2016, Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) assisted Christchurch City Council, Otakaro Ltd and the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) with a joint.
	comprehensive review of parking needs and opportunities within the south western area of the central city. The review was focussed on identifying a unified plan
	principally in support of the following key developments proposed at that time under the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan:
	<ul> <li>The new Health Precinct, encompassing developments including the re- development of the Hospital and construction of the new Acute Services building:</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The construction of a new Outpatients building, Health Research and Education Facility (HREF), and other local health estate developments (including the then planned re – development of the site of the former public</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>parking building ("Blue" building);</li> <li>Parking needs associated with CDHB management services re – located to the new facility between Oxford Terrace and Tuam Street;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The proposed Metro Sports Facility - on a site to the immediate south of the Health Precinct, between St Asaph Street and Moorhouse Avenue;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Other expected developments and future land uses within the western end of the South Frame / Health Precinct.</li> </ul>
	Quality Transport Planning (QTP) were appointed at that time jointly by the City Council and DCL to undertake a supporting South West Quadrant Vehicle Parking Options analysis - into the likely network effects of some of the key new parking facility options being considered by DCL. That report was published in October 2016 and formed a technical appendix to the resulting DCL report "Car Parking in the South – West Central City" – January 2017.
	Prior transport studies (themselves also supported by QTP) had also assessed the transport network impacts of parking provision for the new Metro Sports Facility (Aurecon / QTP for Otakaro Ltd, 2016), and options for the replacement of the "Blue" public parking building north of St Asaph Street (GHD / QTP for CERA, 2015). Each had assessed their effects against An Accessible City (the transport chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan) comprehensive street works changes around Hospital Cerner, which are currently approaching final completion (July 2019).
	The purpose of this commission is to re-assess / update the findings of the QTP October 2016 Network Impact Analysis report findings, again at an horizon year of 2031 – and specifically assess the impacts of a number of subsequent development decisions and parking supply options:
	<ul> <li>The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital staff parking building (located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street) by some two floors – and with an expected 270 additional spaces;</li> <li>The implications of the decision to <u>not</u> now replace the former Hospital public parking (Blue) building on the site porth of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Street (and for there to be now no significant parking supply on that block);</li> <li>Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550 parking spaces to a larger parking supply. The analysis will specifically test the impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streats and intersections as</li> </ul>

1	
	previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and
	engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF);
	• Re – visit the key findings of the OTP October 2016 Network Impact Analysis
	report - which had identified the potential for a new parking huilding or
	huildings to be leasted within the South Frame development, between St
	Acarda Tuerra Antique and Mantreal Streate
	Asaph, Tuam, Antigua and Montreal Streets.
	<ul> <li>Specifically, this refreshed site specific analysis will further explore the</li> </ul>
	following options as to their network and access effects:
	<ul> <li>The potential benefits / implications of physically linking any new</li> </ul>
	parking building or buildings, to the currently planned extension of the
	Hospital staff parking building (east of Antigua Street) – and therefore
	permitting its phased extension to the immediate east for public casual
	or further staff parking.
	<ul> <li>Ontional parking building sites to the north and south of the proposed</li> </ul>
	optional parking building sites to the north and sodar of the proposed
	The notantial hanofite/implications of any new parking building or
	• The potential benefits/ implications of any new parking building of
	buildings accessed from both Tuam and St Asaph Streets (and
	therefore spanning the greenway in some form);
	<ul> <li>The optimum access arrangements for any of these combinations in</li> </ul>
	terms of minimising local network traffic impacts and offering flexibility
	around the management of public and CDHB staff parking operations;
	<ul> <li>Local network sensitivity testing of those options at overall <u>additional</u></li> </ul>
	parking quantums (ie beyond the planned staff parking expansion of
	270 spaces) - of 800, 1000, 1200 or 1400 spaces – and the local
	network levels of service of each
	Commission Outputs
	The key anticipated outputs of this study will be:
	Store A
	Stage A
	<ul> <li>A short, initial report (ideally by mid-August) exploring the local network involvesting of the advantage of the suggest begins of the sugges</li></ul>
	implications of the planned extension of the current Hospital staff parking
	building by 270 spaces – particularly exploring the impacts of:
	<ul> <li>alternative all or restricted movements at the main access from Antigua</li> </ul>
	Street;
	<ul> <li>any merits of permitting entry as well as exit from the St Asaph Street</li> </ul>
	access point;
	<ul> <li>the potential implications of any later extension of the building to its</li> </ul>
	immediate east, as associated with the options assessment in Stage B
	of the study work (below):
	o any alternative access and operational arrangements that may benefit
	local network levels of service
~	Note: this report shall use the same CAST v.2018a model as deployed for Stage B of the study
X	work and pay reference to potential parking supply and access options to be tested in that, in
	order the partners can be confident of its consistency with any later Stage B outputs.
r	Stava D
	Stage B
	<ul> <li>A short report containing appropriate summary network effects diagrams</li> </ul>
	(using the latest appropriate iteration of the CAST model, v.2018a) in order to
	highlight the likely network effects of the main parking supply options outlined
	above - and their likely network levels of service at 2031;
	<ul> <li>advice as to the optimal quantums and "best for network" access</li> </ul>
	configurations across the above optional site supply configurations, to achieve
	configurations across the above optional site supply configurations, to achieve
	configurations across the above optional site supply configurations, to achieve balanced network outcomes against An Accessible City and the Recovery

2.0	Methodology (The <u>Consultant</u> is to provide a full explanation of the methodology proposed in the execution of 1.0)						
	The Scope of required services is clearly set out above. Our summary of the tasks involved, hours and fees is as follows:						
	Task	and the second	Hrs Estimate				
	1	Project Management and Liaison					
	2	Create Project Base Model from v18a Generic Model					
	3	MSF Parking Capacity Testing					
	4	Set Up and Run Parking Building Scenarios & Generate Model Outputs	- AV				
	5	Phase A reporting					
	6	Phase B reporting	$\leftarrow -$				
	7	Health Precinct Technical Group Briefing					
		Total					
	A more o	detailed breakdown of the sub-tasks is as follow	S:				
	A more o	detailed breakdown of the sub-tasks is as follow	s:				
	A more of	detailed breakdown of the sub-tasks is as follow	s:				
E	A more of	detailed breakdown of the sub-tasks is as follow	s:				
	A more of	detailed breakdown of the sub-tasks is as follow	s:				
Task	task		Hrs	Estimate	Notes		
------	------	--	-----	----------	--		
1	1	Project Management and Liaison					
2	1	Reflect Metrosports Access Arrangements in Base Model.			Access roads, zone loading, access intersections.		
2	2	Reflect current and potential parking buildings in modelled network.			Includes current Staff Parking Building (SPB) access, removal of 'Blue Building' in future assumptions, additional nodes and zones for potential parking buildings.		
2	3	Refine base model demands.			Adjust Blue Building, SPB and Metro Sports demands to create base demand scenario.		
3	1	MSF Parking Testing			Create and run 800 & 1000 CP demand scenarios.		
3	2	MSF Parking Testing Hold- point Liaison.			Based on results of MSF testing, agree MSF parking scenario to form basis of HPB testing.		
4	1	Stage A HSPB Extension Testing	K	0	Increase HSPB demands by 270CPs and run 3 access scenarios (w/wo full St Asaph St Access & no Antigua Access)		
4	2	Western New Parking Building Testing			Set up and run 7 demand / access scenarios		
4	3	Eastern New Parking Building Testing			Set up and run 2 demand / access scenarios		
4	4	Prepare Model Outputs			Set up and extract plots for all scenarios illustrating zonal demands (as a check) assigned flows, flow differences, delays, delay impacts.		
5	1	Stage A Reporting			A short report summarising the modelling process, interpretation of results with regards to the Stage A outputs listed in 1.0 Scope of Services.		
6	1	Stage B Reporting			A short report summarising the modelling process, interpretation of results with regards to the Stage B outputs listed in 1.0 Scope of Services.		
7	1	Health Precinct Technical Group Briefing			2-hour briefing + 3 hour to prepare key points presentation.		
		Total					

Sconario		NG)	Blue Building CP	MSF CPS	нарв	HSPB w. Foll St Asaph Access	N150	NBP Linked To HSPB	HSPB No Antigua Access
18a Base Model	v18a	0	~	550	1				
MCC Deddag	Oa	1	×	550	~				
Testing	Ob	2	×	800	1				
resting	Oc	3	×	1000	1				
Stage A HSPB	1a	4	×	800	+270			N	
Extension	1b	5	×	800	+270	1		NY~	
Testing	1c	5	×	800	+270	1	0	2	-
	2a	7	×	800	+270	10	Wns	×	
	2b	8	ж	800	+270	4	Wns	~	
Western New	2c	9	×	800	+270	X	Wns	~	1
Parking Building	2d	10	×	800	+270	~	Ws	~	
Testing	2e	11	ж	800	+270	~	W5	~	1
	2f	12	×	800-	+270	~	Wn	1	
	2g	13	×	800	+270	~	Wn	~	1
Eastern New	3a	14	×	800	+270	~	En	×	
Parking Building	3b	15	×	800	+270	~	Es	×	
Testing	3c=2a		×	800	+270	~	Ens	×	

For each of the 9 New Parking Building (NPB) Scenario Numbers (7 thru 15), modelling will be undertaken with four demand variations (800, 1000, 1200 & 1400 CPs) as per the Scope of Services. A total of 42 model scenarios will be run (combinations of network and demands) each for the AM and PM peak hours.

Modelling will be undertaken using the latest (recently completed) version of the CAST model (v18a) for the horizon year of 2028.

Signal optimisation will implemented for local intersections in the study area, allowing the network capacity and therefore modelled delays to respond to the changing demands.

Note that whilst full sets of modelled plots will be available (and appended to the report), reporting will be highly summarised, noting the salient points for each network scenario and only illustrative plots for selected scenarios included within the main text.

1.	Dell'ssealth as Mile	estones and Fi	ogramm	Completie	n Data	Cost			
	Deliverable or Mile	stone		Completio	n Date	COSt			
1	Project Managemen	and Liaison	maria						
2	Create Project Base I	viodel from v18a Ge	eneric						
-	Model	Tastias							
3	MSF Parking Capacit	y resting	oc 9.						
4	Generate Model Out	ng Building Scenari puts	05 84						
5	Phase A reporting			16/08/19		7			
6	Phase B reporting			23/08/19					
7	Health Precinct Tech	nical Group Briefing	3	As require	d				
	Complete delivery of the in payment of the Services, 5 of the Panel Agreement	ndividual deliverable/mile The Consultant may invo	istone to the s ice the Client	atisfaction of t for the comple	he Client will er ted Services in	title the Consultant to accordance with Claus			
4.0	PRICE				1				
	Consultants per	sonnel assigne	d to Proi	ect and F	rice Deta	l			
	Name	Expert Experie Technie	/ enced / cal	Hours (allocated per person)	Hourly Rate (as per agreement)	Total Cost per Resource			
	Tim Wright	Expert							
	John Falconer	Expert	-						
1	None Subconsultants	- Consultant to co	section (if a	applicable)					
	O								
	Company Name	Service provided	4			Cost			
1	NA	Service provided	1			Cost \$			
	Company Name NA The total cost of this (including disbursements,	Service provided project is capped a Wany) (delete Target of	d at TARGET Lump Sum	or LUMP-S	UM price of applicable)	Cost \$			
	Company Name NA The total cost of this (including disbursements, RFQ TERMS 8	Service provided project is capped a Wany) (delete Target of CONDITION	d at TARGET Lump Sum	or LUMP S	UM price of applicable)	Cost \$			
	NA The total cost of this (including disbursements, RFQ TERMS & Evaluation Resp	Service provided project is capped a wany) (delete Target of CONDITION	d at TARGET Lump Sum	or LUMP S	UM price of applicable)	Cost \$			
	Company Name NA The total cost of this (including disbursements, RFQ TERMS & Evaluation Resp (a) The Client rese (b) The lowest, or the (c) On award of the parties.	Service provided project is capped a if any) (delete Target of CONDITION CONSES righest scoring, or any que a request for Quotation, or	d at TARGET Lump Sum S S r reject any q uotation will n no further cor	or LUMP S whichever is no uotation submi ot necessarily i respondence w	UM price of applicable) tted. be accepted. vill be entered in	Cost \$			
	Company Name NA The total cost of this (including disbursements, RFQ TERMS & Evaluation Resp (a) The Client rese (b) The lowest, or h (c) On award of thi parties. General	Service provided project is capped a if any) (delete Target of CONDITION CONSES righest scoring, or any que a request for Quotation, of	d at TARGET Lump Sum IS or reject any q uotation will n no further cor	or LUMP S whichever is no uotation submi ot necessarily I respondence w	UM price of applicable) tted. be accepted. rill be entered in	Cost \$			
	NA The total cost of this (including disbursements, RFQ TERMS & Evaluation Resp (a) The Client rese (b) The lowest, or the (c) On award of this parties. General a) No legal or other oblig conduct or outcome of the b) Terms of supply will b Consultancy Services -	Service provided project is capped a if any) (delete Target of CONDITION CONSES request for Quotation, or a request for Quotation, or a request for Quotation, or a request for Quotation, or a reques	at TARGET Lump Sum IS or reject any q uotation will n no further cor een the Pros and until bo al Agreement	or LUMP S whichever is no uotation submi ot necessarily i respondence w pective Consu th Parties hav for Consultan	UM price of applicable) tted, be accepted, vill be entered in ultant and the o e signed this S icy Services fo	Cost \$ nto with the unsuccessf Client in relation to the SOW. or Transport Planning			
	NA The total cost of this (including disbursements, RFQ TERMS & Evaluation Resp (a) The Client rese (b) The lowest, or the (c) On award of this parties. General a) No legal or other oblig conduct or outcome of the b) Terms of supply will be Consultancy Services - SIGN OFF	Service provided project is capped a Wany) (delete Target of CONDITION CONSES results to accept of highest scoring, or any que a request for Quotation, or any que a request for Quotation, or pations shall arise between those set out in Pane Panel Agreement	d at TARGET Lump Sum IS or reject any q uotation will n no further cor een the Pros	or LUMP S whichever is no uotation submi ot necessarily I respondence w pective Consu th Parties hav for Consultan	UM price of applicable) tted, be accepted, vill be entered in ultant and the of e signed this S icy Services fo	Cost \$ nto with the unsuccessf Client in relation to the SOW. r Transport Planning			
	NA The total cost of this (including disbursements, RFQ TERMS & Evaluation Resp (a) The Client rese (b) The lowest, or the (c) On award of this parties. General a) No legal or other oblig conduct or outcome of the D) Terms of supply will b Consultancy Services - SIGN OFF SIGNED for the Co	Service provided project is capped a (fany) (delete Target of CONDITION CONSES (CONDITION (delete Target of CONDITION (delete Target of CONDIT	d at TARGET Lump Sum Support Lump Sum SIGN	or LUMP S whichever is no uotation submi ot necessarily i respondence w pective Consu th Parties hav for Consultan ED for the	UM price of applicable) tted. be accepted. vill be entered in ultant and the of e signed this S icy Services fo Council:	Cost \$ nto with the unsuccessf Client in relation to the SOW. r Transport Planning			
	NA The total cost of this (including disbursements, RFQ TERMS & Evaluation Resp (a) The Client rese (b) The lowest, or the (c) On award of this parties. General a) No legal or other oblig conduct or outcome of the (c) Terms of supply will b Consultancy Services - SIGN OFF SIGNED for the Co	Service provided project is capped a (fany) (delete Target of CONDITION CONSES (CONDITION (a conses) (a conset of a conset of a request for Quotation, of a request for Quotation, of a request for Quotation, of a conset of a conset conset of a conset of a conset of a conset of a conset of a conset of a conset of a conset of a conset of a conset of	d at TARGET Lump Sum Sum en reject any q uotation will n no further cor en the Pros and until bo and until bo si Agreement SIGN	or LUMP S whichever is no uotation submi ot necessarily i respondence w pective Consult th Parties hav for Consultan ED for the	UM price of applicable) tted. be accepted. vill be entered in ultant and the of e signed this S icy Services for Council:	Cost \$ nto with the unsuccess Client in relation to the SOW. or Transport Planning			

÷











































Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Modelling Scenarios

HSPB No Antigua Access									1		1		1			
NBP Linked to HSPB							×	1	>	1	>	1	1	×	×	×
NPB							Wns	Wns	Wns	Ws	Ws	Wn	Wn	En	ß	Ens
HSPB w. full St Asaph Access						>	1	1	1	>	>	1	11			1
HSPB	1	1	1	1	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270	+270
MSF CPs	550	550	800	1000	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800
Blue Building CP	1	×	×	×	×	×	×	x	x	×	×	×	×	ж	ж	×
No.	0	1	2	3	4	5	9	7	~	б	10	11	12	13	14	
R	v18a	0a	q0	0c	1a	1b	2a	2b	2c	2d	2e	2f	2g	3a	Зb	3c=2a
Scenario	v18a Base Model		MSF Parking Testing		Stage A HSPB	Extension Testing			Western New	Parking Building	Testing				Eastern New Parking	Building Testing

i.

- m
- 0 5
- ASF 'Base' Scenarios Stage A HSPB Scenarios NPB Configurations x 4 Car Park Sizes (800,1000,1200,1400 spaces)
  - 41

31 Jul 2019

161

Health Precinct Parking Impact Project Budget Tracking ulsm

Kathleen Smitheram	
From:	9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz>
Sent:	Monday, 5 August 2019 12:22 p.m.
То:	S(2)(a) Tim Lester; Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle;
	9(2)(a) Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
	Nursing) 9(2)(a)
Cc:	Sue Imrie;
Subject:	RE: Car Parking Technical Group - QTP Traffic Modelling Proposal
9(2	
Sounds good to me	- when do you expect them to report back ?
(2)(a)	
2)(a)	
2)(0)	Ōtākaro Limited
	Town 62 Million to Barland Chairt and 2002
Level 8, Anthony Harpe	r Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
otakaroltd.co.nz   B	Building places for people
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 5 Aug	ust 2019 12:08 PM
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Tim Lester <tim lester@cdhb.health.nz="">; Susan Fitzmaurice</tim>
<susan.fitzmaurice@< td=""><td>cdhb.health.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; 9(2)(a)</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></td></susan.fitzmaurice@<>	cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; 9(2)(a)</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>
)(a) @otage	o.ac.nz>9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
<mary.gordon@cdhb< td=""><td>o.health.nz&gt;</td></mary.gordon@cdhb<>	o.health.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue.im< td=""><td>rie@cdhb.health.nz&gt;;</td></sue.im<>	rie@cdhb.health.nz>;
Subject: Car Parking T	echnical Group - QTP Traffic Modelling Proposal
9(2)(a)	
Dear – as I t	hink we agreed last time, it would probably be best if we next meet once QTP have delivered
their analysis report s	o we can begin to focus on some leading options?
On that I have attach	ed their methodology and an outline of the notional sites and access arrangements they play
to test for us As your	can see, this starts to get complex fairly quickly as we have quite a few options for them to
analyse That's why it	will probably be good for us to start with this "long list" of tested options and quickly refine
than as a group to so	will probably be good for us to start with this fong list. On tested options and quickly refine
internas a group to so	me leading options going forward? I have asked them to include a briefing to the group on a
uture date to accomp	sany men report.
As you will see, the pl	an is for early reporting on the effects of the staff building extension - and then the second
phase being to look at	tother supplementary supply options, consistent with that.
5	
Unless anyone has an	v problems with the attached. I'm hoping to ask OTP to make a start later this week?
	,
2)(a)	
Fransport Asset Plann	ing Team – City Services
(Z)(a)	
www.ccc.govt.nz	

<sup>(</sup>Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

	163
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz]	
Sent: Thursday, 1 August 2019 12:37 p.m.	
To: (2)(3) @ccc.govt.nz>; Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.h</u>	ealth.nz>; Susan
Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle &lt;<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.healt</u> 9(2)(a)</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>	( <u>h.nz</u> >;
(Executive Director of Nursing) (Mary Gordon@cdbb bealth pace)	nz>; Mary Gordon
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue imrie@cdbb.bealth.nz=""></sue>	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	
Hello all – are we meeting again soon ?	$\wedge$
9(2)(a)	0
Stakaro Elinited	NY.
Level 8, Anthony Harper Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013	5
stakaralte co.pz.   Building places for people	
otakaroitu.co.nz   Building places for people	
9(2)(a)	
Sent: Thursday, 11 July 2019 10:49 AM	
9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>; Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.h</u>	ealth.nz>; Susan
Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.healt< td=""><td><u>h.nz</u>&gt;;</td></rachel.cadle@cdhb.healt<></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>	<u>h.nz</u> >;
@otago.ac.nz>9(2)(a) @ara.ac.r	<u>1z</u> >; Mary Gordon
(Executive Director of Nursing) < <u>Mary,Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Farlier Background Studies for Discussion	
Subject Ref car Parking recimical Group - Lamer Background Studies for Discussion	
Great, thanks <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> looking forward to seeing the draft scope when you've had a chance to	o draft 🔘
9(2)(a)	
Ötäkaro Limited	
Level 8. Anthony Harper Tower, 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013	
ever of Anthony Halper Tower, oz Worcester Boulevald, christenurch sols	
otakaroltd.co.nz   Building places for people	
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	
Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 2019 4:28 PM	1 121 - 5 16 16 16
To: Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.</u>	health.nz>; Rachel Cadle 9(2)(a)
9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.pz>: Mary Gordon (Even	outive Director of
Nursing) <mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdhb.health.nz>	cutive Director of
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue imrie@cdhb.health.nz=""></sue>	
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	
Thank you fim. So everyone is aware, I have had an initial word with QTP (our key traffic mo	delling consultants) re
their likely resource availability to undertake this work. They are hoping to have capacity to	wards the end of the
month. That will give us a couple of weeks to refine the brief as a group, which I'll get onto a	a first cut of in the
coming days to share with you all.	
(2)(a)	

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)

2

0

(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz]	
Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 2019 11:25 a.m.	
To: (9,6) @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	<u> </u>
Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >(5(5)(3) (2)(a) @etalereltd.ca.nz>;5(2)(3)	
Wursing) <many @cdbb="" bealth="" gordon="" nz=""></many>	
Cc: Sue Imrie <sue imrie@cdbb.health.nz=""></sue>	Þ
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion	
and the second state state states of piscasses	
Hi All	
Thanks for your time yesterday.	
9(2)(a)	
Thought I'd circulate a brief summary based on my recollection of the meeting (and for benefit- in her	
absence). If there's any additions or corrections please reply to the group.	
Thanks to Tim C for sharing Council's providence periods (anti-unit) important of the second seco	
CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue corport will not be replaced on it for non-site.	
<ul> <li>CDHB re-confirmed that the Blue carpark will not be replaced on its tormer site;</li> <li>(2)(0)(ii)</li> </ul>	_
•	
<ul> <li>Ability to use Miles North and/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings.</li> </ul>	
Judge's decision awaited and parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our	
documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;	
<ul> <li>Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>No party has the ability to fund-therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on</li> </ul>	
a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;	
<ul> <li>Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence;</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc</li> </ul>	
Actions:	
<ul> <li>to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.</li> </ul>	
As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.	
Noneed to meet again until after the updated OTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep	
discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate	

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

From: Tim Lester Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m. To:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice 9(2)(a) <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</u> Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz 9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a) @otakaroltd.co.nz> Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) < Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz> Cc: Sue Imrie <<u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion 9(2)(a) has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans: https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City ORME Thanks **Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz. From: Tim Lester Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:43 p.m. (2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice 9(2)(a) <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz 9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz><sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>;<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) < Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz> Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group-Earlier Background Studies for Discussion Hi All For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting Kind regards **Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz. 9(2)(a) From @ccc.govt.nz] Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Tim @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a) Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>;9(2)(a)

Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz

9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz><sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of

Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:

Cc: David Meates < David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members – as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wider Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west
  of Antigua Street and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of – so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services Christchurch City Council 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: <u>www.ccc.govt.nz</u> (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m. To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester;

@otago.ac.nz';<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

#### 9(2)(a)

David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) Subject: Car Parking Technical Group When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board 4 03 364 4110 | <u>susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>

P O Box 1600, Christchurch www.cdhb.heaith.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

# Canterbury

District Health Board



\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### Values - ? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others - Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

167

10MA

\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* This are

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council <u>http://www.ccc.govt.nz</u>

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. Otākaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Ötäkaro. For further information about Ötäkaro Limited, please visit www.otakaroltd.co.nz

-----

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. Otakaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Otakaro. For further information about Otakaro Limited, please visit www.otakaroltd.co.nz

\_\_\_\_\_

9(2)(a)
@ccc.govt.nz>
9(2)(a) Tim Lester: Susan Eitzmausice: Pashal Cadle:
9(2)(a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a)
Nursing)
Sue Imriei <sup>9</sup> (2)(a)
RE: Car Parking Technical Group - OTP Traffic Modelling Proposal
Re, ear raiking rechnical droup of r name modeling roposa
g, maybe in a week or two - for the remainder of the commission, I'm estimating end
per (which may be best for our next group meeting?)
m – City Services
ys to Thursdays)
@otakaroltd.co.nz]
) 12:22 p.m.
<pre>@ccc.govt.nz&gt;; Tim Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan</tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz></pre>
ce@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>;</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>
@otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>; Mary Gordon
g) <mary.gordon@cdbb.health.nz></mary.gordon@cdbb.health.nz>
hb.health.nz>; <sup>5/2</sup> (a) @ccc.govt.nz>
nical Group - QTP Traffic Modelling Proposal
en do you expect them to report back ?
Oka Lange Line it of
Otākaro Limited
62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013 places for people
62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013 places for people
Otākaro Limited 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013 places for people @ccc.govt.nz>
Otākaro Limited 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013 places for people @ccc.govt.nz> 9 12:08 PM
Otākaro Limited 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013 places for people @ccc.govt.nz> 12:08 PM @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Susan Fitzmaurice valtb.nz>: Bachel Cadle <bachel cadle@cdbb.healtb.nz="">; <sup>9(2)</sup>(a)</bachel>
Otākaro Limited 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013 places for people @cccc.govt.nz> 9 12:08 PM @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Susan Fitzmaurice ralth.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> 9(2)(a) @ara.ac.pz>: Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013 places for people @ccc.govt.nz> 9 12:08 PM @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Susan Fitzmaurice alth.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) nz>
Otākaro Limited         62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013         places for people         @ccc.govt.nz>         9 12:08 PM         @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Tim Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice         salth.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle <rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>         9(2)(a)       @ara.ac.nz&gt;; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)         nz&gt;         hb. health.nz&gt;; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>       @ccc.govt.nz&gt;</rachel.cadle@cdhb.health.nz></tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>
Otākaro Limited 62 Worcester Boulevard, Christchurch 8013 places for people @ccc.govt.nz> 9 12:08 PM @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Susan Fitzmaurice Palth.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> 9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) .nz> hb.health.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz> I Group - OTP Traffic Modelling Proposal

Dea — as I think we agreed last time, it would probably be best if we next meet once QTP have delivered their analysis report so we can begin to focus on some leading options?

On that, I have attached their methodology and an outline of the notional sites and access arrangements they plan to test for us. As you can see, this starts to get complex fairly quickly as we have quite a few options for them to analyse. That's why it will probably be good for us to start with this "long list" of tested options and quickly refine them as a group to some leading options going forward? I have asked them to include a briefing to the group on a future date to accompany their report.

As you will see, the plan is for early reporting on the effects of the staff building extension – and then the second phase being to look at other supplementary supply options, consistent with that.

Unless anyone has any problems with the attached, I'm hoping to ask QTP to make a start later this week?

	$\mathcal{O}$
9(2)(d)	
Transport Asset Planning Team – City Se	rvices
9(2)(a)	
www.ccc.govt.nz	
(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thurs	days)
9(2)(a)	@otakaroltd.co.pz]
Sent: Thursday, 1 August 2019 12:37 p.r	m.
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>; Tim Lester < Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan
Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.l</u>	nealth.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >;
9(z)(a)	@otago.ac.nz>; <sup>g(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>; Mary Gordon
(Executive Director of Nursing) < <u>Mary.G</u>	ordon@cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdnb.nealtn.r</u>	Explice Declemented Studies for Discussion
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group	p - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Hello all – are we meeting again soon ?	
9(2)(a)	Ötäkaro Limited
Level 8, Anthony Harper Tower, 62 Worcest	er Boulevard, Christchurch 8013
otakaroltd.co.nz   Building places for	r people
otakaroita.co.iiz   bailania piaces ioi	people
9(2)(a)	
Sent: Thursday, 11 July 2019 10:49 AM	
To: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>; Tim Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>; Susan</tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>
Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.l< td=""><td>health.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle &lt;<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>&gt;;</td></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.l<>	health.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >;
9(2)(a)	@otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ara.ac.nz>; Mary Gordon
(Executive Director of Nursing) < Mary.G	ordon@cdhb.health.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.r</u>	12>
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Grou	p - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Great, thanks <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> looking forward to	seeing the draft scope when you've had a chance to draft ${igodot}$
9(2)(a)	Ōtākaro Limited
Laural D. Anthenny Lingson Frances 63 (1)	er Bouleverd Christehursh 9012
Level 8, Anthony Harper Tower, 62 Worcest	er Boulevard, Christchurch 8013

otakaroltd.co.nz | Building places for people

From <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 2019 4:28	PM
To: Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.h</u>	ealth.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice < <u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; Rachel Cadle
< <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >; <sup>9(2)</sup>	(a) @otago.ac.nz>; <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
@ara.ac.nz> (2/d)	<u>@otakaroltd.co.nz</u> >; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of these
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.heal</u>	th.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue Imrie@cdhb.hea</u>	Ith.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical G	roup - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
Thank you Tim. So everyone is awar their likely resource availability to u month. That will give us a couple of coming days to share with you all.	e, I have had an initial word with QTP (our key traffic modelling consultants) re ndertake this work. They are hoping to have capacity towards the end of the weeks to refine the brief as a group, which I'll get onto a first cut of in the
(2)(a)	
Transment Asset Disemine Team Cit	Candens .
2)(a)	yservices
www.ccc.govt.nz	
Normal office hours: Mondays to Th	hursdays)
From: Tim Lester (mailto:Tim Lester	Ocdbb health nzl
Sent: Wednesday, 10 July 2019 11:2	5 a.m.
ro: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>;/Susan Fitzmaurice <susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>;</susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>
Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.t</u>	mealth.nz>9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a)
2)(a) @ara.ac.nz> <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of
Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.heal</u>	th.nz>
Cc: Sue Imrie < <u>Sue.Imrie@cdhb.hea</u>	lth.nz>
Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical G	roup - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion
er under minnen anderen frankrikken er hande i einen er inderen i den som er inderen som er en en anderen har s Inderfandt so	
Hi All	
Thanks for your time yesterday.	
Thought I'd circulate a brief summa	py based on my recollection of the meeting (and for $\frac{9(2)(a)}{a}$ benefit, in her
absence) If there's any additions or	corrections please reply to the group
absence). In there saily additions of	corrections prease reply to the Broup.
• Thanks to 9(2)(a) for sharing	Council's previous parking/network impact reports:
CDHR re-confirmed that the	Blue carpark will not be replaced on its former site:
9(2)(b)(ii)	Blae carpark will not be replaced on its former skey
•	
<ul> <li>Ability to use Miles North and</li> </ul>	nd/or Miles South remains subject to outcome of judicial review proceedings.
Judge's decision awaited an	d parties note the risk of delays/appeal. Care to be taken with our

- documentation/RFP so as not to pre-empt/prejudice those proceedings;
- Note the designation for the laneway between the Miles North and South parcels;

- No party has the ability to fund- therefore we'd likely need go to market for a third party to fund/provide on . a DBOOT (design, build, own, operate and transfer back) model;
- Need to have requirements fixed (available land, parks required etc) before going to market.
- All reports/analysis we hold will be useful to provide to respondents for their due diligence; .
- planning matters: discretionary activity; height restrictions etc- to be confirmed for RFP;
- Continue to look at complementary services; park and ride, shuttle services etc

### Actions:

- 9(2)(a) to prepare a brief for QTP to update the parking/network impact reports;
- Other parties to feed into QTP brief as required to ensure assumptions are accurate.

As a collective we aim to agree some options/ recommendations for our respective CE's.

No need to meet again until after the updated QTP report has been received. However we're happy to keep discussing/meet as and when the parties consider appropriate ORMÁ

Kind regards

**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

(2)(a) T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Wednesday, 3 July 2019 11:14 a.m. To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice

)(2)(a) <Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz>; Rachel Cadle <Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz>; (2)(a) 9(2)(a) 9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>; @otago.ac.nz>;

@otakaroltd.co.nz>;

Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing) < Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz>

Cc: Sue Imrie <Sue.Imrie@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group- Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

9(2)(a) has kindly provided the below ink that has some more recent satellite imagery than the plans:

https://propertysearch.canterburymaps.govt.nz/#/property?propertyAddress=276%20Antigua%20Street,%20Christ church%20Central,%20Christchurch%20City

Thanks

Tim Lester **Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

9(2)(a) T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M

E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz

Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester		
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 5:	43 p.m.	
To <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>; Susan Fitzmaurice	9(2)(a)
<susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.he< td=""><td>alth.nz&gt;; Rachel Cadle &lt;<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>&gt;;</td><td></td></susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.he<>	alth.nz>; Rachel Cadle < <u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u> >;	
(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>	9(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>9(2)(a)	@otakaroltd.co.nz>;
Mary Gordon (Executive Dire	ctor of Nursing) < <u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u> >	

Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: RE: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Hi All

For ease of reference, please find attached electronic copies of the plans that were presented in the meeting

Kind regards

**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

9(2)(a) T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

9(2)(a) From:

@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: Wednesday, 26 June 2019 4:12 p.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice <<u>Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Rachel Cadle <<u>Rachel.Cadle@cdhb.health.nz</u>>; Tim Lester <<u>Tim\_Lester@cdhb\_health\_nz></u>9(2)(a) 2)(a) 9(2)(a) @otago.ac.nz>;9(2)(a)

(2)(a) @ara.ac.nz>; @otakaroltd.co.nz>; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of

173

Nursing) <<u>Mary.Gordon@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Cc: David Meates <David.Meates@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group - Earlier Background Studies for Discussion

Dear Technical Group Members - as we discussed at yesterday's first meeting, I am attaching for you two previous studies looking into the car parking needs of the Hospital, wide Health Precinct, South Frame and SW central city area.

As I mentioned, some of the information in these reports remains sensitive and confidential please, especially where discussing potential parking facility sites across the central city - and I would just ask you keep that in mind if you need to share any of this information with other colleagues. That said, I think it is helpful for you to see that were are not starting from a blank sheet with our Group's work - and while some matters have moved on (substantially in some cases) from these 2016 and 2017 reports, this is hopefully useful background for us to focus on as to the upcoming opportunities.

A few extra points I'd raise about what's attached:

- The DCL report discusses three timelines for solutions for the most part we can now focus solely on the ٠ third (mid-long term);
- Our overview here of the DCL report is that the demand scenarios that we should be focussing on are those informed by the detailed Traffic Impact Assessments (for the Hospital / Health Precinct and Metro Sports Facility);
- Neither report as far as I am aware represents our formal "position" on the matters raised or the recommendations made;
- Both reports already focus on a new building or buildings within the south frame between Tuam and St Asaph Streets as potentially meeting a good proportion of the identified precinct parking needs best (and ideally accessed off both streets as I mentioned yesterday);
- The previous analyses still assumed a replacement "Blue" parking building might be located on the site west of Antigua Street – and as we heard yesterday, that is no longer an expected outcome.

So, I suggest that if we can meet again in the next two weeks we can have a conversation about what this tells us and I can seek some direction from the Group as to how we might re-visit the earlier assessment of our remaining site options. I'd suggest for now we would certainly want to test what parking supply numbers on those site(s) I ask our consultants to re-test the local traffic network effects of - so we can have a good understanding of a likely maximum size of parking facility(s) and access arrangements the local traffic network capacity can cope with?

Any queries - please just get in touch.

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services **Christchurch City Council** 53 Hereford Steet Christchurch 8011 PO Box 73014 Christchurch 8154 9(2)(a)

web: www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Susan Fitzmaurice [mailto:Susan.Fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz]

Sent: Monday, 10 June 2019 11:21 a.m.

To: Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; 9(2)(a)

@otago.ac.nz<sup>)</sup>9(2)(a) David Meates; Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)

9(2)(a)

Subject: Car Parking Technical Group

When: Tuesday, 25 June 2019 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. (UTC+12:00) Auckland, Wellington. Where: Corporate 112, DHB Offices, Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Chch

Thank you everyone for your prompt response to the Doodle Poll Regards

Susan Fitzmaurice | EA to David Meates, Chief Executive Canterbury District Health Board and West Coast District Health Board

West Coast-

C 03 364 4110 | susan.fitzmaurice@cdhb.health.nz P O Box 1600, Christchurch

www.cdhb.health.nz | www.westcoastdhb.org.nz

# Canterbury

District Health Board Te Poort Hauona o Wataha

#### Values -? M?tou Uara

Care and respect for others- Manaaki me te whakaute i te tangata | Integrity in all we do - H?pai i ? m?tou mahi katoa i runga i te pono | Responsibility for outcomes - Te Takohanga i ng? hua

\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

\*\*\*\* nde sole sole sole sole sole

ORMATIONACT

MATIONAC

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council <u>http://www.ccc.govt.nz</u>

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council <u>http://www.ccc.govt.nz</u>

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. Ōtākaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Ōtākaro. For further information about Ōtākaro Limited, please visit www.otakaroltd.co.nz

-----

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council <u>http://www.ccc.govt.nz</u>

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this email and attachments is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the author immediately and erase all copies of the email and attachments. Ōtākaro Limited accepts no responsibility for changes made to this message or attachments after transmission from Ōtākaro. For further information about Ōtākaro Limited, please visit www.otakaroltd.co.nz

-----

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*

PETERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

## Kathleen Smitheram

From:	
Sent:	
To:	
Subject:	

9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz> Wednesday, 7 August 2019 4:12 p.m. Tim Lester RE: CDHB; Carparking technical advisory group

Tim – just to update you, I have had a word with QTP about how we might better understand the effects on the various parking building options, of <u>not</u> extending the current staff building. To avoid making the number of combinations we ask them to assess too complex, we've agreed it's probably best we leave the options to be tested "as is" for their reporting back this month. That said, once the Technical Group have chosen some leading options from that to report back on / recommend, then I can ask QTP as a closing piece of work, to undertake some sensitivity testing (*if needed*) on whether any of the leading outcomes are affected by maybe not pressing ahead with the extension.

Hope that clarifies where we are for now with QTP – and just to confirm, they have effectively made a start in building the model and starting to test scenarios.

## 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)

<u>www.ccc.govt.nz</u> (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: Tim Lester [mailto:Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz] Sent: Thursday, 1 August 2019 10:42 a.m. To:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz> Subject: CDHB; Carparking technical advisory group

#### 9(2)(a)

Regarding the existing CDHB staff carpark- it has just come to light that there will be more engineering required than first envisaged (by the engineer) and therefore significant additional costs. It is therefore not a given that we will be able to progress with the additional 2 floors on the existing staff carpark on Antigua Street. This may have an effect on the QTP assumptions/ modelling. Brad and his team are investigating further. Do we need to advise QTP?

Regards

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

\*\*\*\*\*

This email may contain privileged and confidential information, including health information protected by the Health Information Privacy Code and the Privacy Act. It is intended solely for the intended recipient(s).

Any unauthorized use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this email and/or its attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message, including attachments, from your system. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual sender, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Canterbury District Health Board unless otherwise stated.

#### \*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. REFERSION Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz 

THOMAS
		179

From:	9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>
Sent:	Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m.
To:	Tim Lester
Cc:	9(2)(a)
Subject:	Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)
Attachments:	HPPB Network Impact Analysis Stage A - v01a Complete.pdf

Hello Tim – I hope all is well with you?

Kathleen Smitheram

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group – here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site – which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group – but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated to that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group – and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better – but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work – and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS – please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached – most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days – returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz \*\*\*\*\* REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFFICIALINGORMATIONACT



# Health Precinct Parking Buildings

# Network Impact Analysis Stage A

August 2019

HPPB Network Impact Analysis Stage A - V01a.Docx

Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019

Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A

REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFFICIALINGORMATIONAGE



# **Document Issue Record**

Version No	Prepared By	Description	Date
00a	9(2)(a)	Draft issue for information pending internal review.	19 August 2019
01a	9(2)(a)	First formal issue.	20 August 2019
			<u> </u>
9			AP .
		6	

# **Document Verification**

REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



### Contents

1	Executive Summary1
2	Introduction
2.10	Study Stage A
2.11	Study Stage B
3	Modelling Methodology
3.1	Overview of Study Method
3.2	Networks
3.3	Traffic Demands
3.4	Parking Demands
4	Analysis and Assessment Overview
5	Stage A Analysis and Assessment
5.1	MSF Parking Testing
5.2	Hospital Staff Parking Building Extension Testing
6	Conclusions and Recommendations
App	endices

# Appendices

Appendix A - Parking Scenario Diagrams Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays Appendix C - Modelled Flow Differences Appendix D - Modelled Delay Differences RELEASEDUND

REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A

# 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report describes the first stage (Stage A) of analysis undertaken on behalf of Christchurch City Council (CCC) to assess the network impacts of a number of alternative options for increasing the provision of parking to serve the Health Precinct within the Central City.
- 1.2 In 2016, QTP were jointly appointed by CCC and Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) to undertake analysis (the 2016 SWQ Analysis) of key new parking facility options being considered by DCL. The analysis involved application of Council's Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic model (CAST) to inform the assessment of the effects of the alternative options on the operation of the road network.
- 1.3 In essence, the purpose of this commission is to re-assess the parking options in the light of a number of development decisions and changes to parking supply options that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The implications of the decision to not now replace the former Hospital public parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua Street;
  - Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550 parking spaces to a larger parking supply. The analysis will specifically test the impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF);
  - The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital Staff Car Park (HSCP), located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street, by some two floors – and with an expected 270 additional spaces;
- 1.4 In addition, there are two further factors that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis assumed signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection for a scenario with 620 spaces at the MSF. This assumption was informed by the supporting transport modelling analysis for the MSF which indicated such an upgrade would be required to maintain efficient network operation for parking levels in excess of 550 spaces. For this study, CCC have advised that the Stewart Street / Moorhouse signals are not to be assumed for the bulk of the analysis of the impact of the Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) options.
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis was undertaken using the then-current version of CAST (v16a). Since that time, CAST has recently been updated (v18a completed in early 2019) with revised assumptions from CCC around the level of employment and residents that have an associated increase in traffic within the Central City in future years.
- 1.5 This initial report pertains to Stage A of the study which provides analysis of the potential effects of extension to the (existing) HSCP. Building on the results of Stage A, Stage B of this study will go on to assess, and report on, the network effects of the alternative options



Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A

for the new Parking Building.

- 1.6 The principal conclusions and recommendations arising from this Stage A traffic modelling study are as follows:
  - a. The assumption that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection will not be pursued as part of the MSF access strategy results in high levels of congestion (around 2 minutes) being forecast on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue in the PM peak hour for the number of parking spaces to be constructed (around 550 spaces).
  - b. The incremental delay impacts of assuming additional parking at the MSF (beyond the consented 550 spaces) are relatively modest. However, it is not recommended that any further parking be provided at the MSF in the absence of signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue as this will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue.
  - c. Sensitivity testing with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place, the modelling indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
  - d. Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.
  - e. Generally, the modelled network effects of expansion of the existing HSCP by 270 spaces are modest. However, modelling indicates that the expansion will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue (with delays increasing by around 10s from around 2 minutes).
  - f. Whilst the network efficiency effects of the proposed HSCP expansion are modest, the increased vehicular movements to/from the building across the Antigua Street cycleway would exacerbate an existing safety issue at this location.
  - g. Provision of an additional egress from the expanded HSCP to St Asaph Street (in addition to the current egress) would only partially mitigate the safety (and cycle amenity) impacts of the expansion. This is because the Antigua Street access would likely remain popular for inbound vehicle movements during the morning peak hour.
  - The Moder the option to provide both access and egress from St Asaph Street, traffic modelling indicates that closure of the existing access/egress on Antigua Street could be accommodated without any significant net local network efficiency impacts.
  - The option of, effectively, relocation all vehicle access to the HSCP away from Antigua Street and on to St Asaph Street would be highly effective in improving safety for cyclists as the St Asaph Street vehicular access would not involve traversing a cycleway (the cycleway at this location is located on the south side of St Asaph Street).

# 2 Introduction

- 2.1 QTP Ltd have been commissioned by Christchurch City Council (CCC) to undertake analysis of the transport network impacts of a number of alternative options for increasing the provision of parking to serve the Health Precinct within the Central City.
- 2.2 In 2016, QTP were jointly appointed by CCC and Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) to undertake analysis of key new parking facility options being considered by DCL. The analysis involved application of Council's Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic model (CAST) to inform the assessment of the effects of the alternative options on the operation of the road network. The findings were presented within the report titled "South West Quadrant Vehicle Parking Options – Network Impact Analysis"<sup>1</sup>, subsequently referred to within this report as "the 2016 SWQ Analysis"
- 2.3 In essence, the purpose of this commission is to re-assess the parking options in the light of a number of development decisions and changes to parking supply options that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The implications of the decision to not now replace the former Hospital public parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua Street;
  - Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550 parking spaces to a larger parking supply. The analysis will specifically test the impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF);
  - The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital staff parking building (located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street) by some two floors – and with an expected 270 additional spaces;
- 2.4 In addition, there are two further factors that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis assumed signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection for a scenario with 620 spaces at the MSF. This assumption was informed by the supporting transport modelling analysis for the MSF which indicated such an upgrade would be required to maintain efficient network operation for parking levels in excess of 550 spaces. For this study, CCC have advised that the Stewart Street / Moorhouse signals are not to be assumed for the bulk of the analysis of the impact of the Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) options.
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis was undertaken using the then-current version of CAST (v16a). Since that time, CAST has recently been updated (v18a completed in early 2019) with revised assumptions from CCC around the level of employment and residents that have an associated increase in traffic within the Central City in future years.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Dated October 2016, the final issue being 01b, dated 15 November 2016.



Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A

- 2.5 Specifically, this refreshed site-specific analysis will further explore the following options as to their network and access effects:
  - The potential benefits / implications of physically linking any New Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) or buildings, to the currently planned extension of the Hospital Staff Car Park (HSCP, east of Antigua Street) – and therefore permitting its phased extension to the immediate east for public casual or further staff parking;
  - Optional parking building sites to the north and south of the proposed east west greenway running west from Montreal Street;
  - The potential benefits/ implications of any new parking building or buildings accessed from both Tuam and St Asaph Streets (and therefore spanning the greenway in some form);
  - The optimum access arrangements for any of these combinations in terms of minimising local network traffic impacts and offering flexibility around the management of public and CDHB staff parking operations;
  - Local network sensitivity testing of those options at overall <u>additional</u> parking quantums (*ie beyond the planned staff parking expansion of 270 spaces*) of 800, 1,000, 1,200 or 1,400 spaces and the local network levels of service of each.
- 2.6 The above options translate to some 14 main scenarios with regards to parking building locations and linkages which are best understood through referral to the individual diagrams of **Appendix A**. The components of the various building location and linkage combinations are illustrated within the following diagram centred on the St Asaph Street / Antigua Street / Tuam Street / Montreal Street block:



Figure 2.1: Existing HSCP (Blue) and Potential HPPB Location (Red) and Linkage Options

2.7 In addition, three scenarios are initially to be considered as to the potential quantum of parking that may be accommodated at the MSF site whilst maintaining reasonable network performance. The three scenarios are the consented 550 spaces and testing of 800 and 1,000 spaces scenarios. The assessed acceptable quantum of parking is to be



taken forward as part of the base scenario for the HPPB option analysis.

### 2.8 Thus the resulting scenarios to be modelled for this study are as follows:

HSCP w. **HPPB** HSCP Blue MSF Linked No full St HPPB Building HSCP Scenario No. CPs Asaph Antigua to CP Access HSCP Access 1 550 1 v18a Base Model v18a 0 1 1 × 550 0a **MSF** Parking 0b 2 800 V ж Testing 1000 3 1 Őc. × 4 +2701a 800 × Stage A HSCP 1b5 800 +270 1 Extension я Testing 6 800 +2701 1 1c\* 2a 7 × 800 +270 1 Wns × 800 +270 X Wns 1 2b 8 × 1 1 Wns 9 800 +270 2c ж 1 Western New **Parking Building** +270 2d 10 800 Ý W5 ~ ж Testing 800 +270 1 Ws 1 1 2e 11 ж +270 1 2f 12 800 1 Wn × 1 1 +270 800 V Wn 2g 13 ж +270 1 NEn × 3a 14 H 800 Eastern New 3b 15 800 +2701 SEs х × Parking Building 16 × 800 +270 V NEn+SEs ж 3c Testing 3d=2a<sup>1</sup> +270 1 NEn+SEs × × 800

1. 3d varies from 3c in that the Eastern parking buildings spanning the greenway would be linked. In modelling terms, this is the same as 2a.

### Table 2.1: HPPB Network Impact Modelling Scenarios

2.9 For each new HPPB option (No's 7 through 16) the Scope requires modelling of four car park sizes in order to determine the quantum of parking at the threshold of acceptable network performance. Thus in total some 46 scenarios are to be modelled, each for the AM and PM peak hours.

### Study Stage A

2.10

2.10.1 As per the study scope, this initial report pertains to Stage A of the study which provides analysis of the potential effects of extension to the (existing) HSCP and therefore is informed by the first six model scenarios listed in the above Table.

### 2.11 Study Stage B

2.11.1 Building on the results of Stage A, Stage B of this study will go on to assess, and report on, the network effects of the alternative options for the new HPPB, being informed by the 10 model scenarios 7 to 16 listed within the above Table.

# 3 Modelling Methodology

### 3.1 Overview of Study Method

- 3.1.1 As set out in the project scope, this study uses the recently-released 'v18a' version (May 2019) of the Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic (CAST) model, as the basis of analysis for this project.
- 3.1.2 The horizon year for all analyses is 2028. The CAST v18a model includes three 'generic' models of the short (2028), medium (2038) and long-term (2048) horizon years. The 2016 SWQ Analysis, adopted the medium-term horizon year of the then-current v16a model, being 2031.
- 3.1.3 Note that whilst the horizon year has effectively been bought forward from 2031 to 2028, as alluded to at section 2.4, the demographic forecasts for the Central City upon which the model travel demands are related have increased significantly between the previous (v16a) and current (v18a) models. The following table, extracted from the CAST v18a Model Update Report, summarises the changes in demographic inputs and travel demands between the v16a 2031 model and the v18a 2028 model.

	v16 2031		v16 v18 2031 2028			Change v18 2028 vs v16 2031			% Change v18 2028 vs v16 2031			
	Рор	Jobs	Trips	Pep	Jobs	Trips	Pop	Jobs	Trips	Pop	Jobs	Trips
WDC	55,000	17,000	280,000	58,000	15,000	287,000	3,000	-2,000	7,000	5%	-12%	3%
SDC	49,000	14,000	236,000	55,000	15,000	258,000	6,000	1,000	22,000	12%	7%	9%
CHCH	382,000	182,000	1,840,000	402,000	165,000	1,900,000	20,000	-17,000	60,000	5%	-9%	3%
CBD	13,000	54,000	266,000	18,000	69,000	316,000	5,000	15,000	70,000	38%	28%	26%

Table 3.1: v18a 2028 Model vs v16a 2031 Model Demographic and Demand Comparison

- 3.1.4 Thus it can be seen that the latest demographic forecasts prepared by CCC result in population, job and trip forecasts that are around some 30% higher in the v18a 2028 model than within the v16a 2031 model.
- 3.1.5 As for previous investigations, the *principal* focus of analysis has been on the evening (PM) peak hour, being 4:30-5:30pm. This is the period of greatest congestion on the road network in the vicinity of the Health Precinct. It is also the peak period anticipated for the MSF trip generation and parking demands and is coincident with the wider network peak.
- 3.1.6 The key stages of the modelling methodology are summarised as:
  - Modify the generic CAST model networks to provide greater detail in the vicinity of the MSF and HPPB locations to more accurately reflect the specific location of the parking demands, access arrangements and any internal parking linkages
  - ii. Modify the generic CAST model demands for each 'zone' to reflect estimated demands for each parking facility (and residual demands for the blocks in which the parking is located) for each scenario.
  - iii. Undertake model 'assignments' for each scenario, where the model assigns the modified demands (trips) to their optimal routes and simulates the network performance, including optimisation of signal times at intersections in the vicinity of the study area, for the altered traffic demands for each scenario.
- 3.1.7 As noted within the previous Chapter, in addition to the fundamental change to the generic CAST model relating to the new demographic forecasts at 2028, there are two further



significant changes to 'base' assumptions from those adopted for the 2016 SWQ Analysis:

- The Moorhouse/Stewart Street intersection is not assumed to be signalised; and
- The Hospital Parking Blue Building is not assumed to be reinstated.
- 3.1.8 The impact of the car parks can, in practice, be expected to be influenced not only by their capacity assumed (for each scenario), but also by the nature of their potential management regime, at least insofar as what proportions are assumed to be assigned to staff (or leased), free visitor and/or public-casual (paid) parking.
- 3.1.9 The scenarios modelled have been analysed to identify the principal potential network effects with appropriate diagrams prepared (in a manner similar to previous analyses) that highlight the effects on likely network delay-based Levels of Service (LoS).

### 3.2 Networks

- 3.2.1 The 'v18a' CAST generic future year 2028 network has been used as the basis for this study. This assumes implementation of the An Accessible City (AAC) network projects, along with other programmed projects on the wider greater Christchurch transport network that have been agreed with the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) partners.
- 3.2.2 A significant focus of the 2016 SWQ Analysis was the varying effects that alternative treatments in the future year for the Antigua Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection associated with the Quarryman's Trail Major Cycle Route (MCR). The intersection has since been upgraded to include separate physically separated cycle facilities and this configuration (and signal phasing) is now adopted within the base model for this study.
- 3.2.3 As noted previously, both the 2016 SWQ Analysis and the generic v18a future year models assume signalisation of the Moorhouse/Stewart Street intersection. CCC have advised that for this study the intersection is to remain in its current form. The v18a 2028 generic model network has been adjusted accordingly.

In-line with the traffic modelling conducted for the MSF and the 2016 SWQ Analysis, the parking and access design plans for the MSF (being access to and from Moorhouse Avenue to the south, Stewart Street to the west, St Asaph Street to the north and via Antigua St to the east of the site) have been incorporated within the modelling. CCC have forwarded the construction plan for the MSF. For the purposes of traffic modelling this is not materially different to the concept plan upon which the 2016 SWQ Analysis was based.

Also as noted earlier, the Blue Building is <u>not</u> assumed to be reinstated. Thus the access to/from Antigua Street assumed in both the 2016 SWQ Analysis and the generic v18a future year models has been removed. The zone and loading from St Asaph Street has however been retained to allow an estimate of residual demands to/from private car parks and servicing of the 'triangle' block to be modelled.

3.2.4 In addition to the above changes, the St Asaph Street / Antigua Street / Tuam Street / Montreal Street block ('The Block', represented within the v18a CAST model by a single zone, #702) has also been sub-divided in order to provide for more rapid assessment of the multiple parking scenarios considered by this study, whilst also providing a consistent network framework so that comparable analysis (e.g. network change plots) may be undertaken. CAST zone #702 has been divided into 5, as follows:



- 4 'spare' zones (Zones 4041, 4051, 4061 and 4071) have been moved to this location, to represent specific existing/potential car parking areas on this block; and
- Zone 702 is retained, to represent demand from potential residual/additional development in the block (beyond that covered by the zones below).
- Zone 4041 has been added to represent the location of the existing CDHB staff parking building, for which floor plans indicate a capacity of 408 spaces. Access options are to/from Antigua St and to St Asaph Street (only) as at present, or full access to/from St Asaph Street, either additionally to the Antigua St access or as an alternative.
- Zone 4051 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most north-easterly location considered within The Block, at around 70 Tuam Street – being building 'NE' within Figure 2.1. Access would be Right-In, Right-Out (RIRO) from Tuam Street.
- Zone 4061 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most south-easterly location considered within The Block, at around 77 St Asaph Street – being building 'SE' within Figure 2.1. Access would be Right-In, Right-Out (RIRO) from St Asaph Street.
- Zone 4071 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most westerly location considered within The Block, immediately to the east of the existing CDHB SCP – being building 'SE' within Figure 2.1. Scenarios involving a parking building at this location allow for examining the effects of providing for internal linkage to the location of the existing SCP.
- 3.2.5 In modelling terms, the precise location of the potential new parking building locations accessed from either Tuam Street or St Asaph Street is not important as the conflicting flows at the access and the route choices to/from the car parks would be similar in either case. Thus the key purpose of reflecting the different potential east and west parking building locations is to allow the differing implications of the access arrangements to be modelled. For example, a single parking building accessed only from Tuam Street would have similar network effects irrespective of its east / west location. However, if separate parking buildings were provided, accessed individually from Tuam and St Asaph Streets, the demands to and from each car park would be required to be modelled as separate zones. Similarly, a single car park with access from either Tuam or St Asaph Streets is most intuitively modelled as a single zone accessed from either street. The adopted approach provides sufficient zonal resolution for the effects of each of the scoped parking scenarios to be modelled accurately and intuitively.





3.2.7 The following diagram illustrates the modelled base road network in the study area:

Figure 3.1: Model Network adopted for SW Quadrant Assessment

- 3.2.8 In-line with the construction plans for the MSF site (as provided by CCC), the proposed accesses at St Asaph Street and Moorhouse Avenue are assumed to be LILO intersections, with the accesses onto Stewart and Antigua Streets assumed to cater for all turning movements.
- 3.2.9 Note that the construction plans for the MSF suggest it is possible to through-route through the MSF grounds both east-west and north-south. This possibility is not reflected within the model. The node, link and zone structure has been developed to allow access to/from the MSF as a single origin/destination, from either of the four access points. This effectively allows modelled trips entering and exiting the site to always choose the most optimal access, which in reality, would only be possible with the internal connections. A sensitivity test could be undertaken to understand the potential desire for 'rat-running' through the site. However, in practice the site should be managed to deter this (with appropriate speed treatment).
- 3.2.10 For all scenarios (including the modified base), the signal timings (including relative offsets), have been optimised to minimise overall delays to traffic, within the vicinity of the study area only.

### **Traffic Demands**

3.3

- 3.3.1 Base vehicular demands have been drawn from 2028 CAST model 'v18a' version (May 2019). Note that the 2016 SWQ Analysis used 'full' model demands as opposed to a 'target' mode share scenario that had previously been used for some studies (being around 85% of the default car travel demands to/from the Central City that already reflect the regional transport mode-split modelling).
- 3.3.2 Whilst this assessment similarly uses 'full demands' from the v18a model, it should be noted that the latest version of the CAST model includes a further demand response to

HPPB Network Impact Analysis Stage A - V01a.Docx



increasing (or decreasing) levels of congestion forecast. This was introduced during the v18a CAST model build to provide a more realistic response to very high levels of congestion (and model instability) that arise in future years under the revised demographic forecasts for the Central City. The 'elasticated' demands reflect possible additional demand responses to varying congestion not captured within the regional 'CTM' travel demand model upon which the CAST demands are initially based. Such responses are trip re-timing away from the peak hours, increased home-working, the greater take-up of alternative modes under possible significant enhancements to cycle networks and public transport networks and services, Travel Demand Management initiatives and emerging new modes such as e-scooters.

3.3.3 The effects of the elastic assignments are to reduce the default demands to/from the Central City by around 13% in the 2028 PM peak hour.

### 3.4 Parking Demands

- 3.4.1 Trip rates for each of the potential parking facilities examined in this study have been applied on a similar basis to those applied for the 2016 SWQ Analysis and as developed for previous studies, notably for the MSF traffic modelling and also for the Performing Arts Precinct (PAP) Parking Building analysis. The PAP analysis identified trip rates for prequake central city parking buildings and adjusted these for occupancy to understand how trip rates varied across the different Central City parking buildings depending primarily on the varying proportions of long and short-term parking accommodated.
- 3.4.2 The assumed trip rates per car park and resulting traffic demands are illustrated within the following tables,

Distance in the second						
Car Park Supply and Demand Element		Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Supply	495	55	- 100 X200 -		_	550
Arrive	0.65	0.70	322	39	360	0.66
Depart	0.50	0.10	248	6	253	0.46
Total/Rate	1.15	0.80	569	44	613	1.12
Arrive	0.60	0.10	297	6	303	0.55
Depart	0.60	0.20	297	11	308	0.56
Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	594	17	611	1.11
Arrive	1.00	0.10	495	6	501	0.91
Depart	1.00	0.70	495	39	534	0.97
Total/Rate	2.00	0.80	990	44	1034	1.88
	Supply and Element Supply Arrive Depart Total/Rate Arrive Depart Total/Rate Depart Total/Rate	Supply and ElementRate ShortSupply495Arrive0.65Depart0.50Total/Rate1.15Arrive0.60Depart0.60Total/Rate1.20Arrive1.00Depart1.00Total/Rate2.00	Supply and ElementNateNateShort- StayShort- StayLong- StaySupply49555Arrive0.650.70Depart0.500.10Total/Rate1.150.80Arrive0.600.10Depart0.600.20Total/Rate1.200.30Arrive1.000.70Depart1.000.70Total/Rate2.000.80	Supply and Element  Rate  Short-  Short- <td>Supply and Element  Cate  Thps  Thps    Short- Element  Short- Stay  Long- Stay  Short- Stay  Long- Stay  Short- Stay  Long- Stay  Short- Stay  Long- Stay  Stay  Stay  Stay    Supply  495  55 </td> <td>Supply and Element  Rate  Imps  Imps  Imps  Trips Total    Supply  Arrive  Short- Stay  Stay  Stay  Stay  Stay  Total    Supply  495  55  Imps  Trips  Total    Arrive  0.65  0.70  322  39  360    Depart  0.50  0.10  248  6  253    Total/Rate  1.15  0.80  569  44  613    Arrive  0.60  0.10  297  6  303    Depart  0.60  0.20  297  11  308    Total/Rate  1.20  0.30  594  17  611    Arrive  1.00  0.10  495  6  501    Depart  1.00  0.70  495  39  534    Total/Rate  2.00  0.80  990  44  1034</td>	Supply and Element  Cate  Thps  Thps    Short- Element  Short- Stay  Long- Stay  Short- Stay  Long- Stay  Short- Stay  Long- Stay  Short- Stay  Long- Stay  Stay  Stay  Stay    Supply  495  55	Supply and Element  Rate  Imps  Imps  Imps  Trips Total    Supply  Arrive  Short- Stay  Stay  Stay  Stay  Stay  Total    Supply  495  55  Imps  Trips  Total    Arrive  0.65  0.70  322  39  360    Depart  0.50  0.10  248  6  253    Total/Rate  1.15  0.80  569  44  613    Arrive  0.60  0.10  297  6  303    Depart  0.60  0.20  297  11  308    Total/Rate  1.20  0.30  594  17  611    Arrive  1.00  0.10  495  6  501    Depart  1.00  0.70  495  39  534    Total/Rate  2.00  0.80  990  44  1034

# MSF Car Park: 550 Spaces (Mainly Visitors)

Table 3.2: MSF Car Park Trip Rates and Demands



Car Park Demand	Supply and Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park	Supply	0	408				408
AM Book	Arrive	0.50	0.70	0	286	286	0.70
Hour	Depart	0.10	0.10	0	41	41	0.10
Hour	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	0	326	326	0.80
Interneck	Arrive	0.60	0.10	0	41	41	0.10
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	0	82	82	0.20
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	0	122	122	0.30
DM Dook	Arrive	0.25	0.10	0	41	41	0.10
Pivi Peak	Depart	0.80	0.70	0	286	286	0.70
Hour	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	0	326	326	0.80

Table 3.3: CDHB Staff Car Park Trip Rates and Demands – Existing

### CDHB Car Park: 678 Spaces (Long Term Parking)

Car Park Supply and Demand Element		Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park S	Supply	0	678				678
AM Dook	Arrive	0.50	0.70	0	475	475	0.70
AM Peak	Depart	0.10	0.10	0-	68	68	0.10
Hour	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	0	542	542	0.80
Internet	Arrive	0.60	0.10	0	68	68	0.10
Haur	Depart	0.60	0.20	0	136	136	0.20
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	0	203	203	0.30
PM Peak Hour	Arrive	0.25	0.10	0	68	68	0.10
	Depart	0.80	0.70	0	475	475	0.70
	Total/Rate	1,05	0.80	0	542	542	0.80

Table 3.4: CDHB Staff Car Park Trip Rates and Demands - Plus 270 Spaces

Car Park Supply and Demand Element		Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park S	iupply	400	400	-		i	800
AM Dook	Arrive	0.50	0.70	200	280	480	0.60
Alvi Peak	Depart	0.10	0.10	40	40	80	0.10
FIOUR	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	240	320	560	0.70
Patarnaak	Arrive	0.60	0.10	240	40	280	0.35
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	240	80	320	0.40
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	480	120	600	0.75
DM Deek	Arrive	0.25	0.10	100	40	140	0.18
Pivi Peak	Depart	0.80	0.70	320	280	600	0.75
Hour	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	420	320	740	0.93

Table 3.5: HPCP Trip Rates and Demands - 800 Spaces





Car Park Demand	Supply and I Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park S	upply	500	500		in the second		1000
AM Deek	Arrive	0.50	0,70	250	350	600	0.60
Alvi Peak	Depart	0.10	0.10	50	50	100	0.10
Hour	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	300	400	700	0.70
Internenk	Arrive	0.60	0.10	300	50	350	0.35
Interpeak	Depart	0.60	0.20	300	100	400	0.40
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	600	150	750	0.75
DM Deal	Arrive	0.25	0.10	125	50	175	0.18
Pivi Peak	Depart	0.80	0.70	400	350	750	0.75
Hour	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	525	400	925	0.93

Table 3.6: HPCP Trip Rates and Demands – 1000 Spaces

### Health Precinct Car Park: 1200 Spaces (Mix of Hospital/Wider Uses)

Car Park Supply and Demand Element		Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park	Supply	600	600				1200
AMA Deels	Arrive	0.50	0.70	300	420	720	0.60
AM Peak	Depart	0.10	0.10	60	60	120	0.10
Hour	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	360	480	840	0.70
Internet	Arrive	0.60	0.10	360	60	420	0.35
Interpeak	Depart	0.60	0.20	360	120	480	0.40
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	720	180	900	0.75
PM Peak Hour	Arrive	0.25	0.10	150	60	210	0.18
	Depart	0.80	0.70	480	420	900	0.75
	Total/Rate	1,05	0.80	630	480	1110	0.93

Table 3	3.7:	HPCP	<b>Trip Rates</b>	and	Demands	- 1200	Spaces
---------	------	------	-------------------	-----	---------	--------	--------

	Car Park Supply and Demand Element Car Park Supply		Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
			700	700				1400
	AM Peak Hour	Arrive	0.50	0.70	350	490	840	0.60
		Depart	0.10	0.10	70	70	140	0.10
C		Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	420	560	980	0.70
	Interpeak Hour	Arrive	0.60	0.10	420	70	490	0.35
		Depart	0.60	0.20	420	140	560	0.40
		Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	840	210	1050	0.75
ON	PM Peak Hour	Arrive	0.25	0.10	175	70	245	0.18
		Depart	0.80	0.70	560	490	1050	0.75
r		Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	735	560	1295	0.93

### Table 3.8: HPCP Trip Rates and Demands - 1400 Spaces

3.4.3 The manipulation of the base v18a CAST model demands to reflect the above car park facility trip numbers has been achieved by factoring the relevant existing v18a zone.



# 4 Analysis and Assessment Overview

- 4.1 In order to understand the potential absolute and relative effects of the alternative scenarios, a wide variety of plots have been generated and analysed.
- 4.2 These include:
  - Plots of trip generation (origins and destinations) by zone as a check that the demand manipulations result in the desired zonal demands for each scenario;
  - Vehicle Flow plots (where the bandwidth is proportional to the actual volume of traffic forecast to be carried on each part of the modelled network;
  - Plots of Link Delays (refer Appendix B), showing average delays<sup>2</sup> (weighted across all turning movements) for each approach to intersections colour-coded to the CAST Level of Service (LoS) as follows:
    - LoS A-C (<30s) Green</li>
    - LoS D (30-50s) Orange
    - LoS E (50-70s) Red
    - LoS F (>70s) Black
  - Plots of differences (changes) in flows (Appendix C) and delays (Appendix D) between scenarios. Typically these are provided as differences between the Option being assessed and the relevant base model in order to provide an indication of the impact for each car park option. Increases are illustrated as red bands (with the width proportional to the change) whilst decreases are green.
  - Plots of Select Link Analysis indicating modelled routeing to specific origins and destinations (proposed car park zones); and
  - Plots for specific intersection delays/flows;
- 4.3 As agreed with CCC, it is not considered necessary to provide (and give a written interpretation) for each and every one of these plots, for the purpose of supporting the conclusions and recommendations arising from this study. Selected diagrams are included within the main text in order to illustrate the conclusions reached and the recommendations that follow. Appendices B, C and D provide a record of the recorded link delays and impacts on flows and delays for each scenario in the PM peak hour as a record of essential information that may easily be referred to. The full set of diagram are available electronically on request, for both the AM and PM peak hours.

2

Note that the link delays are average values during the peak hour for all turning movements on a given approach, and in practice will vary from cycle to cycle. There is likely to be some 'peaking within the peak' of the demands, such that delays at the height of the peak demands will be a little higher than the aggregate modelled for the whole of the peak hour.



# 5 Stage A Analysis and Assessment

### 5.1 MSF Parking Testing

- 5.1.1 Testing of three alternative parking scenarios was undertaken to establish a limit of parking numbers that could be accommodated at the MSF site. The scenarios tested are 550 spaces, as per the construction plans, and 800 space and 1,000 space scenarios to understand the viability of accommodating further parking.
- 5.1.2 As noted earlier within this report, CCC have advised that the initial testing is to be completed in the absence of signals at Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue.
- 5.1.3 The following diagrams illustrate the flows and delay-based LoS on the road network.



Figure 5.1: Directional 2028 PM Peak Vehicle Flows, MSF 550 Spaces

RELEASED



Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A



Figure 5.2: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, MSF 550 Spaces

- 5.1.4 The above LoS diagram illustrates high delays at the following locations:
  - Antigua Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue LoS F (120s or 2 minutes)
  - Selwyn Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue LoS F (80s or 1.5 minutes)
- 5.1.5 The delay occurs due to traffic heading westbound from the MSF in the PM peak hour attempting to turn right on to Moorhouse Avenue.
- 5.1.6 Due to the lane and phasing configuration at Antigua / Moorhouse, queuing right-turning traffic tends to block through-movements, thus delays caused by the right turning traffic affects through-movements also.
- 5.1.7 There are very limited options for alternative routes for westbound traffic from the MSF, being practically limited<sup>3</sup> to Antigua Street and less conveniently Selwyn Street. Some traffic may also route via Riccarton Avenue, depending on the destination of each trip and the relative delays on the alternative routes.
- 5.1.8 For the 550 space scenario, the Antigua Street southbound approach is predicted to be at capacity (100% saturated) under signal optimisation and hence the large delays.
- 5.1.9 Under higher parking number scenarios, delays at Antigua Street southbound increase only a little to around 130s for the 1,000 spaces scenario.
- 5.1.10 Given these highly undesirable delays under all three MSF parking spaces scenarios, Council requested further investigation of the implications on these findings should signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued, as assumed in the MSF traffic modelling in 2016 and the 2016 SWA analysis.
- 5.1.11 The configuration assumed at the Stewart Street signals is as follows:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Right turns are only permitted on southbound approaches to Moorhouse Avenue at Selwyn Street and Antigua Street in the vicinity of the MSF. The next available location to the east is at Durham Street, a detour of around 1km.





Figure 5.3: Assumed Configuration of Stewart Street Moorhouse Avenue Signals

The following diagrams illustrates the delay-based LoS on the road network for the 550 5.1.12 space scenario with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals assumed.



Figure 5.4: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, MSF 550 Spaces

- 5.1.13 The provision of signals at Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue provides a 'release valve', allowing the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue to operate with reasonable network performance with delays of around 85-90 seconds (around 1.5 minutes in all three parking number scenarios).
- 5.1.14 The precise level of delay forecast at the Selwyn, Stewart and Antigua signals is dependent on the relative priorities provided to Moorhouse Avenue and the side roads. Modelling has been conducted with signal timings automatically optimised to minimise overall (total) delays to traffic through the intersections in a similar manner to the SCATS



system that adjusts signals timings in response to actual flows detected. This process affords greater priority to Moorhouse Avenue with its comparatively high traffic volumes that reflect its position as an Arterial Road at the top of the An Accessible City road hierarchy.

- 5.1.15 The modelling indicates high delays (around 2 minutes) on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue for the planned number of spaces (550) at the MSF in the absence of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in the PM peak hour for the appraisal year of 2028 (the short-term CAST model horizon year).
- 5.1.16 With the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place, the modelling indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
- 5.1.17 Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.

### 5.2 Hospital Staff Parking Building Extension Testing

### Scenario 1a - Effects of Car Park Expansion Under Existing Access Arrangements

- 5.2.1 With respect to the MSF network and demand scenarios discussed above, that taken forward as part of the base scenario for the HPPB analysis is the 550 space and no Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals scenario.
- 5.2.2 The following diagram illustrates the modelled effects on network delays of increasing the existing HSCP by 270 spaces from 408 to 678 spaces.



Figure 5.5: 2028 PM Peak Effects on Delays of HSCP +270 Spaces

5.2.3 The above diagram illustrates moderate effects (around 10 seconds or less) on delays at any specific location on the road network as a consequence of the expansion. Note



however that the modelled increase in delays of 10 seconds on the Antigua Street southbound approach is additional to the approximately 120s delays forecast in the base scenario (refer Figure 5.2 above), resulting in forecast delays of some 130 seconds at this bottleneck.

### Scenario 1b - Effects of HSCP Full RIRO Access at St Asaph Street

- 5.2.4 Presently, full access is provided to/from the HSCP from Antigua Street and right-turns out is the only form of access permitted to one-way St Asaph Street. This scenario assumes that under the HSCP expansion, access at the St Asaph Street access is modified to allow Right-In and Right-Out (RIRO) access.
- 5.2.5 The following diagram illustrates the modelled effects on network delays of this change in access strategy for the (expanded) 678 space HSCP.



Figure 5.6: 2028 PM Peak Effects on Delays of HSCP +270 Spaces

- 5.2.6 In the PM peak hour, no significant changes in delays on the road network are forecast as a result of accommodating right-turns in to the HSCP from St Asaph Street. This is understandable given that the predominant movements from the car park in the PM peak hour are outbound. The flow change plots indicate that the additional access results in around only 40 vehicles per hour being directly accessing the car park from St Asaph Street and the existing access.
- 5.2.7 In the AM peak hour, the modelling indicates that the proposed access could attract around 240 vph resulting in a more significant reduction in vehicles routing via the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection and performing the right-turn across the footpath and the Quarryman's Trail Major Cycle Route (MCR).
- 5.2.8 The associated modelled delay reductions at the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection are low at under 5 seconds in the AM peak hour. However, the access strategy is considered highly desirable in removing potential conflict as vehicles accessing the car park traverse cyclists on the MCR. Presently, the existing situation is considered

HPPB Network Impact Analysis Stage A - V01a.Docx



undesirable for both cyclists and motorists. In particular, vehicles attempting to turn right into the car park from St Antigua Street await a gap in the oncoming southbound vehicles on Antigua Street. It is particularly difficult for motorists to be aware of northbound cyclists approaching, effectively from the rear, on the right side of the vehicle when looking straight ahead to ascertain if it is safe to turn across oncoming vehicles (and cycles).

5.2.9 The MCR on Antigua Street only became operational in the latter half of 2018 so presently there is a limited time window for which crashes between cyclists and drivers could occur. The NZ Transport Agency's (NZTA's) Crash Analysis System (CAS) does however list one crash (ID 201820140) that occurred between a northbound cyclist and a vehicle exiting the car park at approximately 7:00 am on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2018. The vehicle failed to give way to the cyclist approaching from the left.

### Scenario 1c - Effects of HSCP St Asaph Street Full RIRO Access and Closure of Antigua Street Access

- 5.2.10 Given on-site observations and the above crash report it is highly desirable that an access option be pursued that minimises the exposure between cyclists on the MCR and conflicting vehicle movements. This sub-options considers the effects on traffic flows and delays of closing the existing vehicular access to the HSCP in the event that access were to be provided to the expanded car park via St Asaph Street, both inbound and outbound (RIRO) as per sub-option 1b.
- 5.2.11 The physically segregated cycleway on St Asaph Street is located on the south side of carriageway. Thus the cyclist safety benefits to be gained by removing potential conflict between cyclists and vehicles on the popular Antigua Street cycleway would <u>not</u> be offset by increased vehicle use of the St Asaph Street access.
- 5.2.12 The following diagrams illustrate the modelled turning movements for the expanded HSCP under the three different access scenarios (1a, 1b and 1c) for the peak hours.



Figure 5.7: Turning Flows for HSCP Options 1a, 1b and 1c, 2028 AM Peak



Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A



Figure 5.8: Turning Flows for HSCP Options 1a, 1b and 1c, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.13 The above diagrams illustrate how the modelled turning volumes at the Antigua Street and St Asaph Street accesses vary under the scenarios and also the effects on turning volumes at the intersections of Antigua Street with Tuam and St Asaph Street.
- 5.2.14 In the AM peak hour, the (two-way) vehicle volumes traversing the Antigua Street cycleway are around 500 vph for Option 1a (existing access), around 280 vph for Option 1b (with the addition of the St Asaph Street Right-turn In) and zero under option 1c (closure of Antigua St under St Asaph Street RIRO). The comparative volumes in the PM peak hour are 250 for Option 1a, 220 for Option 1b and zero for Option 1c.
- 5.2.15 Thus clearly in terms of removing the safety issue, and increasing cycle amenity, Option 1c is considerably more effective than Option 1b, particularly in the PM peak hour.
- 5.2.16 The following diagrams illustrate the modelled effects on vehicle flows of Option 1c relative to Option 1a for the peak hours.



Figure 5.9: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Traffic Flows vs Option 1a, 2028 AM Peak

Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A



Figure 5.10: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Traffic Flows vs Option 1a, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.17 As might be anticipated, the modelled effect on traffic volumes is greater in the AM peak when the inbound movement predominates. Impacts on traffic volumes in the more critical PM peak hour (in terms of network congestion) are more modest.
- 5.2.18 The following diagrams illustrate the modelled effects on delays around the network of Option 1c relative to Option 1a for the peak hours.



Figure 5.11: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Delays vs Option 1a, 2028 AM Peak

P



Health Precinct Parking Building - Network Impact Analysis Stage A



Figure 5.12: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Delays vs Option 1a, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.19 Overall, the above diagrams indicate net localised improvements in network operation under the assumed closure of the Antigua Street vehicular access to the car park.
- 5.2.20 The small increase in delay indicated on Antigua Street northbound to Tuam Street (around 10s) is largely a consequence of re-routing of vehicles destined for the HSCP away from Antigua Street (on to Montreal Street). This reduces traffic volumes and associated delays on Antigua Street northbound approaching the St Asaph Street intersection, which in-turn makes the corridor more attractive for general traffic (not bound for the HSCP) which leads to the small increase on modelled delays approaching Tuam Street.
- 5.2.21 In summary, the option of closing the Antigua Street access to the HSCP under inbound and outbound access being provided from St Asaph Street has potential to significantly improve cyclist safety and amenity without any significant impact on road network efficiency.

RELEASE



# 6 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 6.1 The principal conclusions and recommendations arising from this Stage A traffic modelling study are as follows:
  - a. The assumption that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection will not be pursued as part of the MSF access strategy results in high levels of congestion (around 2 minutes) being forecast on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue in the PM peak hour for the number of parking spaces to be constructed (around 550 spaces).
  - b. The incremental delay impacts of assuming additional parking at the MSF (beyond the consented 550 spaces) are relatively modest. However, it is not recommended that any further parking be provided at the MSF in the absence of signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue as this will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue.
  - c. Sensitivity testing with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place, the modelling indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
  - d. Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.
  - e. Generally, the modelled network effects of expansion of the existing HSCP by 270 spaces are modest. However, modelling indicates that the expansion will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue (with delays increasing by around 10s from around 2 minutes).
  - f. Whilst the network efficiency effects of the proposed HSCP expansion are modest, the increased vehicular movements to/from the building across the Antigua Street cycleway would exacerbate an existing safety issue at this location.
  - g. Provision of an additional egress from the expanded HSCP to St Asaph Street (in addition to the current egress) would only partially mitigate the safety (and cycle amenity) impacts of the expansion. This is because the Antigua Street access would likely remain popular for inbound vehicle movements during the morning peak hour.
  - M Under the option to provide both access and egress from St Asaph Street, traffic modelling indicates that closure of the existing access/egress on Antigua Street could be accommodated without any significant net local network efficiency impacts.
    - The option of, effectively, relocation all vehicle access to the HSCP away from Antigua Street and on to St Asaph Street would be highly effective in improving safety for cyclists as the St Asaph Street vehicular access would not involve traversing a cycleway (the cycleway at this location is located on the south side of St Asaph Street).



Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A

REFERSEDUMPERTIFE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

HPPB Network Impact Analysis Stage A - V01a.Docx

Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019

210



# REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFFICIALINGORMATIONACT



Health Precinct Parking Building – Network Impact Analysis Stage A

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

HPPB Network Impact Analysis Stage A - V00a.Docx





Identifying Parking Building Scenarios to be Modelled

31<sup>th</sup> July 2019





Identifying Parking Building Scenarios to be Modelled

31<sup>th</sup> July 2019




5

Identifying Parking Building Scenarios to be Modelled

31<sup>th</sup> July 2019





































Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix B – Modelled Approach Delays



# REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFFICIALINFORMATIONACT

HPPB Stage A Ap B - Approach Delays.Docx

Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix B – Modelled Approach Delays

REFERSEDUMPERTIE

Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays



HPPB Stage A Ap B - Approach Delays.Docx

QTP Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019

Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays



HPPB Stage A Ap B - Approach Delays.Docx

Page 2 of 4

QTP Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019



Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays ALS SATUR 0Sp ¢ belay see 30.7em 844 19.00 \$2:88 lee 11.15 100 10.302.0P 1100-0-010 W. SATUR 050 41514 143.0 Lich marine Delay ter Statute 30,7m 10.00 0 50.00 Brei 11.15 and the -107 aP ahilla WANTUP )sp 8 a diministration of the second 1314 Link America (w)ay and Jo. Zant 1044 30.00 \$8:88 \_ Bur 11.15 Eastern B. 10.001.07 RealthPrestmiParking 202020 810 (002+270,004,8160,8546114) 17- 8-19

232

REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL IMPORTANTION ACT

Appendix C - Modelled Flow Differences



# PELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

HPPB Stage A Ap C - Flow Differences.Docx

.

AQTP

Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix C – Modelled Flow Differences

REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFFICIALINFORMATIONACT



Appendix C - Modelled Flow Differences





Appendix C - Modelled Flow Differences



HPPB Stage A Ap C - Flow Differences.Docx

QTP Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019 Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix D – Modelled Delay Differences



# RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix D – Modelled Delay Differences

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



Appendix D - Modelled Delay Differences

239





Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix D – Modelled Delay Differences

SATUP losp l 12 Carlo India 4517 ATTA MALINE RE-HE I Landaridi ter 4 19 . Zem Res. 11.15 . (1) (1) 16-1002 60. <u>101-107</u> NO.A SATUR 0.5 4.4.4.8.3 2.41= 451.1 link bionts. Tel:The I 6-44 IMPECTOR 15.7mm dee 11.11 1 16.1001 68. <u>101</u>: 197 al Linitz NAMESTREE P+270, 8tA, 8180 202010 010 WAS SATUR teals and LANK, AND ALL Tot Time ( , junited handled hits and handled handl 800.33.15 1 Donne, 45-0001 10, 10, 10 BealthFreeintEarking 2020FM BIG (00F+270,804,8180,808m(10) 17- 0-19

HPPB Stage A Ap D - Delay Differences.Docx

Page 2 of 2

### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	Tim Lester
Sent:	Friday, 6 September 2019 10:16 a.m.
To:	Mike Wheeler
Subject:	FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)
Attachments:	HPPB Network Impact Analysis Stage A - v01a Complete.pdf
	, PC
Tim Lester	
Corporate Solicitor	
Canterbury District Health B	loard
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext	: 62128)   M <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz

### **Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board**

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.m

From: 9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 28 August	2019 3:33 p.m.
To: Tim Lester <tim.lester@c< th=""><th>dhb.health.nz&gt;</th></tim.lester@c<>	dhb.health.nz>
Cc: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim - I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group - here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site – which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated to 9(2)(a) that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better - but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work – and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached – most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days - returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?

9(2)(a)

# Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL MONTH The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

242

ATIONACT



# Health Precinct Parking Buildings

# Network Impact Analysis Stage A

August 2019

HPPB Network Impact Analysis Stage A -V01a.Docx Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019



REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFTICIALINGORMATIONACT

Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019



# **Document Issue Record**

Version No	Prepared By	Description	Date
00a	9(2)(a)	Draft issue for information pending internal review.	19 August 2019
01a		First formal issue,	20 August 2019
			40

# **Document Verification**

	Name	Signature	Date
Preparation	9(2)(a)	9(2)(a)	19 August 2019
Reviewer			20 August 2019
Approval			20 August 2019
	JANUC		



RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



## Contents

1	Executive Summary			
2	Introduction			
2.10	Study Stage A			
2.11	Study Stage B			
3	Modelling Methodology4			
3.1	Overview of Study Method4			
3.2	Networks			
3.3	Traffic Demands			
3.4	Parking Demands			
4	Analysis and Assessment Overview11			
5	Stage A Analysis and Assessment			
5.1	MSF Parking Testing			
5.2	Hospital Staff Parking Building Extension Testing			
6	Conclusions and Recommendations			
App	endices O <sup>X</sup>			

## Appendices

Appendix A - Parking Scenario Diagrams Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays Appendix C - Modelled Flow Differences RELEASED Appendix D - Modelled Delay Differences



PELEPSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

249

## 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report describes the first stage (Stage A) of analysis undertaken on behalf of Christchurch City Council (CCC) to assess the network impacts of a number of alternative options for increasing the provision of parking to serve the Health Precinct within the Central City.
- 1.2 In 2016, QTP were jointly appointed by CCC and Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) to undertake analysis (the 2016 SWQ Analysis) of key new parking facility options being considered by DCL. The analysis involved application of Council's Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic model (CAST) to inform the assessment of the effects of the alternative options on the operation of the road network.
- 1.3 In essence, the purpose of this commission is to re-assess the parking options in the light of a number of development decisions and changes to parking supply options that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The implications of the decision to not now replace the former Hospital public parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua Street;
  - Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550 parking spaces to a larger parking supply. The analysis will specifically test the impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF);
  - The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital Staff Car Park (HSCP), located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street, by some two floors – and with an expected 270 additional spaces;
- 1.4 In addition, there are two further factors that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis assumed signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection for a scenario with 620 spaces at the MSF. This assumption was informed by the supporting transport modelling analysis for the MSF which indicated such an upgrade would be required to maintain efficient network operation for parking levels in excess of 550 spaces. For this study, CCC have advised that the Stewart Street / Moorhouse signals are not to be assumed for the bulk of the analysis of the impact of the Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) options.
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis was undertaken using the then-current version of CAST (v16a). Since that time, CAST has recently been updated (v18a completed in early 2019) with revised assumptions from CCC around the level of employment and residents that have an associated increase in traffic within the Central City in future years.
- 1.5 This initial report pertains to Stage A of the study which provides analysis of the potential effects of extension to the (existing) HSCP. Building on the results of Stage A, Stage B of this study will go on to assess, and report on, the network effects of the alternative options



for the new Parking Building.

1.6

The principal conclusions and recommendations arising from this Stage A traffic modelling study are as follows:

- a. The assumption that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection will not be pursued as part of the MSF access strategy results in high levels of congestion (around 2 minutes) being forecast on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue in the PM peak hour for the number of parking spaces to be constructed (around 550 spaces).
- b. The incremental delay impacts of assuming additional parking at the MSF (beyond the consented 550 spaces) are relatively modest. However, it is not recommended that any further parking be provided at the MSF in the absence of signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue as this will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue.
- c. Sensitivity testing with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place, the modelling indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
- d. Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.
- e. Generally, the modelled network effects of expansion of the existing HSCP by 270 spaces are modest. However, modelling indicates that the expansion will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue (with delays increasing by around 10s from around 2 minutes).
- f. Whilst the network efficiency effects of the proposed HSCP expansion are modest, the increased vehicular movements to/from the building across the Antigua Street cycleway would exacerbate an existing safety issue at this location.
- g. Provision of an additional egress from the expanded HSCP to St Asaph Street (in addition to the current egress) would only partially mitigate the safety (and cycle amenity) impacts of the expansion. This is because the Antigua Street access would likely remain popular for inbound vehicle movements during the morning peak hour.

Moder the option to provide both access and egress from St Asaph Street, traffic modelling indicates that closure of the existing access/egress on Antigua Street could be accommodated without any significant net local network efficiency impacts.

The option of, effectively, relocation all vehicle access to the HSCP away from Antigua Street and on to St Asaph Street would be highly effective in improving safety for cyclists as the St Asaph Street vehicular access would not involve traversing a cycleway (the cycleway at this location is located on the south side of St Asaph Street).


# 2 Introduction

- 2.1 QTP Ltd have been commissioned by Christchurch City Council (CCC) to undertake analysis of the transport network impacts of a number of alternative options for increasing the provision of parking to serve the Health Precinct within the Central City.
- 2.2 In 2016, QTP were jointly appointed by CCC and Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) to undertake analysis of key new parking facility options being considered by DCL. The analysis involved application of Council's Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic model (CAST) to inform the assessment of the effects of the alternative options on the operation of the road network. The findings were presented within the report titled "South West Quadrant Vehicle Parking Options – Network Impact Analysis", subsequently referred to within this report as "the 2016 SWQ Analysis".
- 2.3 In essence, the purpose of this commission is to re-assess the parking options in the light of a number of development decisions and changes to parking supply options that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The implications of the decision to not now replace the former Hospital public parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua Street;
  - Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550 parking spaces to a larger parking supply. The analysis will specifically test the impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF);
  - The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital staff parking building (located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street) by some two floors – and with an expected 270 additional spaces;
- 2.4 In addition, there are two further factors that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis assumed signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection for a scenario with 620 spaces at the MSF. This assumption was informed by the supporting transport modelling analysis for the MSF which indicated such an upgrade would be required to maintain efficient network operation for parking levels in excess of 550 spaces. For this study, CCC have advised that the Stewart Street / Moorhouse signals are not to be assumed for the bulk of the analysis of the impact of the Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) options.
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis was undertaken using the then-current version of CAST (v16a). Since that time, CAST has recently been updated (v18a completed in early 2019) with revised assumptions from CCC around the level of employment and residents that have an associated increase in traffic within the Central City in future years.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Dated October 2016, the final issue being 01b, dated 15 November 2016.



- 2.5 Specifically, this refreshed site-specific analysis will further explore the following options as to their network and access effects:
  - The potential benefits / implications of physically linking any New Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) or buildings, to the currently planned extension of the Hospital Staff Car Park (HSCP, east of Antigua Street) – and therefore permitting its phased extension to the immediate east for public casual or further staff parking;
  - Optional parking building sites to the north and south of the proposed east west greenway running west from Montreal Street;
  - The potential benefits/ implications of any new parking building or buildings accessed from both Tuam and St Asaph Streets (and therefore spanning the greenway in some form);
  - The optimum access arrangements for any of these combinations in terms of minimising local network traffic impacts and offering flexibility around the management of public and CDHB staff parking operations;
  - Local network sensitivity testing of those options at overall <u>additional</u> parking quantums (*ie beyond the planned staff parking expansion of 270 spaces*) of 800, 1,000, 1,200 or 1,400 spaces and the local network levels of service of each.
- 2.6 The above options translate to some 14 main scenarios with regards to parking building locations and linkages which are best understood through referral to the individual diagrams of **Appendix A**. The components of the various building location and linkage combinations are illustrated within the following diagram centred on the St Asaph Street / Antigua Street / Tuam Street / Montreal Street block:



Figure 2.1: Existing HSCP (Blue) and Potential HPPB Location (Red) and Linkage Options

2.7 In addition, three scenarios are initially to be considered as to the potential quantum of parking that may be accommodated at the MSF site whilst maintaining reasonable network performance. The three scenarios are the consented 550 spaces and testing of 800 and 1,000 spaces scenarios. The assessed acceptable quantum of parking is to be

taken forward as part of the base scenario for the HPPB option analysis.

### 2.8 Thus the resulting scenarios to be modelled for this study are as follows:

HSCP w. HPPB HSCP Blue MSF full St Linked No HSCP HPPB Scenario No. Building Antigua CPs Asaph to CP Access HSCP Access 0 550 v18a Base Model v18a 1 1 1 1 550 0a × **MSF** Parking 800 V 0b 2 × Testing 0c 3 1000 V ж 1a 4 × 800 +270 Stage A HSCP Extension 1b 5 × 800 +270 V Testing 1 1c6 х 800 +2701 7 +270 2a х 800 1 Wns × 2b 8 800 +270 $\checkmark$ Wns 1 × 9 +270 Wns 1 1 2c 800 1 Western New × 1 +270 1 10 800 Ws **Parking Building** 2d× Testing 1 2e 11 800 +270 1 Ws 1 х 12 800 +270 1 Wn 1 21 ĸ 800 +270 1 1 13 1 Wn 2g × 3a 14 800 +270 1 NEn ж × Eastern New 3b 15 х 800 +2701 SEs × **Parking Building** 3c 16 R 800 +270 1 NEn+SEs × Testing 1 NEn+SEs 3d=2a<sup>1</sup> 800 +270 × х

1. 3d varies from 3c in that the Eastern parking buildings spanning the greenway would be linked. In modelling terms, this is the same as 2a.

### **Table 2.1: HPPB Network Impact Modelling Scenarios**

2.9 For each new HPPB option (No's 7 through 16) the Scope requires modelling of four car park sizes in order to determine the quantum of parking at the threshold of acceptable network performance. Thus in total some 46 scenarios are to be modelled, each for the AM and PM peak hours.

# Study Stage A

As per the study scope, this initial report pertains to Stage A of the study which provides 2.10.1 analysis of the potential effects of extension to the (existing) HSCP and therefore is informed by the first six model scenarios listed in the above Table.

### 2.11 Study Stage B

Building on the results of Stage A, Stage B of this study will go on to assess, and report 2.11.1 on, the network effects of the alternative options for the new HPPB, being informed by the 10 model scenarios 7 to 16 listed within the above Table.

2.10

# 3 Modelling Methodology

# 3.1 Overview of Study Method

- 3.1.1 As set out in the project scope, this study uses the recently-released 'v18a' version (May 2019) of the Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic (CAST) model, as the basis of analysis for this project.
- 3.1.2 The horizon year for all analyses is 2028. The CAST v18a model includes three 'generic' models of the short (2028), medium (2038) and long-term (2048) horizon years. The 2016 SWQ Analysis, adopted the medium-term horizon year of the then-current v16a model, being 2031.
- 3.1.3 Note that whilst the horizon year has effectively been bought forward from 2031 to 2028, as alluded to at section 2.4, the demographic forecasts for the Central City upon which the model travel demands are related have increased significantly between the previous (v16a) and current (v18a) models. The following table, extracted from the CAST v18a Model Update Report, summarises the changes in demographic inputs and travel demands between the v16a 2031 model and the v18a 2028 model.

		v16 2031		v18 2028			Change v18 2028 vs v16 2031			% Change v18 2028 vs v16 2031		
	Pop	Jobs	Trips	Рор	Jobs	Trips	Pop	Jobs	Trips	Pop	Jobs	Trips
WDC	55,000	17,000	280,000	58,000	15,000	287,000	3,000	-2,000	7,000	5%	-12%	3%
SDC	49,000	14,000	236,000	55,000	15,000	258,000	6,000	1,000	22,000	12%	7%	9%
СНСН	382,000	182,000	1,840,000	402,000	165,000	1,900,000	20,000	-17,000	60,000	5%	-9%	3%
CBD	13,000	54,000	266,000	18,000	69,000	336,000	5,000	15,000	70,000	38%	2.8%	26%

Table 3.1: v18a 2028 Model vs v16a 2031 Model Demographic and Demand Comparison

- 3.1.4 Thus it can be seen that the latest demographic forecasts prepared by CCC result in population, job and trip forecasts that are around some 30% higher in the v18a 2028 model than within the v16a 2031 model.
- 3.1.5 As for previous investigations, the *principal* focus of analysis has been on the evening (PM) peak hour, being 4:30-5:30pm. This is the period of greatest congestion on the road network in the vicinity of the Health Precinct. It is also the peak period anticipated for the MSF trip generation and parking demands and is coincident with the wider network peak.
- 3.1.6 The key stages of the modelling methodology are summarised as:
  - Modify the generic CAST model networks to provide greater detail in the vicinity of the MSF and HPPB locations to more accurately reflect the specific location of the parking demands, access arrangements and any internal parking linkages
  - ii. Modify the generic CAST model demands for each 'zone' to reflect estimated demands for each parking facility (and residual demands for the blocks in which the parking is located) for each scenario.
  - iii. Undertake model 'assignments' for each scenario, where the model assigns the modified demands (trips) to their optimal routes and simulates the network performance, including optimisation of signal times at intersections in the vicinity of the study area, for the altered traffic demands for each scenario.
- 3.1.7 As noted within the previous Chapter, in addition to the fundamental change to the generic CAST model relating to the new demographic forecasts at 2028, there are two further



significant changes to 'base' assumptions from those adopted for the 2016 SWQ Analysis:

- · The Moorhouse/Stewart Street intersection is not assumed to be signalised; and
- The Hospital Parking Blue Building is not assumed to be reinstated.
- 3.1.8 The impact of the car parks can, in practice, be expected to be influenced not only by their capacity assumed (for each scenario), but also by the nature of their potential management regime, at least insofar as what proportions are assumed to be assigned to staff (or leased), free visitor and/or public-casual (paid) parking.
- 3.1.9 The scenarios modelled have been analysed to identify the principal potential network effects with appropriate diagrams prepared (in a manner similar to previous analyses) that highlight the effects on likely network delay-based Levels of Service (LoS).

### 3.2 Networks

- 3.2.1 The 'v18a' CAST generic future year 2028 network has been used as the basis for this study. This assumes implementation of the An Accessible City (AAC) network projects, along with other programmed projects on the wider greater Christchurch transport network that have been agreed with the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) partners.
- 3.2.2 A significant focus of the 2016 SWQ Analysis was the varying effects that alternative treatments in the future year for the Antigua Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection associated with the Quarryman's Trail Major Cycle Route (MCR). The intersection has since been upgraded to include separate physically separated cycle facilities and this configuration (and signal phasing) is now adopted within the base model for this study.
- 3.2.3 As noted previously, both the 2016 SWQ Analysis and the generic v18a future year models assume signalisation of the Moorhouse/Stewart Street intersection. CCC have advised that for this study the intersection is to remain in its current form. The v18a 2028 generic model network has been adjusted accordingly.

In-line with the traffic modelling conducted for the MSF and the 2016 SWQ Analysis, the parking and access design plans for the MSF (being access to and from Moorhouse Avenue to the south, Stewart Street to the west, St Asaph Street to the north and via Antigua St to the east of the site) have been incorporated within the modelling. CCC have forwarded the construction plan for the MSF. For the purposes of traffic modelling this is not materially different to the concept plan upon which the 2016 SWQ Analysis was based.

Also as noted earlier, the Blue Building is <u>not</u> assumed to be reinstated. Thus the access to/from Antigua Street assumed in both the 2016 SWQ Analysis and the generic v18a future year models has been removed. The zone and loading from St Asaph Street has however been retained to allow an estimate of residual demands to/from private car parks and servicing of the 'triangle' block to be modelled.

3.2.4 In addition to the above changes, the St Asaph Street / Antigua Street / Tuam Street / Montreal Street block ('The Block', represented within the v18a CAST model by a single zone, #702) has also been sub-divided in order to provide for more rapid assessment of the multiple parking scenarios considered by this study, whilst also providing a consistent network framework so that comparable analysis (e.g. network change plots) may be undertaken. CAST zone #702 has been divided into 5, as follows:



- 4 'spare' zones (Zones 4041, 4051, 4061 and 4071) have been moved to this location, to represent specific existing/potential car parking areas on this block; and
- Zone 702 is retained, to represent demand from potential residual/additional development in the block (beyond that covered by the zones below).
- Zone 4041 has been added to represent the location of the existing CDHB staff parking building, for which floor plans indicate a capacity of 408 spaces. Access options are to/from Antigua St and to St Asaph Street (only) as at present, or full access to/from St Asaph Street, either additionally to the Antigua St access or as an alternative.
- Zone 4051 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most north-easterly location considered within The Block, at around 70 Tuam Street – being building 'NE' within Figure 2.1. Access would be Right-In, Right-Out (RIRO) from Tuam Street.
- Zone 4061 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most south-easterly location considered within The Block, at around 77 St Asaph Street – being building 'SE' within Figure 2.1. Access would be Right-In, Right-Out (RIRO) from St Asaph Street.
- Zone 4071 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most westerly location considered within The Block, immediately to the east of the existing CDHB SCP – being building 'SE' within Figure 2.1. Scenarios involving a parking building at this location allow for examining the effects of providing for internal linkage to the location of the existing SCP.
- 3.2.5 In modelling terms, the precise location of the potential new parking building locations accessed from either Tuam Street or St Asaph Street is not important as the conflicting flows at the access and the route choices to/from the car parks would be similar in either case. Thus the key purpose of reflecting the different potential east and west parking building locations is to allow the differing implications of the access arrangements to be modelled. For example, a single parking building accessed only from Tuam Street would have similar network effects irrespective of its east / west location. However, if separate parking buildings were provided, accessed individually from Tuam and St Asaph Streets, the demands to and from each car park would be required to be modelled as separate zones. Similarly, a single car park with access from either Tuam or St Asaph Streets is most intuitively modelled as a single zone accessed from either street. The adopted approach provides sufficient zonal resolution for the effects of each of the scoped parking scenarios to be modelled accurately and intuitively.





3.2.7 The following diagram illustrates the modelled base road network in the study area:

Figure 3.1: Model Network adopted for SW Quadrant Assessment

- 3.2.8 In-line with the construction plans for the MSF site (as provided by CCC), the proposed accesses at St Asaph Street and Moorhouse Avenue are assumed to be LILO intersections, with the accesses onto Stewart and Antigua Streets assumed to cater for all turning movements.
- 3.2.9 Note that the construction plans for the MSF suggest it is possible to through-route through the MSF grounds both east-west and north-south. This possibility is not reflected within the model. The node, link and zone structure has been developed to allow access to/from the MSF as a single origin/destination, from either of the four access points. This effectively allows modelled trips entering and exiting the site to always choose the most optimal access, which in reality, would only be possible with the internal connections. A sensitivity test could be undertaken to understand the potential desire for 'rat-running' through the site. However, in practice the site should be managed to deter this (with appropriate speed treatment).
- 3.2.10 For all scenarios (including the modified base), the signal timings (including relative offsets), have been optimised to minimise overall delays to traffic, within the vicinity of the study area only.

### **Traffic Demands**

- 3.3.1 Base vehicular demands have been drawn from 2028 CAST model 'v18a' version (May 2019). Note that the 2016 SWQ Analysis used 'full' model demands as opposed to a 'target' mode share scenario that had previously been used for some studies (being around 85% of the default car travel demands to/from the Central City that already reflect the regional transport mode-split modelling).
- 3.3.2 Whilst this assessment similarly uses 'full demands' from the v18a model, it should be noted that the latest version of the CAST model includes a further demand response to



increasing (or decreasing) levels of congestion forecast. This was introduced during the v18a CAST model build to provide a more realistic response to very high levels of congestion (and model instability) that arise in future years under the revised demographic forecasts for the Central City. The 'elasticated' demands reflect possible additional demand responses to varying congestion not captured within the regional 'CTM' travel demand model upon which the CAST demands are initially based. Such responses are trip re-timing away from the peak hours, increased home-working, the greater take-up of alternative modes under possible significant enhancements to cycle networks and public transport networks and services, Travel Demand Management initiatives and emerging new modes such as e-scooters.

3.3.3 The effects of the elastic assignments are to reduce the default demands to/from the Central City by around 13% in the 2028 PM peak hour.

### 3.4 Parking Demands

- 3.4.1 Trip rates for each of the potential parking facilities examined in this study have been applied on a similar basis to those applied for the 2016 SWQ Analysis and as developed for previous studies, notably for the MSF traffic modelling and also for the Performing Arts Precinct (PAP) Parking Building analysis. The PAP analysis identified trip rates for prequake central city parking buildings and adjusted these for occupancy to understand how trip rates varied across the different Central City parking buildings depending primarily on the varying proportions of long and short-term parking accommodated.
- 3.4.2 The assumed trip rates per car park and resulting traffic demands are illustrated within the following tables,

MSF Car Park: 550 Spaces (Mainly Visitors)							-
Car Park Supply and Demand Element Car Park Supply		Rate Rate Short- Long- Stay Stay		Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
		495	55				550
AM Peak	Arrive	0.65	0.70	322	39	360	0.66
	Depart	0.50	0.10	248	6	253	0.46
Hour	Total/Rate	1.15	0.80	569	44	613	1.12
Interneck	Arrive	0.60	0.10	297	6	303	0.55
Начи	Depart	0.60	0.20	297	11	308	0.56
FIGUR	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	594	17	611	1.11
PM Peak Hour	Arrive	1.00	0.10	495	6	501	0.91
	Depart	1.00	0.70	495	39	534	0.97
	Total/Rate	2.00	0.80	990	44	1034	1.88

# MSF Car Park: 550 Spaces (Mainly Visitors)

Table 3.2: MSF Car Park Trip Rates and Demands



Car Park : Demand	Supply and Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park	Supply	0	408	5-2-5	t-mather	n national	408
AM Book	Arrive	0.50	0.70	0	286	286	0.70
Hour	Depart	0.10	0.10	0	41	41	0.10
Hour	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	0	326	326	0.80
Interneck	Arrive	0.60	0.10	0	41	41	0.10
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	0	82	82	0.20
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	0	122	122	0.30
DM Deels	Arrive	0.25	0.10	0	41	41	0.10
Pivi Peak	Depart	0.80	0.70	0	286	286	0.70
HOUF	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	0	326	326	0.80

Table 3.3: CDHB Staff Car Park Trip Rates and Demands – Existing

# CDHB Car Park: 678 Spaces (Long Term Parking)

Car Park Supply and Demand Element Car Park Supply		Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
		0	678	(1997) Ale		E	678
AM Peak	Arrive	0.50	0.70	0	475	475	0.70
	Depart	0.10	0.10	0	68	68	0.10
Hour	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	0	542	542	0.80
Interneck	Arrive	0.60	0.10	0	68	68	0.10
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	0	136	136	0.20
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	0	203	203	0.30
PM Peak Hour	Arrive	0.25	0.10	0	68	68	0.10
	Depart	0.80	0.70	0	475	475	0.70
	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	0	542	542	0.80

Table 3.4: CDHB Staff Car Park Trip Rates and Demands - Plus 270 Spaces

### Health Precinct Car Park: 800 Spaces (Mix of Hospital/Wider Uses)

	Car Park Supply and Demand Element		Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
	Car Park S	upply	400	400	1			800
	AM Deak	Arrive	0.50	0.70	200	280	480	0.60
	Hour	Depart	0.10	0.10	40	40	80	0.10
0		Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	240	320	560	0.70
0	Internet	Arrive	0.60	0.10	240	40	280	0.35
	Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	240	80	320	0.40
	Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	480	120	600	0.75
2 <sup>LL</sup>	DM Deals	Arrive	0.25	0.10	100	40	140	0.18
	Pivi Peak	Depart	0.80	0.70	320	280	600	0.75
	Hour	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	420	320	740	0.93

Table 3.5: HPCP Trip Rates and Demands - 800 Spaces



259



Health Pre	cinct Car Pa	rk: 1000 S	spaces (Mi	x of Hospit	al/Wider U	lses)	
Car Park S Demand	Supply and I Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park S	upply	500	500		1-1-1-1-1-1-	4.00554	1000
AM Book	Arrive	0.50	0.70	250	350	600	0.60
Hour	Depart	0.10	0.10	50	50	100	0.10
Hour	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	300	400	700	0.70
Interneck	Arrive	0.60	0.10	300	50	350	0.35
Перевк	Depart	0.60	0.20	300	100	400	0.40
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	600	150	750	0.75
DM Deals	Arrive	0.25	0.10	125	50	175	0.18
PM Peak	Depart	0.80	0.70	400	350	750	0.75
Hour	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	525	400	925	0.93

Table 3.6: HPCP Trip Rates and Demands - 1000 Spaces

### Health Precinct Car Park: 1200 Spaces (Mix of Hospital/Wider Uses)

Car Park Supply and Demand Element		Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park	Supply	600	600				1200
AM Deek	Arrive	0.50	0.70	300	420	720	0.60
Alvi Peak	Depart	0.10	0.10	60	60	120	0.10
Hour	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	360	480	840	0.70
Internet	Arrive	0.60	0.10	360	60	420	0.35
Haur	Depart	0.60	0.20	360	120	480	0.40
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	720	180	900	0.75
PM Peak Hour	Arrive	0.25	0.10	150	60	210	0.18
	Depart	0.80	0.70	480	420	900	0.75
	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	630	480	1110	0.93

Table	3.7:	HPCP	Trip	Rates	and	Demands	- 1200	Spaces

Car Park Supply and Demand Element		Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park S	ar Park Supply		700			1	1400
	Arrive	0.50	0.70	350	490	840	0.60
Hour	Depart	0.10	0.10	70	70	140	0.10
FIOUR	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	420	560	980	0.70
Internet	Arrive	0.60	0.10	420	70	490	0.35
Heur	Depart	0.60	0.20	420	140	560	0.40
Hour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	840	210	1050	0.75
PM Peak Hour	Arrive	0.25	0.10	175	70	245	0.18
	Depart	0.80	0.70	560	490	1050	0.75
	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	735	560	1295	0.93

### Table 3.8: HPCP Trip Rates and Demands - 1400 Spaces

3.4.3 The manipulation of the base v18a CAST model demands to reflect the above car park facility trip numbers has been achieved by factoring the relevant existing v18a zone.

# 4 Analysis and Assessment Overview

- 4.1 In order to understand the potential absolute and relative effects of the alternative scenarios, a wide variety of plots have been generated and analysed.
- 4.2 These include:
  - Plots of trip generation (origins and destinations) by zone as a check that the demand manipulations result in the desired zonal demands for each scenario;
  - Vehicle Flow plots (where the bandwidth is proportional to the actual volume of traffic forecast to be carried on each part of the modelled network;
  - Plots of Link Delays (refer Appendix B), showing average delays<sup>2</sup> (weighted across all turning movements) for each approach to intersections colour-coded to the CAST Level of Service (LoS) as follows:
    - LoS A-C (<30s) Green</li>
    - LoS D (30-50s) Orange
    - LoS E (50-70s) Red
    - LoS F (>70s) Black
  - Plots of differences (changes) in flows (Appendix C) and delays (Appendix D) between scenarios. Typically these are provided as differences between the Option being assessed and the relevant base model in order to provide an indication of the impact for each car park option. Increases are illustrated as red bands (with the width proportional to the change) whilst decreases are green.
  - Plots of Select Link Analysis indicating modelled routeing to specific origins and destinations (proposed car park zones); and
  - Plots for specific intersection delays/flows;
- 4.3 As agreed with CCC, it is not considered necessary to provide (and give a written interpretation) for each and every one of these plots, for the purpose of supporting the conclusions and recommendations arising from this study. Selected diagrams are included within the main text in order to illustrate the conclusions reached and the recommendations that follow. Appendices B, C and D provide a record of the recorded link delays and impacts on flows and delays for each scenario in the PM peak hour as a record of essential information that may easily be referred to. The full set of diagram are available electronically on request, for both the AM and PM peak hours.

2

Note that the link delays are average values during the peak hour for all turning movements on a given approach, and in practice will vary from cycle to cycle. There is likely to be some 'peaking within the peak' of the demands, such that delays at the height of the peak demands will be a little higher than the aggregate modelled for the whole of the peak hour.



# 5 Stage A Analysis and Assessment

# 5.1 MSF Parking Testing

- 5.1.1 Testing of three alternative parking scenarios was undertaken to establish a limit of parking numbers that could be accommodated at the MSF site. The scenarios tested are 550 spaces, as per the construction plans, and 800 space and 1,000 space scenarios to understand the viability of accommodating further parking.
- 5.1.2 As noted earlier within this report, CCC have advised that the initial testing is to be completed in the absence of signals at Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue.
- Hand Park and the second secon
- 5.1.3 The following diagrams illustrate the flows and delay-based LoS on the road network.

Figure 5.1: Directional 2028 PM Peak Vehicle Flows, MSF 550 Spaces

RELEASED





Figure 5.2: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, MSF 550 Spaces

- 5.1.4 The above LoS diagram illustrates high delays at the following locations:
  - Antigua Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue LoS F (120s or 2 minutes)
  - Selwyn Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue LoS F (80s or 1.5 minutes)
- 5.1.5 The delay occurs due to traffic heading westbound from the MSF in the PM peak hour attempting to turn right on to Moorhouse Avenue.
- 5.1.6 Due to the lane and phasing configuration at Antigua / Moorhouse, queuing right-turning traffic tends to block through-movements, thus delays caused by the right turning traffic affects through-movements also.
- 5.1.7 There are very limited options for alternative routes for westbound traffic from the MSF, being practically limited<sup>3</sup> to Antigua Street and less conveniently Selwyn Street. Some traffic may also route via Riccarton Avenue, depending on the destination of each trip and the relative delays on the alternative routes.
- 5.1.8 For the 550 space scenario, the Antigua Street southbound approach is predicted to be at capacity (100% saturated) under signal optimisation and hence the large delays.
- 5.1.9 Onder higher parking number scenarios, delays at Antigua Street southbound increase only a little to around 130s for the 1,000 spaces scenario.
- 5.1.10 Given these highly undesirable delays under all three MSF parking spaces scenarios, Council requested further investigation of the implications on these findings should signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued, as assumed in the MSF traffic modelling in 2016 and the 2016 SWA analysis.
- 5.1.11 The configuration assumed at the Stewart Street signals is as follows:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Right turns are only permitted on southbound approaches to Moorhouse Avenue at Selwyn Street and Antigua Street in the vicinity of the MSF. The next available location to the east is at Durham Street, a detour of around 1km.





Figure 5.3: Assumed Configuration of Stewart Street Moorhouse Avenue Signals

5.1.12 The following diagrams illustrates the delay-based LoS on the road network for the 550 space scenario with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals assumed.



Figure 5.4: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, MSF 550 Spaces

- 5.1.13 The provision of signals at Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue provides a 'release valve', allowing the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue to operate with reasonable network performance with delays of around 85-90 seconds (around 1.5 minutes in all three parking number scenarios).
- 5.1.14 The precise level of delay forecast at the Selwyn, Stewart and Antigua signals is dependent on the relative priorities provided to Moorhouse Avenue and the side roads. Modelling has been conducted with signal timings automatically optimised to minimise overall (total) delays to traffic through the intersections in a similar manner to the SCATS



system that adjusts signals timings in response to actual flows detected. This process affords greater priority to Moorhouse Avenue with its comparatively high traffic volumes that reflect its position as an Arterial Road at the top of the An Accessible City road hierarchy.

- 5.1.15 The modelling indicates high delays (around 2 minutes) on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue for the planned number of spaces (550) at the MSF in the absence of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in the PM peak hour for the appraisal year of 2028 (the short-term CAST model horizon year).
- 5.1.16 With the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place, the modelling indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
- 5.1.17 Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.

# 5.2 Hospital Staff Parking Building Extension Testing

# Scenario 1a - Effects of Car Park Expansion Under Existing Access Arrangements

- 5.2.1 With respect to the MSF network and demand scenarios discussed above, that taken forward as part of the base scenario for the HPPB analysis is the 550 space and no Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals scenario.
- 5.2.2 The following diagram illustrates the modelled effects on network delays of increasing the existing HSCP by 270 spaces from 408 to 678 spaces.



Figure 5.5: 2028 PM Peak Effects on Delays of HSCP +270 Spaces

5.2.3 The above diagram illustrates moderate effects (around 10 seconds or less) on delays at any specific location on the road network as a consequence of the expansion. Note



however that the modelled increase in delays of 10 seconds on the Antigua Street southbound approach is additional to the approximately 120s delays forecast in the base scenario (refer Figure 5.2 above), resulting in forecast delays of some 130 seconds at this bottleneck.

### Scenario 1b - Effects of HSCP Full RIRO Access at St Asaph Street

- 5.2.4 Presently, full access is provided to/from the HSCP from Antigua Street and right-turns out is the only form of access permitted to one-way St Asaph Street. This scenario assumes that under the HSCP expansion, access at the St Asaph Street access is modified to allow Right-In and Right-Out (RIRO) access.
- 5.2.5 The following diagram illustrates the modelled effects on network delays of this change in access strategy for the (expanded) 678 space HSCP.



Figure 5.6: 2028 PM Peak Effects on Delays of HSCP +270 Spaces

- 5.2.6 In the PM peak hour, no significant changes in delays on the road network are forecast as a result of accommodating right-turns in to the HSCP from St Asaph Street. This is understandable given that the predominant movements from the car park in the PM peak hour are outbound. The flow change plots indicate that the additional access results in around only 40 vehicles per hour being directly accessing the car park from St Asaph Street and the existing access.
- 5.2.7 In the AM peak hour, the modelling indicates that the proposed access could attract around 240 vph resulting in a more significant reduction in vehicles routing via the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection and performing the right-turn across the footpath and the Quarryman's Trail Major Cycle Route (MCR).
- 5.2.8 The associated modelled delay reductions at the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection are low at under 5 seconds in the AM peak hour. However, the access strategy is considered highly desirable in removing potential conflict as vehicles accessing the car park traverse cyclists on the MCR. Presently, the existing situation is considered



undesirable for both cyclists and motorists. In particular, vehicles attempting to turn right into the car park from St Antigua Street await a gap in the oncoming southbound vehicles on Antigua Street. It is particularly difficult for motorists to be aware of northbound cyclists approaching, effectively from the rear, on the right side of the vehicle when looking straight ahead to ascertain if it is safe to turn across oncoming vehicles (and cycles).

5.2.9 The MCR on Antigua Street only became operational in the latter half of 2018 so presently there is a limited time window for which crashes between cyclists and drivers could occur. The NZ Transport Agency's (NZTA's) Crash Analysis System (CAS) does however list one crash (ID 201820140) that occurred between a northbound cyclist and a vehicle exiting the car park at approximately 7:00 am on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2018. The vehicle failed to give way to the cyclist approaching from the left.

# Scenario 1c - Effects of HSCP St Asaph Street Full RIRO Access and Closure of Antigua Street Access

- 5.2.10 Given on-site observations and the above crash report it is highly desirable that an access option be pursued that minimises the exposure between cyclists on the MCR and conflicting vehicle movements. This sub-options considers the effects on traffic flows and delays of closing the existing vehicular access to the HSCP in the event that access were to be provided to the expanded car park via St Asaph Street, both inbound and outbound (RIRO) as per sub-option 1b.
- 5.2.11 The physically segregated cycleway on St Asaph Street is located on the south side of carriageway. Thus the cyclist safety benefits to be gained by removing potential conflict between cyclists and vehicles on the popular Antigua Street cycleway would <u>not</u> be offset by increased vehicle use of the St Asaph Street access.
- 5.2.12 The following diagrams illustrate the modelled turning movements for the expanded HSCP under the three different access scenarios (1a, 1b and 1c) for the peak hours.



Figure 5.7: Turning Flows for HSCP Options 1a, 1b and 1c, 2028 AM Peak





Figure 5.8: Turning Flows for HSCP Options 1a, 1b and 1c, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.13 The above diagrams illustrate how the modelled turning volumes at the Antigua Street and St Asaph Street accesses vary under the scenarios and also the effects on turning volumes at the intersections of Antigua Street with Tuam and St Asaph Street.
- 5.2.14 In the AM peak hour, the (two-way) vehicle volumes traversing the Antigua Street cycleway are around 500 vph for Option 1a (existing access), around 280 vph for Option 1b (with the addition of the St Asaph Street Right-turn In) and zero under option 1c (closure of Antigua St under St Asaph Street RIRO). The comparative volumes in the PM peak hour are 250 for Option 1a, 220 for Option 1b and zero for Option 1c.
- 5.2.15 Thus clearly in terms of removing the safety issue, and increasing cycle amenity, Option 1c is considerably more effective than Option 1b, particularly in the PM peak hour.
- 5.2.16 The following diagrams illustrate the modelled effects on vehicle flows of Option 1c relative to Option 1a for the peak hours.



Figure 5.9: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Traffic Flows vs Option 1a, 2028 AM Peak





Figure 5.10: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Traffic Flows vs Option 1a, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.17 As might be anticipated, the modelled effect on traffic volumes is greater in the AM peak when the inbound movement predominates. Impacts on traffic volumes in the more critical PM peak hour (in terms of network congestion) are more modest.
- 5.2.18 The following diagrams illustrate the modelled effects on delays around the network of Option 1c relative to Option 1a for the peak hours.



Figure 5.11: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Delays vs Option 1a, 2028 AM Peak





Figure 5.12: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Delays vs Option 1a, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.19 Overall, the above diagrams indicate net localised improvements in network operation under the assumed closure of the Antigua Street vehicular access to the car park.
- 5.2.20 The small increase in delay indicated on Antigua Street northbound to Tuam Street (around 10s) is largely a consequence of re-routing of vehicles destined for the HSCP away from Antigua Street (on to Montreal Street). This reduces traffic volumes and associated delays on Antigua Street northbound approaching the St Asaph Street intersection, which in-turn makes the corridor more attractive for general traffic (not bound for the HSCP) which leads to the small increase on modelled delays approaching Tuam Street.
- 5.2.21 In summary, the option of closing the Antigua Street access to the HSCP under inbound and outbound access being provided from St Asaph Street has potential to significantly improve cyclist safety and amenity without any significant impact on road network efficiency.

2ELEASE



# 6 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 6.1 The principal conclusions and recommendations arising from this Stage A traffic modelling study are as follows:
  - a. The assumption that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection will not be pursued as part of the MSF access strategy results in high levels of congestion (around 2 minutes) being forecast on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue in the PM peak hour for the number of parking spaces to be constructed (around 550 spaces).
  - b. The incremental delay impacts of assuming additional parking at the MSF (beyond the consented 550 spaces) are relatively modest. However, it is not recommended that any further parking be provided at the MSF in the absence of signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue as this will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue.
  - c. Sensitivity testing with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place, the modelling indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
  - d. Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.
  - e. Generally, the modelled network effects of expansion of the existing HSCP by 270 spaces are modest. However, modelling indicates that the expansion will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue (with delays increasing by around 10s from around 2 minutes).
  - f. Whilst the network efficiency effects of the proposed HSCP expansion are modest, the increased vehicular movements to/from the building across the Antigua Street cycleway would exacerbate an existing safety issue at this location.
  - g. Provision of an additional egress from the expanded HSCP to St Asaph Street (in addition to the current egress) would only partially mitigate the safety (and cycle amenity) impacts of the expansion. This is because the Antigua Street access would likely remain popular for inbound vehicle movements during the morning peak hour.
  - Under the option to provide both access and egress from St Asaph Street, traffic modelling indicates that closure of the existing access/egress on Antigua Street could be accommodated without any significant net local network efficiency impacts.
    - The option of, effectively, relocation all vehicle access to the HSCP away from Antigua Street and on to St Asaph Street would be highly effective in improving safety for cyclists as the St Asaph Street vehicular access would not involve traversing a cycleway (the cycleway at this location is located on the south side of St Asaph Street).



RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

.



# REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFHICIALINFORMATIONACT



RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT







Scenario 1a

































Identifying Parking Building Scenarios to be Modelled

31<sup>th</sup> July 2019














Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays



# REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFFICIALINFORMATIONACT



Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix B – Modelled Approach Delays

PERFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays



HPPB Stage A Ap B - Approach Delays.Docx

QTP Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019

Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays



HPPB Stage A Ap B - Approach Delays.Docx

Page 2 of 4

QTP Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019



Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays



HPPB Stage A Ap B - Approach Delays.Docx

QTP Ref: 2019-023 © QTP Ltd 2019



Appendix B - Modelled Approach Delays

REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix C – Modelled Flow Differences



# RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix C – Modelled Flow Differences

REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



Appendix C - Modelled Flow Differences





Appendix C - Modelled Flow Differences



HPPB Stage A Ap C - Flow Differences.Docx

Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix D – Modelled Delay Differences



# REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFICIALINFORMATIONACT

AQTP

Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix D – Modelled Delay Differences

REFERSEDUMPERTILEOFFICIALINGORMATIONACT



Appendix D - Modelled Delay Differences





Appendix D - Modelled Delay Differences



HPPB Stage A Ap D - Delay Differences.Docx

Kathleen Smitheran	
From:	9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>
Sent:	Wednesday, 11 September 2019 12:31 p.m.
То:	Tim Lester
Cc:	9(2)(a)
Subject:	FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final
	Report

303

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which I sent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that QTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

### So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite 9(2)(a)
   from QTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and QTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

## QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

- Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.
- 2. The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):
  - p. "Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have potential for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
    - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces

- Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
- Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces
- q. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.
- r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

# Report available here:

(2)(b)(ii

9(2)(a)

So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to hearing from you so we can take this to the next stage? FFICIAL



www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

# From:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

Cc:

Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m.

To: 'Tim Lester' <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>

@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim - I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group – here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site – which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group – but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated to 9(2)(a) that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better - but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

PS - please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached - most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days - returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this, ORMATIONAC leaves us later next week if that's of help?

(2)(a)				
Transport A (2)(a)	sset Planning	g Team – (	City Services	
	27.07			
(Normal off	lice hours: Mo	ondays to	Thursdays)	

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz 25-1-F-ASEDUMDE \*\*\*\* \*\*\*

IONA

### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	Tim Lester
Sent:	Wednesday, 11 September 2019 4:39 p.m.
To:	Brad Cabell; Mike Wheeler
Subject:	FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final
	Report

For internal discussion- not for further distribution at this stage pls

# Tim Lester

Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>,

From <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz] Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 12:31 p.m. To: Tim Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz> Cc:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which Lsent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that QTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

### So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite 9(2)(a) from QTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group
  reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and QTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

- Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.
- The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):
  - p. "Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have potential for reasonable network performance and minimal impact: MATION
    - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces
  - q. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.
  - r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

# Report available here:

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(a)

So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to hearing from you so we can take this to the next stage?

Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

9(2)(a) From

Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m. To: 'Tim Lester' <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>

ə(2)(a) Cc:

@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim - I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group - here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site - which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group - but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated to 9(2)(a) that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better - but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work - and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS - please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached - most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations (s based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days - returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help? FFICIP

|--|

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From: Sent: To: Subject: **Tim Lester** Wednesday, 11 September 2019 4:48 p.m. Brad Cabell; Mike Wheeler RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report MATIONAC

Extract from clause 1.5

- g. Generally, the modelled network effects of expansion of the existing HSCP by 270 spaces are modest.
- h. Whilst the network efficiency effects of the proposed HSCP expansion are modest, the increased vehicular movements to/from the building across the Antigua Street cycleway would exacerbate an existing safety issue at this location.
- i. Provision of an additional egress from the expanded HSCP to St Asaph Street (in/ addition to the current egress) would only partially mitigate the safety (and cycle amenity) impacts of the expansion. This is because the Antigua Street access would likely remain popular for inbound vehicle movements during the morning peak hour,
- j. Under the option to provide both access and egress from St Asaph Street, traffic modelling indicates that closure of the existing access/egress on Antigua Street could be accommodated without any significant net local network efficiency impacts.
- k. The option of, effectively, relocation all vehicle access to the HSCP away from Antigua Street and on to St Asaph Street would be highly effective in improving safety for cyclists as the St Asaph Street vehicular access would not involve traversing a cycleway (the cycleway at this location is located on the south side of St Asaph

**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

9(2)(a) T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) M E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 4:39 p.m.

To: Brad Cabell <Brad.Cabell@cdhb.health.nz>; Mike Wheeler <Mike.Wheeler@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

For internal discussion- not for further distribution at this stage pls

**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

9(2)(a) From:

@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 12:31 p.m. To: Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

### @ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which I sent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that QTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

### So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
   <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> from QTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> at QTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

- Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.
- 2. The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):
  - p. "Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have potential for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
    - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces

r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

# Report available here:

FFICIAL MATION (2)(b)(ii) So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to hearing from you so we can take this to the next stage? 9(2)(a) Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a) www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays) 9(2)(a) From: Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m. To: 'Tim Lester' <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz> @ccc.govt.nz> Cc: Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim – I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group - here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site - which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group - but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated to 9(2)(a)that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better - but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work - and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS - please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached - most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days - returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?



\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council, If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council RELEASED

http://www.ccc.govt.nz \*\*\*\* 10NAC

200

### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Tim Lester Wednesday, 11 September 2019 5:14 p.m.

: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Im

RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

	9(2)(a)	
	J(Z)(u)	
ы		

Thanks for your email

A couple of disappointing developments since we last spoke:

- The judicial review Miles brought against the Crown found largely in favour of Miles (meaning the Crown cannot enforce its agreement against Miles at this time- in turn the Miles North parcel is not available to CDHB); and
- Subsequent advice has been received in respect of the proposed 2 floor extension to the existing staff carpark- apparently the building requires additional engineering that means that the costs may now be prohibitive.

The QTP report proposes a number of carpark options. All (except a 2 floor extension of the existing staff carpark) require acquisition of third party land that, short of a compulsory acquisition, is not likely available to us.

b)(ii)	
Difficult to know where we can go from here	
Happy for you to circulate the report and Lcan organise the next meeting	
Kind regards	
Tim Lester	
Corporate Solicitor	
Canterbury District Health Board	
T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128)   M <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz	
Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch   PO Box 1600   Christchurch   www.cdhb.govt.nz.	
9(2)(a)	
@ccc.govt.nz]	
Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 12:31 p.m.	
To: Tim Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz></tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>	
@ccc.govt.nz>	
Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report	

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which I sent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the

consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that QTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

### So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
   <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> from QTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and QTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

- Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.
- 2. The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):
  - p. "Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have potential for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
    - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces

This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.

r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

## Report available here:

(2)(b)(ii)

So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to hearing from you so we can take this to the next stage?

9(2)(a)		
9(2)(a)		
Transport Asset Planning Team 9(2)(a)	ı – City Services	
www.ccc.govt.nz		
(Normal office hours: Mondays	to Thursdays)	

From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m. To: 'Tim Lester' <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Cc:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim - I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group — here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site — which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group — but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself. Thad indicated to <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group – and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better – but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work – and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS – please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached – most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days – returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?

3

9	(2	)(	а	)	

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a) MATIONA

### www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

## \*\*\*\*\*

.

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended

### **Kathleen Smitheram**

9(2)(a)
@ccc.govt.nz>
Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:07 a.m.
Tim Lester
RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final
Report

Morning Tim – yes, that is disappointing as it narrows our options considerably as you say.

That said, I think it's still worth exploring with Otakaro Ltd the potential for more parking on the Metro Sports site, which looks a possible way forward if we could address the Stewart Street / Moorhouse issue (not out of the question in my view). The QTP modelling of course is simply indicating that access to Tuam and St Asaph Street looks to enable new parking east of your staff building to work better. So, is a building sited to the south of the block, but with a vehicle laneway access north to Tuam a possibility? That's pretty much how the parking building in the SALT precinct works - ie it's accessed via a new laneway (Nurseryman Lane). Maybe you could then "reverse engineer" the order there - create the new building first and then re-develop the staff building as a Phase B?

So, I suggest I distribute the QTP report without too much commentary (other than their own summary of key findings) - and indicate you will follow up with some optional meeting dates? Think it not worth inviting QTP to attend that next meeting, given that we have some fundamental issues to grapple with?

All that said, very happy to catch up with you if that is of any use on possible ways forward, as I remain keen to help in any way we can to unlock this.

9(2)(a)	
	A
Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services	
9(2)(a)	
www.ccc.govt.nz	
(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)	

From: Tim Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz> Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 5:14 p.m. To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> @ccc.govt.nz> Cc<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

9(2)(a) H

# Thanks for your email

A couple of disappointing developments since we last spoke:

- The judicial review Miles brought against the Crown found largely in favour of Miles (meaning the Crown cannot enforce its agreement against Miles at this time- in turn the Miles North parcel is not available to CDHB); and
- Subsequent advice has been received in respect of the proposed 2 floor extension to the existing staff carpark- apparently the building requires additional engineering that means that the costs may now be prohibitive.

ATIONAC

The QTP report proposes a number of carpark options. All (except a 2 floor extension of the existing staff carpark) require acquisition of third party land that, short of a compulsory acquisition, is not likely available to us.

In my mind the most feasible option would be extending the existing staff carpark east along St Asaph frontage over Medcar land to Miles south. I cannot see potential for further extension north over Medcar to Tuam Street as modelled.

Difficult to know where we can go from here ...

Happy for you to circulate the report and I can organise the next meeting

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>

From <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 12:31	p.m.
To: Tim Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz></tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>	1997 - 1999 1
Cc: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	c.govt.nz>

Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which I sent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that QTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
   <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> from QTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group
  reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> QTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical

Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18th, 19th), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

- Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.
- The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):
  - p. "Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have potential for reasonable network performance and minimal impact;

FORMA

- Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
- Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
- Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces
- q. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.
- r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

# **Report available here:**

So, plenty to discuss – and I look forward to hearing from you so we can take this to the next stage?

9(2)(a)

9(2)(a)

(2)(b)(ii)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

Cc:

Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m.

To: 'Tim Lester' <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz> 9(2)(a)

@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim - I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group – here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site – which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group – but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated to (2)(a) that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better – but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work – and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS – please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached – most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days – returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?

\*\*\*\*

9(2)(a)	
9(2)(a)	
Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)	Z
www.ccc.govt.nz	

(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFTICIALINGORMATIONACT http://www.ccc.govt.nz \*\*\*\*\*

 From:
 Tim Lester

 Sent:
 Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:20 a.m.

 To:
 Mike Wheeler

 Subject:
 FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

fyi

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: 027 8994468| E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.az

From: Tim Lester

Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 5:14 p.m.

To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
@ccc.govt.nz>
Cc:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

9(2)(a)

Thanks for your email

A couple of disappointing developments since we last spoke:

- The judicial review Miles brought against the Crown found largely in favour of Miles (meaning the Crown cannot enforce its agreement against Miles at this time- in turn the Miles North parcel is not available to CDHB); and
- Subsequent advice has been received in respect of the proposed 2 floor extension to the existing staff carpark- apparently the building requires additional engineering that means that the costs may now be prohibitive.

The QTP report proposes a number of carpark options. All (except a 2 floor extension of the existing staff carpark) require acquisition of third party land that, short of a compulsory acquisition, is not likely available to us.

In my mind the most feasible option would be extending the existing staff carpark east along St Asaph frontage over Medcar land to Miles south. I cannot see potential for further extension north over Medcar to Tuam Street as modelled.

Difficult to know where we can go from here ...

Happy for you to circulate the report and I can organise the next meeting

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>. FION AC
From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]	
Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 :	12:31 p.m.	
To: Tim Lester <tim.lester@cdhb.healt< td=""><td><u>h.nz</u>&gt;</td><td></td></tim.lester@cdhb.healt<>	<u>h.nz</u> >	
Cc: 9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz>	
Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Ne	eeds and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report	

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which I sent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that OTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

#### So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite 9(2)(a) from QTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and OCTO at QTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

#### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

- Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.
- 2. The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):
- 2

"Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street Intersection), the following options have **potential** for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:

- Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
- Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
- Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces

NP P

- Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
- Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces
- a. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.
- r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

#### **Report available here:**

ext sta official-information So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to hearing from you so we can take this to the next stage?

9(2)(a)

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

## From:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

Cc:

Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m.

To: 'Tim Lester' <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.pz>

@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim - I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group - here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site - which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group - but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated  $tc^{9(2)(a)}$ that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better - but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work - and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS – please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached – most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days – returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?

9(2	
24	9(2)(a)
	Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services
	9(2)(a)
	www.ccc.govt.nz
	(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)
	******
	This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
	The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender
	and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.
	If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the
	sender and delete.
	http://www.ccc.govt.nz
	*********
	▼

FION AC

#### **Kathleen Smitheram**

From:	Tim Lester
Sent:	Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:22 a.m.
To:	Mike Wheeler
Subject:	FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final
	Report



**Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board** 

)(2)(a) T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.n

#### 9(2)(a) From:

@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:07 a.m.

To: Tim Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz>

Subject: RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Morning Tim – yes, that is disappointing as it narrows our options considerably as you say.

That said, I think it's still worth exploring with Otakaro Ltd the potential for more parking on the Metro Sports site, which looks a possible way forward if we could address the Stewart Street / Moorhouse issue (not out of the question in my view). The QTP modelling of course is simply indicating that access to Tuam and St Asaph Street looks to enable new parking east of your staff building to work better. So, is a building sited to the south of the block, but with a vehicle laneway access north to Tuam a possibility? That's pretty much how the parking building in the SALT precinct works - ie it's accessed via a new laneway (Nurseryman Lane). Maybe you could then "reverse engineer" the order there – create the new building first and then re-develop the staff building as a Phase B?

So, I suggest I distribute the QTP report without too much commentary (other than their own summary of key findings) – and indicate you will follow up with some optional meeting dates? I think it not worth inviting QTP to attend that next meeting, given that we have some fundamental issues to grapple with?

All that said, very happy to catch up with you if that is of any use on possible ways forward, as I remain keen to help in any way we can to unlock this.

9(2)(a)

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 5:14 p.m. (2)(a) To: @ccc.govt.nz> @ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

9(2)(a)

9(2)(b)(ii)

Thanks for your email

A couple of disappointing developments since we last spoke:

- The judicial review Miles brought against the Crown found largely in favour of Miles (meaning the Crown cannot enforce its agreement against Miles at this time- in turn the Miles North parcel is not available to CDHB); and
- Subsequent advice has been received in respect of the proposed 2 floor extension to the existing staff carpark- apparently the building requires additional engineering that means that the costs may now be prohibitive.

The QTP report proposes a number of carpark options. All (except a 2 floor extension of the existing staff carpark) require acquisition of third party land that, short of a compulsory acquisition, is not likely available to us.

Difficult to	know where we	can go from	here
Difficult to	KIIOW WHELE WE	can go nom	nerem

Happy for you to circulate the report and I can organise the next meeting

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: 9(2)(a) E: tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

From <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 11 Septemb	er 2019 12:31 p.m.
To: Tim Lester < Tim.Lester@co	hb.health.nz>
Cc: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>	@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Health Precinct P	arking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which I sent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that QTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

#### So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
   9(2)(a) from QTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and Tim Wright at QTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

#### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

- Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.
- The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):
  - p. "Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have potential for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
    - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces
  - q. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPRB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.
  - r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

3

#### Report available here:

9(2)(b)(ii)

So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to hearing from you so we can take this to the next stage?

9(2)(a)

9(2)(a)

328

#### Transport Asset Planning Team - City Services

9(2)(a)

<u>www.ccc.govt.nz</u> (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

From: <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m.
To: 'Tim Lester' <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>
Cc:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim - I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group – here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site – which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group – but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated to (2(a)) that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, Ym happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group – and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better – but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work – and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS – please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached – most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days – returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?

9(2)(a)	~	
Transport Asset Pl 9(2)(a)	anning Team – City Services	
www.ccc.povt.nz		

(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council <u>http://www.ccc.govt.nz</u>

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*\*\*\*

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL ME The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council.

ATIONAC

#### Kathleen Smitheram

From:	9(2)(a) @ccc.govt.nz>
Sent:	Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:40 a.m.
То:	Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester; 9(2)(a) Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
Subject:	Health Precinct Parking Technical Group - Health Precinct Parking Study - Network Impacts Analysis

Dear Parking Technical Group members – I'm pleased to say we have now received QTP's (the traffic consultancy) largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work). A link to that is at the end of this note (*it's a very large file size*).

As we requested in their brief, the report explores how a number of alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work in overall traffic network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), what they see as the highlights of the report – and the options they believe offer the best network outcomes (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

I have spoken with Tim, who will seek a suitable time for us to meet as a group in the next few weeks, when we can discuss these findings and how we might move forward.

#### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access (the staff parking building) and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d.

#### Report available here:

9(2)(b)(ii)

So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to discussing the report's findings with you in the coming weeks.



(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

\*\*\*

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz \*\*\*\*\*

#### Kathleen Smitheram

From: Sent: To: Subject: Mike Wheeler Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:44 a.m. Tim Lester RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Thanks Tim,

Are you comfortable that the Carpark Extension planning group pick the relevant information out this that is pertinent to our specific project.

I'll highlight the confidentiality of the information.

9(2)(a) has already highlighted that he has been privy to some of the information due to informal discussions with the CCC on the subject.

Regards Mike

From: Tim Lester Sent: Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:22 a.m. To: Mike Wheeler <Mike.Wheeler@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

And <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> response...

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) [ M <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>

@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:07 a.m.

To: Tim Lester <<u>Tim/Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

Subject: RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Morning Tim yes, that is disappointing as it narrows our options considerably as you say.

That said, I think it's still worth exploring with Otakaro Ltd the potential for more parking on the Metro Sports site, which looks a possible way forward if we could address the Stewart Street / Moorhouse issue (not out of the question in my view). The QTP modelling of course is simply indicating that access to Tuam and St Asaph Street looks to enable new parking east of your staff building to work better. So, is a building sited to the south of the block, but with a vehicle laneway access north to Tuam a possibility? That's pretty much how the parking building in the SALT precinct works – ie it's accessed via a new laneway (Nurseryman Lane). Maybe you could then "reverse engineer" the order there – create the new building first and then re-develop the staff building as a Phase B?

So, I suggest I distribute the QTP report without too much commentary (other than their own summary of key findings) – and indicate you will follow up with some optional meeting dates? I think it not worth inviting QTP to attend that next meeting, given that we have some fundamental issues to grapple with?

All that said, very happy to catch up with you if that is of any use on possible ways forward, as I remain keen to help in any way we can to unlock this.



From: Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>
Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 5:14 p.m.
To<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
@ccc.govt.nz>
Cc:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

9	(2)	(a)	

2)(b)(ii)

Thanks for your email

A couple of disappointing developments since we last spoke:

- The judicial review Miles brought against the Crown found largely in favour of Miles (meaning the Crown cannot enforce its agreement against Miles at this time- in turn the Miles North parcel is not available to CDHB); and
- Subsequent advice has been received in respect of the proposed 2 floor extension to the existing staff carpark- apparently the building requires additional engineering that means that the costs may now be prohibitive.

The QTP report proposes a number of carpark options. All (except a 2 floor extension of the existing staff carpark) require acquisition of third party land that, short of a compulsory acquisition, is not likely available to us.

Difficult to know where we can go from here ...

Happy for you to circulate the report and I can organise the next meeting

Kind regards

Tim Lester

Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: 9(2)(a)

@ccc.govt.nz]

Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 12:31 p.m. To: Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>> ATIONA

#### @ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which I sent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that QTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

#### So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite <sup>9(2)(a)</sup>
   <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> from QTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> and at QTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

#### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

- Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.
- 2. The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):
  - p. "Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have potential for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
    - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces

- g. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.
- r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

#### Report available here:

9(2)(6)(6)	_
So, plenty to discuss – and I look forward to hearing fror	n you so we can take this to the next stage?
2)(a)	
9(2)(a)	
Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)	
	R.
www.ccc.govi.nz	
(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)	CIT
9(2)(a)	
Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m.	
To: 'Tim Lester' <tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz></tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz>	
Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Imp	acts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim – I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group - here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site – which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group - but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated  $tc^{9(2)(a)}$ that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group – and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better – but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work – and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS – please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached – most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough piece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days – returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?

9(2)(a)		
Transport Asset Pla	nning Team – City Services	

(Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

\*\*\*\*\* This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz \*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz FIFASE

CNA

338

TIONA

#### Kathleen Smitheram

From: Sent: To: Subject: Tim Lester Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:44 a.m. Mike Wheeler RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Yes, that's fine Mike. Makes sense that we all have the benefit of the same information

Cheers

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M:<sup>9(2)(a)</sup> E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>

From: Mike Wheeler Sent: Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:44 a.m. To: Tim Lester <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz> Subject: RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Thanks Tim,

Are you comfortable that the Carpark Extension planning group pick the relevant information out this that is pertinent to our specific project.

I'll highlight the confidentiality of the information.

9(2)(a) has already highlighted that he has been privy to some of the information due to informal discussions with the CCC on the subject.

Regards Mike

From: Tim Lester Sent: Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:22 a.m. To: Mike Wheeler <u>Mike.Wheeler@cdhb.health.nz</u>> Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

esponse... And

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: E: <u>tim.lester@cdhb.health.nz</u> Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

From: Sent: Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:07 a.m.

@ccc.govt.nz]

Subject: RE: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Morning Tim – yes, that is disappointing as it narrows our options considerably as you say.

That said, I think it's still worth exploring with Otakaro Ltd the potential for more parking on the Metro Sports site, which looks a possible way forward if we could address the Stewart Street / Moorhouse issue (not out of the question in my view). The QTP modelling of course is simply indicating that access to Tuam and St Asaph Street looks to enable new parking east of your staff building to work better. So, is a building sited to the south of the block, but with a vehicle laneway access north to Tuam a possibility? That's pretty much how the parking building in the SALT precinct works – ie it's accessed via a new laneway (Nurseryman Lane). Maybe you could then "reverse engineer" the order there – create the new building first and then re-develop the staff building as a Phase B?

So, I suggest I distribute the QTP report without too much commentary (other than their own summary of key findings) – and indicate you will follow up with some optional meeting dates? I think it not worth inviting QTP to attend that next meeting, given that we have some fundamental issues to grapple with?

All that said, very happy to catch up with you if that is of any use on possible ways forward, as I remain keen to help in any way we can to unlock this.

2)(a)	
ransport Asset Planning 7 )(a)	Feam – City Services
ww.ccc.govt.nz	
Normal office hours: Mon	days to Thursdays)
rom: Tim Lester < <u>Tim.Les</u>	ter@cdhb.health.nz>
ent: Wednesday, 11 Sept	ember 2019 5:14 p.m.
9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz>
-9(2)(a)	@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Health Precin	ct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report
doject. Kc. Health Prech	et Parking seeds and retwork impacts Analysis - Draft Pinar Report

Thanks for your email

A couple of disappointing developments since we last spoke:

 The judicial review Miles brought against the Crown found largely in favour of Miles (meaning the Crown cannot enforce its agreement against Miles at this time- in turn the Miles North parcel is not available to CDHB); and

2. Subsequent advice has been received in respect of the proposed 2 floor extension to the existing staff carpark- apparently the building requires additional engineering that means that the costs may now be

prohibitive.

The QTP report proposes a number of carpark options. All (except a 2 floor extension of the existing staff carpark) require acquisition of third party land that, short of a compulsory acquisition, is not likely available to us.

In my mind the most feasible option would be extending the existing staff carpark east along St Asaph frontage over Medcar land to Miles south. I cannot see potential for further extension north over Medcar to Tuam Street as modelled.

Difficult to know where we can go from here ...

Happy for you to circulate the report and I can organise the next meeting

Kind regards

*Tim Lester* Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: Level 1, 32 Oxford Terrace, Christchurch | PO Box 1600 | Christchurch | <u>www.cdhb.govt.nz</u>.

 From:
 @ccc.govt.nz]

 Sent: Wednesday, 11 September 2019 12:31 p.m.

 To: Tim Lester <<u>Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz</u>>

 Cc:
 @ccc.govt.nz

Subject: FW: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Draft Final Report

Dear Tim – I'm pleased to say I now have a copy of QTP's largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work), and a link to that is at the end of this note (a very large file size).

It picks up from the earlier Stage A conclusions which I sent you a week or two back (below) – and goes on to explore which of a dozen or so alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work best in overall network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex piece of "optioneering" work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), the highlights and which options they would suggest the Technical Group might like to focus on in moving forward (ie Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

My own impression is that there don't appear to be any huge surprises in these findings, as they are broadly consistent with the earlier 2016 study work – and largely as we have ranged over at our recent Parking Technical Group discussions. What's different from the earlier 2016 work of course, is that QTP have re-visited the concept of extra parking possibly located at the MSF site (largely dependent seemingly on Stewart/ Moorhouse signalisation), and of course have removed from the new analyses further consideration of any significant parking supply of any kind on the old "Blue Building" site.

So, I'd suggest the following way forward from here with your agreement:

- I distribute the attached full report, with QTP's summary highlights, to the Parking Technical Group members;
- You suggest a date(s) for the Parking Technical Group to reconvene to discuss that, when we invite 9(2)(a) from OTP to attend (its in their commission), in order to summarise their work, key findings and take questions;
- We discuss as a Group the next steps from there and how we best distil the key findings in our Group
  reporting.

I also need to let you know that I'm overseas from the first week of October until mid-November, and <sup>9(2)(a)</sup> OTP is similarly away for a few weeks from the end of this month. So, our suggestion is that maybe a Technical Group is convened later next week (Wed / Thu 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>), or a suitable day the following week, for maybe 1-2 hours so we can discuss what's attached?

#### QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

 Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. It will be evident from this that, not surprisingly, the bottlenecks we've previously discussed (Antigua and Selwyn SB to Mhouse) result in 'significant' (wider network) impacts for all scenarios.

1017

#### 2. The final three paragraphs of the Executive Summary (p to r):

- p. "Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have potential for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
  - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
  - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
  - Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
  - Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
  - Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
  - Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
  - Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces
- q. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.
- r. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d."

#### **Report available here:**

So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to hearing from you so we can take this to the next stage?

9(2)(a)

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)

www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

9(2)(a)

Sent: Wednesday, 28 August 2019 3:33 p.m. To: 'Tim Lester' <Tim.Lester@cdhb.health.nz> Cc: 02(a) @ccc.g

@ccc.govt.nz>

Subject: Health Precinct Parking Needs and Network Impacts Analysis - Stage A report from QTP (Traffic Consultants)

Hello Tim - I hope all is well with you?

Before I share more widely with the full Parking Technical Group – here is QTP's draft report into Stage A of the work (ie with a focus on the CDHB staff building extension). They have also explored the potential impacts of adding more parking to the Metro Sports site – which looks to hinge on a necessary signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue. That's really a matter for the full group – but seems to suggest that providing that intersection is signalised, some more parking supply on the MSF site (ie beyond the planned 550 spaces) does look possible.

So, focussing on the staff building extension itself, I had indicated to Andrew Willis that we would seek to get this explored early in network impact terms to help his work for you on that. So, I'm happy for you to share extracts from the attached with him if you wish? The wider content remains confidential of course to our Technical Group – and so you may wish to ask him for a non-disclosure agreement with you before you share more than extracts directly pertaining to his work for you? On the staff building extension, it basically concludes that attempts to focus more entry / exit movements to St Asaph Street in the building re-design will work better – but mainly because of improved safety at the Antigua Street cycleway. The network capacity impacts are seemingly limited.

QTP are already moving on to complete Part B of the study work – and I'm expecting I'll have a similar draft of that in the next week or so. That may be a good time to re-convene the Technical Working Group to consider their full findings? I've asked QTP to be ready to brief the Group direct, and they are happy to do so.

PS – please don't worry too much about the technical detail in the attached – most of what you need is in the Executive Summary and conclusions. I think it does show however that this has been a very thorough plece of work so we can be reasonably confident that our reporting back to our organisations is based on some good science.

So you know, I'm away for a few days – returning next Tuesday. Very happy to call over and chat about where this leaves us later next week if that's of help?

#### 9(2)(a)

Transport Asset Planning Team – City Services 9(2)(a)

<u>www.ccc.govt.nz</u> (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. Christchurch City Council <u>http://www.ccc.govt.nz</u>



# Health Precinct Parking Buildings

# **Network Impact Analysis**

August 2019

343



REFERSEDUMPERTIFICOPHICIALINFORMATIONACT

#### **Document Issue Record**

Version No	Prepared By	Description	Date
00b	Tim Wright	First issue.	29 August 2019
			Ć
			4
			<u> </u>
		21	
Documer	nt Verification		

### **Document Verification**

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Preparation	Tim Wright	JO CM	28 August 2019
Reviewer	John Falconer	Offin Sterre	29 August 2019
Approval	Tim Wright	~ in wh	29 August 2019

RELEASED



RELEASED WORR THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT This page is intentionally blank for double-sided printing.



#### Contents

1	Executive Summary	.1
2	Introduction	.4
2.10	Study Stage A	. 6
2.11	Study Stage B	. 6
3	Modelling Methodology	.7
3.1	Overview of Study Method	.7
3.2	Networks	. 8
3.3	Traffic Demands	10
3.4	Parking Demands	11
4	Analysis and Assessment Overview	14
5	Stage A Analysis and Assessment	15
5.1	MSF Parking Testing	15
5.2	Hospital Staff Parking Building Extension Testing	20
6	Stage B Analysis and Assessment (New Parking Building)	26
6.1	Common Assumptions	26
6.2	Base Scenario	26
6.3	Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2a	27
6.4	Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2b	29
6.5	Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2c2	29
6.6	Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2d2	29
6.7	Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2e	30
6.8	Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2f	31
6.9	Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2g	31
6.10	Eastern New Parking Building Testing: Option 3a	31
6.11	Eastern New Parking Building Testing: Option 3b	32
6.12	Eastern New Parking Building Testing: Option 3c	33
6.13	Eastern New Parking Building Testing: Option 3d	34
6.14	Modelling Summary	35
7	Conclusions and Recommendations	38

#### **Appendices**

- Appendix A Parking Scenario Diagrams
- Appendix B Modelled Approach Delays
- Appendix C Modelled Flow Differences
- Appendix D Modelled Delay Differences



REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFICIALINGORMATIONACT This page is intentionally blank for double-sided printing.



#### **1 Executive Summary**

- 1.1 This report describes the analysis undertaken on behalf of Christchurch City Council (**CCC**) to assess the network impacts of a number of alternative options for increasing the provision of parking to serve the Health Precinct within the Central City. It builds on, and includes, the Stage A analysis previously reported<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.2 In 2016, QTP were jointly appointed by CCC and Development Christchurch Limited (**DCL**) to undertake analysis (the **2016 SWQ Analysis**) of key new parking facility options being considered by DCL. The analysis involved application of Council's Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic model (**CAST**) to inform the assessment of the effects of the alternative options on the operation of the road network.
- 1.3 In essence, the purpose of this commission is to re-assess the parking options in the light of a number of development decisions and changes to parking supply options that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The implications of the decision to not now replace the former Hospital public parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua Street;
  - Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550 parking spaces to a larger parking supply. The analysis will specifically test the impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF);
  - The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital Staff Car Park (**HSCP**), located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street, by some two floors and with an expected 270 additional spaces;
- 1.4 In addition, there are two further factors that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis assumed signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection for a scenario with 620 spaces at the MSF. This assumption was informed by the supporting transport modelling analysis for the MSF which indicated such an upgrade would be required to maintain efficient network operation for parking levels in excess of 550 spaces. For this study, CCC have advised that the Stewart Street / Moorhouse signals are not to be assumed for the bulk of the analysis of the impact of the Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) options.
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis was undertaken using the then-current version of CAST (v16a). Since that time, CAST has recently been updated (v18a completed in early 2019) with revised assumptions from CCC around the level of employment and residents that have an associated increase in traffic within the Central City in future years.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Refer "Health Precinct Parking Buildings Network Analysis Stage A" dated 22 August 2019 (version 02a).



- 1.5 The principal conclusions and recommendations arising from the Stage A analysis of the potential effects of extension to the (existing) HSCP are as follows:
  - a. The assumption that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection will not be pursued as part of the MSF access strategy results in high levels of congestion (approaching 2 minutes) being forecast on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue in the PM peak hour for the number of parking spaces to be constructed (around 550 spaces).
  - b. Sensitivity testing around the complexities of the vehicle / pedestrian / and cyclist interactions on the Antigua Street southbound approach indicates delays could be greater still at around 2.5 minutes.
  - c. Further sensitivity testing around the relative priorities, in terms of green time, to be afforded to Antigua Street and Moorhouse Avenue indicate that delays could be reduced on the Antigua Street approach from around 2.5 minutes to less than 2 minutes. However, this is at the cost of increasing overall intersection delays (that the automated signal optimisation seeks to achieve) by modestly increasing delays on the relatively highly trafficked Moorhouse Avenue corridor which also 'pushes' some traffic from Moorhouse Avenue onto alternative routes within the Central City.
  - d. The incremental delay impacts of assuming additional parking at the MSF (beyond the consented 550 spaces) are relatively modest. However, it is not recommended that any further parking be provided at the MSF in the absence of signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue as this will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue.
  - e. Sensitivity testing with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
  - f. Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.
  - g. Generally, the modelled network effects of expansion of the existing HSCP by 270 spaces are modest.
  - h. Whilst the network efficiency effects of the proposed HSCP expansion are modest, the increased vehicular movements to/from the building across the Antigua Street cycleway would exacerbate an existing safety issue at this location.
  - Provision of an additional egress from the expanded HSCP to St Asaph Street (in addition to the current egress) would only partially mitigate the safety (and cycle amenity) impacts of the expansion. This is because the Antigua Street access would likely remain popular for inbound vehicle movements during the morning peak hour.
  - j. Under the option to provide both access and egress from St Asaph Street, traffic modelling indicates that closure of the existing access/egress on Antigua Street could be accommodated without any significant net local network efficiency impacts.
  - k. The option of, effectively, relocation all vehicle access to the HSCP away from Antigua Street and on to St Asaph Street would be highly effective in improving safety for cyclists as the St Asaph Street vehicular access would not involve traversing a cycleway (the cycleway at this location is located on the south side of St Asaph



Street).

- 1.6 The principal conclusions and recommendations arising from the Stage B analysis of the network effects of the alternative options for the new HPPB are as follows.
  - I. All HPPB scenarios result in significant additional delays (>5s) at the two key bottlenecks (the Antigua Street and Selwyn Street approaches to Moorhouse Avenue) operating at LoS F.
  - M. All HPPB scenarios result in significant additional delays (>10s) on Riccarton Avenue westbound. These delays become around 1 minute (LoS E)<sup>2</sup> for most HPPB options at around 1200 parking spaces.
  - n. Under all parking building scenarios with access at Antigua Street maintained, poor performance of the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection is forecast (LoS E or F). Most Western HPPB locations are forecast to significantly increase these delays. The exceptions are Options 2a, 2c and 2g. Options 2c and 2g assume north (Tuam Street) and south (St Asaph Street) access is provided and include no Antigua Street access. Option 2a maintains access at Antigua Street, but use of the access is limited to the HSCP as no internal linkage to the HPPB is assumed.
  - o. Several parking building options result in high delays and / or significant impacts at the Antigua / Tuam Street intersection. The exceptions are Options 2a-c and 2f-g and 3d where the availability of north and south accesses allows some trips to/from the HPPB to bypass this intersection.
  - p. Under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have *potential* for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
    - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces
  - q. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.

Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Level of Service (LoS) criteria developed specifically for CAST assessments,



#### 2 Introduction

- 2.1 QTP Ltd have been commissioned by Christchurch City Council (**CCC**) to undertake analysis of the transport network impacts of a number of alternative options for increasing the provision of parking to serve the Health Precinct within the Central City.
- 2.2 In 2016, QTP were jointly appointed by CCC and Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) to undertake analysis of key new parking facility options being considered by DCL. The analysis involved application of Council's Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic model (CAST) to inform the assessment of the effects of the alternative options on the operation of the road network. The findings were presented within the report titled "South West Quadrant Vehicle Parking Options Network Impact Analysis"<sup>3</sup>, subsequently referred to within this report as "the 2016 SWQ Analysis".
- 2.3 In essence, the purpose of this commission is to re-assess the parking options in the light of a number of development decisions and changes to parking supply options that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The implications of the decision to not now replace the former Hospital public parking (Blue) building on the site north of St Asaph Street and west of Antigua Street;
  - Sensitivity testing the impacts of any increase in the planned quantum of parking planned for the Metro Sports facility, from the currently planned 550 parking spaces to a larger parking supply. The analysis will specifically test the impact of any increased quantum on adjacent streets and intersections as previously addressed in the Aurecon / QTP transport assessment and engineering report(s) for the Metro Sports Facility (MSF);
  - The impacts of the forthcoming proposal to enlarge the current Hospital staff parking building (located east of Antigua Street and north of St Asaph Street) by some two floors and with an expected 270 additional spaces;
- 2.4 In addition, there are two further factors that have the potential to significantly affect the 2016 analysis and findings:
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis assumed signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection for a scenario with 620 spaces at the MSF. This assumption was informed by the supporting transport modelling analysis for the MSF which indicated such an upgrade would be required to maintain efficient network operation for parking levels in excess of 550 spaces. For this study, CCC have advised that the Stewart Street / Moorhouse signals are not to be assumed for the bulk of the analysis of the impact of the Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) options.
  - The 2016 SWQ Analysis was undertaken using the then-current version of CAST (v16a). Since that time, CAST has recently been updated (v18a completed in early 2019) with revised assumptions from CCC around the level of employment and residents that have an associated increase in traffic within the Central City in future years.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Dated October 2016, the final issue being 01b, dated 15 November 2016.



- 2.5 Specifically, this refreshed site-specific analysis will further explore the following options as to their network and access effects:
  - The potential benefits / implications of physically linking any New Health Precinct Parking Building (HPPB) or buildings, to the currently planned extension of the Hospital Staff Car Park (HSCP, east of Antigua Street) – and therefore permitting its phased extension to the immediate east for public casual or further staff parking;
  - Optional parking building sites to the north and south of the proposed east west greenway running west from Montreal Street;
  - The potential benefits/ implications of any new parking building or buildings accessed from both Tuam and St Asaph Streets (and therefore spanning the greenway in some form);
  - The optimum access arrangements for any of these combinations in terms of minimising local network traffic impacts and offering flexibility around the management of public and CDHB staff parking operations;
  - Local network sensitivity testing of those options at overall <u>additional</u> parking quantums (*ie beyond the planned staff parking expansion of 270 spaces*) of 800, 1,000, 1,200 or 1,400 spaces and the local network levels of service of each.
- 2.6 The above options translate to some 14 main scenarios with regards to parking building locations and linkages which are best understood through referral to the individual diagrams of **Appendix A**. The components of the various building location and linkage combinations are illustrated within the following diagram centred on the St Asaph Street / Antigua Street / Tuam Street / Montreal Street block:



Figure 2.1: Existing HSCP (Blue) and Potential HPPB Location (Red) and Linkage Options

2.7 In addition, three scenarios are initially to be considered as to the potential quantum of parking that may be accommodated at the MSF site whilst maintaining reasonable network performance. The three scenarios are the consented 550 spaces and testing of 800 and 1,000 spaces scenarios. The assessed acceptable quantum of parking is to be



taken forward as part of the base scenario for the HPPB option analysis.

2.8 Thus the resulting scenarios to be modelled for this study are as follows:

Scenario		No.	Blue Building CP	MSF CPs	HSCP	HSCP w. full St Asaph Access	НРРВ	HPPB Linked to HSCP	HSCP No Antigua Access	Ś
v18a Base Model	v18a	0	$\checkmark$	550	$\checkmark$				X	
MSF Parking Testing	0a	1	×	550	$\checkmark$				1	
	0b	2	×	800	$\checkmark$			ン	ノ	
	0c	3	×	1000	$\checkmark$			$\sim$		
Stage A HSCP	1a	4	×	800	+270					
Extension	1b	5	×	800	+270	✓	20			
Testing	1c	6	×	800	+270	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>			✓	
	2a	7	×	800	+270	$\checkmark$	Wns	×		
	2b	8	×	800	+270	X	Wns	$\checkmark$		
Western New	2c	9	×	800	+270		Wns	$\checkmark$	✓	
Parking Building Testing	2d	10	×	800	+270	/	Ws	$\checkmark$		
	2e	11	×	800	+270	$\checkmark$	Ws	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
	2f	12	×	800	+270	$\checkmark$	W <mark>n</mark>	$\checkmark$		
	2g	13	×	800	+270	$\checkmark$	Wn	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
Eastern New Parking Building Testing	3a	14	×	800	+270	$\checkmark$	NEn	×		
	3b	15		800	+270	$\checkmark$	SEs	×		
	3c	16	×	800	+270	$\checkmark$	NEn+SEs	×		
	3d=2a <sup>1</sup>	$\searrow$	×	800	+270	$\checkmark$	NEn+SEs	×		

1. 3d varies from 3c in that the Eastern parking buildings spanning the greenway would be linked. In modelling terms, this is the same as 2a.

#### Table 2.1: HPPB Network Impact Modelling Scenarios

2.9 For each new HPPB option (No's 7 through 16) the Scope requires modelling of four car park sizes in order to determine the quantum of parking at the threshold of acceptable network performance. Thus in total some 46 scenarios are to be modelled, each for the AM and PM peak hours.

#### 2.10 Study Stage A

2.10.1

As per the study scope, the initial report pertaining to Stage A of the study provides analysis of the potential effects of extension to the (existing) HSCP and therefore is informed by the first six model scenarios listed in the above Table.

#### 2.11 Study Stage B

2.11.1 Building on the results of Stage A, Stage B of this study assesses, and reports on, the network effects of the alternative options for the new HPPB, being informed by the 10 model scenarios 7 to 16 listed within the above Table.



#### 3 Modelling Methodology

#### 3.1 **Overview of Study Method**

- 3.1.1 As set out in the project scope, this study uses the recently-released 'v18a' version (May 2019) of the Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic (**CAST**) model, as the basis of analysis for this project.
- 3.1.2 The horizon year for all analyses is 2028. The CAST v18a model includes three 'generic' models of the short (2028), medium (2038) and long-term (2048) horizon years. The 2016 SWQ Analysis, adopted the medium-term horizon year of the then-current v16a model, being 2031.
- 3.1.3 Note that whilst the horizon year has effectively been bought forward from 2031 to 2028, as alluded to at section 2.4, the demographic forecasts for the Central City upon which the model travel demands are related have increased significantly between the previous (v16a) and current (v18a) models. The following table, extracted from the CAST v18a Model Update Report, summarises the changes in demographic inputs and travel demands between the v16a 2031 model and the v18a 2028 model.

	v16 2031			v18		Change v18 2028 vs v16 2031			% Change v18 2028 vs v16 2031			
<u> </u>				2028								
	Рор	Jobs	Trips	Рор	Jobs	Trips	Pop	Jobs	Trips	Рор	Jobs	Trips
WDC	55,000	17,000	280,000	58,000	15,000	287,000	3,000	-2,000	7,000	5%	-12%	3%
SDC	49,000	14,000	236,000	55,000	15,000	258,000	6,000	1,000	22,000	12%	7%	9%
CHCH	382,000	182,000	1,840,000	402,000	165,000	1,900,000	20,000	-17,000	60,000	5%	-9%	3%
CBD	13,000	54,000	266,000	18,000	69,000	336,000	5,000	15,000	70,000	38%	28%	26%

Table 3.1: v18a 2028 Model vs v16a 2031 Model Demographic and Demand Comparison

- 3.1.4 Thus it can be seen that the latest demographic forecasts prepared by CCC result in population, job and trip forecasts that are around some 30% higher in the v18a 2028 model than within the v16a 2031 model.
- 3.1.5 As for previous investigations, the *principal* focus of analysis has been on the evening (PM) peak hour, being 4:30-5:30pm. This is the period of greatest congestion on the road network in the vicinity of the Health Precinct. It is also the peak period anticipated for the MSF trip generation and parking demands and is coincident with the wider network peak.
- 3.1.6 The key stages of the modelling methodology are summarised as:
  - Modify the generic CAST model networks to provide greater detail in the vicinity of the MSF and HPPB locations to more accurately reflect the specific location of the parking demands, access arrangements and any internal parking linkages
  - ii. **Modify the generic CAST model demands** for each 'zone' to reflect estimated demands for each parking facility (and residual demands for the blocks in which the parking is located) for each scenario.
  - iii. **Undertake model 'assignments' for each scenario**, where the model assigns the modified demands (trips) to their optimal routes and simulates the network performance, including optimisation of signal times at intersections in the vicinity of the study area, for the altered traffic demands for each scenario.
- 3.1.7 As noted within the previous Chapter, in addition to the fundamental change to the generic CAST model relating to the new demographic forecasts at 2028, there are two further



significant changes to 'base' assumptions from those adopted for the 2016 SWQ Analysis:

- The Moorhouse/Stewart Street intersection is not assumed to be signalised; and
- The Hospital Parking Blue Building is <u>not</u> assumed to be reinstated.
- 3.1.8 The impact of the car parks can, in practice, be expected to be influenced not only by their capacity assumed (for each scenario), but also by the nature of their potential management regime, at least insofar as what proportions are assumed to be assigned to staff (or leased), free visitor and/or public-casual (paid) parking.
- 3.1.9 The scenarios modelled have been analysed to identify the principal potential network effects with appropriate diagrams prepared (in a manner similar to previous analyses) that highlight the effects on likely network delay-based Levels of Service (LoS).

#### 3.2 Networks

- 3.2.1 The 'v18a' CAST generic future year 2028 network has been used as the basis for this study. This assumes implementation of the An Accessible City (AAC) network projects, along with other programmed projects on the wider greater Christchurch transport network that have been agreed with the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) partners.
- 3.2.2 A significant focus of the 2016 SWQ Analysis was the varying effects that alternative treatments in the future year for the Antigua Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection associated with the Quarryman's Trail Major Cycle Route (**MCR**). The intersection has since been upgraded to include separate physically separated cycle facilities and this configuration (and signal phasing) is now adopted within the base model for this study.
- 3.2.3 As noted previously, both the 2016 SWQ Analysis and the generic v18a future year models assume signalisation of the Moorhouse/Stewart Street intersection. CCC have advised that for this study the intersection is to remain in its current form. The v18a 2028 generic model network has been adjusted accordingly.

In-line with the traffic modelling conducted for the MSF and the 2016 SWQ Analysis, the parking and access design plans for the MSF (being access to and from Moorhouse Avenue to the south, Stewart Street to the west, St Asaph Street to the north and via Antigua St to the east of the site) have been incorporated within the modelling. CCC have forwarded the construction plan for the MSF. For the purposes of traffic modelling this is not materially different to the concept plan upon which the 2016 SWQ Analysis was based.



Also as noted earlier, the Blue Building is <u>not</u> assumed to be reinstated. Thus the access to/from Antigua Street assumed in both the 2016 SWQ Analysis and the generic v18a future year models has been removed. The zone and loading from St Asaph Street has however been retained to allow an estimate of residual demands to/from private car parks and servicing of the 'triangle' block to be modelled.

3.2.4 In addition to the above changes, the St Asaph Street / Antigua Street / Tuam Street / Montreal Street block ('**The Block**', represented within the v18a CAST model by a single zone, #702) has also been sub-divided in order to provide for more rapid assessment of the multiple parking scenarios considered by this study, whilst also providing a consistent network framework so that comparable analysis (e.g. network change plots) may be undertaken. CAST zone #702 has been divided into 5, as follows:



- 4 'spare' zones (Zones 4041, 4051, 4061 and 4071) have been moved to this location, to represent specific existing/potential car parking areas on this block; and
- Zone 702 is retained, to represent demand from potential *residual/additional* development in the block (beyond that covered by the zones below).
- Zone 4041 has been added to represent the location of the existing CDHB staff parking building, for which floor plans indicate a capacity of 408 spaces. Access options are to/from Antigua St and to St Asaph Street (only) as at present, or full access to/from St Asaph Street, either additionally to the Antigua St access or as an alternative.
- Zone 4051 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most north-easterly location considered within The Block, at around 70 Tuam Street – being building 'NE' within Figure 2.1. Access would be Right-In, Right-Out (RIRO) from Tuam Street.
- Zone 4061 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most south-easterly location considered within The Block, at around 77 St Asaph Street – being building 'SE' within Figure 2.1. Access would be Right-In, Right-Out (RIRO) from St Asaph Street.
- Zone 4071 has been added to represent a potential new parking building in the most westerly location considered within The Block, immediately to the east of the existing CDHB SCP – being building 'SE' within Figure 2.1. Scenarios involving a parking building at this location allow for examining the effects of providing for internal linkage to the location of the existing SCP.
- 3.2.5 In modelling terms, the precise location of the potential new parking building locations accessed from either Tuam Street or St Asaph Street is not important as the conflicting flows at the access and the route choices to/from the car parks would be similar in either case. Thus the key purpose of reflecting the different potential east and west parking building locations is to allow the differing implications of the access arrangements to be modelled. For example, a single parking building accessed only from Tuam Street would have similar network effects irrespective of its east / west location. However, if separate parking buildings were provided, accessed individually from Tuam and St Asaph Streets, the demands to and from each car park would be required to be modelled as separate zones. Similarly, a single car park with access from either Tuam or St Asaph Streets is most intuitively modelled as a single zone accessed from either street. The adopted approach provides sufficient zonal resolution for the effects of each of the scoped parking scenarios to be modelled accurately and intuitively.





3.2.7 The following diagram illustrates the modelled base road network in the study area:

Figure 3.1: Model Network adopted for SW Quadrant Assessment

- 3.2.8 In-line with the construction plans for the MSF site (as provided by CCC), the proposed accesses at St Asaph Street and Moorhouse Avenue are assumed to be LILO intersections, with the accesses onto Stewart and Antigua Streets assumed to cater for all turning movements.
- 3.2.9 Note that the construction plans for the MSF suggest it is possible to through-route through the MSF grounds both east-west and north-south. This possibility is not reflected within the model. The node, link and zone structure has been developed to allow access to/from the MSF as a single origin/destination, from either of the four access points. This effectively allows modelled trips entering and exiting the site to always choose the most optimal access, which in reality, would only be possible with the internal connections. A sensitivity test could be undertaken to understand the potential desire for 'rat-running' through the site. However, in practice the site should be managed to deter this (with appropriate speed treatment).
- 3.2.10 For all scenarios (including the modified base), the signal timings (including relative offsets), have been optimised to minimise overall delays to traffic, within the vicinity of the study area only.

#### Traffic Demands

3.3

- 3.3.1 Base vehicular demands have been drawn from 2028 CAST model 'v18a' version (May 2019). Note that the 2016 SWQ Analysis used 'full' model demands as opposed to a 'target' mode share scenario that had previously been used for some studies (being around 85% of the default car travel demands to/from the Central City that already reflect the regional transport mode-split modelling).
- 3.3.2 Whilst this assessment similarly uses 'full demands' from the v18a model, it should be noted that the latest version of the CAST model includes a further demand response to


increasing (or decreasing) levels of congestion forecast. This was introduced during the v18a CAST model build to provide a more realistic response to very high levels of congestion (and model instability) that arise in future years under the revised demographic forecasts for the Central City. The 'elasticated' demands reflect possible additional demand responses to varying congestion not captured within the regional 'CTM' travel demand model upon which the CAST demands are initially based. Such responses are trip re-timing away from the peak hours, increased home-working, the greater take-up of alternative modes under possible significant enhancements to cycle networks and public transport networks and services, Travel Demand Management initiatives and emerging new modes such as e-scooters.

3.3.3 The effects of the elastic assignments are to reduce the default demands to/from the Central City by around 13% in the 2028 PM peak hour.

### 3.4 **Parking Demands**

- 3.4.1 Trip rates for each of the potential parking facilities examined in this study have been applied on a similar basis to those applied for the 2016 SWQ Analysis and as developed for previous studies, notably for the MSF traffic modelling and also for the Performing Arts Precinct (**PAP**) Parking Building analysis. The PAP analysis identified trip rates for prequake central city parking buildings and adjusted these for occupancy to understand how trip rates varied across the different Central City parking buildings depending primarily on the varying proportions of long and short-term parking accommodated.
- 3.4.2 The assumed trip rates per car park and resulting traffic demands are illustrated within the following tables,

MSF Car	Park: 550 S							
Car Park S Demand	Supply and I Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total	
Car Park S	Supply	495	55				550	
AM Dook	Arrive	0.65	0.70	322	39	360	0.66	
	Depart	0.50	0.10	248	6	253	0.46	
TIOUI	Total/Rate	1.15	0.80	569	44	613	1.12	
Intornoak	Arrive	0.60	0.10	297	6	303	0.55	
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	297	11	308	0.56	
TIOUT	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	594	17	611	1.11	
PM Peak	Arrive	1.00	0.10	495	6	501	0.91	
	Depart	1.00	0.70	495	39	534	0.97	
ΠΟΟΙ	Total/Rate	2.00	0.80	990	44	1034	1.88	

Table 3.2: MSF Car Park Trip Rates and Demands

1



CDHB Ca	r Park: 408	B Spaces (						
Car Park S Demand	Supply and I Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total	
Car Park	Supply	0	408				408	
AND Deals Arrive		0.50	0.70	0	286	286	0.70	
	Depart	0.10	0.10	0	41	41	0.10	
	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	0	326	326	0.80	C
Intornoak	Arrive	0.60	0.10	0	41	41	0.10	
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	0	82	82	0.20	
noui	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	0	122	122	0.30	$\sim$
DM Dook	Arrive	0.25	0.10	0	41	41	0.10	)`
	Depart	0.80	0.70	0	286	286	0.70	
noui	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	0	326	326	0.80	

Table 3.3: CD	HB Staff Car P	Park Trip Rates and	l Demands – Existing 🔹
		und imp nates and	

CDHB Car Park:	678 Spaces	(Long Term	Parking)
	010 00000	(	i i ai iai ig/

Car Park S Demand	supply and Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park Su	upply	0	678	'8			678
	Arrive	0.50	0.70	0	475	475	0.70
AIVI Peak	Depart	0.10	0.10	0	68	68	0.10
rioui	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	0	542	542	0.80
Intornoak	Arrive	0.60	0.10	0	68	68	0.10
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	0	136	136	0.20
	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	0	203	203	0.30
DM Dook	Arrive	0.25	0.10	0	68	68	0.10
	Depart	0.80	0.70	0	475	475	0.70
ΠΟΟΙ	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	0	542	542	0.80

Table 3.4: CDHB Staff Car P	ark Trip Rates and Demands	– Plus 270 Spaces
	•	•

	Health Pred	cinct Car P	ark: 800 S	paces (Mix	c of Hospit	al/Wider U	ses)	
	Car Park S Demand	upply and Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
	Car Park Su	upply	400	400				800
	AM Peak Hour	Arrive	0.50	0.70	200	280	480	0.60
		Depart	0.10	0.10	40	40	80	0.10
(		Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	240	320	560	0.70
	Interpeak	Arrive	0.60	0.10	240	40	280	0.35
		Depart	0.60	0.20	240	80	320	0.40
2 Chr	riour	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	480	120	600	0.75
		Arrive	0.25	0.10	100	40	140	0.18
		Depart	0.80	0.70	320	280	600	0.75
	Hour	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	420	320	740	0.93

Table 3.5: HPPB Trip Rates and Demands – 800 Spaces

Û



Health Prec	inct Car Pa	rk: 1000 S	paces (Mix	c of Hospit	al/Wider U	lses)	
Car Park S Demand	upply and Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park Su	pply	500	500 500				
AM Book	Arrive	0.50	0.70	250	600	0.60	
AIVI Peak	Depart	0.10	0.10	50	50	100	0.10
TIOUI	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	300	400	700	0.70
Intornook	Arrive	0.60	0.10	300	50	350	0.35
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	300	100	400	0.40
HOUI	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	600	150	750	0.75
	Arrive	0.25	0.10	125	50	175	0.18
PM Peak	Depart	0.80	0.70	400	350	750	0.75
HOUI	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	525	400	925	0.93

### Table 3.6: HPPB Trip Rates and Demands – 1000 Spaces

### Health Precinct Car Park: 1200 Spaces (Mix of Hospital/Wider Uses)

Car Park S Demand	Supply and Element	Rate Short- Stay	Rate Long- Stay	Trips Short- Stay	Trips Long- Stay	Trips Total	Implied Rate Total
Car Park S	Supply	600	600				1200
	Arrive	0.50	0.70	300	420	720	0.60
Alvi Feak	Depart	0.10	0.10	60	60	120	0.10
HOUI	Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	360	480	840	0.70
Intornoak	Arrive	0.60	0.10	360	60	420	0.35
Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	360	120	480	0.40
lioui	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	720	180	900	0.75
	Arrive	0.25	0.10	150	60	210	0.18
Рім Реак	Depart	0.80	0.70	480	420	900	0.75
HOUI	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	630	480	1110	0.93

	Health Pro	ecinct Car	Park: 1400	Health Precinct Car Park: 1400 Spaces (Mix of Hospital/Wider Uses)													
	Car Park S Demand	Car Park Supply and Rate Rate Trips Trips Demand Element Stay Stay Stay Stay Stay					Trips Total	Implied Rate Total									
	Car Park S	Supply	700	700				1400									
		Arrive	0.50	0.70	350	490	840	0.60									
	Hour	Depart	0.10	0.10	70	70	140	0.10									
~		Total/Rate	0.60	0.80	420	560	980	0.70									
X	Interneak	Arrive	0.60	0.10	420	70	490	0.35									
	Hour	Depart	0.60	0.20	420	140	560	0.40									
	TIOUI	Total/Rate	1.20	0.30	840	210	1050	0.75									
	DM Dook	Arrive	0.25	0.10	175	70	245	0.18									
		Depart	0.80	0.70	560	490	1050	0.75									
	HOUI	Total/Rate	1.05	0.80	735	560	1295	0.93									

### Table 3.8: HPPB Trip Rates and Demands – 1400 Spaces

3.4.3 The manipulation of the base v18a CAST model demands to reflect the above car park facility trip numbers has been achieved by factoring the relevant existing v18a zone.



# 4 Analysis and Assessment Overview

- 4.1 In order to understand the potential absolute and relative effects of the alternative scenarios, a wide variety of plots have been generated and analysed.
- 4.2 These include:
  - Plots of trip generation (origins and destinations) by zone as a check that the demand manipulations result in the desired zonal demands for each scenario;
  - Vehicle Flow plots (where the bandwidth is proportional to the actual volume of traffic forecast to be carried on each part of the modelled network;
  - Plots of Link Delays (refer Appendix B), showing average delays<sup>4</sup> (weighted across all turning movements) for each approach to intersections colour-coded to the CAST Level of Service (LoS) as follows:
    - ► LoS A-C (<30s) Green
    - ▶ LoS D (30-50s) Orange
    - ▶ LoS E (50-70s) Red
    - ► LoS F (>70s) Black
  - Plots of differences (changes) in flows (Appendix C) and delays (Appendix D) between scenarios. Typically these are provided as differences between the Option being assessed and the relevant base model in order to provide an indication of the impact for each car park option. Increases are illustrated as red bands (with the width proportional to the change) whilst decreases are green.
  - Plots of Select Link Analysis indicating modelled routeing to specific origins and destinations (proposed car park zones); and
  - Plots for specific intersection delays/flows;
- 4.3 As agreed with CCC, it is not considered necessary to provide (and give a written interpretation) for each and every one of these plots, for the purpose of supporting the conclusions and recommendations arising from this study. Selected diagrams are included within the main text in order to illustrate the conclusions reached and the recommendations that follow. Appendices B, C and D provide a record of the recorded link delays and impacts on flows and delays for each scenario in the PM peak hour as a record of essential information that may easily be referred to. The full set of diagram are available electronically on request, for both the AM and PM peak hours.

HPPB Network Impact Analysis - V00b.Docx

Note that the link delays are average values during the peak hour for all turning movements on a given approach, and in practice will vary from cycle to cycle. There is likely to be some 'peaking within the peak' of the demands, such that delays at the height of the peak demands will be a little higher than the aggregate modelled for the whole of the peak hour.



# 5 Stage A Analysis and Assessment

# 5.1 **MSF Parking Testing**

- 5.1.1 Testing of three alternative parking scenarios was undertaken to establish a limit of parking numbers that could be accommodated at the MSF site. The scenarios tested are 550 spaces, as per the construction plans, and 800 space and 1,000 space scenarios to understand the viability of accommodating further parking.
- 5.1.2 As noted earlier within this report, CCC have advised that the initial testing is to be completed in the absence of signals at Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue.
- 5.1.3 The following diagrams illustrate the flows and delay-based LoS on the road network.



Figure 5.1: Directional 2028 PM Peak Vehicle Flows, MSF 550 Spaces

RELEASED





Figure 5.2: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, MSF 550 Spaces

- 5.1.4 The above LoS diagram illustrates high delays at the following locations:
  - Antigua Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue LoS F (100s or nearly 2 minutes)
  - Selwyn Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue LoS F (80s or nearly 1.5 minutes)
- 5.1.5 The highest delay occurs due to traffic heading westbound from the MSF in the PM peak hour attempting to turn right on to Moorhouse Avenue, with a delay of around 2 minutes modelled for the right-turn from Antigua Street. High delays (around 100 seconds) are also modelled for the through and left-turn movements on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue.
- 5.1.6 Note that the situation on the Antigua Street southbound approach to the Moorhouse Avenue signals is reasonably complex in modelling terms:
  - Left and right-turn traffic movements must give way to separate cyclist and pedestrian movements on both the east and west sides of Antigua Street;
  - The degree to which turning movements are impeded by the cycle and pedestrian movements depends upon the frequency with which each of the four cycle and pedestrian phases are activated;
  - Because the left-turn shares the through-lane, any left vehicles giving-way to cyclists or pedestrians (on a red arrow) block the through movement;
  - The degree to which left-turning vehicles block the through-movement varies from signal cycle to cycle, depending on the position at which any left turners are located within the queue of vehicles;
  - Any queues of right-turning vehicles extending beyond the right-turning bay of around 40 metres will block the other movements. Similarly, any queue in the single lane for the left and through-movement exceeding 40m will block the right-turn movement.
  - A further complication arises in that the modelled capacity and delays is largely dependent on the relative priorities afforded when allocating signals green time to maintaining efficiency on Moorhouse Avenue and Antigua Street (refer 5.1.18 below).



- 5.1.7 The CAST model is a sophisticated simulation model and does allow the majority of the above aspects to be captured in the modelling. To this end, considerable focus has been placed on observing the degree to which cyclists and pedestrians impede the traffic movements and reflecting this within the base model signal phasing and timings.
- 5.1.8 However, on-site observation and detailed analysis of how the modelled capacity of the southbound through-movement varies throughout the green phase (as it is impeded by the left-turn giving way to cyclists and pedestrians) suggests that whilst the blocking effect is reflected within the modelling, it <u>may</u> be under-represented. This is considered to particularly be the case when the number of left-turning movements can be expected to increase with the MSF and additional Health Precinct Parking in place.
- 5.1.9 Accordingly, a sensitivity test has been run that assumes the southbound throughmovement is blocked by waiting left-turners for the duration of the average cycle / pedestrian phase. As mentioned above, in practice the frequency and degree of this blocking depends on the proportion of left-turning vehicles and the position in the waiting queue, that varies from cycle to cycle. PM peak hour observations indicate that full or partial blocking occurs on most cycles (around 90%) and the blocking varies from full (left turners at the head of the queue) to partial.
- 5.1.10 The sensitivity test indicates delays may increase to some 140 seconds (2.5 minutes) with the MSF in place, as illustrated in the following diagram.



Figure 5.3: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, MSF 550 Spaces, Antigua / Moorhouse Signals 'Increased Blocking' Sensitivity Test

5.1.11 There are very limited options for alternative routes for westbound traffic from the MSF, being practically limited<sup>5</sup> to Antigua Street and less conveniently Selwyn Street. Some traffic may also route via Riccarton Avenue, depending on the destination of each trip and the relative delays on the alternative routes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Right turns are only permitted on southbound approaches to Moorhouse Avenue at Selwyn Street and Antigua Street in the vicinity of the MSF. The next available location to the east is at Durham Street, a detour of around 1km.



- 5.1.12 For the 550 space scenario, the Antigua Street southbound approach is predicted to be approaching capacity (around 90% saturated) under signal optimisation and hence the large delays of around 100 seconds in the 'main' model runs (not the 'increased blocking' sensitivity test).
- 5.1.13 Under higher parking number scenarios, delays at Antigua Street southbound increase only a little to around 110s for the 1,000 spaces scenario.
- 5.1.14 Given these highly undesirable delays under all three MSF parking spaces scenarios, Council requested further investigation of the implications on these findings should signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued, as assumed in the MSF traffic modelling in 2016 and the 2016 SWA analysis.
- 5.1.15 The configuration assumed at the Stewart Street signals is as follows:



Figure 5.4: Assumed Configuration of Stewart Street Moorhouse Avenue Signals

5.1.16 The following diagrams illustrates the delay-based LoS on the road network for the 550 space scenario with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals assumed.

2FLFAS





Figure 5.5: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, MSF 550 Spaces

- 5.1.17 The provision of signals at Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue provides a 'release valve', allowing the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue to operate with reasonable network performance with delays of around 85-95 seconds (around 1.5 minutes in all three parking number scenarios). This level of delay is more a function of the high cycle time on Moorhouse Avenue (115 seconds in the PM peak hour) rather than the approach nearing capacity.
- 5.1.18 The precise level of delay forecast at the Selwyn, Stewart and Antigua signals is highly dependent on the relative priorities provided to Moorhouse Avenue and the side roads. Modelling has been conducted with signal timings automatically optimised to minimise overall (total) delays to traffic through the intersections in a similar manner to the SCATS system that adjusts signals timings in response to actual flows detected. This process affords greater priority to Moorhouse Avenue with its comparatively high traffic volumes that reflect its position as an Arterial Road at the top of the An Accessible City road hierarchy.
- 5.1.19 A further sensitivity test has been undertaken to understand the implications of over-riding the optimised signal timings that seek to minimise total vehicle delays through the Antigua Street / Moorhouse intersection. This test changes the green-splits from around 72% / 28% Moorhouse / Antigua to around 62% / 38%, and has been applied with the 'increased blocking sensitivity test'. The result is that the modelled delays of 140 seconds on the Antigua Street approach reduce to around 100 seconds and delays on the Moorhouse Avenue increase only slightly (from 15s to 17s per vehicle). Thus it is possible that high delays forecast on the Antigua Street approach to Moorhouse Avenue could be reduced by increasing the priority to Antigua Street relative to those that seek to minimise overall delays to traffic through the intersection. It should however be recognised that this approach is not optimal in terms of overall economic efficiency of the transport network (i.e. it has a 'cost' associated with it). Furthermore, the modelling indicates that even the associated small increases in travel time on Moorhouse Avenue reduce the attractiveness



of the corridor (by around 200 vph) with corresponding increases on other Central City roads.

- 5.1.20 As noted above, the 'main' model runs (non-sensitivity tests) indicate high delays (approaching 2 minutes) on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue for the planned number of spaces (550) at the MSF in the absence of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in the PM peak hour for the appraisal year of 2028 (the short-term CAST model horizon year).
- 5.1.21 With the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place, the modelling indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
- 5.1.22 Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.

### 5.2 Hospital Staff Parking Building Extension Testing

### Scenario 1a - Effects of Car Park Expansion Under Existing Access Arrangements

- 5.2.1 With respect to the MSF network and demand scenarios discussed above, that taken forward as part of the base scenario for the HPPB analysis is the 550 space and no Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals scenario (and without the Antigua Street / Moorhouse Avenue sensitivity testing).
- 5.2.2 The following diagram illustrates the modelled effects on network delays of increasing the existing HSCP by 270 spaces from 408 to 678 spaces.



Figure 5.6: 2028 PM Peak Effects on Delays of HSCP +270 Spaces

5.2.3 The above diagram illustrates modest effects (less than 10 seconds) on delays at any specific location on the road network as a consequence of the expansion. Note however



that the modelled increase in delays of around 5 seconds on the Antigua Street southbound approach is additional to the approximately 100s delays forecast in the base scenario (refer Figure 5.2 above), resulting in forecast delays of around 105 seconds at this bottleneck.

### Scenario 1b - Effects of HSCP Full RIRO Access at St Asaph Street

- 5.2.4 Presently, full access is provided to/from the HSCP from Antigua Street and right-turns out is the only form of access permitted to one-way St Asaph Street. This scenario assumes that under the HSCP expansion, access at the St Asaph Street access is modified to allow Right-In and Right-Out (RIRO) access.
- 5.2.5 The following diagram illustrates the modelled effects on network delays of this change in access strategy for the (expanded) 678 space HSCP.



Figure 5.7: 2028 PM Peak Effects on Delays of HSCP +270 Spaces

5.2.6 In the PM peak hour, no significant changes in delays on the road network are forecast as a result of accommodating right-turns in to the HSCP from St Asaph Street. This is understandable given that the predominant movements from the car park in the PM peak hour are outbound. The flow change plots indicate that the additional access results in around only 40 vehicles per hour being directly accessing the car park from St Asaph Street and the existing access.



.7 In the AM peak hour, the modelling indicates that the proposed access could attract around 240 vph resulting in a more significant reduction in vehicles routing via the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection and performing the right-turn across the footpath and the Quarryman's Trail Major Cycle Route (**MCR**).

5.2.8 The associated modelled delay reductions at the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection are low at under 5 seconds in the AM peak hour. However, the access strategy is considered highly desirable in removing potential conflict as vehicles accessing the car park traverse cyclists on the MCR. Presently, the existing situation is considered



undesirable for both cyclists and motorists. In particular, vehicles attempting to turn right into the car park from St Antigua Street await a gap in the oncoming southbound vehicles on Antigua Street. It is particularly difficult for motorists to be aware of northbound cyclists approaching, effectively from the rear, on the right side of the vehicle when looking straight ahead to ascertain if it is safe to turn across oncoming vehicles (and cycles).

5.2.9 The MCR on Antigua Street only became operational in the latter half of 2018 so presently there is a limited time window for which crashes between cyclists and drivers could occur. The NZ Transport Agency's (NZTA's) Crash Analysis System (CAS) does however list one crash (ID 201820140) that occurred between a northbound cyclist and a vehicle exiting the car park at approximately 7:00 am on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2018. The vehicle failed to give way to the cyclist approaching from the left.

# Scenario 1c - Effects of HSCP St Asaph Street Full RIRO Access and Closure of Antigua Street Access

- 5.2.10 Given on-site observations and the above crash report it is highly desirable that an access option be pursued that minimises the exposure between cyclists on the MCR and conflicting vehicle movements. This sub-option considers the effects on traffic flows and delays of closing the existing vehicular access to the HSCP in the event that access were to be provided to the expanded car park via St Asaph Street, both inbound and outbound (RIRO) as per sub-option 1b.
- 5.2.11 The physically segregated cycleway on St Asaph Street is located on the south side of carriageway. Thus the cyclist safety benefits to be gained by removing potential conflict between cyclists and vehicles on the popular Antigua Street cycleway would <u>not</u> be offset by increased vehicle use of the St Asaph Street access.
- 5.2.12 The following diagrams illustrate the modelled turning movements for the expanded HSCP under the three different access scenarios (1a, 1b and 1c) for the peak hours.



Figure 5.8: Turning Flows for HSCP Options 1a, 1b and 1c, 2028 AM Peak





Figure 5.9: Turning Flows for HSCP Options 1a, 1b and 1c, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.13 The above diagrams illustrate how the modelled turning volumes at the Antigua Street and St Asaph Street accesses vary under the scenarios and also the effects on turning volumes at the intersections of Antigua Street with Tuam and St Asaph Street.
- 5.2.14 In the AM peak hour, the (two-way) vehicle volumes traversing the Antigua Street cycleway are around 500 vph for Option 1a (existing access), around 280 vph for Option 1b (with the addition of the St Asaph Street Right-turn In) and zero under option 1c (closure of Antigua St under St Asaph Street RIRO). The comparative volumes in the PM peak hour are 250 for Option 1a, 220 for Option 1b and zero for Option 1c.
- 5.2.15 Thus clearly in terms of removing the safety issue, and increasing cycle amenity, Option 1c is considerably more effective than Option 1b, particularly in the PM peak hour.
- 5.2.16 The following diagrams illustrate the modelled effects on vehicle flows of Option 1c relative to Option 1a for the peak hours.



Figure 5.10: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Traffic Flows vs Option 1a, 2028 AM Peak





Figure 5.11: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Traffic Flows vs Option 1a, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.17 As might be anticipated, the modelled effect on traffic volumes is greater in the AM peak when the inbound movement predominates. Impacts on traffic volumes in the more critical PM peak hour (in terms of network congestion) are more modest.
- 5.2.18 The following diagrams illustrates the modelled effects on delays around the network of Option 1c relative to Option 1a for the peak hours.



Figure 5.12: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Delays vs Option 1a, 2028 AM Peak





Figure 5.13: HSCP Access Option 1c Effects on Delays vs Option 1a, 2028 PM Peak

- 5.2.19 Overall, the above diagrams indicate net localised improvements in network operation under the assumed closure of the Antigua Street vehicular access to the car park.
- 5.2.20 The small increase in delay indicated on Antigua Street northbound to Tuam Street (around 10s) is largely a consequence of re-routing of vehicles destined for the HSCP away from Antigua Street (on to Montreal Street). This reduces traffic volumes and associated delays on Antigua Street northbound approaching the St Asaph Street intersection, which in-turn makes the corridor more attractive for general traffic (not bound for the HSCP) which leads to the small increase on modelled delays approaching Tuam Street.
- 5.2.21 In summary, the option of closing the Antigua Street access to the HSCP under inbound and outbound access being provided from St Asaph Street has potential to significantly improve cyclist safety and amenity without any significant impact on road network efficiency.

RELEASE



# 6 Stage B Analysis and Assessment (New Parking Building)

### 6.1 **Common Assumptions**

- 6.1.1 Referring to the Stage A analysis presented within the previous Chapter, the following assumptions are common to all HPPB scenarios modelled as part of Stage B of this study:
  - The MSF is assumed to accommodate the consented 550 parking spaces. The Stage A modelling indicates capacity and delay issues on Antigua Street southbound which would be exacerbated under higher levels of parking demand assumed at the MSF.
  - The Moorhouse Avenue / Stewart Street intersection is assumed to remain in its present priority (give-way) form. Note that analysis undertaken in Stage A indicates that the MSF could accommodate increased levels of parking (over the 550 spaces consented) with a reasonable level of network performance preserved <u>if</u> this intersection were to be signalised. It is suggested that the results of this Stage B analysis be revisited if there is interest in signalising this intersection. This is because the release of this modelled bottleneck could affect modelled traffic volumes and operation on the wider road network that may affect the level of network impacts assessed for the HPPB options.
  - The HSCP is assumed to undergo expansion resulting in an increase of 270 parking spaces as tested in Scenarios 1a to 1c (refer Stage A).
  - The St Asaph Street access to the HSCP is assumed to be modified under the proposed expansion to accommodate outbound (right-turning) traffic in addition to inbound (right-turning) traffic as per Scenario 1b. This modification is considered beneficial both in terms of safety impacts at the Antigua Street access (by reducing conflict with cyclists and pedestrians) and network efficiency impacts (some trips through the Tuam Street / St Asaph Street intersection are removed). The sub-option of removing the Antigua Street access (as per Scenario 1c) is tested for the Western HPPB options (Scenario 2) as part of this Stage B analysis.
- 6.1.2 Note that whilst the HSCP is assumed to be expanded under all HPPB options, the level of impact assessed for each scenario is relative to a 'base' scenario that does not include increased parking at the site. This is to ensure that the cumulative impacts of the parking building options being assessed are presented.
- 6.1.3 Given the requirement for brevity in reporting specified within the Scope of Services, commentary is limited to only the most pertinent points noted from the scenario modelling for each Health Precinct car park configuration option. Model outputs showing the PM peak hour flows, delays and impacts are however provided for each of the 49 scenarios modelled within the Appendices.

### 6.2 Base Scenario

- 6.2.1 The modelled operation of the road network for the 'base' scenario against which the impacts of the HPPB scenarios are tested is that illustrated in Figure 5.2, reproduced here as Figure 6.1, for ease of reference.
- 6.2.2 Whilst for the sake of brevity the illustration of network impacts within the main text of this chapter focuses on plots illustrating the change in delays around the road network



(relative to the base scenario) the actual levels of network delays forecast for each scenario (as per the delay LoS plots of Appendix B) are referred to with regards to informing the significance of the delay changes.



Figure 6.1: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, Base Scenario (No HSCP, MSF 550 Spaces, No HPPB)

### 6.3 Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2a

- 6.3.1 Option 2a assumes no linkage to the HSCP but with north and south accesses on Tuam Street and St Asaph Street.
- 6.3.2 The impact on delays on the local road network for the 1400 space scenario is illustrated in the following diagram.

RELEASED





Figure 6.2: 2028 PM Peak Effects on Delays of Option 2a, 1400 Spaces

- 6.3.3 This scenario results in significant delay impacts around the local road network, most notably at:
  - Antigua Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue;
  - Selwyn Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue; and
  - Riccarton Avenue westbound at the merge from 2 lanes to 1.
- 6.3.4 Given the high delays forecast at the Antigua and Selwyn Street locations in the base case, these impacts are considered highly undesirable. The impacts on Riccarton Avenue are also significant, changing from LoS B (<30s) to LoS E (around 1 minute).
- 6.3.5 The threshold of acceptable network performance appears to be at around (or a little less than) for the smallest car park size tested of 800 spaces. Even then, moderate impacts on delays of around 15 seconds are forecast on Antigua Street and Riccarton Avenue.
- 6.3.6 The impacts at these locations are sufficiently remote from The Block accommodating the HPPB options tested that the impacts are similar irrespective of the HPPB scenario tested. Thus the modelling undertaken leads to the recommendation that a limit of somewhere less than 800 spaces should be planned for at the HPPB in order to avoid significant wider network congestion impacts <u>if</u> assuming that Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue remains unsignalised.
- 6.3.7 As noted within the Stage A modelling, the signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection provides a 'release valve', allowing the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue to operate with reasonable performance. This has knockon effects on both the Selwyn Street and Riccarton Avenue bottlenecks which would also be relieved to some degree by traffic from the MSF routing away from these locations, reducing delays for other vehicles.
  - 6.3.8 Within the more immediate vicinity of the car park, network impacts are generally modest (around 10s or less) and a reasonable LoS preserved, even for the 1400 space scenario.



### 6.4 Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2b

- 6.4.1 Option 2b differs from Option 2a only in that a link to the HSCP is assumed to be provided.
- 6.4.2 Generally, the modelled delays and impacts are very similar to those of Option 2a. One notable effect of the

link between the parking buildings is the reduced delays on the Antigua Street northbound approach to Tuam Street. This is because eastbound traffic from the HSCP is able to route internally through the parking building and bypass the Antigua Street / Tuam Street intersection. Delay impacts are however a little greater less than Option 2a at the Antigua / St Asaph Street intersection.

# 6.5 Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2c

6.5.1 Option 2c differs from Option 2b only in that the existing access at Antigua Street is assumed to be closed. This is under the assumption common to all the HPPB scenarios that the existing St Asaph Street egress becomes a full

two-way (RIRO) access (refer section 5.2, above) and under the assumption of Option 2b that a link is provided between the new HPPB and the expanded HSCP.

- 6.5.2 Generally, the modelled delays and impacts are similar to those of Options 2a and 2b. One notable effect of removing access at Antigua Street (Option 2c vs 2b) is the reduced delays on the Antigua Street northbound approaching St Asaph Street. This is principally because some traffic from the south destined for the car parks routes instead via Montreal Street in order to access the car parks from Tuam Street, rather than from the closed Antigua Street access.
- 6.5.3 As noted under the Stage A modelling (refer section 5.2, above), the option of closing the Antigua Street access to the HSCP under inbound and outbound access being provided from St Asaph Street has potential to significantly improve cyclist safety and amenity without any significant impact on road network efficiency.

# 6.6 Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2d

- 6.6.1 Option 2d differs from Option 2b only in that access from the HPPB is not assumed to be provided at Tuam Street.
- 6.6.2 The delay plots of Appendix D indicate high delays under all parking space









quantum scenarios at the Antigua Street / Tuam Street intersection. The following diagram indicates the modelled network delays for the lowest parking quantum scenario (800 spaces) for comparison with Figure 6.1 above for the base scenario.



Figure 6.3: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, HPPB Option 2d, 800 Spaces

6.6.3 Because most northbound and eastbound trips from the HPPBs are inclined to route via the Antigua Street / Tuam Street intersection, high delays (and impacts) are modelled at this location. The degree of delay forecast could alter under a scenario with signalisation of the Moorhouse Avenue / Stewart Street signals as this would likely free-up some capacity on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue, allowing a greater proportion of eastbound trips from the HPPBs to route via Moorhouse Avenue than via Tuam Street.

# 6.7 Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2e

- 6.7.1 Option 2e differs from Option 2d only in that the existing access at Antigua Street is assumed to be closed.
- 6.7.2 The delay plots of Appendix D indicate a similar pattern of high delays as per Option 2d.



6.7.3 One key difference is that delays for Option 2e on the Antigua Street approach to Tuam Street are significantly lower, though the approach is at LoS F for the lowest car park quantum scenario. The reduced (but high) delays are due to eastbound traffic routing either 'around the block' via St Asaph Street / Hagley Avenue and Tuam Street or via Antigua Street and Moorhouse Avenue (the latter resulting in higher delays at the Antigua Street approach to the Moorhouse Avenue bottleneck).



### 6.8 Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2f

- 6.8.1 Option 2f differs from Option 2a only in that access to the new HPPB is assumed only to be via Tuam Street, but noting that access via St Asaph Street is allowed for via the HSCP link.
- 6.8.2 The modelled delays and impacts are, in modelling terms, the same as those of Option 2a. One circumstance in which this scenario could yield different network operation to Option 2a would be if there were capacity issues at the single car park egress on to St Asaph Street, rather than via the two exits afforded by Option 2a. The operation of any access/egress is dependent on the detailed design regarding the method of entry/exit control and the number of lanes provided. Under the assumption for this option that effectively three egress points are provided from the HPPBs, none are modelled with significant delays as they give-way to traffic on the adjacent roads under the assumption that each is a single lane give-way situation.

# 6.9 Western New Parking Building Testing: Option 2g

- 6.9.1 Option 2g differs from Option 2f only in that the existing access at Antigua Street is assumed to be closed.
- 6.9.2 The modelled delays and impacts are, similar to those of Option 2f, but with slightly reduced delays on the Antigua





Street approaches to the Tuam Street and St Asaph Street intersections.

6.9.3 Note that under this scenario only two points of access are provided to/from the surrounding road network (on Tuam and St Asaph Streets). Whilst the modelling indicates no significant capacity issues at the give-way egresses on to the one-way streets, it is noted that the exit flows are very close to the modelled sustainable throughput capacity of the egress points themselves (around 800 cars per hour). As noted above, in practice the exit capacity will be dependent on the detailed design regarding the method of entry/exit control and the number of lanes provided.

# 6.10 Eastern New Parking Building Testing: Option 3a

6.10.1 In modelling terms, this option varies from Option 2a (Western new parking building without a link to the HSCP) principally in that only a single point of access is provided, being at Tuam Street.



6.10.2 Modelling of the 800 and 1000 car park scenarios indicate similar network operation to



Option 2a. However, for the 1200 car park scenario, the estimated PM outbound demand of 900 trips (refer Table 3.7) exceeds the modelled capacity of the car-park exit lane and significant queues and delays result at the car park egress as illustrated within the following diagram:



Figure 6.4: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, HPPB Option 3a, 1200 Spaces

### 6.11 Eastern New Parking Building Testing: Option 3b

6.11.1 In modelling terms, this option varies from Option 2a (Western new parking building without a link to the HSCP) principally in that only a single point of access is provided, being at St Asaph Street. Thus the option is



similar to Eastern new parking building Option 3a, but instead the single point of access is taken from St Asaph Street, rather than Tuam Street. The option is also similar to Western new parking building Option 2d, but without a link assumed between the new HPPB and the HSCP.

6.11.2 The modelling of this option indicates similar issues to those of Option 2d. Because most northbound and eastbound trips from the HPPBs must route via the Antigua Street / Tuam Street intersection, high delays (and impacts) are modelled at this location. The following diagram indicates the modelled network delays for the lowest parking quantum scenario (800 spaces) for comparison with Figure 6.1 above for the base scenario.





Figure 6.5: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, HPPB Option 3b, 800 Spaces

6.11.3 Note the high delays (80s, LoS F) forecast for Antigua Street northbound to Tuam Street. As noted above for Option 2d, the degree of delay forecast could alter under a scenario with signalisation of the Moorhouse Avenue / Stewart Street signals as this would likely free-up some capacity on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue, allowing a greater proportion of eastbound trips from the HPPBs to route via Moorhouse Avenue than via Tuam Street.

### 6.12 Eastern New Parking Building Testing: Option 3c

In modelling terms, this option varies from Option 2a (Western new parking building without a link to the HSCP) principally in that it is assumed that the two new eastern HPPBs are physically segregated by the planned



greenway running east-west through The Block. Thus the estimated demand for each of the HPPBs is assumed to be half of the totals listed within Table 3.5 to Table 3.8 for the different parking quantums.

6.12.1

Given the results of the analysis for Options 2d and 3b, it is not surprising that the modelling of this option (Option 3c) also indicates potential delays and delay impacts at the Antigua Street / Tuam Street intersection. As might be anticipated, with only half the estimated HPPB demands being 'captive' to St Asaph Street, the forecast delays are not as severe as for Option 3b (or 2d). The following diagram indicates the modelled network delays for the lowest parking quantum scenario (800 spaces) to enable comparison with Figure 6.5 above.





Figure 6.6: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, HPPB Option 3c, 800 Spaces

6.12.2 Thus the above diagram indicates delays of just under one minute (LoS E) on Antigua Street northbound to Tuam Street for the 800 space scenario, being at around the limit of reasonable performance.

### 6.13 Eastern New Parking Building Testing: Option 3d

Finally, Option 3d is similar to Option 3c, but assumes that a link is provided between the eastern HPPBs. In modelling terms, this option is very similar to Option 2a (Western new parking building without a link to the



HSCP). The only difference is the precise location at which the access points to the HPPBs are located, being further east along Tuam and St Asaph Streets. Thus in terms of network impact analysis, the modelling of this option is as per Option 2a (refer section 6.3, above).

- 6.13.1 As noted at section 6.3, all HPPBs scenarios modelled have significant delays and delay impacts at three bottlenecks within close proximity to the Health Precinct:
  - Antigua Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue;
  - Selwyn Street southbound to Moorhouse Avenue; and
  - Riccarton Avenue westbound at the merge from 2 lanes to 1.
- 6.13.2 Figure 6.2 above illustrates the delay *impacts* on the base network of Option 2a for the 1400 parking spaces scenario (refer to Appendix D for delay impacts for other parking quantums tested).
- 6.13.3 The following diagram illustrated the modelled network performance (delay-based LoS) for the 1,000 space scenario for comparison with the base scenario (Figure 5.5).





Figure 6.7: Delay-Based LoS, 2028 PM Peak, HPPB Option 3d (or 2a), 1000 Spaces

- 6.13.4 Putting aside the three key bottlenecks identified in paragraph 6.13.1 above, the 1,000 space scenario indicates generally modest impacts on the local road network (around 10 second or less at specific locations) and the network is forecast to operate reasonably (with delays of around 1 minute or less, LoS E or better) in the more immediate vicinity of the Health Precinct. This remains true of the 1,400 space scenario.
- 6.13.5 Thus if the wider network bottlenecks in the base scenario are resolved (for example through signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Intersection) then there is *potential* for the higher HPPB parking quantums to be accommodate with reasonable network performance and modest impacts. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.

### 6.14 Modelling Summary

- 6.14.1 The modelling undertaken is extensive (around 50 scenarios) and collectively difficult to comprehend given the permutations of parking building locations, sizes, linkages and access options. This report is however considered a useful resource for understanding the potential impacts when considering a specific parking option.
- 6.14.2 The delay and delay impact plots together provide a reasonably clear picture of the forecast network performance and impacts of each option. The following table attempts to summarise this information in relation to locations of key impacts for all scenarios. It attempts to reflect both LoS (delay) issues (red and black crosses) in absolute terms and delay impacts (though coloured shading) in relative terms. Thus pink (and orange) shading indicates for each scenario the locations of significant network delay impact.

						HPPB 800 Spaces					HPPB 1000 Spaces				HPPB 1200 Spaces					HPPB 1400 Spaces				
Scenari	io	HPPB Access	HPPB Linked to HSCP	HPPB No Antig Access	Antig / Mhouse	Slwyn / Mhouse	Ricc Ave WB	Antig / Tuam	Antig / St Asaph	Antig / Mhouse	Slwyn / Mhouse	Ricc Ave WB	Antig / Tuam	Antig / St Asaph	Antig / Mhouse	Slwyn / Mhouse	Ricc Ave WB	Antig / Tuam	Antig / St Asaph	Antig / Mhouse	Slwyn / Mhouse	Ricc Ave WB	Antig / Tuam	Antig / St Asaph
MSF	0a				×	×				×	×				×	×				×	×			
Parking	0b				×	×				×	×				×	x				×	×			
Testing	0c				×	×				×	×				x	×				×	×			
Stage A	1a				×	×				×	×				×	×				×	×			
HSCP	1b				×	×				×	×				×	×				×	×			
Extension	1c			✓	×	×				×	×				*	*				×	×			
	2a	Wns	×		×	×			×	×	×			×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×		×
Western	2b	Wns	✓		×	*			×	×	×		$\mathbf{O}$	×	×	×			×	×	×			×
New	2c	Wns	✓	✓	×	×				×	×				×	*				×	×	×		
Parking	2d	Ws	✓		×	×		×	×	×	×		×	*	×	×	×	×	*	×	×	×	×	*
Building	2e	Ws	✓	✓	×	×		×	×	×	x		×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×		×	×
	2f	Wn	✓		×	×			×	×	×			×	×	×			×	×	×	×		×
	2g	Wn	✓	✓	×	×				×	×				×	×			×	×	×	*		×
Eastern	3a	NEn	×		×	×				×	×				Parkin	g Egress	Capa	icity Exc	eeded	Parking Egress Capacity Exceeded				
New	3b	SEs	×		×	×		×	×	×	×		×	×	Parkin	g Egress	Capa	icity Exc	eeded	Parking	g Egress	Capa	city Exc	eeded
Parking	3c	Nen/SEs	×		×	×		×	×	×	×		×	*	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	*
Building	3d <sup>1</sup>	NEn+SEs	×		×	×			×	×	×			×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×		×
1.3d varies fro	m 3c in	that the East	ern parkin	g buildings	s spanning t	he greenway	would	be linked.	In modelli	ng terms, thi	s is the sam	e as 2a	ı.											
					C::f:	nt Delau			(- 10-)															
						ignificant Delay Improvement (>10s)																		
*	LoS F	Borderli	ne)	x	LoSE&	Significan	nt Imp	act (>10	is)															
×	LoSF	(High Del	ays)	×	LoS F &	Significan	it Imp	act (>5s	)													-		

 Table 6.1: Summary of Network Key Delays and Delay Impacts by Scenario



- 6.14.3 Thus from the above table, the following points are noted:
  - a. In the 'Base' models with the MSF in place, the LoS is poor (LoS F) on the Antigua Street and Selwyn Street approaches to Moorhouse Avenue.
  - b. Stage A Modelling of the proposed HSCP Extension indicates the poor LoS at these two locations prevails but delays do not increase significantly (by more than 5s).
  - c. All HPPB scenarios result in significant additional delays (>5s) at the two key bottlenecks operating at LoS F.
  - d. All HPPB scenarios result in a significant additional delays (>10s) on Riccarton Avenue westbound. These delays become around 1 minute (LoS E) for most HPPB options at around 1200 parking spaces.
  - e. Under all parking building scenarios with access at Antigua Street maintained, poor performance of the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection is forecast. Most Western HPPB locations are forecast to significantly increase these delays. The exceptions are Options 2a, 2c and 2g. Options 2c and 2g assume both north (Tuam Street) and south (St Asaph Street) access is provided and assume no Antigua Street access. Option 2a maintains access at Antigua Street, but use of the access is limited to the HSCP as no internal linkage to the HPPB is assumed.
  - f. Several parking building options result in high delays and / or significant impacts at the Antigua / Tuam Street intersection. The exceptions are Options 2a-c and 2f-g and 3d where the availability of north and south accesses allows some trips to/from the HPPB to bypass this intersection.
  - g. As discussed at section 6.13, under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have *potential* for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
    - a. Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - b. Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
    - c. Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
    - d. Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
    - e. Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
    - f. Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
    - g. Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces
- h. This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.



# 7 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 7.1 The principal conclusions and recommendations arising from the Stage A traffic modelling study are as follows:
  - a. The assumption that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue intersection will not be pursued as part of the MSF access strategy results in high levels of congestion (approaching 2 minutes) being forecast on the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue in the PM peak hour for the number of parking spaces to be constructed (around 550 spaces).
  - b. Sensitivity testing around the complexities of the vehicle / pedestrian / and cyclist interactions on the Antigua Street southbound approach indicates delays could be greater still at around 2.5 minutes.
  - c. Further sensitivity testing around the relative priorities, in terms of green time, to be afforded to Antigua Street and Moorhouse Avenue indicate that delays could be reduced on the Antigua Street approach from around 2.5 minutes to less than 2 minutes. However, this is at the cost of increasing overall intersection delays (that the automated signal optimisation seeks to achieve) by modestly increasing delays on the relatively highly trafficked Moorhouse Avenue corridor which also 'pushes' some traffic from Moorhouse Avenue onto alternative routes within the Central City.
  - d. The incremental delay impacts of assuming additional parking at the MSF (beyond the consented 550 spaces) are relatively modest. However, it is not recommended that any further parking be provided at the MSF in the absence of signalisation of Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue as this will exacerbate the forecast delays at the Antigua Street southbound approach to Moorhouse Avenue.
  - e. Sensitivity testing with the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals in place indicates that up to around 1,000 spaces could be accommodated at the MSF site with a reasonable level of network performance.
  - f. Irrespective of the number of parking spaces to ultimately be accommodated at the MSF site, it is strongly recommended that signalisation of the Stewart Street / Moorhouse Avenue signals be pursued to avoid the risk of severe congestion on Antigua Street (which may block-back and interfere with the wider road network) when the MSF is operational.
  - g. Generally, the modelled network effects of expansion of the existing HSCP by 270 spaces are modest.
  - h. Whilst the network efficiency effects of the proposed HSCP expansion are modest, the increased vehicular movements to/from the building across the Antigua Street cycleway would exacerbate an existing safety issue at this location.
  - i. Provision of an additional egress from the expanded HSCP to St Asaph Street (in addition to the current egress) would only partially mitigate the safety (and cycle amenity) impacts of the expansion. This is because the Antigua Street access would likely remain popular for inbound vehicle movements during the morning peak hour.
  - j. Under the option to provide both access and egress from St Asaph Street, traffic modelling indicates that closure of the existing access/egress on Antigua Street could be accommodated without any significant net local network efficiency impacts.
  - k. The option of, effectively, relocation all vehicle access to the HSCP away from Antigua



Street and on to St Asaph Street would be highly effective in improving safety for cyclists as the St Asaph Street vehicular access would not involve traversing a cycleway (the cycleway at this location is located on the south side of St Asaph Street).

- 7.2 The principal conclusions and recommendations arising from the Stage B analysis of the network effects of the alternative options for the new HPPB are as follows:
  - s. All HPPB scenarios result in significant additional delays (>5s) at the two key bottlenecks operating at LoS F.
  - t. All HPPB scenarios result in significant additional delays (>10s) on Riccarton Avenue westbound. These delays become around 1 minute (LoS E) for most HPPB options at around 1200 parking spaces.
  - u. Under all parking building scenarios with access at Antigua Street maintained, poor performance of the Antigua Street / St Asaph Street intersection is forecast. Most Western HPPB locations are forecast to significantly increase these delays. The exceptions are Options 2a, 2c and 2g. Options 2c and 2g assume north (Tuam Street) and south (St Asaph Street) access is provided and include no Antigua Street access. Option 2a maintains access at Antigua Street, but use of the access is limited to the HSCP as no internal linkage to the HPPB is assumed.
  - v. Several parking building options result in high delays and / or significant impacts at the Antigua / Tuam Street intersection. The exceptions are Options 2a-c and 2f-g and 3d where the availability of north and south accesses allows some trips to/from the HPPB to bypass this intersection.
  - w. As discussed at section 6.13, under a different base scenario where the wider network bottlenecks at Moorhouse Avenue and Riccarton Avenue are resolved (i.e. through the signalisation of the Moorhouse / Stewart Street intersection), the following options have *potential* for reasonable network performance and minimal impact:
    - Option 2a up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2b up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2c up to 1400 parking spaces
    - Option 2f up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 2g up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3a up to 1000 parking spaces
    - Option 3d up to 1400 parking spaces

This potential impact would however require additional scenario testing to confirm the modelled network impacts of the HPPB Options under the altered traffic patterns on the road network resulting from any such network improvement.

y. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Options 2c, 2g and 3d.



REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



# RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL MCORMATION ACT



REFERSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT




























































































REFERSEDUMPERTIE



## RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



REFERSEDUNDERTHEOFICIALINGORMATIONACT This page is intentionally blank for double-sided printing.















 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis} \\ \mbox{Appendix B} - \mbox{Modelled Approach Delays} \end{array}$ 



































HPPB Stage B Ap B - Approach Delays.Docx



 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis} \\ \mbox{Appendix B} - \mbox{Modelled Approach Delays} \end{array}$ 





















RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



## RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL MEDIANTION ACT



## Notes

- Refer to title for the scenario for which flow changes are illustrated •
- MSF 800 and 1000 spaces flow differences are vs. MSF 550 spaces •
- HSCP 1a (+270 spaces) flow difference is vs. Base Model (00a with 550 MSF spaces) •
- HSCP 1b and 1c (access options) flow differences are vs HSCP 1a (current access) •
- HPPB Scenarios (2a through to 3c) flow difference is vs. Base Model (00a with 550 MSF

HPPB Stage B Ap C - Flow Differences.Docx



Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix C – Modelled Flow Differences





Health Precinct Parking Building Network Impact Analysis Appendix C – Modelled Flow Differences














HPPB Stage B Ap C - Flow Differences.Docx















































## RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



## Notes

- Refer to title for the scenario for which delay changes are illustrated •
- MSF 800 and 1000 spaces delay differences are vs. MSF 550 spaces •
- HSCP 1a (+270 spaces) delay difference is vs. Base Model (00a with 550 MSF spaces) •
- HSCP 1b and 1c (access options) delay differences are vs HSCP 1a (current access)) •
- , currer . odel (00a v MARTINE OFFICIALING ALLEASEDUMDER HPPB Scenarios (2a through to 3c) delay difference is vs. Base Model (00a with 550 MSF

































































From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Tim Lester Thursday, 12 September 2019 10:42 a.m. Sue Imrie Car Parking Technical Group- next meeting Health Precinct Parking Technical Group - Health Precinct Parking Study - Network Impacts Analysis

R

Hi Sue

Are we able to try and line up another meeting please off the back of Council's email (attached)?

Same attendees as the last one (for ease of reference the last meeting was 9 July at 10:30am).

Thanksl

Tim Lester Corporate Solicitor Canterbury District Health Board

T: 03 364 4128 (Internal ext: 62128) | M: 90 Box 1600 | Christchurch | www.cdhb.govt.nz.

Ch

Kathleen Smitheram	
From:	9(4)(a) Dccc.govt.nz>
Sent:	Thursday, 12 September 2019 9:40 a.m.
То:	Susan Fitzmaurice; Rachel Cadle; Tim Lester, <sup>9(2)(0)</sup> @otago.ac.nz'; <sup>2(2)(0)</sup> Mary Gordon (Executive Director of Nursing)
Subject:	Health Precinct Parking Technical Group - Health Precinct Parking Study - Network

Dear Parking Technical Group members – I'm pleased to say we have now received QTP's (the traffic consultancy) largely finalised report for this study (ie both Stages A and B of the work). A link to that is at the end of this note (*it's a very large file size*).

As we requested in their brief, the report explores how a number of alternative locations, sizes and combinations of new parking buildings might work in overall traffic network effect terms. As this has resulted in a fairly complex plece of work, the consultants have helpfully summarised (extract in red below), what they see as the highlights of the report – and the options they believe offer the best network outcomes (le Options 2c, 2g and 3d in the main report).

I have spoken with Tim, who will seek a suitable time for us to meet as a group in the next few weeks, when we can discuss these findings and how we might move forward.

## QTP's highlights of the full report are as follows:

Table 6.1 on Page 36 provides a single page summary of the modelled network delays and impacts for each scenario. If you first focus just on the pink shading, this indicates where 'a significant' impact occurs for each option. Given the findings of Stage A of this study in relation to the safety and efficiency benefits of closing the Antigua Street access (the staff parking building) and assuming that access at St Asaph Street is modified to in and out access, the recommended options for taking forward are Option's 2c, 2g and 3d.

## Report available here:

(2)(6)(0)

So, plenty to discuss - and I look forward to discussing the report's findings with you in the coming weeks.



www.ccc.govt.nz (Normal office hours: Mondays to Thursdays)

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete. REFERSEDUMPERTITE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT Christchurch City Council http://www.ccc.govt.nz

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL MEDORMATION ACT